

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 Fisher



Tigerfish[®]
Transcribing·Editing

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

www.tigerfish.com

**Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135
Fisher Loop**

[Abrupt beginning of recorded material]

Craig Middleton: -- the centuries of Presidio history to the park visitors. [Those was a really] [audio gap] long exercise. Tonight is an opportunity for us [audio gap] formal setting, and I hope we can kind of keep this informal and conversational and productive, and to share with you some of the work that we have been doing and has come out of discussions that we've been having with our sister agencies, those being the National Park Service. And I know we have people here from the National Park Service who've been working with us. Thanks for being here.

The State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation in Washington, these conversations have been going on for some months. More recently in recent weeks, we've been bringing into these conversations the other consulting parties, many of which are represented here tonight, as well. So now we want to bring you, the broader public, into these conversations.

Michael and Chandler will get into the details of tonight's exercise in just a minute. But in essence, the discussion we've been having is about what is the baseline? From an historic preservation perspective, what is the baseline that we should use to calibrate our efforts to minimize and mitigate for adverse effects to the National Historic Landmark District?

The exercise that we're going through is not intended to show you what an ultimate project or set of projects will look like. It's intended to show you what a project or a set of projects that had absolutely no adverse effect was a homerun from an historic preservation perspective, what that would look like.

We feel that it's really important to kind of establish that baseline in an iterative set of conversations, so that we can understand what that looks like, and can then calibrate our efforts to understand what a project that is going to be placed, or a set of projects that will be placed in an Historic Landmark District would look like, or could look like.

I want to point out that, as with all things related to the Presidio, there are numerous perspectives from which we view any proposal or project. Historic preservation is a very important one of those perspectives, but it's not the only one. Others involve the importance of program.

For example, the Child Development Center that is located in the vicinity of the bowling alley, up the hill from the bowling alley, is a very important program that we want to ensure stays in the Presidio. We're not going to talk about that tonight, but that's another perspective that we would bring to making a decision about any of these projects.

So tonight's really about historic preservation, the National Historic Landmark District, what is possible within the constraints of a National Historic Landmark District. Let me also say a word about controversy and heated debate.

As long as I've been associated with the Presidio -- and I was trying to figure it out today; it's been well over a decade -- I have really been heartened by the tremendous affection that people have in San Francisco and everywhere in the country for this magnificent place. There's an abiding appreciation for the qualities that make the Presidio and its centerpiece, the Main Post, such a magnificent resource for the people of this community and for the nation.

The love for this place is really one of its greatest assets. It underlies my sense of confidence and optimism that the Presidio will be a public place for many, many generations to come. So passion is important. Passion has clearly made our conversations about the Presidio and its future much more heated, much more exciting. But also the passion, I think, is essential to continue to support the Presidio, and to ensure that there's public support for the place for the generations to come.

Tonight we're here in the middle of a deliberative process. We're not here to make decisions; we're here to explore, to talk, to understand, to hear, to listen, trying to determine the best way to move forward on the Main Post. It's an important set of decisions that we have to make in the next several months.

And our responsibility as stewards to the Presidio is to really make good, well-informed decisions, to give careful consideration to a host of issues, to view opportunities and challenges through the many lenses, and from as many perspectives as possible, so that we make a good set of decisions in the final analysis for the Presidio.

As I've said before, our objective is for this to be an informal evening, for us to hear from you. We're going to talk a little bit first to try to explain this exercise that we've been going through. But then we want to hear from you. And then there is always an opportunity for more formal comment.

You can write a comment if you want to send us a letter or an email, or you can come to the public meeting that we'll be having on December 9th at 6:30 in the Palace of Fine Arts Auditorium. That will be more of our kind of typical public meeting where you can stand up and make a two or three minute comment. But this is really much more of an informal session.

Thank you for coming. I really appreciate your being here. I'm going to turn the mic over to Michael Boland, our Director of Park Projects and Programs, and then he's going to take it from there.

Michael Boland: All right. Thank you, and thank you again for coming tonight. I just wanted to say a few words to introduce the evening before I turn the mic over to Chandler, who's going to walk us through the materials that we've handed everyone in detail. I just want to make sure that

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 5
everyone who has walked in has gathered up two things at the front desk.

The first, a small piece -- a couple of pages stapled together which are a synopsis of the process that we've been in the midst of, which I'll talk about in a general way in a few minutes; and then the sort of main event, if you will, which is this larger 11 by 17 set of materials called "The Update on New Construction in the Historic Main Post." We're going to focus quite a bit of time on this packet of materials, so I want to make sure that everybody has a copy of it, so you can follow along in person as we move through it.

So just a little bit about our agenda tonight. Craig talked a bit about it, and we've got it up here on the wall. We would like to begin briefly by talking about where we are in the compliance process. I'll do that pretty quickly. And as I say, I've handed out a much more detailed synopsis of the entire planning process to date, and what we see as the next steps. And we'll be happy to answer questions about that process after we get through the first part of our presentation.

Next we'd like to turn our attention to a brief discussion of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, how they're used in the management, the rehabilitation particularly of a historic site like the Presidio Historic Landmark District. Then we'd like to talk a bit about how you think about rehabilitating a historic site, and what conforming new construction, what infill construction, what additions to historic buildings might look like.

We're going to focus our attention tonight on really the three infill construction projects that are included in the Main Post SEIS: the proposed art museum, the proposed Presidio Lodge, and the proposed addition to the Presidio Theater. So those three projects are really what we're going to focus on tonight. Then we'd like to open the mic, answer anybody's questions, try to engage in a conversation about the ideas that we've put on the table and get your feedback on them. And then last, at the very end of the evening, we'll talk a little bit about next steps, so people have a sense of what's on the horizon.

In terms of these materials, I thought it might be helpful just to talk for a minute about how they were developed. As Craig mentioned, this has been a collaborative process. The first iteration of these materials were developed in a two and a half day charette between members of the Park Service and the Trust. It included a lot of planning and design staff architects and planners. It also included a number of historic preservation specialists. It included both local staff, and also particularly Park Service staff from around the country.

We came together for two and a half days, and we really spent a lot of time focusing in on the Secretary's Standards, and trying to apply them to the specific undertakings that are included in the SEIS, and develop the first draft of the materials that you see. We then spent about a month reviewing those materials with the State Historic

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 7
Preservation Officer, and also some staff with the Advisory Council
on Historic Preservation.

So the materials you have in front of you have had the benefit of development by all of us, and have not been changed since that initial pass at developing these materials. Since that time, however, as Craig mentioned, we've had a number of sessions where we've shared these materials with other members of our consultation process, other consulting parties, and had the benefit of their feedback.

Our goal is to hear what people have to say about the materials, to incorporate those comments, and to produce an updated version of this after this process. And when that's done, we'll post that on our Web site.

As I mentioned, the materials really focus only on those three new construction projects, and don't focus on some of the other things that are proposed in the Main Post SEIS, things like the rehabilitation of the Montgomery Street Barracks, or the transformation of the Officers' Club into a Heritage Center, or the treatment of the El Presidio.

It doesn't really delve into those. It really focuses on infill construction specifically, and really, as Craig mentioned, looks at these various proposed projects, and the various sites that we've identified in the SEIS, and tries to establish a baseline for what a

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 8
conforming infill construction project at each of those locations
might look like.

It's an imperfect process. As Craig mentioned, it doesn't encompass the entire universe of ways that one could build conforming architecture, but begins to suggest some ways that we want to think about how these projects might be shaped as we move forward on these various sites. I think it's also important to point out that these don't constitute new proposals. They're ways that we would shape the existing ideas, these existing proposals, to bring them into better conformance with the Secretary's Standards.

A number of folks have asked, "How does this fit into the bigger process?" and "How is it that we find ourselves talking about this at this particular moment?" So I created this simple diagram that looks at the two parallel processes that we're undertaking.

Many of you know that compliance action encompasses really two parallel compliance processes, one focusing on the compliance with the National Historic Policy Act, NEPA, which looks at environmental effects; and the National Historic Preservation Act, which looks at historic preservation. These are two processes that we've been engaged in. They're on a parallel track.

And here we are, right here at this point in both of these processes. We initiated both of these processes in October of 2007. For example, the NEPA process began with a scoping period, based on the feedback we received from the public, developed and analyzed a

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 9
series of alternatives that were released in the draft EIS that came out in June.

And since that time, we've been in the middle of a public comment period where folks have been formulating their responses to the alternatives that we've put on the table. So we thought that it would be useful to present these ideas at this time, before the close of the public comment period, so that as you're deliberating and putting together your comments on the draft alternatives, that you would have the benefit of the information that we've put together.

Similarly, in terms of historic preservation compliance, we're at a period of time between the release of the draft Finding of Effect and the finalization of the Finding of Effect where we've been in this iterative process with our consulting partners, looking at and trying to develop a concise articulation of the effects of the proposals. And so again, we felt that this particular undertaking was particularly timely in terms of that process, as well.

That's just a little bit to give you a sense of how we see this fitting into the larger process. And we can talk a little bit more about this at the end of the meeting when we talk about next steps.

At this point what I'd like to do is turn the mic over to Chandler McCoy. He's the Associate Director of Planning and Design for the Presidio Trust. He's going to walk us through the meat of the evening. And as I say, at the end of his presentation, we'd like to open the mic up and answer any questions that anyone might have

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 10
about the materials that we've put on the table, or about next steps
in our process. Thank you.

Chandler McCoy: Good evening. Craig said that we were going to talk for a little while about these issues related to compatible new construction. But I'm afraid I'm actually going to be talking for quite a long while about this. I'll probably be talking for about a half an hour straight, possibly longer.

If you look at the materials that we've passed out there, it's a lot of dense writing and isn't necessarily easy to understand. So I'm going to go through it in a certain amount of detail, so that you get the gist of what we've done here. Specifically I'm going to be talking about this matrix, which is a methodology that we've established for looking at new construction on the Main Post.

I apologize in advance if I appear longwinded, but it's not going to go on forever, and then there's this cooking show demonstration here that might break up the monotony of my tedious droning.

[Laughter]

First of all, we sat down with our partners in the National Park Service and tried to come up with sort of a common language that we could use to describe how we would achieve a compatible or conforming building on the Main Post, and we started with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. These are 10 standards for rehabilitation that the National Park Service's Secretary of Interior

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 11
has written in this form of shared language that we all understand
that guides us in this endeavor.

The endeavor is known as rehabilitation. We're not doing reconstruction here at the Presidio. We're not doing renovation or restoration. It's called rehabilitation. We're finding new uses for old buildings, compatible new uses, and this is all in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior and what is permitted.

Craig [Kenkal], who was part of our group, who's sitting at the back, is with the GGNRA. He described the Secretary's Standards as being something that if you gave a copy to 10 different architects, you'd get 10 different interpretations about what they meant. These aren't rigid rules; they're open to interpretation. And so what we sat down with the Park Service and did was we attempted to take the standards and apply them to this particular project.

We also took this Archaeological Sensitivity Map, which I think you have in your packet, because this is the sort of framework that we have to work in. Where we expect there to be important archaeology underground, this forms a sort of framework for us.

And then I know you can't read this slide: "The Character-Defining Features of the Main Post." This is in your packet. To some extent it's self-evident, but maybe not. I mean, the Presidio has its own set of visual and architectural characteristics, and these are things like

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 12
the palette, the classic sort of red roof, and Presidio white walls, the red brick Montgomery Street Barracks, the layout of open spaces and buildings, the preponderance of long, skinny buildings here.

So there's a set of things that we call character-defining features that make the Main Post what it is. And we identified this as a group in this charette that Michael talked about. And we took these character-defining features, and we attempted to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to them. There are 10 Secretary of the Interior's Standards. We felt that five of them were apropos.

That is, the property should be used for its historic purpose, or placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the character-defining features. Number two, the historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved. And number three, each property should be recognized as a physical record of its time, and we should avoid creating a false sense of history.

Number eight -- this one is appropriate, of course, because it says significant archaeological resources should be protected. And number nine, new additions and alterations should not destroy historic materials. And the new work should be differentiated from the old, but it should be compatible. And that's one of the most difficult things to agree on, how you create something that's different so that it isn't mistaken for being historic, but it's also compatible.

So those were the things that we attempted to analyze. And this matrix, which you all have in your packet, goes like this. In the leftmost column are the Secretary's Standards, the five standards that apply here. And in the second column, these are the character-defining features that we have identified. And what we've tried to do is look at the character-defining feature through the lens of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

What we were trying to do is create a methodology, or a consistent strategy, and use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards over here as criteria that we can apply. So we can look at that CAMP proposal, we can look at the lodge proposal, and we can look at the theater, apply these criteria, and figure out if those buildings that are proposed conform to the Secretary's Standards. And if they don't, what would it take to achieve conformance? So that was our goal in all of this.

Got it? I mean, it's kind of complicated. But anyway, the goal was to try to use a set of standards that are preexisting standards, so that we could all speak the same language about these different issues about the size, and scale, and bulk, and massing, and color of a building, so that it isn't subjective, so that it's anchored in some sort of an objective method.

Just to run through some of these things to make my points, Secretary's Standard one is about minimizing change to the materials, features, and spatial relationships. How can we do that here? Well, we could avoid the removal of historic structures.

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 14
Secretary's Standard number two talks about maintaining the historic character and avoiding the removal of feature spaces and spatial relationships.

When you look at the Main Post, there's a strong orthogonal layout -- that means a geometric layout. The buildings are at right angles to each other. You could superimpose a grid over this Main Post, and you'd see that everything is at right angles. It's a very orderly site. That's one of its character-defining features. And all the buildings are arranged in these long rows that run north-south with the openness to the bay. That was for strategic reasons, and that's one of the character-defining features. So if we maintain those two things, we feel that this is one way of fulfilling this standard.

The next standard talks about retaining the historic character, and it's the same standard. The historic roadways at the Main Post are important. They're actually individually listed on the National Register -- Sheraton, Lincoln, Montgomery -- these are actually listed as contributing features here, as well as these buildings. And then these landscapes, the Main Parade, the Old Parade, and the El Presidio are extremely important open spaces. We can't talk about buildings without talking about those open spaces that they surround and that they define.

The next example of is the same standard, number two. We talked about the open space that looks towards the bay. There was also an open space at this end of the Main Parade. The parade ground ended at Sheraton, and I'll talk more about this later. You can see this

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 15
strong north-south layout of the buildings. And this other concept, this seriality or the repetition of forms, is one of the most distinctive things about the Main Post.

There are a series of identical buildings that are lined up in a row. It happens with the Montgomery Street Barracks; it happens with Funston; it happens with 38 and 39; it happens with Infantry Terrace -- they're not in a row, but this concept of seriality was an idea that we hadn't quite articulated yet, and is one of the main things that characterizes this place. Yeah, that's all I need to say about that.

In order to avoid creating a false sense of history, we can create new construction that's differentiated from the old that's compatible. This is an example of how we've added new buildings in the past. This is the Letterman complex. The thing we tried to achieve with Letterman is to somehow have the buildings refer to some of the character-defining features of the former Letterman complex, these long wards, and the use of materials and a color palette that's compatible.

This is the Transit Center. This is an example of how new construction is made to be compatible with its historic setting through the use of clapboard siding and the red roof, and that sort of thing.

This is the addition that we added between '86 and '87. This is an example of how you can add an addition between two historic

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 16
buildings. This is it here. We created a new lobby, an elevator entry to connect the two buildings. And it's very similar in appearance to the two 1880s barracks that bracket it, but it is different; it's clearly from our time. You can see that by the size of the glass and so forth. But it's also compatible.

The Fire Station is another example of how you can add an addition to an historic building that's compatible. When we designed this building, we picked up on the roofline, and the dormer windows, and the color of the stucco to create a building that fit in. So those are some examples of compatibility.

The next thing to talk about is the archaeology. If you look at this map -- I'm sure it's hard to see this slide. This is F1. This is probably the most important archaeology at the Presidio. This is the El Presidio site. And realize this is from 1993. This is the Park Service's predicted archaeology map. We've done a lot of archaeology since 1993. But be that as it may, this is what was listed on the National Register.

These are predicted sites. And as we learn more about this place, we hone our understanding of these sites. This is an 18th century Spanish colonial site. These other sites, like this one here that's underneath the Main Parade, is a 19th century military site. The one very important one down at Crissy Field is P1. That's a prehistoric site. So anyway, this is our basis.

New additions in construction will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size. If you look at this aerial, you see there are a lot of consistent-looking buildings, but they're red buildings, they're white buildings; there are these long, skinny buildings; there are some very large buildings. So there's a variety of scale. There's also areas where the scale of buildings is very consistent.

We've got a very consistent color palette at the Main Post. They're red buildings or they're white buildings, and there's not much in between. There are bricks, there's board-formed concrete, and there's wood, and there's stucco. So that's our material palette.

Now in terms of this particular slide, we discussed -- and we've been talking about this for quite a while -- building heights, and how we can make sure that new additions or new buildings are of a compatible height within the district.

This building 100 here at its ridgeline is about 48 feet from the ground. The movie theater here, it's about 30 feet from the eave line to the ground. And if you look at the existing bowling alley to the very top of its peaked roof, that's about 30 feet as well. So there's sort of a range between 45 and 30 feet that are found in buildings around the areas that we're discussing. I'll talk more about that later.

The compatible features. There are a lot of elements like porches and texture of walls and things like that that are traditional here, that are character-defining. There are flat roofs, pitched gable roofs, hipped roofs. That's about it. And the movie theater has sort of a mansard roof. But it's a fairly limited vocabulary of roof types here.

Then massing -- this is a sketch of the site where we're proposing a lodge, and this is showing how massing could be developed that would be compatible with this seriality that I mentioned.

This is all sort of a preamble. Now I'm going to start going through the matrix and explaining how we came up with this methodology. This is the part where it becomes like a cooking show.

The Secretary's Standards. This is the cooking show part.

[Unintelligible] Can you see it now? You might have to turn off that one, too. Well anyway, this is the Main Post as it exists today. And when we started our analysis, we took a look at the proposal that we received for CAMP, which goes something like this. Okay, yeah, that's pretty visible, I think. Right? So we applied these criteria -- I'm turning to page two now, and I'm jumping over to the far right column. It's too dark for you to follow along, but that's what I'm doing.

We applied our criteria to this proposal, and the results that we got were very similar to what we say in our Finding of Effect that we've recently released. So let me just explain how this works. I'll run through some of these. For the Secretary's Standards number one, avoid removal of historic structures. Well, no, it doesn't do that, because it removes Building 97 here.

For criterion number two, maintaining an orthogonal orientation, I spoke about this grid. You see that this building has this angled piece, so it gets a no. It doesn't maintain that orthogonal grid. It

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 19
does have a north-south orientation. It avoids disrupting historic street corridors.

Then the question is, "Does it maintain historic open spaces?" And in this case, we say no, because this site here, which we're calling the bowling alley site, although it was never part of the Main Parade, it was open for long periods of time, or it had low-density construction. It has a bowling alley on it now. So we felt that this building did not maintain that same sense of low-density construction at the size.

This is, as you know, 100,000 square foot building that was proposed for this site. Significant views are blocked by this building if you're standing here looking at Building 100, which is this one. Or if you're standing at the Officers' Club, this building does block views to the Montgomery Street Barracks. And then the question is, "Is it a compatible scale?" And we said no, because we figured this way:

There were small buildings on the site, but when the bowling alley was constructed in 1989, it went through the Section 106 process, and it was determined to have no adverse effect on the NHL. We felt like a building of that size would be no adverse effect. But there's obviously a difference between that building which is about 20, and this building which has about I think 55 or 60 thousand square feet above [grade].

So we said, "No, it's essentially too big for the site." And then the seriality -- well, no, it doesn't really have that. It does not create a false sense of history, because it's clearly differentiated from the historic setting, but we felt like it wasn't compatible because of its size.

And then the question of the archaeology. I showed you the archaeology map you're looking at, which basically showed that the F1 zone, which was El Presidio, is here, and the Main Parade zone comes to about here. So this building actually extends into what we say is a predicted archaeology zone. So we have to say no in terms of archaeology.

Then the criterion number nine: Is it of compatible scale of proportion? And we said actually no, or the group decided, "No, it exceeds the scale and proportions of the buildings within the immediate context." We were looking specifically at the movie theater and Building 100.

I hope you're getting an idea of how we work. We took these criteria and we applied them. And as I said, the Secretary of Interior's Standards are not sort of black and white, but we had to do some interpretation, and this matrix is a result of those discussions, and compromises, and whatever arguments that we had. We arrived at these sort of mutual understandings about how to apply the Secretary's Standards.

We talked about materials, as well. We said essentially, "No, it doesn't have compatible materials." The proposal was a building of board-formed concrete, which is a material that's used here at the Main Post. But we felt like the scale was so big that it didn't quite meet our sense of compatibility, and that the building height was compatible. We had originally established this 45-foot height limit because it's similar to the buildings along Montgomery Street, so it doesn't exceed those. It's not taller than any building on the Main Post, and it's of a height that's consistent with its neighbors. So yes, it is of compatible height.

Does it have compatible features? We were thinking about some of those historic things like porches, or individual windows, or shade and shadow, or the articulation of the walls, and we felt that it didn't have those features. They could be added, but currently it doesn't.

The roof type -- now, we can have flat roofs on the Main Post -- Building 80, the Bay School Building. Thirty-five has a flat roof there. The building that we're in, Building 34, Trust Headquarters, has a flat roof. But we felt like this building is so big that it makes it a little bit more difficult just because of its size. And there was a proposal to put a green roof on it. And there again, this group was a little hesitant to say that that would be appropriate.

And then in terms of massing, we felt that, as I mentioned before, it doesn't have enough modulation or articulation, as there are too many long, unbroken walls. So that was our take, and that's sort of where we started. So then we said, "What can we do, then? How

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 22
could you put a building on this site that would conform? And how could you do it and end up with a building that looked better than the current bowling alley?"

So we decided that if we put a building such as this on this site, we could get there. For example, we could leave Building 97, and therefore we wouldn't demolish a historic building. We'd demolish the bowling alley. It's not historic. And it has an orthogonal relationship; it's got a north-south axis.

And then in terms of maintaining open spaces, we talked a bit about -- this is kind of a difficult site to immediately grasp. As I said, it isn't part of the original Main Parade, but it traditionally had very low-density construction on it. So we thought if we put a building on this site where the bowling alley currently is, and we maintain the open space in front of Building 100, that we will have succeeded in creating something that's conforming at least in terms of those two criteria.

The next thing we looked at is views. A building of this size will actually go a long way to maintaining those views, because we'll still have views to Building 100, and it doesn't block views of the Montgomery Street Barracks.

Now one of the things we talked about this site is the maintaining of the open space. And we determined that although 50 feet or 45 feet was compatible, it would be better if this building was no taller than 30 feet, because 30 feet is the measurement -- if you look at the

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 23
theater and measure the height of the eaves, it's 30 measured at the middle point of the building.

So we decided that a 30-foot height would be better, and that about 20,000 square foot of footprint would basically be just like what the bowling alley is covering. That doesn't say it couldn't have two stories or something like that, but it couldn't be more than 30 feet tall. And the footprint -- that is the part of the building that touches the ground -- couldn't be more than 20,000 square feet.

Now this building -- we talked about new construction being differentiated from the old, and not creating a false sense of history. And we said yes, a building like this would do that, because it doesn't create a strong southern edge to the Main Parade. That was one of the criticisms that we've heard about the proposed CAMP building. Because it comes so close to the edge of the Main Parade, it creates a very dominant presence. A building such as this does not do that. That was the consensus of our group.

And of course, it avoids the predicted archaeology because it sits back on the site that's already been disturbed by the bowling alley. And it could be a compatible scaled building. We had a discussion about color, and one of the things that we put on the table is that if the building were of a dark color, it would recede into the background. For example, if you were standing at the northern end of the Main Parade and the building were not white, or off-white the way it is now, it were a darker color, it might sort of fade into the

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 24
vegetation. So that was an idea that was put on the table during this session.

Let me see. I talked about the building height, compatible features. Well, this is just a blob of Styrofoam, but you could add features, you could modulate it. So we said, "Yes, a compatible building could fit in this shape." And we felt like because of its small size, the roof type would be more flexible; we could have a flat roof, or we could have a pitched roof.

This was one of the concepts that we developed through our talk, was that the size of the building -- it gets smaller on this site within this sort of sacred precinct. The smaller it is, the more flexibility it has. The bigger it is, the more of an impact it is, so the more careful you have to be.

There's a view. As I say, it doesn't look like anything here. It lacks scale, of course. It isn't a real building. But we could apply those elements to it. And then finally, the massing would need to be articulated.

So then we looked at what would happen if we put a building on the south of Moraga site. And this is a proposal that is in our EIS. As you know, it's alternative 2A. And we looked at a couple of things. One page three -- we're calling this Concept A -- we looked at putting a building of 140,000 square feet over here. And it has like some wings. And don't take this form too literally. The goal here was just to look at what does 140,000 square feet look like.

We actually came to the conclusion that, first of all, the buildings that would be removed up here are not historic, so there would be no impact on the historic buildings. It maintains the orthogonal grid. It has a north-south orientation. It doesn't impact roadways, etcetera. It doesn't interrupt views. And we decided that if it's depressed on the side -- we actually developed a 45-foot height limit here, or pushed against the sloping side of Infantry Terrace -- the building could be sort of pushed out of view.

And our group decided that this could be a conforming building. And even though it's an extremely long building, you don't perceive the length of it that much, certainly from this district here. We had this robust discussion about sort of what's sacred and what's profane, or where's the area where we have to exercise the most care, and we decided between Moraga and Lincoln, and between Taylor and Funston. That's sort of the heart of the historic area.

And south in this area here, it's far enough away from the El Presidio and the Main Parade and the Old Parade that there's more latitude on this site. There's more flexibility up here because it's outside of the main quad, so to speak. And because these Infantry Terrace houses are so much elevated above, they would sort of look across the top of it; it would not block their views. So that was the consensus, that such a thing was possible on this site.

In terms of scale, of course it avoids the archaeology, and it could be developed. It could be possible to have 140,000 square feet on

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 26
this site, but there would have to be strategies developed to push it down, or bury it, or break it up or something like that. Nobody is accepting this block of foam as the final answer, but just as an envelope that you could put a building within. And of course we'd want to see compatible materials, and we'd want to design the building to recede from view, that this location, as I said before, allows greater flexibility. I think that's all I need to say about this one.

Now in contrast to this, the building that was located in the middle of the site, which is very similar to the one that we show in our EIS, which is called Alternative 2A, was hotly debated. And it turned out that nobody liked this one at all, because the building is really very prominent here where it's located on the main axis of the Parade. And it seems to be looming over and create sort of a central dominating building, and that was considered to be extremely undesirable.

Even though the buildings are quite similar -- I mean, we're using the same foam -- there appeared to be a huge difference between here and here. So we found out that one of the desirable characteristics about this site is to leave this space relatively undeveloped and have a lot of open space in here, because everybody felt like just the simple act of sliding the building about 50 feet over to give it this strong prominent position on the Main Post was not a good idea.

So that's what we say here, that we wouldn't want to do that. And many of the other characteristics are the same as the scheme I just mentioned. So compatible scale and position, we say, "No, it's not compatible," but just because of its position in the center of the site. So that was pretty much the idea that came across in this one. There's a lot of difficulty with this scheme here.

Then there was another scheme that we looked at, but it wasn't a scheme that we examined in our EIS. But we thought, "Well, what if you looked at both of the sites together? What if we took the bowling alley site and the south of Moraga site, and instead of one huge building, what if there was like a cluster?" We called this the village scheme, where you have [unintelligible]. It doesn't really matter how it's laid out, but we felt that it was possible to take another approach that we could get 100,000 square feet, but broken up into small buildings on both sites.

And if those building blocks were compatibly scaled, and if we maintained the 30-foot height limit here, and we maintained a 45-foot height limit over here, we could actually assemble 100,000 square feet, and it's still centrally located but it doesn't loom over the site in the way that previous building did. So we considered that this would be a concept that would result in a conforming building.

Another thing that this has that was this concept of seriality or repetition of forms -- you could see that as a little cluster of identical buildings, or similar buildings. And in fact, that achieves a

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 28
lot of compatibility in terms of scale. So that was the interesting thing about this particular scheme.

Now we also looked at the lodge in our reflections with the group. So as you know, in our EIS we have a lodge that's more or less like this on the site where Building 34 currently stands. And we analyze the lodge using our methodology. Let me get a drink of water. I told you I'd be talking for a long time.

Anthony: [Unintelligible].

Chandler McCoy: That's a good point. Anthony was talking about the museum scheme that I showed you. This scheme here, this big bar, is 140,000 square feet, and this building is 100. And the thing is -- and I think you all know this, but the proposal that is called CAMP is including Building 101 for the educational and staff offices and so forth. So between this building and Building 101, it's a total of 140,000 square feet.

We wanted to see if you took that 140,000 and put it all in one building, what would you get? And in fact, our alternative 2A in the EIS looks at 140,000 square feet on this site. But this little village scheme here is 100. It could be 140, and we'd end up with a few more blocks up here. But there is a difference there. So we're just trying to look at a range of different considerations.

Where was I? We're going to apply the same methodology to the lodge, and I'll run through some of the things that we found out

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 29
when we did that. The lodge that we currently have in our proposed action consists of these four individual volumes on the site that was formally occupied by a small collection of buildings in the 19th and early 20th century.

What we've done is essentially looked at the proposal, very similar to what we received, but we tweaked it a little bit to make it a conforming proposal. I'll explain how we did that. It avoids removal of historic structures; it's orthogonal to the Main Post orientation and the grid.

Then there's this issue of maintaining historic open spaces. In fact, we said it does maintain historic open spaces. That may sound curious because we're actually putting a building on an open space, but of course the issue here is that we're talking about historic open spaces. And historically there was the Old Parade and the New Parade, and they were clearly separated by buildings in this area.

We have always felt that it's possible to put buildings back in this area, and it would help reinforce the reading of these two separate parade grounds. And this has been missing since the army tore them down, and now it all just sort of reads about 1950 or so. The army tore down this row, and they build Building 34 in 1969.

Anyway, it gets a yes in terms of maintaining open space. But there's some caveats on that, which I'll get to in a minute. In concept, the group felt that putting buildings here was okay. But in terms of things like restricting views, we obviously get dinged

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 30
because these buildings, at three stories in height, which are actually connected -- I don't show that in the model, but the idea is that this is a hotel complex, and there are connectors between all of the four blocks. So it felt that this idea of transparency was important and needed to be reinforced. That would be a very important thing to apply to the scheme that we have to make it conforming.

Here's another one. The compatible scale issue is debated quite a bit, and we decided that compatible scale is possible to achieve, as long as the buildings don't exceed the height of the 86 and 87, which is the 1880s barracks that I talked about earlier. This building is about 40 feet at its ridge. And we felt if we could hold something like that, or something between 35 and 40 feet, we could achieve this.

Another thing that we decided is that -- and I don't know if you can see this, but it's a 65-foot wide building, but we've made an attempt to modulate its width. Maybe you can see that. So that in fact it looked -- can you see what I'm talking about? There's this part of the building that has a pitched roof, and a part that has a flat roof.

We thought that was a way to modulate the scale, and that we could cut in the corners at the north and south ends so that in fact we can somehow carry the width of Buildings 86 and 87 through here, and somehow break down this scale, too, because we don't want the building that faces Graham Street to have the same identical facade on the [Anza] Street side. We also want to indicate that this is the

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 31
primary facade and so forth. So we thought that it was possible to achieve in a 65-foot width building, through modulating [in] architectural detail something that would be appropriate.

In terms of color materials, we feel like that's easy to achieve. The proposal we're looking at is white walls and wood siding and so forth, and we could apply all of those [palliative] materials to this scheme and achieve compatibility. In terms of compatible features, the proposal has a two-story porch on the front with echoes the porches that you see around the Presidio. So we felt that was fairly important. This north-south hipped roof is also a very important feature. In general, we felt like with not too much change to the scheme that we've got, we can achieve compatibility.

Now the final addition that we looked at was this piece here, which is an addition to the Presidio movie theater, which is Building 99. And we thought that it was important to not impact the existing building by changing dramatically the interior volume; but if we could avoid that, that it would be possible to add this addition to the side, as long as it was separated and pulled away a little bit.

The addition is orthogonal and maintains the north-south orientation on all of that stuff. And it's far enough away from the Main Parade that you don't see much of it; it doesn't have an impact on any of the three main open spaces at the Main Post. So people were fairly sanguine about the possibility of an addition there, because we know that it can be done in a way that will make it an appropriate complement to the historic building.

There was an issue that you might note, that there's this archaeological site called F16 that was identified in 1993. And this addition would be on site F16. However, we feel through the research that we've done in the intervening years that there isn't really very much integrity left to F16, because the site has been very drastically cut over the years. They leveled the site. They did quite a bit of cutting and filling here. We don't think this is going to be a problem in terms of archaeology. As I said, we felt like a compatible and appropriate building could be developed for this site.

And then the final page of this -- I'm almost going to stop talking now -- is a look at the commissary site, and we don't have that in our model. But the commissary site, as you know, is looked at in our EIS. And our PTMP looked at the commissary site as a possible place for a museum. So in this table here, the proposition we looked at was, "What would it be like if we tore down the commissary, which is currently occupied by the sports [basement], and build a new building of the same size on that same site?"

We felt that even though the character-defining features of Crissy Field are quite different from the Main Post, and we didn't go through that exercise of identifying them, that it would be possible to develop a new building on that site that would be compatible with Crissy Field and its own particular unique set of architectural characteristics, and the scale, and the colors, and so forth.

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 33
And in terms of archaeology, we would be able to avoid P1, which is the archaeology site I was stumbling over a little bit earlier. There again, the group felt that this was not a great concern; that it would be possible to achieve this.

Okay. So that's the end of my presentation. I'll put all these away, and we'll get down to questions and answers now. I know it's sort of hard to see this. You can come up at the end if you want to and play with the blocks and get into it, if you're interested. But I'm going to turn the microphone now over to somebody else.

Michael Boland: All right. Thank you, Chandler.

[Applause]

Chandler McCoy: Thanks.

Michael Boland: I'd like to ask actually a couple of my colleagues to come up and join me. We're going to sit down front here. And we have a mic. Jody, if you'd identify yourself. Jody has a mic so everyone can hear if anyone has questions. And if you'd identify yourself when you ask a question that'd be really great. We're recording the meeting, as we always do, and we just want to make sure we get your name before we get your comment. All right? Thank you. Okay.

Who wants to go first? Questions? Thoughts? I'm sorry. Before we get into questions, I'm wondering if I might ask my colleagues to

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 34
just identify themselves, so you know who we are. You already
know who I am, so [unintelligible].

Brian [Rama]: I'm Brian Rama. I'm with [unintelligible].

[Unintelligible]

Karen Cook: Can't hear it. Can you hear me now? Okay.

Male Voice: All right.

Karen Cook: I'm Karen Cook. I'm General Counsel. You know Chandler. He's
been talking all night.

Chandler McCoy: Chandler McCoy, cooking show host. [Laughter]

Tia Lombardi: Tia Lombardi. I'm the Director of Public Affairs.

Andrea Anderson: Andrea Anderson. I'm the Environmental Attorney for the Trust.

John Pelka: And I'm John Pelka, the Compliance Manager for the Trust, and the
Project Manager for the draft SEIS.

[Unintelligible]

Male Voice: The definition of rehabilitation, yeah.

[Unintelligible]

Karen Cook: There are no commitments at this point. [Unintelligible]. We've made no decisions or no commitments at this point. At this point, we're still analyzing these proposals. And the SEIS does, in fact, take into account some of the things that you've discussed, some of the issues like traffic and the public nature of the proposals that we're discussing.

[Unintelligible]

Rednan Kernan: Could you describe the process going forward that you will go through? This is an interesting exercise, but it appears to be that what does the least removal of buildings [in this age] [and not] throwing away my newspapers but recycling them, is to go to [commissary]. So what is your process going forward in terms of [unintelligible] [recommendation]?

Male Voice: Do you want to [unintelligible]?

Andrea Anderson: Well, from this point forward, what we're doing right now is we're obviously taking public comment on both the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, as well the draft Finding of Effect. The Trust then is going to have a public meeting on the 9th of December. And then the public comment period for both of those documents will close then on the 15th of December.

At that time, the Trust is going to be taking that information and formulating a preferred alternative, trying to determine how we

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 36
would proceed forward. Within the final Environmental Impact Statement that will be coming out sometime next year, the Trust is going to articulate what that preferred alternative is, and that will also be analyzed in the final Environmental Impact Statement that comes out.

In the Section 106 parallel process at the same time, once we finish that Finding of Effect, coming out with a final agency Finding of Effect, we're then going to move into the next step of that process, which is trying to take a look at ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the impacts from these proposed projects.

As you can see on the diagram up there, both those processes come to a conclusion at the same point in time, whereby we take that finding of effect; we take a look at ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate; and then we come forward with a resolution document, either a programmatic agreement or a memorandum of understanding, to resolve the 106 process. Then the Trust proceeds forward at that point in time with the record of decision, and determines which if any of these projects we're going to go forward with.

Rednan Kernan: Will the public have any other input into the 106 process, that the last day for comment on the 106 -- this is the first time most people have seen it. How do they digest it? How do they comment on the results of this? Is that part of [unintelligible]? Is it the EIS [unintelligible] 106 comment? I'm confused between the two processes and what one does with what one has learned.

Andrea Anderson: Well, tonight obviously you take this and you apply what you've heard tonight in the comments that you will be providing by the 15th of December. The 106 process has a certain number, as you know, of consulting parties, which are members with an interest in historic preservation that have joined the consultation, if you will. Those consulting parties, we're going to have further meetings with them.

So while we will be closing out the public comment period on the draft Finding of Effect, we still have to move onto the next phase, which is the resolution phase. And the consulting parties will also be given the opportunity to participate in the process whereby we create this agreement document to resolve the consultation phase.

Chandler McCoy: The matrix that I spent so much time talking about, we'll take that into this resolution phase with us when we start talking about what the proper shape and size and form of the building is. And we'll also take this matrix into the revisions that we do to our planning and design guidelines. So this isn't a dead-end here; this will kind of lead us into the next -- well, I guess that's the final phase, maybe, of this Section 106. Then we actually get into a design scenario.

Rednan Kernan: But for the public, this is [one] look at it, and make comment on [it, too].

Karen Cook: When you say, "comment on it," the "it" that is being commented on is the Finding of Effect, which is the consulting parties who have

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 38
had the Finding of Effect now for some number of months. We are asking they submit those comments to the Finding of Effect by December the 15th. The rest of the public at large [unintelligible] on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement -- again, those comments also will be due on December the 15th.

If others want to give us comments of what they've heard tonight, of course we're happy to accept those comments. I think we are anticipating that most of the comments on the Finding of Effect are going to be coming from the consulting parties who signed up for being part of that consultation process.

Male Voice 1: I have a question [unintelligible]. Most of these proposals seem to be involved with demolishing the bowling alley. [Unintelligible] proposal [add on to the] theater. The theater is not currently being used, but the bowling alley is being used. And it's a nice little bowling alley.

From [that stand point] going on, if you keep the bowling alley, which kind of gives it human [unintelligible] place and is a nice recreational part of coming to the park. You're going to bring kids to the Presidio if you keep the bowling alley. There's nothing wrong with the bowling alley [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Again, what we're doing tonight is we were trying to describe a project that would fit on the bowling alley site, based on proposals that we have already received. So we are really kind of analyzing those proposals that we have received that do anticipate removal of

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 39
the bowling alley. We're not getting into an analysis of the relative merits of the bowling alley versus some other use.

Michael Boland: Again, this evening, as Craig mentioned, we're looking at these questions through one lens, through the lens of historic preservation. The bowling alley is not a contributing structure. So therefore, there are no historic impacts related to the removal of the bowling alley. It's just one lens. We're not looking at these projects through the lens of recreation, which is really the lens [of] different kinds of public use, which I think is really the question that you're raising. Again, tonight we're focusing on one question only.

Wendy [Moosely]: [Unintelligible] I live in the Presidio [unintelligible]. I just have [unintelligible] questions. The first that comes to mind is why you apply [unintelligible] historical [unintelligible]?

Chandler McCoy: Well, we were picking the five that we thought were the most relevant to this particular project. It wasn't to say that we were ignoring the others, but we just didn't choose to apply them. There was no more to it than that.

Wendy [Moosely]: And what is [unintelligible] decision on [unintelligible]?

Chandler McCoy: Well, do we have the standards up here? Yeah, we do. Some of them don't --

Wendy [Moosely]: Why [didn't] you use all of them?

Chandler McCoy: Well, some of them don't apply. Look at number five. It's about features, finishes, construction techniques. Some of them are very particular to buildings. The original Secretary's Standards were developed for building rehabilitation. In 1992, it was expanded to include cultural landscapes, as well.

It's just that some of them -- here, look at number two -- chemical or physical treatments such as sandblasting should be avoided. It doesn't apply. We're not trying to hide something or shirk our responsibilities. But those particular ones are very much about particular buildings treatments, and we tried to pick the ones that would be relevant to a big district and a landscape, and things like that.

Wendy [Moosely]: And my next question is are there different standards for [unintelligible]?

Chandler McCoy: No, that's --

Wendy [Moosely]: Because it seems to me that what's [being proposed is not] really [unintelligible].

Chandler McCoy: Yeah. Number 10 is the standard that applies. And then if you dig deeper into this document, there's a discussion about neighborhoods and districts. But it echoes the same values. If it's an addition to a building or an addition to a historic district, we're still wanting to make sure that that is compatible and distinct from the historic

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 41
setting. So it's sort of a matter of scale. But the principle is the same. So number nine is the kind of fundamental.

Wendy [Moosely]: But 10 also [unintelligible].

Chandler McCoy: Number 10 applies to reversibility, which is a concept that we really use mostly when we're talking about adding something, like an addition to a building, or putting a new feature in a building, being able to remove it in the future. It doesn't especially apply to this.

Wendy [Moosely]: Okay. Another question was did you receive any other proposal besides [unintelligible]? And if not, does that mean that all of your deciding going forward is where to put these [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Yes. There's no limitation on the Trust's decisions. The Trust can decide not to go forward, or to select among the proposals it has received. I should mention we also received a proposal for a history museum at the bowling alley site. That proposal is also subsumed within Alternative 3 in the SEIS. And that is intended to parallel relatively closely the proposal on the history museum.

Tom McAteer: Hi. I'm Tom [McAteer]. I was curious about some workshops that have been conducted by the Trust that involve the neighbors [unintelligible] eight or 10 tables [unintelligible]. And a couple of things. I haven't heard any presentation here tonight [about] any good ideas that came forth in those workshops, or incorporated into analysis.

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 42
And to give you an example, the hotel. The table that I was at, some of the other people I was talking to were all against the hotel. What they wanted to do was [have the] hotel accommodations in existing buildings. And I can't remember the numbers for those buildings or their locations, but there were a number of buildings that could be turned into lodging -- lodging in historic buildings, lodging in ex-military barracks, and those types of things.

So my question is what happened to the public input that was developed in these very elaborate, extensive workshops that were held [unintelligible]? I don't hear anything about that. So what am I missing here?

[Applause]

Tia Lombardi: Hi, Tom. We had a series of workshops, you're right, in September and October. We invited most of you, I think. And we have the transcripts from those workshops online. At that time, we described those workshops as being a time for the public to think about all the various proposals in their different configurations, and just begin to develop, or give us some input on what a preferred alternative might look like.

We're still in the comment period, and those materials are very, very important as part of that comment period. The Trust has not yet identified a preferred alternative.

Tom McAteer: I understand, [unintelligible]. But when I listened to the presentation tonight -- okay, they got the little hotel [hut] thing [here] four buildings, and they're all connected with the lodge [and everything]. But I didn't hear, "Well, this is an idea, but we're also looking at putting the hotel in this building."

I mean, I don't understand where the public comment [unintelligible]. It didn't get included here. That's all I know. I'm [unintelligible]. I don't know what's on the Web site or is floating out in [some place]. It's not presented to the public here, period.

Tia Lombardi: In the SEIS, we have an alternative that looks exactly what you're talking about. So we are analyzing that alternative. What we're looking at tonight are not specific alternatives, but of ideas about how new construction could conform to the historic site, be compatible. So these are not alternatives. They don't replace anything that's been analyzed in the EIS, and they don't replace public comment.

Female Voice 1: [Unintelligible], and I have a comment [unintelligible]. First of all, I [unintelligible] the village concept [unintelligible] conform to the standards that were set up. In fact, this is [unintelligible] lodge. There was a Presidio entrance [unintelligible], and that [unintelligible] Building 39. [Unintelligible] facing [unintelligible] that open area of the Presidio, so that, in fact, we could have sometime in the future [unintelligible].

But we could still have an open area from the one parade ground to the other parade ground. [Unintelligible] [so there's a historicalness]. And at some point, maybe 50 years from now, [unintelligible] Presidio [historical] [unintelligible]. And [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] talk about the recreational uses. It's true the bowling alley is really important [unintelligible], but I know [unintelligible] recreational area [unintelligible] utilization of that section [unintelligible].

Furthermore, [unintelligible] of that area in the future [unintelligible]. I think it's appropriate to use the Moraga site as [unintelligible] international [unintelligible], [but] it is being used. And the current exhibit now [unintelligible] right now will be [unintelligible]. But I do think the size [unintelligible] is appropriate there. And [unintelligible] the lodge area [unintelligible] nothing in the way of [unintelligible].

And I think it's okay to have the theater complex [unintelligible] parking, sufficient parking [unintelligible]. And you should have [unintelligible] parking under the museum [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] you couldn't have use without [unintelligible] parking [unintelligible] public transportation [unintelligible].

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Doug: My name is [Unintelligible], [stationed here]. I'm an officer [unintelligible]. And I don't see any historical relevance [unintelligible] for a hotel [in the] Presidio.

[Applause]

Doug: I do see relevance of the bowling alley, because I bowl.

[Laughter]

[Unintelligible]

Doug: So I don't understand. If you're going to have some kind of a [guest lodge] [unintelligible] [over here, so that] [unintelligible].

[Applause]

Michael Boland: Can I ask you all -- I know it's great to applaud, but the last time we had a meeting [unintelligible]. So I just want to be respectful of everybody's time, okay? If I could ask you to hold your applause, we'll get through everybody's comments more quickly. Thank you. [Jason].

Jason Wright: Hi, I had some questions. My first is regarding a comment. I noted that Andrea said that we should [take what we've heard] tonight, and applies to the comments that are [within] the draft SEIS and the draft Finding of Effect on [unintelligible]. But then Karen said that we should only be commenting on the [unintelligible] SEIS [unintelligible]. So this is not part of the document. And what about all the people that [got the documents] that could not be here tonight?

Karen Cook: I think you may have misheard me, because I did specifically say we would of course accept comments to these documents, the things that we have been discussing tonight, about how new construction - - again, the focus is through a historic preservation perspective, how new construction could be made to be compatible within the Main Post district.

Jason Wright: And then my second question is regarding the [unintelligible] that the National [Park District], and where does that stand in the process? Because I feel like that would be a valuable report to document for [the public] additions and projects in the Presidio.

Andrea Anderson: For those of you that might not be familiar with the report that was mentioned, the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation has requested what's known as a Section 213 Report under the National Historic Preservation Act from the Department of the Interior.

Right now we are still awaiting that report coming from the Department of the Interior. As far as we know, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has not received that report yet. So any questions along those lines would probably best be directed towards the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

David Bancroft: [My name is David Bancroft] [unintelligible]. I'd like to ask you a question that [amplifies] a couple of questions. [Unintelligible]. Suppose [unintelligible]. [So you] now set out a number of [proposal configurations] [unintelligible]. And another proposal

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 47
comes along, and it's for [unintelligible], or it's for [amusement]
[bumper cars], or [unintelligible]. I'm asking you this question -- by
the way, [unintelligible] San Francisco [unintelligible].

Let me put it to you in terms of a question. Are all the Secretary's
Standards [all] [unintelligible] exterior design? If we're talking
about [the need to repair] the historical essence of the place, what
about the purpose or the function of the buildings [unintelligible]?
Because it strikes many of us, the question of a contemporary art
museum on the Main Post of the Presidio, is not consistent with the
historical [unintelligible].

So my question is: Is the [principle] function of buildings anywhere
recognized in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards as being
something that has to be consistent with the historic land use
[unintelligible]?

Chandler McCoy: The answer is yes. The type of use is an important aspect. And
when we talk about rehabilitation, we're supposed to be finding
appropriate uses for the old buildings. So yes, we may disagree on
what's an appropriate use. However, because it isn't written
anywhere that you can't put an art museum on an old army base,
and it isn't written anywhere that you couldn't put bumper cars.

So determining what's an appropriate use is part of this process
we're all involved in, and it's somewhat subjective, I suppose -- a
use that doesn't damage the property, a use that's sort of -- I guess
that's all I need to say. It's not spelled out, anyway.

David Bancroft: [Unintelligible] the concept that [unintelligible] having a contemporary art museum [and] all of these configurations [unintelligible] recognition of that [that process]. It inevitably seems [unintelligible] looking for [unintelligible] SEIS [unintelligible]. What we're really talking about here is having a dominant [player], a dominant influence on the historical [quality] of the parade grounds of the Main Post.

And I'd like [you to help me] go through [if you can] Secretary of the Interior's Standards that recognize that the purpose and the function of the [unintelligible] is something that must be [unintelligible] compatible [unintelligible] appropriate for the historical site. If you can show me through [unintelligible], I'd be very appreciative. Thank you.

Chandler McCoy: I can't show you that. There's no list of appropriate uses in the Secretary's Standards.

Brian Ramos: Yeah. The Secretary guidelines are pointing agencies to consider appropriate use, but there's no specific language that says that that use needs to be limited to what historic use would be, because that would mean that anything that was built on the post would be for military use. The guidelines are not that specific.

The process of what is appropriate is determined by an agency throughout the course of everything that we're doing right now, throughout the course of public involvement, throughout the course

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 49
of involving interested parties, historical societies, neighborhood organizations; and taking those views to formulate a determination of what appropriate use is; and doing that through consultation with the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Presidio Trust partner agency, the National Park Service.

It's an iterative process. You'd be unsatisfied to go out and try and seek something that says, "Here's a checklist of things that are okay, and here's a checklist of things that aren't." It's really something that is developed through meetings like today, like what we're going through right now -- stakeholder involvement, public participation, considering the voices of people, and incorporating that into decision-making.

I know that that probably leaves you hungry for more, but it's an iterative process, and it's a public involvement process that leads an agency to their decision.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Pat LeMartre: My name is [Pat LeMartre]. [I am a frequent user] of the Presidio. I have [unintelligible]. My first one is: Where are [going to be] located [unintelligible], as well as [unintelligible] 2000? And my second question is: I know you are [unintelligible] on how [unintelligible] people [unintelligible] Presidio [unintelligible] about how we're going to [unintelligible] a lot of people coming in [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Can I start with the second question first?

Michael Boland: Yeah. [Unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Okay. The SEIS does have proposals for handling traffic and parking associated with these new uses, so I would refer you to that document for that discussion. And it will be part of the final record of decision when we come to a decision on these proposals. Do you want to talk about the --

Michael Boland: The same thing is true for how we address a visitor center or an orientation center/heritage center. In each of the alternatives, there are different proposals that are put on the table for where that activity would be accommodated in the Main Post. And so if you look at Alternative 1, Alternative 2, 2A, 3 and 4, there are different ideas about how a visitor center might be accommodated in different existing buildings.

Male Voice: Where is that [unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: It's in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, in the description of the different alternatives. Before we go on, can I ask a question? I'm wondering if there's anyone that has any questions about what we actually went through tonight. I mean, we're happy to sit and answer other broader questions about the SEIS process and NEPA, etcetera, but we'd like to get everyone's questions

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 51
answered about this first. So why don't I start with you in the pink,
Jody?

Francis Moore: Yes. [My name is Francis Moore], and I've also [unintelligible], and I've been very supportive of what's happened in the Presidio process. But I've noticed [unintelligible]. What are [unintelligible] for an art museum in terms of external sculptures and modern art? Is that [considered] new construction, or will there be an individual decision-making process for a piece of art?

For example, there was a process at Golden Gate Park for the [Young] Museum [unintelligible] itself. And then, of course, there's a sculpture garden with a very large safety pin, which somebody [unintelligible] art. [Unintelligible] modern art [unintelligible] Presidio, you're going to have to [unintelligible] quite large. Is that going to be included in the footprint, or is that going to be considered new construction? I guess I have a question about where that part of the process [falls].

Male Voice: [Unintelligible] answer that?

Karen Cook: Yeah. The proposal for the contemporary art museum does contemplate that there would be some outdoor sculpture within the defined premises of the contemporary art museum. After that, there have been no definitive statements. And yes, placement of sculpture within the greater Presidio would of course have to go through its own compliance process.

Lucia Bogotay: I have a quick one, and then I have a slightly longer one. How and when [will you] decide -- I mean, [unintelligible] MOA [or the PA] [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Well, the MOA and the PA is actually part of the Section 106 NHPA process. And that's actually a decision that will be arrived at through our continuing consultation with the signatories to our existing programmatic agreement. So when you say "when," it'll be sometime down the road as we get into this resolution phase of resolving the adverse effects.

Lucia Bogotay: [What will thrive] [unintelligible] have a choice [in the matrix].

Karen Cook: Well, it may be that we have a programmatic agreement that addresses generally how we will go about resolving, minimizing, mitigating, avoiding these adverse effects. But we may have specific MOAs as to the individual projects that specifically address the particular issues on those projects.

Lucia Bogotay: The next thing I just wanted to [unintelligible] about rehabilitation [unintelligible]. I used to be on the San Francisco Land [Use] Board. It was always a big issue that [unintelligible] compatible. And when you're dealing [with a district], it would seem you'd have to extrapolate from the [unintelligible] the proper way to treat a building, proper way to treat [its history].

But when it says on page 65, "Some exterior and interior alterations to an historic building generally needed to assure its continued use,"

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 53
because we're also worried that it's not use [unintelligible]. So that's
why [you allow] rehabilitation, and you don't [unintelligible]
[forever]. "But it's most important that such alterations do not
radically change, obscure, or destroy character-defining spaces,
materials, features, and finishes."

I think that says it all. I think when we look at this, at these
proposals, and even [unintelligible] we have to ask ourselves how
much [unintelligible] alteration [unintelligible] obscuring and
destroying character-defined spaces [are we willing to do here].
And the other thing, the Secretary of the Interior's standard was
very vague [unintelligible].

My personal theory is because the people who wrote it [never
expected] [unintelligible] wouldn't want to build buildings
[unintelligible], so they [unintelligible] add on something like a
[unintelligible] or something that you need to make it function for
[use]. And I don't know truly believe that the National Historic
Landmark District [unintelligible] without having such a serious
loss of integrity [unintelligible] the district.

And I think what's missing in all of tonight's agenda was any
discussion of [human effect]. Because even if you minimize the
adverse effects from one of these projects, you add them all up, and
it's pretty hard to see that [there's] going to be an adverse effect,
especially if you [have to] demolish historic structures in order to
get [unintelligible] square footage to [unintelligible].

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Michael: Thank you. My name is Michael [Unintelligible] Richmond District. And I want to say I know [unintelligible], and I appreciate very much the presentation here today. I think just talking about the Secretary of Interior's Standards to a public audience like this is very useful. I think the more people know about the Secretary of Interior's Standards, the better off we'll all be when it comes to historic preservation.

And as [someone who attended] the meeting at the Officers Club last December 3rd -- I'm sure a lot of people here were there, as well -- hearing speaker after speaker extolling virtues of the proposed contemporary art museum without obviously any knowledge or interest in the Secretary of Interior's Standards; just blindly talking about how great it will be, how great it will fit in, how the sponsor's architect talked about how great it will fit into the environment.

I mean, it's the [emperor's new clothes] syndrome many times over. And it's so good to hear the talk tonight, civilized talk about how these important standards apply in this kind of situation. So I did really appreciate that and everyone involved with it.

If I could just express a couple of other comments, I think it's important -- correct me if I'm wrong, but there hasn't been any new construction at the Main Post since the army left in 1994, or nothing major.

Chandler McCoy: The transit center.

Michael: No, I'm talking about Main Post, [the aquarium].

Female Voice: [The aquarium].

Chandler McCoy: Yeah. There's been an addition to the fire station. That doubled its size. There's been a transit center, which is a freestanding building. And this addition between 86 and 87.

Michael: Okay, thanks for correcting that. [Unintelligible] of the Main Post there. But the historic Main Post where you can look at, physically, army history beginning with the Spanish [in] the early 1800s -- or the Mexicans, by the time the historic [unintelligible], all the way up to 1994, and see all that history right there with no changes.

I certainly have no problem with adding new buildings to the Presidio in general, but there's something to be said for leaving a relatively small [or fraction] of the Presidio that's the most historic portion basically the way it is, so that you can see this 200 years of army history, and how that was important [to] San Francisco [and the nation]. So that's just something to think about.

And again, I appreciate the information, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. I have some of the concerns expressed by other questioners, and I [loved every one of these] questions. So again,

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 56
thank you, and please keep in mind as much as possible historic
preservation -- not just for buildings, but just historic Main Post.

The contemporary art museum I really think [unintelligible]. Maybe
it just doesn't belong in this area, whether it's one large building or a
broken up series of buildings. It will change [unintelligible] express
the historic essence of this area, and that [will be] [a shame].

Thanks very much.

[Applause]

Female Voice 3: [I live right next to] the Presidio [gate]. [Unintelligible] Presidio. [I
have to] [back out of my garage] -- don't talk about anything about
[traffic], because that isn't pertaining to anything that
[unintelligible]. [Unintelligible]. I do want to thank [unintelligible]
everybody forgets this is a project that requires 13 years to become
self-sufficient.

It's the most expensive park in the park system. [What have they
done?] [unintelligible] Presidio [Trust] up until now [has been
excellent]? [Unintelligible]. I just think that is fabulous. And
[unintelligible] some of these other things, the big picture -- it has to
be self-sufficient [unintelligible] 13 years [unintelligible]. Thank
you. And don't forget about the traffic.

[Laughter]

Donald Green: [My name is Donald Green]. I'm a member of [consulting parties] [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] that the other agencies [unintelligible], the [federal, state], and the National Park Service. I think [all] agree with most of the people I've talked to that you have a lot of [detail] Main Post [unintelligible] on what [the CAMP] decision was, and you also had it in the SEIS, and certainly had it [unintelligible].

It seems to me at this point that you have to have an amended Main Post Update which addresses these two alternatives [unintelligible], and the same thing with [unintelligible] SEIS that will [help] the public [unintelligible] something different. It looks different. You can see it is different. And what do you think about that?

I think just to say, "Well, we've incorporated [unintelligible]," [unintelligible] some people some ideas. I really believe that [half] the issue, the amended Main Post Update, [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] amended SEIS, and I'd like to know why [you people think] that's not necessary, because certainly it's very hard for the public to grasp [unintelligible] through a [unintelligible], which we have [unintelligible] that complicated [unintelligible] to give us a sense of what it really is.

Karen Cook: Michael, do you want me to respond to that?

Michael: Sure, sure.

Karen Cook: Okay. The reason we people don't think it's necessary to reticulate it with new alternatives is, as we explained tonight, we're not proposing new alternatives. What this workshop is about is to explain an exercise, a workshop that we went through, to talk about what would new construction in the Main Post district, compatible new construction, look like? These are not proposals; these are not new alternatives. That's all.

[Unintelligible]

Karen Cook: They changed nothing about the alternatives that are in the SEIS.

Donald Green: [Unintelligible] Main Post Update [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: These are not alternatives. I'll say it again. This was to walk everybody through an exercise that we did. These are not new proposals. They are not new alternatives. The Main Post Update is reflective of Alternative 2 in the SEIS. Those alternatives are as proposed.

Donald Green: [Unintelligible]. There's no opportunity for the public to address these alternatives. All they've got now is the SEIS [unintelligible]. So I just [unintelligible] the public [to comment] on the new [concept] could be [unintelligible] final decision. I think [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Okay. These are not new alternatives. And so what the next step will be for the Trust to identify preferred alternatives. But we invite

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 59
you to comment on the information that you got tonight. We invite you to comment on the alternatives and the information that's in the SEIS. The consulting parties who have been part of the consultation process, we invite you to comment on the adverse effects that are identified in the FOE.

Female Voice 4: [Unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: It's called an "Update on New Construction in the Historic Main Post." Again, it is to talk about the parameters for compatible new construction in the Main Post.

Female Voice 4: [Unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: No, quite the contrary. It is trying to explain to the public at large, as we have been doing with the consulting parties, the kind of parameters that we will take into account as we deliberate on the alternatives that are in the SEIS.

Female Voice 4: [Unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Yeah. Well, first of all, we will begin deliberating after we get through the public comment period on these documents. And so, again, that comment period will end on December 15th. We'll have another public board meeting, and that comment period will end on December 15th. At that point, we'll begin our discussion about these parameters as they relate to the proposals, and how we might fashion a preferred alternative that is reflective of these parameters.

Female Voice 4: [Unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: I'm obviously not communicating this well, so I'm going to let somebody else take a stab at it.

Chandler McCoy: Well, I think there may be some confusion about the fact that this is titled "Update," and Mr. Green was talking about another document that was called an update that was issued. So this probably wasn't a good title for these pages here. But we'll develop a preferred alternative that will be in our final SEIS, and the exercise that we went through will have a bearing on what that new alternative looks like.

That's why we're here tonight, and that's why we're talking about this. And these will have a bearing on how we revise the update that Mr. Green was talking about. So this isn't a tangent; this is going to feed into our future work.

Tia Lombardi: Let me add. What we're trying to do is make available to as many people who are interested or who have participated so far, and these materials are on our Web site. We're trying to make all of our materials available to you, so that you know what we're looking at, and [do] you know what everybody thinks about what we're looking at as we move towards identifying a preferred alternative.

I think that what Don is suggesting is that we've already moved to the preferred alternative, and we haven't. The alternatives that are in

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 61
our draft EIS stand. But we didn't identify a preferred one. The preferred alternative will come out of all of these discussions, and these exercises, and the public comment that you give us. And that preferred [alternative] may look like various components of the alternatives that are in the EIS. If it's substantially different, then we're in another ballgame. But that's not where we are yet.

Female Voice 4: [Unintelligible]. Why [unintelligible]? Have you proposed [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Yes. That's what these are. For instance, when we talk about building at bowling alley site, that's Alternative 2. That is what we are now calling our proposed action in the Main Post Update. So the proposal we have now is for 100,000 square foot building. This matrix takes that proposal and applies these standards as against that 100,000 square foot building and says yes or no; it either meets the standards or it doesn't. And that was the first example that Chandler walked us through.

Female Voice 4: [Unintelligible] Alternative 2 [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Correct. And then if you go to the south of Moraga, that is Alternative 2A in the SEIS. What we did was in the SEIS, we simply talked about 140,000 square feet of new construction at the 2A site, and that was because, again, the current proposal for CAMP is 100,000 square foot new construction plus the reuse of Building 101, which is roughly 40,000 square feet.

The notion was that if we moved the whole project up to the site south of Moraga, Building 101 might become inefficient for that use, because it's too far away from the rest of the project. And so we should anticipate that perhaps the proposal to reuse Building 101 goes away, and the requirement for more square footage should be taken into account. And it's a less constrained site, and so more square footage can fit in that site.

So what we did was actually come up with three different scenarios for how you might fit new construction on that 2A site. One of them is called Concept A; one of them is called Concept B; and the last one is Concept C. But all of them relate back to what is in the SEIS, Alternative 2A, new construction at the south of Moraga site.

Similarly, we take you through the exercise as to the lodge and the theater, all of which parallel the alternatives in the SEIS. So the answer to your question is yes, all of the alternatives in the SEIS have been put through the sieve.

Male Voice 2: [Unintelligible].

Karen Cook: It's okay.

Male Voice2: [Unintelligible] had something called [unintelligible] --

Karen Cook: Proposed action.

Male Voice 2: -- proposed action [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Alternative 2.

Male Voice 2: And then tonight what I'm seeing is something [unintelligible] that has a bunch of yes's or no's [unintelligible]. And it would lead me to believe that 2A, or [unintelligible] the village one, or the 140,000 square foot [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: You're doing a great job, yes.

Male Voice 2: So that's [unintelligible]. And I want to know how do I [unintelligible] my [unintelligible] by December 15th, because I don't like [unintelligible]. How do I [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Well, first of all, I would urge you to use more than two minutes by writing us a letter, because written comments are always much more helpful in actually communicating a point of view, rather than two minutes in a public setting. So that would be my first recommendation. But I really can't advise you how to use your two minutes beyond that, unless --

Male Voice 2: [Unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Fine. [Laughs]

Male Voice 2: [Unintelligible]. [But the gentleman up here had] said earlier, there's no way [unintelligible]. I don't [unintelligible] process, other than [unintelligible] tonight [unintelligible]. So [unintelligible]

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 64
question. Is there a way that I can [get my input in the] process
[unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Well, I guess I'm not quite sure what you mean by that. I mean, the 106 process is a process that is laid out in a statute in the regulations under the National Historic Preservation Act. So we are following that process. And there are certain groups that must be part of that process. Those would be the National Park Service, the Advisory Council, and Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, which is a federal agency, and the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Other consulting parties are invited to join and be part of that, and we have quite a number of them -- most of the neighborhood associations, Presidio Historical Association -- groups whose focus is historic preservation -- the National Trust for Historic Preservation. But we have never refused anybody who asked to be part of that consultation process.

Male Voice 2: [Unintelligible].

Female Voice 5: [Unintelligible]. Is the current proposal [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: We do analyze in the SEIS an alternative that has the museum at Fort Scott. And there's nothing that is not being considered. I think what Chandler was describing in the Concept B was that when we put Concept B through the filters that we have identified in the matrix; it perhaps didn't come out as well as some of the other concepts for new construction at that 2A site.

Female Voice 5: [Unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: All of the locations that we've been discussing are still under consideration. No decisions have been made whatsoever.

Female Voice 6: [Unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: I can't remember. Do you remember?

Chandler McCoy: Quite frankly, we ran out of time.

Michael Boland: We ran out of time.

Male Voice 3: [Unintelligible]. And so [unintelligible] so we really focused our attention on [unintelligible]. So that's [unintelligible].

Female Voice: [Unintelligible]?

Michael Boland: We focused on the Main Post and the commissary site. It wasn't so much that we focused on those sites; it was that Fort Scott was the last one that we were going to get to, and we simply ran out of time in this effort.

Tia Lombardi: But the Fort Scott site is still under consideration. The Fort Scott site is analyzed in the EIS. The Fort Scott site was not fully analyzed in this process. But let's say that ends up [unintelligible] site. Then certainly that site would be analyzed in a very similar

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 66
way. But the reason why it wasn't it that it is, as Michael said,
there's fewer constraints. There probably is more latitude with what
you could do in that site than the new construction in the Main Post.

And also so many of the concerns of the public were about the Main
Post being such an historic [unintelligible]. What can you and what
can't you do? So that's really why the focus was there. But Fort
Scott's not off the table in the analysis.

[Unintelligible]

Tia Lombardi: With the proposed action, it [unintelligible]. The proposed action is
Alternative 2, and that puts 100,000 square foot museum on the
bowling alley site, and a lodge along the eastern edge -- 95,000
square feet along the eastern edge of the Main Parade ground.
That's the proposed action, but we have not identified
[unintelligible] alternative.

[Unintelligible]

Tia Lombardi: There is a standing plan for the Presidio called the Presidio Trust
Management Plan that identifies a number of sites for lodging,
including the Main Post, potentially something at Fort Scott, and
maybe in the future something at Crissy Field.

[Unintelligible]

Male Voice: All right. You, sir.

Male Voice 3: I [have a funny] question, I think. This is a follow-up to a comment made on the other side of the room about the potential sculptures around the museum. My understanding is that the museum will have [unintelligible] necessary for the artistic purposes [unintelligible]. Would that also include [unintelligible] projections on the external walls of the museum, or [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: We'll make sure it does.

[Laughter]

Karen Cook: Yes. I would say that anything that ends up being an intervention such as that would go through a compliance process, as well. We're going through this, but certainly as the projects proceed, assuming that they do, there will be a much more detailed design review stage for specific designs, and would encompass those sorts of things.

Bill Sheperd: Hi, I'm Bill [Sheperd]. [Unintelligible]. I hope [unintelligible]. I thank you very much for that. [Unintelligible] process [unintelligible], but some of us in this room [unintelligible] a lot of time [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] focusing [unintelligible] focused on is [unintelligible]. At this point, [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] what we should do in terms of [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] those of us [unintelligible].

[Unintelligible] ideas that you're saying are [unintelligible] encompass [many of] the alternatives that have been proposed.

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 68
[Unintelligible]. What [unintelligible] focused on [unintelligible]
standards [unintelligible]. I'm not [unintelligible]. I don't want to
[unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] all [unintelligible].

Andrea Anderson: Myself being a former Air Force officer, I'll keep this short and give you three main points, as I was always taught. One of which is that you can use this information tonight to help you determine whether or not we have analyzed the appropriate impacts from the various alternatives that are there.

You've seen an analysis within this matrix of what some of the adverse effects would be from some of these proposed actions. Take a look at that, and give us feedback on whether or not we've done appropriate analysis within the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the various alternatives that are there. So that's one potential.

Another potential is to give us your feedback on what you think the preferred alternatives should be. These are various ways, again, of taking proposed actions and making them conforming. And therefore, that can be some of the feedback you give to us, as to which pieces of these are important in determining what the preferred alternatives should be.

And then finally the third one is, as we go through this process we're not only identifying impacts, but we're also trying to identify ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate for the 106 process. But also in the NEPA process, we have put forth in the draft Supplemental

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 69
Environmental Impact Statement mitigation measures. This is another way of taking a look at mitigation in the NEPA process. So give us your feedback on what you think appropriate mitigation measures should be.

Susie: I'm Susie [Unintelligible], and [unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: We will have our second public board meeting on December 9th at the Palace of Fine Arts. And that would be a place where you would make that statement. You can also send it to us as a comment. This is not a foregone conclusion. We're pretty far from the conclusion.

Male Voice 4: This is regarding the lodge, and how the lodge maintains the historic open space, and it does so by building on the open space. I thought that's very creative, I must say.

[Laughter]

Chandler McCoy: Well, actually the spot where we're putting the building is not on the historic open space site. By "historic open space," we were really talking about the Main Parade, the Old Parade, and the El Presidio. It's confusing.

Male Voice 4: [Unintelligible] because the Old Parade was much disturbed by buildings in 1932, Building 39, 38, and 35. And so to say you're restoring the Old Parade I think is inaccurate.

Chandler McCoy: We're not restoring the Old Parade, and if I said that I misspoke. But we're restoring the separation that used to exist between them. We're trying to bring some of the properties back that are missing. But we're not restoring any -- actually we're not doing any restoration. It's all rehabilitation.

Male Voice 4: [I didn't mean to put words in your mouth.] if it's putting back the barrier between the Old Parade and the Main Parade, when the Old Parade has been significantly disturbed by a row of [rather massive] 38, 39, and 35. And therefore, I think trying to say that replicating or putting building mass where it used to be in the 1870s up until 1940s, I think is a misreading of what should occur.

And I think it was left open by the army since then; the buildings were removed. It's been [unintelligible] in between as open space, and it's the first time that open space [unintelligible] been preserved by building on top of it. So I take your argument, but I disagree. Thank you for listening.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Janet: My name is Janet [Unintelligible]. I have a question [unintelligible]. My question is if [unintelligible] the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, why was it [the] proposed alternative? Why [don't we know about] the negative effects [unintelligible] many, many hours document [unintelligible] 2.5 inches thick [unintelligible] four-page summary about [unintelligible] I can't tell [unintelligible] the traffic is, [unintelligible] how big the parking garage is. [Unintelligible].

So my main question is: Why didn't we have this information included in the original SEIS [unintelligible] proposal [unintelligible] the Secretary of the Interior's Standards [unintelligible] the standards of the NHPA?

Chandler McCoy: Well, I don't think anything I'm presenting tonight is new. All of these concepts were covered in our Finding of Effect. And although the Finding of Effect wasn't released on the same day as the SEIS, it followed, and it's part of the package. So this isn't really new. The Finding of Effect said the same thing, as did the Historic Resources Section of the SEIS.

So I disagree with you. We're not springing a new thing on you. We're taking information that was presented in the Finding of Effect, and we're presenting it in a slightly different way, and applying the Secretary of Interior's Standards. So it's a different way of presenting the information, but it isn't new information.

Jan: [Unintelligible]?

Tia Lombardi: No, no. No, Jan, you didn't. However, the Historic Resources Section in the EIS is essentially duplicative of the FOE. There's a section on Historic Resources in the SEIS that comes to the same conclusions. It has the same information in it. So the baseline information has been there. What this is that is different is thinking about how new construction might work. What would it take to

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 72
make a conforming project? But the effects have remained the same, have been identified.

Male Voice 5: I would like to say in a joking manner that last year they were going to build a bridge to nowhere, and it almost got built. [Unintelligible]. I just want to discuss [unintelligible] new construction [unintelligible] should be stopped [unintelligible] [to nowhere]. It's going to make the Presidio a circus.

Building a Pier 39 [unintelligible] future development [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] people coming in [unintelligible] money and [unintelligible] pyramids [unintelligible] so-called architecture -- my personal opinion. But I'm here to discuss the new construction. It's a bridge to nowhere. I wish you people [could] understand that's what it is.

The people of San Francisco have passed a proposal against this. You guys [have no ears], no [unintelligible], no [unintelligible] [speak]. That's what we're here for. These people aren't here to say, "Rah, rah, build it!" They're here to say, "No, stop." It doesn't belong in the Presidio of San Francisco. [Unintelligible] somebody else said [unintelligible] City of San Francisco [is the] great natural park that we have. Thank you for listening. [Unintelligible].

[Applause]

Male Voice: Anybody else? [Unintelligible].

Boyd DeLarious: Hi. I'm [Boyd DeLarious]. I'm someone who's been involved in this process for a year. And I think the fog is starting to lift a little bit [unintelligible]. But I think the public has expressed this evening the fact that they very confused about it. I know I am very confused about the [unintelligible] and the [unintelligible] process, and the separation thereof. [Unintelligible]. Hopeful.

But it needs a lot of discussion and a lot of explanation for people to understand it. The different voices that are used or the criteria applied in the different sections are not clear to people. And with this in mind, I ask, "What is the haste?" And this meeting was called in haste. There have been [meetings] constantly in the short notice. What is the haste to conclude this process?

You're talking about ending the public comment. Well, the public still doesn't understand what they're looking at. I would ask you to enlighten me, and I'd ask you also to consider extending the period [unintelligible] giving the public time to receive lucid explanation of what's going on. I think that's missing -- that tightness of what the process is needs to be [unintelligible].

[Unintelligible]

Andrea Anderson: Well, I actually don't think we have been moving in haste. We have been in this process now for a year. This meeting -- [Boyd], I believe it came up in a meeting that we were in with you -- we were meeting with all the consulting parties to bring everyone up-to-

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 74
speed on this exercise. And it was suggested that we bring this to the general public. We thought that was a really good idea.

We extended the comment period to December 15th. And here we are. The materials are on our Web site. And we are available for your questions both in these meetings, but individually [unintelligible].

We've put out tonight a table of the process. This table comes from the CEQ, the Council for Environmental Quality. And the first two columns are from their guidance, the NEPA process, followed by the NHPA process. And then the third column is the process that we followed. So we've mapped what we've done along that process. And then Michael distilled it in the slide that we showed tonight.

Boyd DeLarious: [Unintelligible] in [this] short period of time [unintelligible] Holiday period [unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: Well, I'd like to just echo what my colleague Andrea said. This is not new information we did analyze the effects. It is in the EIS. It's also in the draft Finding of Effect. The effects that we showed tonight are not new.

Boyd DeLarious: [Unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: You mean about conforming? Well, the process has not changed. I mean, we're just trying to clarify what the process has been.

Boyd DeLarious:

[Unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi:

I don't really know whom to add [Boyd]. We can talk about it afterwards, if you'd like.

Male Voice 6:

[Unintelligible] when [unintelligible] came out, I read it, and -- tell me if this is wrong -- I believe that the Presidio Trust is moving in the direction of [unintelligible]. Tonight, [unintelligible] meeting [unintelligible] Presidio Trust [unintelligible]. I want to know [unintelligible] believe [until] tonight that Presidio Trust is moving in the direction of Alternative 2A [unintelligible]. So my question is, is was I wrong back then that [unintelligible] or am I wrong now? Which direction [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook:

Yeah, [me again]. [Laughs] We were having a pretty good dialogue before, so maybe we can continue. I don't want to say you were wrong before, but the Presidio Trust identified Alternative 2 as the proposed actions, because those were the compilation of the projects highlighted in this document called the Main Post Update, which is Alternative 2, were the actions for which we had actual proposals. In no way were we indicating that it was a preferred alternative, but it is the actions for which we had specific proposals.

What we have been doing now is putting those through this sieve in the historic preservation context. And you can extrapolate from the things you have heard tonight that as we begin to identify, to put together what we will call our preferred alternative, the alternative that we would like to pursue, that we will take into account all these

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 76
things such that the preferred alternative will be reflective of the kinds of considerations that we have been outlining for you here.

Male Voice 7: [Unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Yeah. I guess what I'm saying is that the proposed actions were never -- they should not be looked at as the Presidio Trust's preference. And I think that it was interpreted that way. But they are the actions for which there were specific proposals. They are the actions for which we had specific proposals, but they have not been identified as where the Trust has made a decision, or where --

Male Voice 9: [Unintelligible].

Karen Cook: I will say this again. Where we go from here is to identify a preferred alternative. We have not had that conversation with our board. We have not finished that analysis. But that will be the next step.

Male Voice 9: [Unintelligible]. And you said [unintelligible] historical [uses]. And so is there a recreational uses form [unintelligible] bowling alley and the lodge [unintelligible] is there some kind [unintelligible]?

Chandler McCoy: There's something I wanted to say. We do have a master plan for the Presidio that's called the PTMP, and in that document we identify seven different planning districts, and we characterize or identify uses for those districts. For the Main Post, we called out for cultural and educational uses. For Crissy Field, we called for

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 77
recreational uses. For Fort Scott, we called it a contemplative
retreat. That means it might be like an academic setting, or a
research or a conference.

So yes, we have identified preferred uses for the different parts of
the Presidio. Letterman is office and so forth and so on. So the Main
Post has not been identified as a recreational area. Crissy Field has.
We like bowling alleys. We'd like to see one on Crissy Field. That's
our planning document. And people are talking as if we have no
master plan; that this has never crossed our mind.

And those uses have already been identified. So it's consistent with
our PTMP to say we would rather have a museum on the Main Post
than a bowling alley. I just wanted to bring that up because nobody
mentioned it, but it's --

Male Voice: [Unintelligible] contemporary art exhibit [unintelligible]. I think
[unintelligible] many alternatives [unintelligible] recreation.
Modern art, fine. Bowling alley, fine. [Unintelligible]. Also,
[unintelligible] [talked] about [unintelligible]. So [unintelligible].

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Okay. [Unintelligible].

Bryant Anderson: My name's Bryant Anderson. First I want to commend you all for
the work you've done. [Unintelligible] very, very nice. The question
I have is with the appearances. A lot of things go on [unintelligible]

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 78
situation [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] should be added
[unintelligible], and then [unintelligible] later [unintelligible],
"Okay, here's where we think we are today," and we are very
confused.

[On] the other question that was asked earlier, are you required to
provide [unintelligible] information from day one [of] where you
are today going forward? [Unintelligible] self-sufficient
[unintelligible]. I'm sure [unintelligible] your mind [unintelligible]
decide [unintelligible] museum or some other [unintelligible]
providing financial information to the public?

Tia Lombardi: We do provide financial information to the public. We have an
annual report. Those reports are available. We report to Congress.
We have quarterly reports, etc. So we have financial information
available. But I think what you were talking about specifically is the
financial analysis of the projects we're looking at.

Male Voice 10: Both.

Tia Lombardi: Okay. Yes. We provide financial reporting to the public. About
these projects, however, these projects are not being undertaken
principally for a financial reason. These projects we are trying to do
to create a visitor destination in the Main Post, to provide visitor
services. So we have undertaken some projects in the past that were
specifically to support that financial foundation -- Letterman, for
instance, was principally that.

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 79
But the Main Post has always been identified as a visitor district.

And so these projects are being undertaken for that purpose. Now that said, these projects need to be financially self-sustaining. These are not things that we can subsidize. But also the financial concern is not part of either the NEPA or the NHPA process. It sits outside that. That sits in another place. But these are not being undertaken principally for generating revenue.

Female Voice: [Unintelligible]. So why are you [unintelligible]?

Tia Lombardi: That's a good question. We certainly didn't intend to say that they conflicted with -- these are uses that are consistent with PTMP. Lodging was identified in PTMP. Cultural uses, like a museum, would be consistent with PTMP. Where there's an inconsistency is in demolition and new construction. So both projects, as proposed, sit outside what was originally contemplated in PTMP. So it's not the uses, but it's the actual size, for instance. That's one of the reasons why we're undertaking this analysis.

Don: I'm a little embarrassed [unintelligible] public [unintelligible] three, six, seven [unintelligible] people. When this proposal came in on July 7th, you guys decided in one month that this is acceptable; we're going to [do an all-day study]; we're going to spend [unintelligible] to see what we can do with it.

[It seems to me] [unintelligible] senior preservation officer consulting with the Park Service, [unintelligible] Advisory Council [unintelligible] two days [in] August of this year [unintelligible],

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 80
and came to the conclusion, which you've demonstrated today,
which is a 20,000 [unintelligible], and I guess it's maybe 600,000
square feet [unintelligible] would fit. [Unintelligible] proposal
wouldn't fit.

If that was done then, [unintelligible] sat down with [unintelligible]
unsolicited proposal -- [to be] clear about this -- and said
[unintelligible], "That's too big. It won't work. Let's sit down and
see what we might do." Instead of that, we spent a year and a half
on a document. And your [judgment] basically was, "That's okay.
[Unintelligible] are preferred."

So [what do you want to] propose? Now you're telling us not only is
it not proposed; it won't work at all. So I'm just very annoyed, as a
taxpayer, and as a person that's been watching the Trust for many
years, and I do give you credit [for relocating] the buildings
[unintelligible] financially [unintelligible]. But on this one, I really
think you guys somehow didn't [unintelligible].

[Unintelligible] respond to anybody, but was there any
consideration given in that first one month, from July 7th to August
7th of last year, when you said, "Thanks for this proposal." Let's
start the process [unintelligible] plan, to come out with an SEIS, to
ask for competitive bids for 100,000 square feet on that place, and
to start a 106 process without even sitting and asking
[unintelligible] question, "Will this fit?"

Karen Cook: We're trying to think about where to being with that one, Don. We did start the process. When we received the proposal is when we started the process. We started the Section 106; we started the NEPA process.

Don: [Unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Well, that's part of what you do in the course of a process.

Don: [Unintelligible], "Let's see if it fits." Nobody said that in your whole organization?

Male Voice: Yeah, let's move on.

Victor: Good evening. I'm Victor [Meyerhoff] of the Presidio Bowling Center. And I'd like to say that [unintelligible] the company that runs it. Obviously [unintelligible] bowling center [unintelligible] bowling alley [unintelligible] derogatory [unintelligible]. And it became that way because [they were] talking about it [unintelligible], "[Unintelligible] bowling alley [unintelligible]." [Unintelligible].

As Chandler [unintelligible] said something [unintelligible] it would look better than a bowling alley. And so you got to be careful when you're talking about it. [Unintelligible]. I've been there for a 13 years. [Unintelligible]. I believe [bowling has an historic] service to the Presidio. I was wondering if anybody [up there] could tell me [how long a bowling center has been at the Presidio]?

Chandler McCoy: There was a bowling alley in Fort Scott that was constructed in --

Victor: Bowling center, sorry.

Karen Cook: I thought it was called the bowling alley.

Chandler McCoy: -- 1945. It was called the bowling alley, but we call it a bowling center.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Chandler McCoy: I don't know. But the one on the Main Post was, as you know, built in 1989, and the one in Fort Scott was built in the '40s during the Second World War. So I'm not sure there's a long history of bowling here prior to the Second World War.

Victor: It was actually established in 1917, so it's [unintelligible].
[Unintelligible] all the work as far as services, per se, but I think it's an important part of the Presidio [to realize that]. It [was an important] characteristic of the Presidio and it should belong.
Leading into that, the Crissy Field idea [unintelligible] a little bit [unintelligible] about [unintelligible] which was [unintelligible] the financial [unintelligible].

But [unintelligible] August 4th I was called in to say [unintelligible] until today the Presidio has been unable to identify [unintelligible]

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 83
Crissy Field [unintelligible] what I would consider historical service
to the Presidio.

Female Voice: [Unintelligible].

Victor: I was told two days before the announcement [-- the press
announcement in] August of last year. So [unintelligible] told me at
[the last minute] [unintelligible] to the end of January [next] year.
So [unintelligible].

As far as the Section 106 process, [unintelligible] meeting. I saw
[an email pop up] another [unintelligible] the next morning, it'd be
nice to have some emails that go out that say, "Hey,
[unintelligible]," [unintelligible] documents [unintelligible] very
long. [Unintelligible] kind of [unintelligible] a couple days to see if
something's on there. I noticed a letter from August [unintelligible]
a couple other organizations showed up there a couple days ago.

As far as the Section 106 process, I believe there's a meeting on
December 2nd. Is that correct? And the public is invited to that?

Karen Cook: I should explain something. The Section 106 process is not a public
process, per se. It is a public process in the sense that people are
invited to become consulting parties in that process. And as I say,
we have virtually never turned anybody away who asked to be a
consulting party. But then the groups that become involved in that
process are those people who have identified themselves as being
consulting parties.

So to the extent that people have said, "Well, we didn't get the Finding of Effect," or, "We haven't had a notice of a consultation meeting," it's because they did not sign on as part of the consultation process. So when we talk about "the public" in Section 106, it's the public as represented by the consultation parties.

Victor: So on the 2nd, [unintelligible]?

Karen Cook: Again, we've had plenty of observers come to those meetings, and I think mainly we've just asked that those people who are observing observe, as the people who are part of the process make their comments.

Victor: That's all I'm asking.

Karen Cook: Yes, yes.

Victor: A lot of people have asked [unintelligible] [response] for the SEIS, and then [unintelligible] I've done my own research [unintelligible] documents. The documents [online are helpful] [unintelligible]. But just like I said, [unintelligible] comments to be able to go and hear [unintelligible].

[I mean], obviously [unintelligible] you guys [unintelligible] there [unintelligible] proponents of the [thick report], as this gentleman [unintelligible]. [Unintelligible] to kind of push the process along

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 85
[unintelligible] Section 106 process [unintelligible], so [I believe it's
common knowledge].

As far as for the public [unintelligible] there was [unintelligible]
SEIS [unintelligible], and there was another public commentary
[unintelligible] to the public, if I'm right.

Karen Cook: I'll let maybe one of you speak to that. But there will be a final
SEIS. Typically after the final SEIS is released, there isn't an
official comment period associated with that, although we have
frequently gotten comments to the final SEIS, which we always
take into account before we write a record of decision, before we
reach our decision.

Victor: That's a 30-day [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Right. It's a 30-day period after the final SEIS is released where
nothing happens. You know, it's called essentially the quiet period,
the no-action period. And yes, you can submit additional comments
that we [will undoubtedly] take into account as we deliberate and
reach our record of decision.

Victor: [Unintelligible] my final comment. On the theater [unintelligible]
document online [unintelligible]. It doesn't show any of the
[unintelligible] museum alternatives, but [unintelligible].

Chandler McCoy: If you look at some of the previous pages, there's a legend under the
little sketch, and the dotted line denotes underground parking.

Victor: So even if [unintelligible] Main Post, the bowling center would still be [demolished]?

Male Voice: Possibly.

Victor: [Unintelligible].

Chandler McCoy: I mean, the two sort of are unrelated. But, I mean, it's possible. And it's possible that there could be an underground parking or something like that built instead of the bowling alley -- the bowling center, excuse me.

[Unintelligible]

Female Voice 10: I'm sorry if [I'm beating the proverbial horse], but it feels to me like I'm still not clear what exactly we're going to do [unintelligible] 106 process. Is it individual projects, or is it the master plan? And if it's the master plan, it sounds to me like the master plan [is now moot], because the master plan [unintelligible] the action [unintelligible] is Alternative 2, which is [unintelligible]. So between now and November 15th, will we have any additional information that will help us determine what it is we're actually criticizing?

Andrea Anderson: Right now, the public comment period goes until December the 15th for the draft Finding of Effect. And the draft Finding of Effect actually analyzes all four alternatives in it -- actually 1, 2, 2A, 3 and 4.

Female Voice 10: [Unintelligible].

Andrea Anderson: Two is the Main Post Update. It's the same thing. Alternative 2 is the same thing that is outlined in the Main Post Update.

Female Voice 10: [Unintelligible].

Brian Ramos: The gentleman over here made a comment earlier about appreciating being exposed to the Secretary of Interior's Standards that have provided a certain understanding of the way that folks are analyzing the project.

And so what we all attempted to do today was to show you in more detail the way that experts are looking at the project, and also which is what was covered in the Finding of Effect document and the supplemental EIS, but also to approach it from a different perspective of, "If it were to be done according to Secretary's Standards, what would conforming structures look like?"

And this information is shared with you not for you to comment on it, per se, as an undertaking, because none of these are undertakings, but it's to empower you to be able to look at this through that lens that a historic preservationist would look at the project. A lot of the comments that have been heard tonight and in other meetings have focused on a lot of things like traffic, what it does to the neighborhood, the bowling center.

And the 106 process is not intended to solve all those issues. The NEPA process is intended to analyze those issues. The 106 process is relative to historic preservation, and it deals with some of those like noise, or visual impacts, or building demolitions, and things like that. But it does not address, "Why are you building it? Why there?" Well, "Why there?" But, "Why here? Why not in Golden Gate Park?" is not a proposed action that is analyzed in the 106 process.

So think of the information that you heard tonight as something that is a tool for you to comment on the documents that you've seen, the draft Finding of Effect and the Supplemental, and you can comment on whatever you'd like in those documents. Your comments could say, "Alternative 1 has this aspect, and Alternative 2 has this. And I think this part of Alternative 1 is good, and this part of Alternative 2 is bad."

I mean, it's your comments. You don't need to feel that you need to fit those into a mould. But the lens of the historic preservationist and historic architects and architectural historians and preservation specialists is what you're seeing here, and everybody thinks that that is useful to share with you.

Female Voice 11: [Unintelligible].

Jenny Weston: Hi. My name is [Jenny Weston]. [Unintelligible]. I have a [mountain of documents]. My concern is [unintelligible] the lodge [unintelligible], but my greater concern is [unintelligible].

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 89
[Unintelligible], and I [unintelligible] National Cemetery
[unintelligible]. [So my concern] [unintelligible].

Male Voice 11: Thanks. I finally get a question to answer. The PTMP and this SEIS has noise sections that identify sacred areas that should remain quiet. And certainly the National Cemetery is one of them. And through our analysis, we've identified ways to come up with approaches to keep those areas quiet through minimizing traffic, through looking at different types of measures to keep that quiet. And we will look at different ways to monitor the noise. And if there are issues surrounding keeping those areas quiet, then we'll adopt those measures.

Female Voice 12: [Unintelligible] areas quiet. Is it 10 million or has it gone up?

Tia Lombardi: Don [Fisher] has proposed a \$10 million philanthropic gift to the Main Parade project.

Male Voice 12: [Unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: Yes, it does cost more. It would be part of the funding.

Male Voice 12: [Unintelligible].

Tia Lombardi: We will be looking for philanthropic funds for those projects.

[Unintelligible]

- Tia Lombardi: Yeah. I don't honestly know if it's contingent. At this point, I honestly don't know. We're not really at that point yet. [He's] not given it to us, that's right.
- Female Voice 13: [Unintelligible].
- Tia Lombardi: That's right.
- Female Voice 14: [Unintelligible] disturbed by on every level [unintelligible] won't even have a place to go to like [the Presidio] when you want to get away from the crowd. Where will we go? Because the crowd will be here. [Unintelligible] aspect, and you cannot get that. Haven't we gotten ourselves in enough trouble in this world with greed, ego and power? That's what we're talking about, and that's what you have to listen to. I'd hate to see you guys [unintelligible] and lose your souls this process.
- Male Voice 12: [Unintelligible].
- Mary McCarthy: My name's [Mary McCarthy]. I worked 12 years in San Francisco as a tour guide. Every day, I drive the tour bus through the Presidio. [I'm] told every day [unintelligible] foreigners from every country in the planet, "Would you like to hear [their general feedback]? Would you?" I told them. They've [put it on a website. I know exactly what's going to come.]. And they all said, "Baloney. Crazy. Forget it." They want history. They want the old army base.

If you put any museum here at all, it better be historical. And [unintelligible] already admitted to me [unintelligible] no historical standards. The public, through dialogue with you and other various experts, are going to establish [what is historical]. Guess what? The general public already knows that a contemporary museum isn't historical. They know this.

Here's an idea. We have the Internet at this day and age. [Unintelligible] on your Web site, "General public of the planet" -- the planet isn't the city -- "please let us know what you think." Put a picture what he intends to do, show the size [unintelligible]. Ask [them] what they think. [Unintelligible] historical. Just ask them. The public counts? Okay. You're going to get millions of votes if you make it public -- millions from all over the planet.

That's my suggestion, because there seems to be millions of dollars to spend on this project. It can't cost that much to put it on a Web site. Get public input, really. It's an idea from the tour guide.

[Applause]

[Unintelligible]

Andrea Anderson: It is on our Web site.

Mary McCarthy: That everyone can vote?

Andrea Anderson: That we take comments via our Web site, yes.

Mary McCarthy: How about [unintelligible] votes no, against it? [Could you] do that?

Andrea Anderson: The public can give us any comment that they want via our Web site or mail, in any way they like.

Mary McCarthy: [Unintelligible] alternative [unintelligible].

Female Voice: There is a No Action alternative that you can say you prefer.

Female Voice: Can you give any feedback to all the different [unintelligible] on the Web site [unintelligible]? [Unintelligible] 50 percent or more [unintelligible]?

Andrea Anderson: In our final documents, we will have a section where we respond to the public comment we've received.

Mary McCarthy: But so far [unintelligible]?

Andrea Anderson: Don?

Female Voice 14: [Unintelligible].

Don: For one, it isn't a beauty contest, and NEPA never meant it to be a beauty contest. We received well over probably 2,500 comments to date, and many of them are negative for various reasons. You choose one, and [you're about to find out].

Female Voice 14: [Unintelligible]?

Don: Of course it does, of course it does. But we are not the decision-makers; our board are. And they get to review these and look at our responses, and make the decision. We're not the decision-makers here. We're staff, all of us. We don't make the decisions.

Female Voice 14: [Unintelligible]? What [unintelligible] the public [unintelligible] the Internet [unintelligible]?

Don: Petitions, comments.

[Unintelligible]

John Pelka: Thank you. Whether or not [Don's issue was adequately informed] early on [just] how [out of scale] Secretary's Standards and with everything, what the [the Main Post] stands for, how [unintelligible] his project [unintelligible] proposal, how far out in left-field that was -- whether or not he was properly informed of that. It's hard to imagine, but [unintelligible].

If as many of us vote, [he] decides that it's not going to work, and he decides not to donate this project to the Main Post of the Presidio, then what becomes of the analysis [unintelligible] tonight? It seems like it could still be useful for another project in that area,

Presidio Trust 11.19.08 - 6.30 p.m. - Golden Gate Club, 135 FisherPage 94
hopefully, [unintelligible]. But [unintelligible] for no use
[unintelligible] if there is no [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: You're exactly right. The work that we have been doing will have continued utility. Even if the proposals go away, this will inform what is a compatible project at the sites that we have analyzed, such that we might not have an active proposal, but we could go put out an RFP again and hope that somebody steps forward with a cultural use that would meet the parameters that we identify when we put together the preferred alternative that I keep referring to that will be forthcoming.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Male Voice 14: I have another procedural question. I'm still a little confused. So comment period ends for both the SEIS and the Finding of Effect on December 15th, after which then there will be issued another draft for us to review [and comment on]? Is that true or not?

Andrea Anderson: No.

Male Voice 14: Because we were told as recently as a month ago that there was going to be a draft final FOE that at least we [unintelligible], and then a final version of that would be issued [for comments]. So I don't see that on this schedule, and I don't really understand how all the feedback from this process [unintelligible] process.

How is that going to be [unintelligible] just in a final document, and then what if all of that comes out in the final document and [unintelligible] don't like [unintelligible]? How is that [unintelligible]? Because there's a lot [that's] been discussed [unintelligible] process [unintelligible] document now [unintelligible] public comment.

Andrea Anderson: I guess I'll take the first part of it, which is on the draft Finding of Effect. If you took a look at that chart that Michael had up there, as well as the process that's here, the thought is that we'll take the comments on the draft Finding of Effect, and we will issue a revised Finding of Effect, and that will be presented to the consulting parties.

And then at that point in time, we are going to be trying to reach consensus with the ACHP or the [SHIPO] and the Natural Parks Service to have them actually concur with that revised Finding of Effect. And then based on that revised Finding of Effect, then we move on to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the various adverse effects that are identified.

So yes, there will be another version issued after this draft period is closed, a revised version, if you will, that then we will seek concurrence from the consulting parties on that revised version of the Finding of Effect.

Male Voice 14: I'm sorry, is that in the schedule?

Andrea Anderson: It is. If you take a look at the one that Michael had in his slide and you take a look here --

[Unintelligible]

Andrea Anderson: If it's not on there, it should be. Because it was on that Michael had, the shortened version. I think it got dropped off on the bottom of the second to the last page. That would be a revised [finding] that will be issued.

Male Voice 14: Yeah, [unintelligible] schedule [unintelligible] every part in the process [unintelligible], and how [unintelligible] processes [are running] [unintelligible].

Andrea Anderson: For the rest of the audience here, the individual is a member of the Presidio Historical Association, which is one of the consulting parties in the 106 process. And as a consulting party, you will be receiving a more thorough consultation plan that will show the rest of these steps in the 106 process. As far as dates, all we can do is sort of estimate dates right now based on where we are in the process. We can't give you final dates.

Male Voice 14: [Unintelligible].

Andrea Anderson: Sometime in the new year.

Male Voice 14: [Unintelligible].

Male Voice:

All right. Well, thank you, everybody. Thank you for coming
[sticking with us]. [Unintelligible].

[Unintelligible]

Male Voice:

Let's just talk here while they're down there mingling and doing
their thing.

[End of recorded material]

