

**12.5.08 Presidio Trust Meeting**



**Tigerfish<sup>®</sup>**  
Transcribing·Editing

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

[www.tigerfish.com](http://www.tigerfish.com)

## 12.5.08 Presidio Trust Meeting

[Beginning of recorded material]

Female Voice: Welcome to Conference America. Please hold.

Male Voice: Welcome to Conference America. Can I have your pass code, please?

Rob Thomson: Yeah.

Male Voice: May I have your name, please?

Rob Thomson: Yeah, it's Rob Thomson.

Male Voice: [Good morning], thank you. Mr. Thomson, just dial star zero if you need any operator assistance at any time during the call today.

Rob Thomson: Okay, thank you.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Rob Thomson: Hi, there. Who do we have on the line there?

Katherine Kerr: You have Katherine Kerr from the ACHP; Betsy Merritt from the National Trust; as well as Wayne Donaldson, Steve Mikesell, and Susan Stratton from SHPO.

Rob Thomson: All right, fantastic.

Katherine Kerr: Thanks.

Male Voice: Hello, Rob.

Rob Thomson: Hi. It's just me here.

[Laughter]

Rob Thomson: Just kidding. We've got a room full of people. We'll go around and do introductions in just a minute. But thank you all for calling in.

Female Voice: [Unintelligible]?

Rob Thomson: No, I got to see over here. Thanks. Yeah, introductions. Lots of faces here, some new, some not. Please everybody be sure to speak with Jennifer Correia over there in the corner to make sure she is recording your presence here. This meeting is being recorded and transcribed, as we've been doing. And the gentleman sitting next to Jennifer is responsible for tracking who's saying what when, which we all know is a challenging job. So let's start off with introductions going around the room. I'm Rob Thomson, preservation specialist with the Presidio Trust.

Amy Meyer: Amy Meyer, People for Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Becky Evans: Becky Evans, Sierra Club.

Andrea Anderson: Andrea Anderson, Presidio Trust.

Nancy Leavens: Nancy Leavens, Cow Hollow Association.

Lynn Fuller: Lynn Fuller, Cow Hollow Association.

Lori Brooke: Lori Brooke, President of Cow Hollow Association.

Michael Boland: Michael Boland, Presidio Trust.

Craig Middleton: Craig Middleton, Presidio Trust.

Melanie Blum: Melanie Blum with the Presidio Theater, project manager.

Mary Murphy: Mary Murphy, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, counsel to the  
Contemporary Art Museum at the Presidio.

Whitney Hall: Whitney Hall, Presidio Historical Association.

Redmond Kernan: Redmond Kernan, Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Elaine Jackson-Retondo, National Park  
Service Regional Office.

Gary Widman: Gary Widman, Presidio Historical Association.

Boyd de Larios: Boyd de Larios, Descendants of Anza & Portolá Expedition.

Anthony Veerkamp: Anthony Veerkamp with the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Donald Green: Donald Green from the Laurel Heights Association.

Brian Ramos: Brian Ramos with ICF-Jones & Stokes.

Eric Blind: Eric Blind, Presidio Trust Archaeologist.

Tia Lombardi: Tia Lombardi, Presidio Trust.

Kelly Wilkinson: Kelly Wilkinson, KQED Radio.

Dee Bardwick: Dee Bardwick. I'm with the Solicitor's Office representing the National Park Service.

Neal Desai: Neal Desai, National Parks Conservation Association.

Craig Kenkel: Craig Kenkel, National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Brian Turner: Brian Turner, National Trust for Historic Preservation, western office.

Jennifer Correia: Jennifer Correia, Historic Preservation Coordinator, Presidio Trust.

[Bibek Shankar]: Bibek Shankar with Bloomberg.

Lucia Bogatay: Lucia Bogatay, Presidio Historical Association.

Alex [Bevk]: Alex Bevk with the San Francisco Architectural Heritage.

Mark [Nagle]: Mark Nagle, Cow Hollow Association.

Jason Wright: Jason Wright, Presidio Historical Association.

Bill Shepard: Bill Shepard from the Neighborhood Associations of Presidio Planning.

Rob Thomson: Thanks everyone. And then we all heard who was on the phone from the Advisory Council/National Trust for Historic Preservation and SHPO's office. Did I get everybody?

Male Voice: Yep.

Rob Thomson: All right. I think Brian Ramos is going to say a little something just about the kind of tone and tenor of the meeting, as he has before. Please.

Brian Ramos: Yeah. Today's meeting is going to have structure, and you all have seen an agenda, but it's not the same structure in the last All Hands

Meeting where we're going with time allotments for each group. I would imagine that folks are going to want to say things. You're going to be presented some information today, and so I just ask for some patience to let some of that information be presented to you.

As always, communication is open. But we have a fairly short time together today, so be mindful of that time as information is being presented here today when folks are talking. This is particularly important in a situation where we have folks that are conferenced into the call. If you're sitting on the other end of a conference call and more than one person is talking at the same time, it just becomes a garbled set of words to the people on the other end. So let's all try and take our turns and speak one at a time, and have our constructive comments heard more effectively that way.

Rob Thomson: Great. Thanks, Brian. And if things really break down, I'll be forced to suspend the meeting and show people pictures of my new baby.

[Laughter]

Rob Thomson: I don't want that to happen.

[Crosstalk]

Rob Thomson: Craig, if you could say a couple things in introduction, please?

Craig Middleton: Sure, thanks. First of all, thank you all for being here, for coming on a beautiful day out here and spending a couple hours with us. I also wanted to put us in a little context. Earlier today we were out at the Public Health Services Hospital celebrating the dinosaur of demolition, I guess [you would] call it, the dinosaur of demolition taking down the wings, the fabled wings of that building.

I bring that up because you will remember about a year and a half ago that the discussions around the Public Health Services Hospital were heated; they were contentious; it was difficult. We never knew whether we would end up with a project there or not. Today we're talking about the Main Post. It's contentious; it's difficult; it's heated.

I just hope that at the end of the day we will all be coming together to celebrate something really great here that accomplishes many of the goals that we all have put in place. I know we're not there yet, and I know we have to keep going. I think one of the things we want to talk about today is how having listened and having engaged in this 106 process, which I frankly think has been really successful to date -- it's not over yet; it's iterative; it's dynamic -- where we think we should go next.

We really think that the next thing to do is to create a new Undertaking, which would be released after the holidays, and would have with it a public comment period, so that everyone would have

a chance to talk to us about it. Of course, that would be incorporated into this 106 consultation that we're in the middle of.

Later in this meeting, I'd like to have Michael walk us through what that Undertaking starts to look like. It's far from complete. We've got the outlines and an idea in place. And as I said, we'll be [looking that over] the next month or so. With that, I'd like to just get us going. I guess, Rob, you're going to get us going. And again, thanks everybody for being part of this process.

Rob Thomson: Great. Thank you, Craig. Per the agenda that I emailed out last night, and that everybody should have a copy of in front of them, what I hope to do is spend a little bit of time talking about the anticipated calendar for the Section 106 consultation moving forward. If anybody who's not at the central table here needs one, please grab one. I see Boyd's got a bunch in front of him here. If we need to make more copies we can do that.

I realize that everybody's had a chance to review the schedule -- or maybe they haven't. But in any case, I thought it was important to walk through this in a step-by-step fashion. You have all been very gracious in your patience with our changing schedule. But as those of you have been through a 106 consultation know, it's an iterative and dynamic process, as Craig said. And that process has changed.

I wanted to spend some time walking through what you can expect over the next couple of days and weeks, and give you what I hope is

a clearer path through the assessment phase, which I believe we're still in, and into the resolution phase of this consultation. So I started back in November and included on the table the meetings that we've already had, just for continuity's sake. But it brings us up to today's meeting, All Hands, where we're discussing the process and calendar.

You see on here also -- and you may know already -- that there was an announcement made today that the Trust has identified a preferred alternative, and that's what Michael Boland's going to spend some time describing later this morning or this afternoon. And we still anticipate a public board meeting next week where some of this same material will be discussed, and the public will have an opportunity to comment.

The next big date, though, that everybody in this room will be interested in is not yet determined, but it's in early to mid-January when the Trust anticipates releasing two new compliance documents, a supplement to the SEIS. And yes, I know it's a SSEIS. But a supplement to the SEIS, and a new Finding of Effect document that assesses the affects of the Revised Undertaking that's described in that environmental document. And I know there may be some questions around that, but we'll come back to that at the end of the calendar discussion.

That release will trigger a 45-day review period from the early to mid-January timeline, and it will also set us up for another series of

consultation meetings that will take place before that comment period closes. The other thing that will happen before that comment period closes is a 213 Report will be released by the Advisory Council, as everybody has come to expect. And since that is an Advisory Council document, I hope Kate can maybe jump in at this point and talk a little bit about what we might expect on that front.

Katherine Kerr: Sure. This is Katherine Kerr from the ACHP. As Rob said, the Section 213 Report was requested by my agency back in August. Through the National Park Service, the Pacific West Region, and specifically to Elaine Jackson-Retondo who was offering the report on behalf of the National Park Service, we granted a request in November for a delay in the National Park Service submitting the report, because at that point in time things had started to change in the National Park Service. And the ACHP wanted to make sure that the Section 213 Report was as current as was the consultation process.

So given this new schedule and this new turn of events for the Section 106 consultation process, I will be working with Elaine and her office to determine what she needs in order to complete a Section 213 Report, and also for it to be delivered to the ACHP. That will take some time, because it will come most likely direct from the National Park Service Director, Ms. Mary Bomar.

We hope that within three to four days of receiving the Section 213 Report we will release it to consulting parties, and then within a

week total, to a week and a half depending on our Web folks, to also post the 213 Report on our Web site. I don't think we can give anybody an exact date as to when that report will be released, because we don't have the materials yet.

So that will be dependent upon when the Presidio Trust is able to release the new Draft Finding of Effect and description of the Undertaking. But it will be within the 45-day comment period, and consulting parties will have an opportunity to review the Section 213 Report prior to the 45-day comment period close.

Rob Thomson: Right. Thanks very much, Katherine. Just to echo what was just said, the report is produced by the National Park Service and released by the Advisory Council, but the Presidio Trust will do everything it can to facilitate that report being released within the comment period, so that it can inform comments of the consulting parties before the period closes. I know there have been a number of questions about that. I hope that clears things up. If you have more questions, just maybe make a note and we'll get back to them after I finish running through the calendar here.

That shouldn't take very long, because the rest of this calendar -- I'm looking at Item Nine here -- describes is a bit more open-ended. You notice a lot of TBDs in the schedule column, and that's deliberate. We expect that once the final Finding of Effect document is released approximately two weeks after the close of

public comment period, that we will close the assessment phase of this consultation and transition into the resolution phase.

The resolution phase carries with it a whole other series of activities, including drafting of Agreement documents, and discussions of mitigations, and other such things that we're not necessarily here to talk about today, and we're not in a position to talk about yet. I went ahead and put the rest of these items on the schedule so that everybody can know what to expect, even though we don't necessarily have a specific timeline assigned to that.

The last important thing I'll note about the calendar is the final item, and that is to reiterate the agency's commitment that the Section 106 process and the NEPA process will close in tandem with one another. We're making a commitment with the release of these new materials in particular to running the rest of the process side-by-side, as has been requested of us, and as is appropriate. So that's what you can expect.

I think that covered everything I wanted to about the consultation calendar. Just please note there will be several more consultation meetings, probably more like the format of the one that we had in September, where we'll go around and people will have opportunities to speak very specifically about the documents we're releasing. And we'll be meeting a lot more, as there's a long way to go here. But as Craig said, I think we can get there together.

Anybody have any questions about this calendar? And let's all try to remain conscious of the time. It's about 1:00 here in San Francisco. We've got another hour and a half. I know Michael has some things to present, as well. So let's try to take 15, 20 minutes or so of time for questions, and then we'll go from there. Lucia Bogatay?

Lucia Bogatay: Lucia Bogatay, Presidio Historical Association. Did I overlook reissuing the Main Post Update? Is that in your calendar and I just didn't see it?

Rob Thomson: You did not overlook that. We will be releasing a series of new documents in early to mid-January, as I said, and that will include some version of design guidelines and project description that will constitute our new Undertaking. And it may or may not be in the precise format that the Main Post Update as a standalone document is, but it will be put together in such a way that it will describe the Undertaking. Does anybody from the Trust have anything to add to that description?

Andrea Anderson: The only thing final is I think what we anticipate is that a final version of the Main Post Update wouldn't come out until around about the time period of the final SEIS would come out.

Whitney Hall: I've got an additional question. Whitney Hall, PHA. The term "undertaking," "preferred action," and "proposed action" have all been used, kind of intermingled. It was earlier established, I think, that the Undertaking was the planning guidance in the Main Post

Update, and the proposed action was the specific configuration of buildings and so forth being dealt with in the 106 process, and that we were advised to keep those separate in our approach. Could you clarify? Because it's already [kind of merged] back together.

Rob Thomson: Yeah, yeah. Thank you. That's an important question. Andrea, would you be willing to describe the movement from a proposed action to a preferred alternative on the NEPA side first?

Andrea Anderson: Sure. Well basically, when we wrote our final SEIS, the proposed action, which is identified in that document as Alternative Two, was really a way for the Trust to show the public what we had received as far as proposals through the RFP process, and outline that in a planning format. Then of course we analyzed other alternatives, as well, within that document.

But within the Draft SEIS, we didn't identify a preferred alternative. That's what the Trust is doing at this point in time; they're identifying a preferred alternative. And that preferred alternative then, the public is going to get an opportunity to comment on that once we release the supplement to the Draft SEIS, as well as we will be releasing in tandem, as indicated before, the Revised Draft Finding of Effect.

So before what we had, in other words, was within the SEIS we had a proposed action with alternatives to the proposed action, but no preferred alternative identified. Now we will have a preferred

alternative identified. The Draft SEIS will analyze that preferred alternative. And then eventually the supplement to the Draft SEIS will be rolled into the final document, so within the final document you'll be able to compare all of the alternatives in one document.

Whitney Hall: We understand that, but that's within the SEIS 106 process focused upon the -- I know you called it "preferred alternative." You didn't use the word "undertaking."

Andrea Anderson: Right. I think Rob wants to turn it over to him, then, to discuss that process.

Rob Thomson: Yeah. I just asked Andrea to clarify things on the NEPA side. On the NHPA side, the new Undertaking will be the preferred alternative. Right?

Karen Cook: Yeah. It's a difference in terminology under the two separate sets of laws.

Whitney Hall: No, I think it's substantive. For instance, purpose and need are established in what we thought was the Underlying Policy document of the MPU. What is the status then of the MPU? Are we just disregarding that in the process?

Karen Cook: The Main Post Update, which is a draft document, was intended to provide more illustration of what is Alternative Two in the SEIS. The language of the SEIS, because it's a NEPA document that only

talks about impacts, didn't really provide an opportunity to give sort of the bigger picture of the vision that was to be accomplished under Alternative Two.

The Main Post Update -- just like when we issued PTMP -- we had PTMP, and then we had the EIS that analyzed all the impacts under PTMP. But the PTMP document itself had a little more florid language, if you will, that could describe the picture rather than just the analysis that's contained in the EIS. That was the purpose of the Main Post Update. It was to provide that more illustrative picture than we could do in the EIS document, only talking about the impacts of Alternative Two.

But it's a draft document. Okay? Let me finish, let me finish.

Whitney Hall: Okay. Because I'm still not clear what is the status of the MPU.

Karen Cook: Okay. The MPU was a description of the proposed action. What we're saying to you now is it was not identified -- it was not a preferred alternative. We are now going to analyze the preferred alternative and provide as much information -- many of the same elements that were in the MPU will be in this supplement that we are talking about.

When we get your comments, we will issue a final Main Post Update that will incorporate the comments that we've heard on the

preferred alternative, and will again provide kind of the vision, the picture, and it will be like when we finalized PTMP and issued that document as our final document.

Whitney Hall: I will close with one statement. I think the public has been confused from Day One about this business of moving to a preferred alternative without thorough review and discussion of the planning guidelines and the design [guidelines] that lead to the final structure. That's the end of my statement. [Unintelligible] if you just completely withdrew the MPU, we knew where we would stand.

We commented on the PTMP and the other documents of that sort in conjunction with the EIS that accompanied them, and I'm completely unclear now on the status of the MPU, and for the underlying rationale for the preferred alternative, which should be what was explained by the MPU.

Karen Cook: I will disagree with you on one point, which is it would have been premature for us to identify a preferred alternative before now, because the agency had not reached that point. And so we were trying to focus the public's attention on those projects for which we had proposed actions, so that it could give the proper attention and the proper comment, if you would, on those actions for which we had real proposals.

But we are now saying -- and again, we are identifying a preferred alternative. We have not adopted anything. It's a preferred

alternative for which we are eliciting your comments, and we will take those into account.

Female Voice: Could you identify yourself? We didn't catch your name.

Karen Cook: I'm sorry. I'm Karen Cook. I'm General Counsel.

Female Voice: Karen Cook?

Karen Cook: And you're right. And Andrea Anderson was speaking earlier.

Female Voice: Okay, thanks.

Amy Meyer: I'd like to express the same thought as Whitney, which is that the level of confusion is very high, and that it really seems necessary to separate these documents, the earlier MPU from this later document that you're going to do, because you're using language that you use every day. Most of us don't use this every day. Most of us deal differently in the world. We could use a separation so this thing has a different cover, has a different title, or it makes a very clear distinction.

Because yes, I agree with you -- I'm sorry, Amy Meyer, People for GGNRA. What you presented earlier you said was based on what had been offered, the RFPs, and the people who had come, and the project for the museum. If this is really going to change from that offering, then a very clear distinction should be made, because we'll

do better. The public will have to make comments. We'll do better if the distinction is made better.

Rob Thomson: Elaine, did you have something to add?

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: I do have a question.

Rob Thomson: Or a question?

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Andrea, if I think I understood you correctly -- this is Elaine Jackson-Retondo, National Park Service -- that there would be a release of the final Main Post Update at approximately the same time that the final SEIS is issued --

Andrea Anderson: That's correct.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: -- and that there would be no interim document between the existing? So that would mean that people would meet to comment on the current Draft Main Post Update if they want their comments considered before you issue the final?

Andrea Anderson: Well, they can comment on the current Main Post Update, which, as Karen indicated, is really just an illustration of Alternative Two. And then obviously that's why we're having a separate public comment period on the preferred alternative. They can comment on the preferred alternative, as well. In other words, we're trying to mirror -- I'm sorry, Karen.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: But my question --

Female Voice: It's just a mess.

Karen Cook: This is Karen Cook again, General Counsel from the Trust. I was just going to make a slight correction to what you said about there not being an interim document. The supplement --

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Will come out before?

Karen Cook: -- to the EIS will essentially be that interim document that describes the preferred alternative, provides the same information essentially that was in the Main Post Update, as to the preferred alternative --

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Right.

Karen Cook: -- which is different than the proposed action.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: But will that supplement come out before the close of comment on the Draft Main Post Update?

Karen Cook: Okay.

Female Voice: Yes, yes. We're [moving on to that].

Rob Thomson: That's an important point that was not yet made. The previous statements we've made about closing public comment on the documents that you currently have, the comment period will not be closed. The comment period is going to remain open on all existing documents through the end of the comment period on the new set of documents that will be released in early to mid-January. So the new close of comment period on all documents will be early to mid-January plus 45 days.

Lynn Fuller: I just want to make one short remark about all these different documents and comment periods. Like we heard from Katherine a little while ago that the Section 213 letter would come out within the comment period, I think is the expression --

Katherine Kerr: Could you please identify yourself?

Lynn Fuller: I'm sorry. I'm Lynn Fuller, Vice President of the Cow Hollow Association. I think we would all be a little more comfortable, those of us who are members of the public, if we could be assured that things that are relevant to the comments that need to be made would be released to us well in advance of the comment period. I would prefer that.

That would make me more comfortable than within the comment period, because that could technically be the day before or two days before. If we were paid staff, we could drop everything and focus on that. Many of us are volunteers and we have to do this on

evenings and weekends, and so on, and we just need more lead time.

Female Voice: Yep, yep.

Male Voice: Well, I think --

Rob Thomson: Thank you for that.

Karen Cook: May I address that?

Female Voice: Sure.

Karen Cook: This is Karen Cook. The comment period doesn't start until the documents are issued. And under NEPA anyway, that is a defined point in time. It's the date of which the Trust issues a federal register notice of the availability of the documents. So the comment period can't start until that official issuance date.

Katherine Kerr: This is Katherine Kerr from the ACHP. I just want to also piggyback on what Karen said. Under NHPA, the comment period does not start until consulting parties have the documents, are in receipt of the documents to be reviewed.

Boyd de Larios: Excuse me.

Rob Thomson: Boyd, please.

Boyd de Larios: Yes, okay.

Rob Thomson: Boyd de Larios.

Boyd de Larios: Boyd de Larios, DAPE. I'd like to ask, based on the statements we've heard before and my own problems, that we take some time out, or perhaps a week, to allow the members of the 106 consultation [unintelligible] to comment on the schedule.

I think that it is very much too compressed. I think that there are elements missing from your analysis, which I applaud you for doing it. But there are things that are necessary in this process that are not covered in this schedule. I think that allowing the parties time to review it and to make suggestions as to what should be there, or to become satisfied with the schedule would be a beneficial thing.

I note in my researches that in NEPA, Title 40, Section 1501.7 under Scoping, the last thing says, "Section C. An agency shall revise the determinations made under Paragraphs A and B of this section if substantial changes are made later in the proposed action, or if significant new circumstances or information arise which bear on the proposal or its impacts."

You may or may not be familiar with that, but I'd like to know, does that have any impact on this process, and are there other things which have an impact on this process that we are not yet

discussing? Therefore, for that reason, let us pause in this process, slow this process down.

I have a secondary point, which is there are a lot of answers which I have listened to from the Presidio Trust staff, and I think I listened to one a little bit earlier where there's a certain circularity in it, and you're making appeals to things that are going to happen as if they have happened. But the purpose and need that was addressed in Mr. Hall's statement, I don't think that was really truly answered. And where the Undertaking lies, I think that was [unintelligible] by the discussion.

Please, let's make this a more clear process. The diagrams which we were shown on November 19th showed a very linear process, and it very much truncated the ability of people to do analysis, and I think very much oversimplified it. So I repeat, I request that we have an extended period to review the schedule and comment on it.

Rob Thomson: Okay. Just to respond briefly to that, you have the schedule. Please feel free to comment on it. The new set of documents has not been released. It won't be for several more weeks. And in that time, we welcome your thoughts and comments on the schedule, and we'll do what we can.

Andrea Anderson: Rob, what about commenting on the presentations that were given in the small groups? Are we treating now as a good time to submit

our reactions to those presentations, or will there be a better time later?

Rob Thomson: I think it's appropriate for the parties to comment on any meetings that they have, or any interactions they have with the Presidio Trust regarding this Undertaking. The thing that's important to remember about the presentations that you were describing is that they were not descriptions of the Undertaking; they were exercises to help members of the consulting parties understand some of the decisions that the Trust is trying to grapple with, and they do not represent a project proposal.

The project proposal, in 106 terms: "The Undertaking," will be released in early to mid-January, and that is the essential document that everybody needs to comment on. But if you do have thoughts, reactions, suggestions, et cetera, based on the meetings that were held in November, please draft them up in a letter and send them into us for the record.

Andrea Anderson: Thank you.

Rob Thomson: Gary?

Gary Widman: Well, I second all the comments you've heard so far about --

Rob Thomson: This is Gary Widman, PHA.

Gary Widman: -- Gary Widman, President of the PHA -- about the potential confusion, and to the extent there's confusion, also legal vulnerability, which you should be concerned about of both the 106 and the NEPA processes. I think we have to remember that your process here involves four separate things at a minimum: the revision of the master plan; the update; the design guidelines; proposal on a hotel; proposal on an art museum. And for all of that, you're running a NEPA process and a 106 process simultaneously.

When you talk about a single Undertaking, or a single preferred alternative, maybe I'm wrong because we haven't seen it yet, but it sounds to me like you're talking one alternative in one of those eight processes, and leaving everything in confusion, if that's the case, for all the rest of it. So it seems to me that if you're going to run those processes, you need to tell us where you are in all of those processes, not just in one process.

On top of that, there is a great concern -- I mean, I would echo the concern that Elaine just expressed a few minutes ago -- when you attempt to use the old documents for new purposes and new deadlines. I mean, the last time we had a 106 meeting, the large 106 meeting, we were basically told that the Main Post Update was the primary document. That's what we should focus on ahead of everything else.

Female Voice: Yep.

Female Voice: Mm-hmm.

Female Voice: Yes.

Gary Widman: And now we're told, "Well, you can still comment on that, but it's no longer relevant." And we won't find out what's relevant until the final impact statement comes out, so we won't have had a meaningful chance to comment on it. I mean, that's the way it's coming across. If I'm wrong on those things, let me know.

But I think you need to be careful, and that you need to put out your documents, meaningful documents which are changed, as Amy and Elaine have both suggested, and Whit is suggesting, and then ask for comments on those, not try to slip them in at the end of the process when people have not had a chance to meaningfully look at them before a final comes out.

Karen Cook: This is Karen.

Katherine Kerr: Karen, this is Katherine Kerr. Can I interrupt Gary?

Karen Cook: Please, please.

Katherine Kerr: Okay. This is Katherine Kerr from the ACHP. I want to make it pointedly clear, as I have done at every meeting, NEPA has its own set of rules; NHPA has its own set of rules. The Presidio Trust is doing its best in meeting both needs of two different federal

regulations. Gary, you mentioned specifically that we're not going to see anything until the environmental impact statement comes out. That's not necessarily true.

Gary Widman: Well, I'd be happy to encourage otherwise.

Katherine Kerr: Gary, please let me finish.

Gary Widman: Well, okay.

Katherine Kerr: Under NHPA, Presidio Trust has to submit documents under NHPA. I have always strongly recommended to them that they are separate from the documents that are released under NEPA, because you have to comment separately under NEPA, and comment separately under NHPA; whereas the Main Post Update, which I strongly believe is our Undertaking that incorporates numerous types of activities such as a lodge, such as addition to the theater, as well as a museum, those documents have to address the Undertaking under NHPA.

And it may be redundant and the same as included in the NEPA documents, which is basically the Environmental Impact Statement. But the Presidio Trust has to produce and release documentation under both NEPA and under NHPA. So when you're commenting on the EIS, you're commenting under NEPA; you're not commenting under NHPA.

Gary Widman: Well, when I made my comments a few minutes ago, I was trying to make what I think is exactly the same point that you just made, which is that those are two separate processes, and the Trust needs to be clear on where they are in all of those. And I didn't hear anything that you said that contradicts that.

Donald Green: Can I address that also?

Rob Thomson: Yeah, Don.

Donald Green: This is Don Green. I've had the same conversations. Let me try and put it one other way. My understanding was that this whole process was -- I'm going to use the word "NEPA" for just a minute, but I'll come back to where we belong. But the whole process was undertaken because you have to have a disparate plan for the Main Post. That's part of the general Presidio Trust Management Plan.

The next step is a District Plan. And because of all these things that were going on, the Trust decided to do a District Plan. And the District Plan, as I understand, is what the Main Post Update is. It gives project details, and it gives design details, and the Director of Planning is agreeing with me.

So the basic document is the Main Post Update. Now on that, the Determination of Effects was made for 106, because Katherine Kerr said that Main Post Update is the Undertaking, and we're going to make Determination of Effects on that. At the same time, the

Supplemental EIS is going to make comments on that. So if we don't have that to begin with, which is the Revised Main Post Update, I don't understand how you can make comments on it from either the NEPA or the 106.

I'd like Katherine or anybody else -- let's stick with the 106, and tell me how you can do a Revised Determination of Effects, which it says you're going to do here, without a Revised Undertaking, or Revised Main Post Update. Please. Katherine?

Karen Cook: I'm happy to answer that, Don.

Donald Green: Okay.

Karen Cook: This is Karen Cook. We will have a Revised Undertaking. That Revised Undertaking will be what we have identified as the preferred alternative.

Donald Green: It's not a separate document that amends the --

Karen Cook: The supplementary documents that we are talking about, the Revised Finding of Effect, and the supplement to the EIS -- they will describe the new Undertaking.

Donald Green: But what's the matter with a document that says, "This is our Undertaking. Here's what it looks like. Here's where it's going to be."

Karen Cook: I will make sure that those documents say, "This is our Undertaking."

Donald Green: Well, can we have a separate document for that purpose, please?

Melanie Blum: I think that's what she's trying to say.

Donald Green: No, no. Just a minute. I'm sorry.

Female Voice: She didn't mention that.

Karen Cook: I am saying that.

Melanie Blum: That's what I'm understanding.

Donald Green: A separate document.

Karen Cook: I guess what you're asking is a separate document in the form that the Main Post Update --

Donald Green: Something that's called a Revised Main Post Update. I don't care about the form. I just want it to be the same kind of information that we had before that reflects the new information you're going to give us now. And without that, I'm at a loss.

Female Voice: [That's right].

Boyd de Larios: So that we no longer need to comment on this document, we're commenting on a new document.

Male Voice: Right.

Karen Cook: That's right.

Male Voice: Well said.

Female Voice: Is that not what is being issued in mid-January --

Karen Cook: Yes.

Female Voice: -- what we've been talking about?

Female Voice: That's not what she said.

[Crosstalk]

Female Voice: I'm just wondering.

Male Voice: Well, let her tell us again. Will there be a separate document in addition to the Supplemental EIS and the Revised Findings of Effect? Will there be a document called the Revised Main Post Update?

Karen Cook: I don't think that we had envisioned the necessity of issuing a document called Revised Main Post Update at this point in time. However, all of the information that is in the Main Post Update would be contained in these supplementary documents that we are going to [crosstalk].

Donald Green: You've heard the confusion.

[Crosstalk]

Karen Cook: I don't understand. But it will have the same information.

Male Voice: Let someone else say it, I guess.

Donald Green: That is the source of [unintelligible] confusion.

[Crosstalk]

Rob Thomson: Wait a second, wait a second.

Donald Green: Excuse me. I'll say it. That is the source of the confusion. You have taken the Draft FOE and the SEIS, and thrown a bunch of stuff in there, and we've been going back and forth from document to document getting different oral representations from various members of the Presidio Trust staff as to what we're supposed to pay attention to, and the public is [unintelligible] confused, as are we at this table.

I think this was a reasonable request to segregate that information from the rest of it. If you produce another SEIS, or you sandwich it in, or footnote the Undertaking, or whatever the heck you do, then it will be just as confusing as what exists now. So I don't see that that's any remedy. Now for those of you who are technically-minded and very sure of what you're doing, we're not.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Can I just say something? This is Elaine, National Park Service. I think I can explain it. And if I'm misrepresenting people, let me know. I think the confusion is that the Main Post Update was identified as a Section 106 document. And now the supplemental to the Supplemental EIS, the EIS, the Draft Supplemental that will come out later, is now being identified as the Section 106 document. I think that's where the confusion is, because as I understand it, the two were not under -- is it point eight that says that the two are being conflated?

Donald Green: The Main Post Update was part of the SEIS initial distribution. They gave us two documents. We've worked hard on it and the Supervisors' Committee, and it was our clear understanding that this is a document that is changing the plan, and these are our analysis of effects. So it wasn't just the 106 document.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Right, right.

Brian Ramos: Look, I'm going to say something here. One is, is that we need to be more orderly.

Male Voice: Does it make any difference if I raise my hand or not?

Brian Ramos: I was going to call on you.

Female Voice: I'm sorry [crosstalk].

Male Voice: It doesn't appear to.

Brian Ramos: Okay. And so that's one of the things that I was going to say, is that we need to speak in turn. So from this point forward, I'd like people to raise their hand, and we'll talk in turn, okay? The other is -- and I don't like looking at the clock, but we do need to. We have not talked about substantive issues since we've been here. We've been here almost an hour, and we've been talking about the schedule.

Everybody has made a point that both the names and types of deliverables for this project, in terms of documents, are confusing. The Trust has heard that. They're confusing. The public is confused by whether it's called the Main Post Update; it's a supplemental; it's this. The Trust will need to put their thinking caps on. The goal is to communicate to you all as best as they can all the elements of the Undertaking.

"The Undertaking" is a 106 term. That Undertaking will include both constructive elements that you've all heard about, and design elements that were part of the Main Post Update. The Trust has some flexibility in terms of how they communicate that information. Don, you've expressed a desire that it be formally called a New Main Post Update. Let them figure out how to do this.

You've made your point about being confused about it, but the goal here today is for you all to hear about the direction that this project is going in. And it's we think positive, and it's positive because of you all. It's positive because of the comments that you've made, because the Trust is listening to concerns of preservation specialists and the public that are interested in this. We have time for question and answers at the end of this.

I think the context in which your comments are expected will be more clear to you after you've heard some of the information presented today. So why don't we take a five minute break here --

Redmond Kernan: [Unintelligible] just make a comment, if I could?

Brian Ramos: Yeah.

Redmond Kernan: And I'll be brief, 20 seconds.

Male Voice: Okay. Redmond Kernan.

Redmond Kernan: Redmond Kernan, Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning. There is a lot of confusion. I would suggest the Trust put out a description of the process that not only we could agree upon, but the public could understand. Secondly, there be a glossary of terms that explains the Undertaking, versus the proposed action, versus the preferred alternative, et cetera.

I leave it with that. I'd like to get off this, because we're not going to all agree here today, but that there be such a document that's passed out to everybody who's here so they can comment and hopefully come up with something that everybody can say, "Okay, I got it. I understand it."

Craig: I second that motion.

[Laughter]

Brian Ramos: Let's do this. Let's take a brief break, a five-minute break, and then we're going to come back and hear a brief presentation.

[Break in recorded material]

Rob Thomson: Let's get started again, please. Gary, if you could grab a seat, we'll get underway again.

Brian Ramos: Okay, let's [crosstalk].

[Crosstalk]

Rob Thomson: Folks on the phone, are you hanging in there?

Katherine Kerr: Hey, we're hanging in here.

Rob Thomson: Okay. Okay.

Katherine Kerr: Brian, this is Katherine from the ACHP. I just want to let everybody know that I have got to get off this phone call at 5:00 Eastern Standard Time, so if Michael Boland is still giving his presentation on the elements of the new Undertaking, I'm just going to silently signoff.

And again, I say this at every meeting: If you have questions regarding the Section 106 process of NHPA, please, please, please, please call me directly. Everybody always says they don't understand, they don't understand, yet nobody calls me.

[Crosstalk]

Female Voice: [Val] does.

Male Voice: What's your phone number?

[Laughter]

Male Voice: You're asking for it.

Female Voice: Or send an email.

Male Voice: Yeah, yeah.

Male Voice: No one ever calls Kate.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Katherine's very good at returning calls.

Craig Middleton: This is Craig Middleton. I just wanted to say thank you to Red for figuring out a way out of the confusion. But I also think we caucused a little bit, our staff did, during this break, and I don't know -- Tia, are you going to [crosstalk]?

Tia Lombard: Sure, sure.

Craig Middleton: I think this will make it clear.

Tia Lombard: Our hope is to make it clear. Our intent has been to issue three pieces of information, three documents, and they are exactly what you've all been asking for. One, a Revised Main Post Update with revised guidelines; two, a supplement to the SEIS; and three, a Revised Finding of Effect. And they will all be clearly identified as what their function is.

Male Voice: Yea! Very good.

Female Voice: Yes.

[Crosstalk]

Rob Thomson: So with that, and in the conciliatory spirit that Craig left us with -- I almost had to bring out the baby pictures there [crosstalk].

[Laughter]

Rob Thomson: It was getting hot. But as always, thank you for your comments. We understand and appreciate your confusion, and apologize. We'll do our best to make the process clear moving forward, and make the documents clear that you'll receive, and get them to you in a timely manner within which you can comment. All your comments are recorded. Thank you for those. Let's move on to a brief description of this preferred alternative that Michael Boland is going to handle.

Michael Boland: Thank you. All right, thank you. I did use a model that should be familiar to many of you, the Main Post as it exists today. And I thought it might be helpful -- Chandler, I'm hoping that you'll -- I don't know if everyone knows Chandler McCoy, Associate Director of Planning -- those of you who came to the cooking show remember him as the man up on the stage. He's going to help me

keep me honest in terms of stats and facts [unintelligible] and things like that.

Let me slide this [unintelligible] so I can actually reach the Main Post. The Main Post is a large district. All right. I thought it might be helpful to start by reminding everyone what the proposed action looked like. Okay. This should all seem familiar, 100,000 square foot, two-story building at the bowling alley site.

[Crosstalk]

Male Voice: Boo.

[Laughter]

Male Voice: Boo.

Female Voice: Moby Dick, Great White.

Female Voice: The Great White.

Female Voice: Mm-hmm.

Female Voice: Big White.

Michael Boland: And a 95,000 square foot lodge up in this area, as well as an 18,000 square foot addition to the theater. So this should look familiar [to

you]. This is the proposed action from the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

Most of you, I think, came to one of the workshops or to the cooking show, and were briefed on the work that we did with the National Park Service, with the State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, looking at these undertakings through the lens of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and identifying that matrix. Many of you, I'm sure, have a copy of the matrix that we produced from before.

What we are attempting to do in our preferred alternative is to re-conceive of these projects informed by the public comment that we receive today, and informed by the results of that undertaking, and informed by the matrix that we develop. [Unintelligible]. Thank you.

In terms of the museum, the museum would be broken into two buildings that would be on either side of Moraga Street. This is Moraga Street, to refresh everyone's memory. The building on the bowling alley site would be no higher than the eave of the theater, which is an important height boundary that we established in that analysis. The mass of the building on this site would be moved over to the south and the west, so that it avoids sensitive archaeology running up along the east side, and also on the north end.

About half of the square footage of the building would be dropped below grade, so that we could achieve the goal of making what is aboveground to be more in scale with the surrounding buildings; being lower to achieve this height.

Male Voice: Is it still 100,000?

Michael Boland: It's still approximately 100,000 square feet, broken into two buildings of -- range is to be determined. But just to refresh everyone's memory, outside of the predicted archaeology zones and the bowling alley site, there's about 37,000 square feet of area that is outside of those two sets of archaeology zones here and here. So just to give everyone a sense of scale.

Female Voice: Michael, would the below grade portion of the building be gallery space or parking?

Michael Boland: It would be gallery space.

Female Voice: Okay.

Michael Boland: The notion is that the square footage of the building would be sunken into the ground [crosstalk] aboveground [crosstalk].

Female Voice: Okay, thank you.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible] still losing the Red Cross Building?

Michael Boland: The disposition of the Red Cross Building is something that we're still working on. It's uncertain at this point. In terms of the lodge, as I mentioned, the SEIS called for --

Female Voice: I'm sorry, Michael, did you talk about the second building? You said [unintelligible] would be --

Female Voice: No. Not yet.

Michael Boland: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Yeah. The second building would take advantage of the grade change that is at the front edge of this site. Most of you are familiar with this site. It would take advantage of that grade to be mostly underground. There would just be a tiny portion of the building that would protrude.

The two buildings would be connected below grade by a tunnel that actually runs under Moraga Street. So these two buildings could communicate with each other. The building would be positioned in such a way that it would take out a Herbst Hall, which is non-contributing, but it would allow the Childcare Center to remain.

Bill Shepard: Could you give us the square footage of the footprint of each building, and the total square footage of each building?

[Crosstalk]

Male Voice: I just want to interrupt a little bit --

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Male Voice: -- because what we're talking about are parameters within which  
[crosstalk] --

Bill Shepard: That's okay. I'd like to get the general parameters.

Michael Boland: Yeah, yeah. Well, again, I could give you the general ballpark,  
because this is just a concept at this point.

Bill Shepard: Sure.

Michael Boland: As I said earlier, there's 37,000 square feet on this site that is  
outside of the sensitive archaeology. So we're looking at a 30,  
35,000 square foot footprint, something like that, on this site. And  
similarly up here, this building is positioned in such a way that it  
avoids -- there's a sensitive archaeology zone that runs up this edge  
of the site.

Each of these is thought of as two stories, but the bulk of the  
building would be underground. So this would be two stories, and  
the bulk of it would be -- one story would be underground. Actually  
almost two stories of it would be underground.

Bill Shepard: So the larger building would be 60 to 70,000 square feet total?

Michael Boland: Yeah, something in the ballpark like that. Again, these are concepts. And the remainder would be in two stories across the street.

Bill Shepard: But what would be the conflated footprint of [the square]?

Michael Boland: This would be approximately 15 to 20,000 square feet. Again, it depends on how much square feet is across [crosstalk].

Bill Shepard: And it's one story?

Michael Boland: No, no. It's two stories.

Bill Shepard: It's two stories?

Michael Boland: Two stories.

Katherine Kerr: Can the gentleman who's asking the questions please identify himself?

Bill Shepard: Yeah, Bill Sheppard.

Male Voice: It's Bill Shepard.

Bill Shepard: So if you take the low figure you've given for the two buildings, that would be a total of 90,000. Is that what you're --

Female Voice: You know, it would be really helpful if we could just go through the overview. Nobody should get too hung up [crosstalk].

Michael Boland: Yeah. I was going to say, don't get hung up on numbers.

Female Voice: This is a concept [crosstalk].

Wayne Donaldson: Hey guys, this is Wayne Donaldson, SHPO. We don't have any visuals in front of us. We don't have any written narratives with numbers or anything. So I think we may just cancel off for a while here. I mean, we're having a hard time following you.

Michael Boland: Yeah. Sorry, Wayne.

Nancy Leavens: Can I ask a question before he signs off?

Michael Boland: Sure, sure.

Nancy Leavens: Nancy Leavens, Cow Hollow. Who owns these buildings?

Michael Boland: Who owns the buildings?

Nancy Leavens: Yeah, who owns them?

Michael Boland: The federal government owns everything here. Now some of them are leased --

Nancy Leavens: No, these new constructions. Who will own the buildings?

Karen Cook: May I answer that question?

Michael Boland: Sure.

Karen Cook: The way these transactions are structured is that we enter into a long-term lease, ground lease, with the developing entities. And for the term of the lease, they have the rights to those buildings. At the end of the lease term, they go to the federal government. So the federal government -- nobody owns the fee-simple title for the property.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Nancy Leavens: So in other words, whoever constructs them doesn't have the right to sell them, should anything happen?

Female Voice: No.

Nancy Leavens: [Thank you very much].

Karen Cook: Well, they can [assign] their interest in a lease, I suppose, depending upon how it's negotiated. But it's subject to their leasehold interest.

Whitney Hall: What's the target lease period at this point?

Karen Cook: You know what? We're not going to get into negotiating [crosstalk]. We're going to go right back to describing the project.

Whitney Hall: Okay.

Michael Boland: Let's talk about a preferred alternative.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Michael, sorry. Elaine, National Park Service.

Michael Boland: Yes. Thanks, Elaine.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Is 101 still being rehabilitated potentially?

Michael Boland: Yes, thank you. Good point. I was just getting to 101. In addition, 101 is still rehabilitated to house classrooms, offices, and workshops. And this is 101 here. So again, the museum proposal is a three-building proposal including the rehabilitation of the building.

The lodge proposal, remember in the SEIS, was 95,000 square feet. The footprint of it, the square footage is reduced to 80,000 square feet, approximately 80,000 square feet. The opportunity that gives us is to address a number of concerns that were expressed. It particularly allows us to pull the footprint of the building back from Powder Magazine.

It allows us to create a series of structures that are no higher than the adjacent Graham Street Barracks, which is another thing that was important that came through in the discussions we had with the Park Service and SHPO's office, and allows us to modulate the edges of the building, pull the corners back, and some of the other things that will tend to break the apparent mass of the building apart. So it reads like a series of smaller buildings in this location. [Unintelligible].

Male Voice: Are there three or four buildings?

Michael Boland: Well, in this scheme it's three. We've shown it as three. But I think really what we're trying to do is illustrate here the notion that there's less square footage, and it's pulled back from the Powder Magazine, which is really the thing I've been trying to achieve [with this scheme].

Male Voice: Sorry, [did] you say the square footage [crosstalk]?

Michael Boland: Eighty thousand --

Male Voice: Thank you.

Michael Boland: -- as opposed to 95, and no higher than the Graham Street Barracks, which are adjacent [to it].

Male Voice: And two-story?

Male Voice: Is there a parking unit, underground parking?

Michael Boland: There would still be underground parking under the lodge.

Male Voice: Is that the lower building?

Michael Boland: Yeah. Again, all we're doing is establishing a height limit. Whether they're two stories or three stories, within that height, space is something that somebody will have to determine. What's really most important in terms of the analysis we did is just the absolute height in relation to the Graham Street Barracks.

Female Voice: And the theater stays the same?

Michael Boland: And the theater proposal they're still proposing is an 18,000 square foot addition.

Wayne Donaldson: [Unintelligible].

Michael Boland: Yes?

[Crosstalk]

Male Voice: Did we forget to say, "Goodbye"?

Michael Boland: Bye, Wayne.

Female Voice: Bye, Wayne.

Wayne Donaldson: Bye, guys.

Female Voice: Sorry.

Michael Boland: Okay.

Male Voice: Thanks, Wayne.

Michael Boland: Okay. Just a few other notes. The Heritage Center and the Archaeology Center are still located in Buildings 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50. For those of you -- I don't know how familiar everybody is -- the Archaeology Lab would be located in these buildings, and a portion of Building 50 and the Heritage Center would be located in much of the remainder of the ground floor of the [O.] Club.

Nancy Leavens: The original design called for sculptures on top of the roof. Do I understand you to say that that probably won't happen?

Michael Boland: That probably will not happen. And in terms of the treatment of El Presidio, Buildings 40 and 41 will still be removed, proposed for removal. And the footprint of El Presidio is commemorated. This paved area will be transformed from places paved with asphalt to something that's paved with more appropriate material, so that we can really get a sense of the footprint of El Presidio.

The margins of El Presidio would be excavated and commemorated, and we would introduce elements that would allow us to close off the of Graham Street -- excuse me, Moraga Street, the other few streets, Pena and Mesa, that run through the footprint of El Presidio, so when we're doing excavations we can actually close those portions of the streets and conduct excavations in those areas, have events and festivals, and public programs, and things like that. Anything else?

Male Voice: Does Arguello remain closed?

Michael Boland: Arguello is pedestrianized. Arguello and this portion of Sheridan and Anza Street, which run here, are pedestrianized. They remain as streets, but the footprint of them remains, because they're historic.

Male Voice: So if Arguello is closed and you will be closing off the other streets around the El Presidio, where is traffic going?

Michael Boland: We would close those streets as needed, and we would close them in such a way that we wouldn't make it impossible to move through the Main Post. For example, if we were excavating in this area or having a festival, we would leave Graham Street open. So it's a strategy that allows us to manage the site flexibly depending on our program [unintelligible].

Male Voice: On a day-to-day basis, how would the traffic coming down the hill on Arguello [dissipate]?

Michael Boland: It depends. For example, if we closed Moraga Street, we would leave Graham open so people could come down Graham. If we closed Graham, we would leave Moraga open. We would use it flexibly. We would do it in a way that we have the ability to manage the flow of traffic [crosstalk].

Craig Middleton: What's fair to say is that -- Michael, this is Craig -- that most of the time it'll all be open.

Michael Boland: Yeah. I mean, often. Yeah. A lot of the time.

Female Voice: Where's the [Doyle] Drive exit?

Michael Boland: About where Andrea is.

[Crosstalk]

Female Voice: Where does it run through this?

Michael Boland: It does not. It does not. It comes off down in the Letterman District, and [it goes] into Lincoln.

Donald Green: Michael, in terms of reality now, I just wonder -- we have a representative of the Fisher Museum here -- has the Fisher Museum

been consulted, or they have any feeling at all as to whether or not this is within the realms of acceptability, or if they were to say, "We're not interested," or, "Yes, we're looking at it," that would help us a lot to know where we're going, if you can say anything at all.

Mary Murphy: Well, we've been participating in this process along with all of you, and as you know, we submitted comments on the FOE. It's been very clear to us during the course of the consultation that the height, and the massing, and scale have [been issues]. We've discussed it with many of you sitting around the room.

We have program requirements, as you know, and this would fit within the program requirements that we need. But I think that it's something that we have to take under advisement. I would think this is something that -- obviously I'm not here with the Fishers right now, and it's something that we'll be conferring about.

Donald Green: Is it likely to get a response prior to the time we move into January 15th and the next six months?

Mary Murphy: Yes.

Donald Green: By January 15th even?

Mary Murphy: Yes.

Donald Green: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible] the preferred alternative.

Mary Murphy: [In fact], I'll be calling Don after this meeting.

[Laughter]

[Crosstalk]

Mary Murphy: I think he's on speed dial.

[Laughter]

Michael Boland: This is a preview of the preferred alternative concept.

Male Voice: Michael.

Male Voice: A preview of the preferred al --

Michael Boland: I was previewing it. It's the --

Male Voice: But this is what the preferred alternative would look like.

Female Voice: Yeah, yeah.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Michael Boland: Yeah. Yeah, that's right.

Male Voice: All right. Okay, thanks.

Mark Nagle: Hi, Mark Nagle, Cow Hollow.

Michael Boland: Hi, Mark.

Mark Nagel: In the evaluation matrix, that analysis concluded that a conforming building on the bowling alley site would have to have the footprint of the existing bowling alley.

Michael Boland: Bowling alley, right.

Mark Nagel: This structure is larger and beyond that. Can you explain that?

Michael Boland: It does extend beyond that. The issue that came up in our discussions around the footprint, it had to be with three dimensions. It had to do with the height of the building, and it had to do with the footprint of the building, which are the two contributors to scale. What this suggests is a building that is actually lower than what would have been allowed, and wider. It's flatter and lower, rather than taller and smaller.

So again, what we're putting on the table is a preferred alternative that does occupy a slightly larger footprint; that does stay out of the

sensitive archaeology, which is the thing that we saw as really a very hard and fast boundary, but also adopts a lower profile. So in our minds it allows the building to be in scale with the surrounding architecture, as well as the other proposal.

Melanie Blum: Back to Nancy's question, I understand you answered the question about sculpture on the roof not being part of this?

Michael Boland: Correct.

Melanie Blum: Are we going to allow sculpture to be a part of the exhibit?

Male Voice: [In the garage].

Melanie Blum: [Crosstalk] outside sculpture? Would we allow outdoor art installations as part of what happens?

Michael Boland: I'm not sure I can speak to that at this moment.

Rob Thomson: Just to remind --

Melanie Blum: And the reason for the sculpture not on the roof is?

Female Voice: Height.

Male Voice: Height.

Male Voice: Height.

[Crosstalk]

Rob Thomson: Just to remind everybody to please identify yourselves before you make comments.

Male Voice: Yeah, yeah.

Becky Evans: Becky Evans, two questions. One is where is the underground canyon with potential water, whatever, below in the new proposal?

Michael Boland: Right, the [unintelligible] stream.

Becky Evans: And will we get story poles finally?

Michael Boland: Well, I can answer the first question. [Crosstalk] the second question.

Becky Evans: Okay. [Laughs]

Michael Boland: The first question is, "Where is the canyon?" And many of you know that before the construction of the Main Parade, there was actually a stream corridor that ran down essentially the center of this site. So the sensitive archaeology really exists in multiple dimensions. This position is actually over the deepest part of fill over that stream. So the stream runs -- it's quite a ways down

actually. Where's Eric? Eric, you can tell me how far down is this stream under in the center here?

Eric Blind: Up to 25 [unintelligible].

Becky Evans: Is there any water flowing through that?

Michael Boland: There's a storm drain down there. [Crosstalk] put in storm drain.

Eric Blind: [Crosstalk] been put in [crosstalk].

Becky Evans: I just was curious whether it would impact the gallery's ability to protect its resources.

Michael Boland: Yeah. No, no.

Craig Middleton: On the issue of story poles -- do you want to keep going?

Michael Boland: No, no.

Male Voice: No.

Craig Middleton: I think it's fair to say that during the comment period in January or February, whenever that is, we'll figure out a way to show the dimensions physically on [crosstalk].

Becky Evans: Thank you.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Female Voice: Good.

Lori Brooke: Lori Brooke, Cow Hall Association. A little while ago when you had several workshops for the public to give input to the Main Post, and there was a lot of consensus that came out of those -- for instance, I know that overall the CAMP [unintelligible] museum located at this specific Main Post was overall not agreed with. Is that input being taken into consideration?

Michael Boland: No, absolutely. I mean, we're taking into account a lot of different kinds of input -- the workshops that we held; the conversation that we went through with the Park Services and the State Historical Preservation Officer; the comment letters that we've gotten, which I forget, Tia, how many we're up to now in terms of comment letters --

Tia Lombardi: A lot.

Michael Boland: -- all the feedback we got on the tours over the summer. So we're trying to incorporate --

Lori Brooke: Well, I think that the biggest thing that came out of it was to have a history museum, because it was more reflective of what the heart of

a presidio would be about. Also it was talking about reusing existing buildings for lodging such as [unintelligible] --

Katherine Kerr: Could you please identify yourself?

Lori Brooke: It's still the same person.

Michael Boland: Lori Brooke, Lori Brooke.

Lori Brooke: It's Lori Brooke with the Cow Hollow Association. And to use existing lodging for the [unintelligible], because that really, truly gives the experience of a visitor versus in a brand new W hotel or whatever. I'm sure it will be designed in a way that's low-key. Those were really big outcomes of all those meetings, and I don't really see that reflected. So is that coming around in another alternative?

Michael Boland: Well, again, I guess I would respond by saying that I think that we've attempted to incorporate all the kinds of feedback we've received, and this solution goes a long way towards addressing a lot of those concerns.

Lori Brooke: I should start by saying you guys have come a long way, and we do appreciate that.

Michael Boland: Okay.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Lori Brooke: Absolutely.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Lori Brooke: But I wanted to point that out.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Lori Brooke: And then a couple more questions related to that, and that's parking. Where will that be, and how does that impact the YMCA Main Post? I know there's talk about you're moving that for parking.

Michael Boland: Yeah. Well, let's talk about parking briefly. I don't have a parking map, obviously, in this. And in the update of the update-update, and the SEIS, the SSEIS, obviously we'll have a parking map that shows exactly where the parking goes and all of that.

Karen Cook: Michael, before you hit parking -- this is Karen Cook -- I just wanted to respond specifically to a question that I did not hear you give the answer to --

Michael Boland: Okay.

Karen Cook: -- which is the lodging alternative still does anticipate reuse of historic buildings as part of that project.

Male Voice: Pershing Hall.

Female Voice: Pershing Hall.

Karen Cook: Pershing Hall, yeah, and other --

Michael Boland: And others.

Karen Cook: -- buildings as possibly being incorporated at some point, whether it's the Upper Funston or the Riley Street houses that might at some point become part of that.

Michael Boland: Neal?

Neal Desai: Neal Desai, National Parks Conservation Association. When you folks release the updated documents in January, what type of specifics can we expect in terms of -- will we actually have the photos or proposals from the actual proponents in addition to things such as how much is aboveground, how much is below, and specific square footages?

Michael Boland: Yeah. Well, let me talk a little bit about what's coming out. In the update, just like in the last update, there will be plans; there will be photographs, photo simulations that show the various kinds of massing strategies. So all the kinds of analyses that were completed last time we will complete for this alternative, as well.

In addition to that, we're going to update the planning guidelines. And as you recall, those are dimensions. For example, it will show how high the buildings are aboveground, what their width is, and all of that. So between the planning guidelines which will lay out the dimensions, and the simulations which will attempt to model the scale of these things in the landscape, our goal is to try to give people a good sense of how these buildings will feel in the space, [crosstalk].

Neal Desai: So from that issuance, then, proponents would use that to craft proposals, updated proposals, what have you?

Michael Boland: That's right.

Neal Desai: Okay.

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Neal Desai: Do we have any idea of when those get fit into your process?

[Crosstalk]

Michael Boland: Yeah. I'm looking over at you guys just because it seems to me that this feeds into the [unintelligible] the consultation process.

Katherine Kerr: This is Katherine Kerr from the ACHP. Neal, I want to address that really quickly before I get off the line.

Neal Desai: Sure.

Katherine Kerr: It's very clear, and it's been made very clear to us in this consultation process that the activity proponent, i.e. CAMP or museum, [unintelligible] lodge, and SF Film for the theater are in various stages of the proposed activity. CAMP is obviously ready to go; lodge, not so much; and SF Film is quite far down the line.

In terms of the Section 106 process, I think what we should focus on is the parameters of, like you had said, Neal, that what would be allowable -- you know, maximum square footage, maximum massing, size, location, scale, conforming to the design guidelines, and incorporating that into the Agreement document under NHPA in Section 106.

But what else the Agreement document would address is the process for when those activities are ready to go forward with actual designing and then construction. And that may take place three, four, five years from now, but the process would be in place, as well, with the Agreement document for how all the consulting parties would come back together to evaluate and comment on designs for these proposed activities based on the Agreement document and stipulations for the parameters.

So that's what I would like you guys to leave with when you're listening to the rest of Michael's presentation. Think about what the parameters are and should be for new construction, demolition, and reuse of buildings within the Main Post Planning District. Don't get tied up on what the actual design is going to be, because we won't see that for the hotel, and we won't see that for the theater for quite some time. But what would you want the maximum to be, or the minimum to be, for any of those activities?

Michael Boland: Before I answer you, I'd like to actually answer Lori's question about parking. We're in the process of starting our analysis on traffic and parking. But based on our preliminary analysis, we find that we'll need about 2,175 parking spaces in the Main Post District to satisfy the projected demand. And we've begun to redesign the parking strategy to respond to that.

For example, what you'll also find -- and I neglected to mention it -- is that in this alternative, the YMCA is actually shown as [unintelligible] because our sense based on our latest conversation with the Y is that for the foreseeable future, the YMCA will stay in place, and it isn't going to be moving anywhere. We're just devising a parking strategy that accepts that the Y will be there, and that we're not going to build that other parking. We're looking at some of the other places where we can adjust the parking supply so that we'll have enough parking.

Donald Green: Michael, [unintelligible] related to that, following up on what [she] just said, a major issue here is scale/quantity. And the main things that have been said up to this point and outside was we want a smaller lodge if any, the size of the Headquarters Building plus the one next to it. And we've said that -- what, sorry?

Redmond Kernan: There's three total.

Donald Green: Okay, plus Pershing. All right. And as far as the [lawn] --

Male Voice: No.

Female Voice: No.

Male Voice: No.

Donald Green: Pershing plus three?

Female Voice: Yes.

Male Voice: Yes.

Donald Green: Okay, thank you. And as far as the lodge goes -- I'm sorry, as far as the museum goes, there was the 100,000 proposal, and there was the historic group for 50,000. I'm very disturbed that your preferred alternative now is 100,000. That's the maximum amount you would ask for. I think if there is going to be a museum there, and for

whatever purpose, it should be much more -- either not there, which some people want, or [up to] 50,000 square feet.

I'd like you to comment as to why you've decided that the 100,000 makes sense in response to these other requests that were made. Once this is done, then we're back down to, "Well, what will it look like?" I think Katherine Kerr is right, going back to [Lucas] and others, the time to talk about it, it's not today because we don't have any impact; it's on the next -- but I would love to see the SEIS clearly consider the option of zero there or 50,000, and tell us why 100,000 is better. I don't want to hear, "Because the Fishers need it," because that's really irrelevant, as far as I'm concerned. The question is, "What's right for that spot?"

Mary Murphy: Can I make a comment?

Donald Green: Yeah.

Mary Murphy: I think it's one thing -- this was a little confusing. You said it was two stories. When I think about stories, I think a story is what's above the grade. And what I heard Michael say is that there's one story above the grade here, which is 30,000; 33,000; 35,000, something like that, and then a story below the grade. And one of the things that many people sitting around this table, when we presented the original design for the museum requested specifically was that we consider using the parking area, which was all below the grade, to be a museum space.

I hear that this is partly in response to not -- I don't think that that was a comment that you necessarily made, Don, but other people sitting around this table made that comment. So I just want to be clear that -- when I used to be on the board, we used to look at things that were above the grade. And I think that that's a very important distinction to be drawn here. What I heard you say -- if you could clarify, Michael, I think it would be useful to people to understand how much building space are you talking about above the grade.

Michael Boland: Yeah, you're absolutely right. What this shows you is 30 to 35,000 square feet of one-story space above grade.

Donald Green: Yeah, but the volume still affects traffic, among other things --

Female Voice: Yes.

Donald Green: -- and visitation. A smaller building presumably would attract fewer people, and the contents would be different. It sounds to me -- let's leave the Fisher Museum out of it -- it's just the notion of a large building versus a small building in that site. And I think Amy has said earlier that between the lodge and this and the theater, you're getting three things. So you apparently have rejected that concept that three things aren't too much, and a big one there is okay even though it's not as high.

Melanie Blum: Melanie Blum. Don, I don't know if you've seen the Fisher Collection, but first of all, the scale of some of the pieces are huge. I don't necessarily agree that a bigger museum is going to bring that many more people. There's a lot of large pieces of art that need to be displayed, and they need a volume of space in which to display them.

Donald Green: Okay.

Melanie Blum: And the other thing is that having developed properties here to that issue, I think part of it is the existing buildings present incredible challenges to anybody who wants to undertake renovating them. They're extremely expensive to rehabilitate, and they're extremely limited in what you're allowed to do and not allowed to do in the spaces to create current modern uses.

I mean, a lot of these buildings were built for military purposes and as barracks where 100 people shared a room. So to create hotel rooms where 100 people used to sleep in one room together, and go into a shower where there was 15 showers, you couldn't bring people to the park and put them in that kind of a situation.

So it's extremely costly. And to some extent, you have to have a certain volume of space to build your programs and to be able to afford to make the whole thing -- and I think the cost of this has to be somewhat of a factor as we're looking at this, and as I said, the scale of the size of the pieces of art that go in there.

Rob Thomson: Craig, did you want to say something?

Craig Kenkel: Yeah. Craig Kenkel, National Park Service. Just a process question for this meeting. Before we move into talking about, and commenting on, and dissecting the preferred Undertaking --

[Laughter]

[Crosstalk]

Craig Kenkel: -- would you please let the group continue to ask questions about the new proposal, and let that all be described to us first before we close out and move into questions about it? So that's what I'm asking.

Redmond Kernan: We went to a cooking school. And with all due respect to Julia over there --

[Laughter]

Redmond Kernan: -- none of that appears. And it was only 10 days ago. It seems like such a short time. And none of that, or the results of that, or the matrix developed, the criteria by which -- none of that -- it's all gone. And so I don't see the result of that. Are there any other alternatives that are going to be presented to the public?

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: Can I address one of your comments, though?  
I don't think it's all gone, because one of those columns in the matrix had the "It takes a village" concept.

Female Voice: Yeah, yeah. The campus kind of thing.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo: The campus concept that said potentially that you could have a building on the bowling alley site; potentially rehabilitate 101 and have one or more buildings south of Moraga. And so from my perspective, this is a variation of that.

Redmond Kernan: It's a lot larger variation [crosstalk].

Female Voice: That's true.

Redmond Kernan: Will there be other alternatives presented to the public?

Karen Cook: I've got to try this again. Those were not alternatives.

Redmond Kernan: No, but forget those. They're gone. Forget his cooking school.

Karen Cook: When you said "other alternatives" --

Redmond Kernan: Well, this is one.

Male Voice: The SEIS.

Redmond Kernan: This is the preferred alternative, right?

Karen Cook: Correct.

Male Voice: Yes.

Male Voice: Right.

Redmond Kernan: Will there be other alternatives included in the Supplemental Supplemental EIS?

Karen Cook: No.

Female Voice: No.

Male Voice: No?

Redmond Kernan: No.

Male Voice: No.

Female Voice: No.

Redmond Kernan: This is it?

Female Voice: This is the preferred.

Craig Middleton: The other alternatives are already [crosstalk].

Karen Cook: They're in the EIS.

Craig Middleton: [All the other] alternatives are still there. This is like an addition.

Female Voice: No Action.

Craig Middleton: This is like an addition.

Redmond Kernan: Well, I didn't know whether out of all of the other studies that were done, it's conceivable there was something that came forth that said, "Here's some variations" --

Karen Cook: That's what this is. This is the variation --

Redmond Kernan: This is the one and only variation.

Karen Cook: -- that is built upon the range of alternatives that are in the current SEIS.

Redmond Kernan: Will the alternative of the commissary site remain?

Michael Boland: Mm-hmm.

Karen Cook: Yes. It is the PTMP alternative.

Male Voice: So everything else is [crosstalk].

[Crosstalk]

Redmond Kernan: Okay. I'm just trying to get clear, because this is different than what I'd anticipated just what will be available. So the commissary site's an alternative, and this is then the preferred alternative.

Karen Cook: Correct.

Redmond Kernan: So essentially there are two.

Karen Cook: No.

Female Voice: No.

Male Voice: No.

Karen Cook: All the alternatives that you have seen in the SEIS, the No Action --

Redmond Kernan: They didn't go away.

Karen Cook: Nothing has gone away.

Female Voice: No.

Male Voice: Right.

Male Voice: Right.

Male Voice: Nothing has gone away.

Redmond Kernan: Okay.

Karen Cook: Nothing has gone away.

Redmond Kernan: Got it, got it. I just --

[Crosstalk]

Karen Cook: Thus the word "supplement."

Amy Meyer: Michael, I [have] the same thing about alternatives, which I brought up at the last meeting. One of them has to do with the theater, which I understand that the interior of the theater as proposed would create problems, dividing it as has been proposed, and more than doubling its size. I'm sorry, Amy Meyer. One of the things I brought up was the idea that if we are talking about that group of historic buildings being part of a Heritage Center, or the Historic Center that's wanted.

In a meeting that you attended of the People for the Parks Group, we discussed having a Visitors' Center attached to the Heritage Center, because they obviously fit together; that these extra screening rooms that are being [called] for in the theater, that they

should be considered both for Building 50 as part of the Heritage Center, or in the Red Cross Building because it's a historic building and people want to retain it, and not going into the kind of doubling of size and historic problems that go on with doubling the theater building.

In the same way, when we talked before about the lodge and how -- I mean, you're showing us a new model. Maybe you could wave your arm and show me how this particular lodge design will effectively divide the two parades. Is that correct that this will divide the two parades, as was hoped for?

Michael Boland: Yes, yes.

Amy Meyer: Okay. I won't go into the square footage issue, because that's very much a legal issue. I'm not going to do that. But one of the considerations I brought up before about alternatives was the idea that it was possible, when we were showing "It takes a village" near Infantry Terrace, that in terms of a lodge away from two event centers, that one should consider that kind of grouping of new buildings.

I do recognize the difference in cost, very much so, between the old and the new for lodging; that one should consider that kind of grouping south of Moraga, because it would give more privacy, take pressure off the parades, and consider a different kind of division between the two parades.

Also, in terms of just the square footage of the buildings, as you know, I'm tracking very closely the "one down, one up" and if you're going to go for a larger building for the museum in this area, larger than the bowling alley in terms of its footprint, then this is another way of making that possible and freeing up the parade area. If any building is done to help with the separation of the two parades, one could consider other things that would be very low-key, but at this moment I'm not prepared to go into them.

Bill Shepard: Michael?

Michael Boland: Yeah.

Bill Shepard: Bill Shepard again. I have a series of short questions. One, regarding the Main Building, which is at the same site as Alternative Two as originally proposed generally would be located, would the same plaza exist in front of it, which was 30 to 50 feet in length, I think? And would the terrace, the same [step] terrace exist in front of the plaza going out onto the Main Parade? I have two other questions after that.

Michael Boland: I'm afraid my answer will not be very satisfying. It's not clear yet, but I will try to make our preferred alternative [unintelligible] as clear on those two points as possible.

Bill Shepard: I think it has a huge impact on the 106 process.

Michael Boland: Well, I'll make sure that we try to speak to both of those [unintelligible].

Bill Shepard: The other question was Moraga Street -- is it going to be closed under this proposal?

Michael Boland: You mean Moraga Street where, here?

Bill Shepard: Yeah, between --

Michael Boland: No, it will stay open. It will be open.

Bill Shepard: Okay. And then the Uphill Building, the low one, will the roof be used for any kind of activity?

Michael Boland: No.

Bill Shepard: Okay. And then lastly, is that preschool retained?

Michael Boland: Retained.

[Crosstalk]

Michael Boland: Neal.

Neal Desai: You go first. I'll go after you.

Anthony Veerkamp: Thanks, Neal.

Neal Desai: Yeah.

Anthony Veerkamp: Anthony Veerkamp with the National Trust. This concept -- the leading edge, the northern edge -- how does that relate to the previous proposal?

Michael Boland: The northern edge.

Male Voice: Do you mean the height of the building?

Anthony Veerkamp: No, not the height.

Female Voice: The plane, the plane.

[Crosstalk]

Anthony Veerkamp: Yes. So if you're pulling it back, could you tell us how far you're pulling it back approximately?

Michael Boland: Yeah. We're pulling it back to this first bay. You see the other building came all the way up to -- I'm sorry, I don't have a good way to describe this -- the northern bay of Building 100, and this pulls back to the southern bay of Building 100.

Anthony Veerkamp: So it's basically the stretch of Building 100 between --

Michael Boland: Yeah. But I think there's another important point that I'll make, which has to do where height is important, because one of the things that we've heard has to do with your ability to look --

Female Voice: Across.

Michael Boland: -- across at Building 100. And the height of this building also has a big role in eliminating that ability, whereas this building is considerably lower than this building. So you would be able to look across from the O. Club, for example, and see the entire row of buildings.

Female Voice: Could you show the bowling alley [unintelligible]?

Male Voice: I think that's about 50 feet [crosstalk].

Michael Boland: Sure. Here's the bowling alley.

Whitney Hall: That's about 20,000 square feet, and the new one is about 60 or 70,000. So it's two or three times.

Michael Boland: [That's a] 20,000 square foot floor [plan]. It's actually 18,000 square foot [crosstalk].

Female Voice: The footprint is.

Michael Boland: The footprint.

Female Voice: And that's a 30 to 35,000 square foot [crosstalk].

Whitney Hall: Okay. What's the footprint on the bowling alley? It's about 20,000?

Michael Boland: Twenty.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible] 18?

Female Voice: Eighteen.

Female Voice: Eighteen.

Male Voice: Eighteen.

Whitney Hall: So about twice the size, 18 to 36 roughly?

Female Voice: Yeah, yeah. Mm-hmm.

Male Voice: Yes.

Whitney Hall: Okay.

Female Voice: [Unintelligible].

Female Voice: Yeah. [Unintelligible].

Male Voice: Neal.

Michael Boland: And Neal had his --

Neal Desai: Thanks. More of a comment. If this is the only sort of addition, sort of modification to what we were looking at previously -- so this is a new addition alternative, it doesn't capture all the feedback and comments that were given over workshops and small groups. Amy's configuration and ideas about the theater, lodging, et cetera -- those were brought up many times. So not to say that the preferred alternative has to change, but there are also other options out there that I hope you folks consider and add a few more alternatives. That was point one.

Two is that one that you've mentioned many times I think in like the small work groups, so maybe just three times, and to me in conversations -- and I don't think everyone in this room knows, and definitely not the public -- is that we should be approaching these alternatives -- this one, other ones -- as basically puzzle pieces.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: Basically what? I'm sorry.

Neal Desai: Puzzle pieces.

Male Voice: Puzzle pieces.

Female Voice: Yes.

Neal Desai: We can say, "You know, we like that building there, but you know what? We want to see [unintelligible]." And I think it's critical that you guys state that upfront. I mean, I don't look at these as proposals [unintelligible] we may want something here, but the lodging, it goes down in the commissary area.

Michael Boland: Does everybody understand Neal's point?

Female Voice: No.

[Crosstalk]

Michael Boland: It's an important one. Karen, do you want to speak to that, the idea of mixing and matching of elements between alternatives?

Karen Cook: [Unintelligible].

Male Voice: When you say "preferred alternative," it gives it a certain weight.

Female Voice: Mm-hmm.

Female Voice: Yeah, it does.

Neal Desai: My third question: Will you folks be issuing an environmentally-preferred alternative [crosstalk]?

Female Voice: Yes.

Female Voice: Yeah.

Female Voice: We will in the final.

Male Voice: In the draft.

Neal Desai: No, in the draft.

Female Voice: The draft.

Neal Desai: In the draft.

Male Voice: Of course.

Female Voice: Wait, wait.

Female Voice: No.

Female Voice: No.

Male Voice: That's what this is. Isn't this the preferred alternative?

Female Voice: No, no, no, no. That's not [crosstalk].

[Crosstalk]

Neal Desai: When agencies sometimes issue a draft like this, you folks will label this as the preferred alternative, and then you will also label another one, if it's different than this, as the environmentally-preferred alternative.

Female Voice: Correct.

Female Voice: That's correct.

Andrea Anderson: Right. NEPA requires that we identify both our preferred alternative and our environmentally-preferred alternative, and we will do both.

Female Voice: In the draft?

Neal Desai: In the draft.

Female Voice: In the final.

Neal Desai: No, but what I'm asking is will it be available in the draft? Because I think the public would like to know from your analysis not only

what's preferred, but what's the environmentally-preferred alternative.

Female Voice: What's better?

Neal Desai: Which is educational.

Female Voice: Right. And that's required according to NEPA by the final, so it will be identified in the final.

Male Voice: Can we ask for it in the draft?

Female Voice: We would like it in the draft.

Andrea Anderson: I think probably the only way it would be in the draft would be if in fact this one ends up being the environmentally-preferred alternative. And I don't know, since we haven't done the analysis yet, if this one is the environmentally-preferred alternative.

Whitney Hall: I think we've asked several times that this document in January, in addition to this one, also come up with one or two other alternatives that are not in the current document, but that would be the compilation of the various comments made heretofore. There ought to be a little scoping process for what we're now doing, in effect. And the scoping process [unintelligible], "Let us tell you the kind of alternatives we'd like you to consider, if you're not considering any other than this one."

Karen Cook: No.

Whitney Hall: No.

Karen Cook: We have done -- we're not going back to scoping. In developing the alternatives originally, we've done that.

Male Voice: Right.

Karen Cook: This is an iterative process, and we're moving forward. This process --

Male Voice: We're not sure of that.

[Laughter]

Female Voice: We're not [unintelligible] sure of that.

Karen Cook: If we're not moving forward, we're certainly --

Female Voice: Circular.

Karen Cook: -- trying not to start over again with scoping.

Whitney Hall: Well, can you consider at least the concept of a couple of other alternatives being presented in this new Draft Supplemental

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement? I don't see why you have to just -- I can understand you do need the preferred. That's very important. But I don't see why you can't have one or two others that we can then comment on. I do know that that's what NEPA calls for.

Rob Thomson: I'd really like to bring the conversation back to NHPA, if we may. I understand there are a lot of thoughts and concerns about NEPA and the presentation of alternatives, and you can take those up at the public board meeting or elsewhere. But please, let's focus on 106. Yeah, Jason?

Jason Wright: Michael, you said that the Red Cross Building is being decided upon still. What about the library?

Male Voice: [Crosstalk].

Male Voice: Same, same.

Jason Wright: Still up in the air?

Michael Boland: Again, those will be clearly identified. All of the demolition -- the buildings that will be proposed for demolition will be clearly identified in the draft.

Redmond Kernan: This is a small point, but one can argue about how much headway is made by pushing it down and eliminating a building, but was there

any thought to [lowering this in the ground], and having [a] less intrusive [unintelligible]?

Melanie Blum: To be honest with you -- this is Melanie Blum from the theater. The Film Society's a nonprofit. We're going to raise the money to do this project. As soon as we start to go underground, it honestly becomes non-affordable for us.

A theater in and of itself anyway is not a money-making -- we're not looking at this as a business project; we're looking at this as an educational center for film, which we've used during the day in collaboration with other organizations that are in the Presidio, including the Bay School, the Y, the other museums, and other entities to run an education outreach program for school kids, and use it in the evenings and weekends for independent foreign language film, not your typical Hollywood movies.

And in looking at the economics and so forth, we sort of approached this -- and I've been working on this project with a variety of theater people for 10 years to try to make a go of this. It doesn't pencil out economically, so anything at this point that's going to increase our costs just make it prohibitive. You can't split it up and move it into different buildings, because you can't staff it that way. It has to be in one center.

The three-theater model is what's being done at other film societies around the country. It's something that works. We've done a lot of

analysis on it, and we feel we can create something that's a real community center for the Presidio, a place that people can use for a lot of purposes including showing films on the Presidio about Presidio history, and Presidio experience, and environmental -- we do a whole environmental series, which we would like to expand. To be honest with you, if we had to go underground, we couldn't afford it.

Nancy Leavens: Melanie, does your plan call for parking?

Melanie Blum: In our conversations about parking -- most of our parking is expected to be at off-peak hours for other building uses. We wouldn't show film during the day for the public, so it would be mostly evenings and weekends.

Nancy Leavens: But if you bring school kids in buses and stuff --

Melanie Blum: We're talking with the other museums and other schools -- what we'd do is we'd bring kids in; the bus would then go park somewhere. It wouldn't be parked on the Main Post. I think that's part of the plan, that the Disney Museum is planning to do [unintelligible] bring the kids in, drop them off. The bus goes and parks, say, down near Crissy Field or someplace where there's a lot, and then he comes back and they pick up the kids. But the buses I don't expect would be parked on the Main Post, per se.

Becky Evans: Is the current theater building an historic building?

Melanie Blum: Yes, it is.

Male Voice: Yeah, it is.

Becky Evans: And is it prohibited to make the kind of design changes you're talking about?

Melanie Blum: No, we've been talking about --

[Laughter]

Melanie Blum: It's currently a 900-seat theater. As I'm sure all of you are aware in the historic preservation community, a 900-seat theater is not economically a viable theater anymore. And most of the large theaters everywhere in the country have closed. And the theater was built 100 years ago when film was screened in a very different way and had very different specifications.

To keep the historic theater, and to keep it as close to its historic form as possible, what we've done is taken the balcony, which is sort of like stadium seating, and proposed splitting it there, keeping the same structure and everything look of that space, and creating one screen there; and then the lower part of the floor, which is more of a sloped floor, keeping that like that, and creating a second screen there.

We feel that has the least historic impact on the historic elements. It's keeping, in fact, sort of the floor plan that's existing in there, but dividing it [in two in way], and then keeping the rest of the historic elements in place.

Rob Thomson: Everything that Melanie is describing will be subject of the analysis that will be released in January. So I'd love to maybe move the conversation on in the waning minutes to a couple of other 106-specific, try to avoid program discussions, try to avoid too many questions about traffic and capacity, simply because those are not 106 issues. Lucia?

Lucia Bogatay: My question has to do with archaeology. I'm Lucia Bogatay from Presidio Historical Association, and I'm very concerned that there hasn't been enough -- maybe Eric can confirm or deny -- investigation of this site to determine that there isn't interesting archaeology there that would be destroyed by going underground with such a great volume. And I'm also very concerned that there be better information on the archaeology in the Revised Revised SEIS.

I have never understood why you went into that document with a 1993 map of potential archaeology, rather than the one that's in the PTMP. Because if you use the map that's in the PTMP, it shows interesting archaeology completely through that valley, and the shape of the important archaeological site is quite different in that document. I've never had anyone explain to my why that one was

not used, and why there isn't more information available and more research done, because that impact is going to be huge.

I also feel that not building on all of the footprints of the old 1860s barracks will preserve some of the archaeology, but I thought it was rather cavalier to say, "There are lots of 1860 barracks around. We don't have to worry about preserving the archaeology in this spot." I want more documentation in the documents, and I'd like someone to explain all this to me.

Eric Blind: Would you like me to try now, or do you want me to do it --

[Laughter]

Lucia Bogatay: You can take a crack at it.

Eric Blind: I can take a crack at it. Keep me on track, because there were a lot of questions. I'll try to remember all of them in some sort of order.

Lucia Bogatay: Okay.

Eric Blind: Let's see. We'll start with I think the last one. We were talking about the 1860s barracks. It's a long feature that goes up the entire length of Graham Street. It's in part being destroyed. That's kind of a first crack at it. And I don't think we've ever tried to say that because it's from the 1860s and there are lots of things from the 1860s that it's not important.

It was contemplated to be built as an office use [and] PTMP, and it kind of went through a level of review during that process to have construction in that location. This is kind of a change of use from an office to a lodge. In effect, as far as archaeology goes, there's really no net difference whether a lodge is constructed there or an office is constructed there.

As for the testing, for especially the museum location, given the depths that are there, it makes testing very difficult, and in some cases with more expense going into engineering and tests than actually the value of the data that you would get out, just because of the depths. These things are up to 25-feet deep -- very difficult to engineer a safe excavation at those depths.

What we did was we took an approach where we tried to verify our modeling of what that landform used to look like, and at what surfaces we would be trying to find archaeology. The modeling we did was verified by a series of [cores] where we did [trans-ex], east/west, and north/south to try to understand whether our predictions were correct. There was remarkably a lot of correspondence between those two.

Then we took that and we tried to extrapolate how much of these structures would be in what we were considering non-historic fill -- they would not be disturbing any archaeology -- and what ones would be in areas that would be where the archaeological potential

had been destroyed because of activities the army had done in the 20th century. That's how we've really tried to engineer our minimization and avoidance. It was based on that kind of modeling.

The third one is a good question, 1993 versus the more current information. The 1993 information, that is what's on the National Register currently. That is what is in 106, or National Historic Preservation. That is what is in effect the documentation of this landmark. The mapping that you saw for PTMP was for NEPA, and it's a different scenario.

We went with the National Park Service's 1993 work, because it's been remarkably accurate over the years in its predictive qualities, and we felt that if we ignored it we would suffer a different sort of wrath if we went with a different set of analysis other than the National Park Service's already-established work.

Lucia Bogatay: That being said, is there any update on the update of the district that was supposedly happening?

Eric Blind: There are so many updates of updates.

Lucia Bogatay: Yeah, because that was supposed to be done last year and incorporated into this process. To my knowledge, I don't know what the status of it is.

Eric Blind: Yeah, I tried to write this into the SEIS as clear as I could. These [were going along] parallel tracks. This work was initiated at the same time that we decided to update the National Historic Landmark documentation, because 15 years had passed. So 2008, 1993, 15 years had passed; we decided to do an update. They went out of the train station apparently at the same time, and we've been trying to get that update finished. The 85 Percent Draft is with Elaine currently, and we're looking to revise that. It still needs considerable work, and the mapping is what we're working on currently.

Lucia Bogatay: Perhaps you can include that in the new draft.

Brian Ramos: Yeah. I was going to say you make some good points. The thing that folks should rest assured of is that all the information is going to be used in the decision-making. And particularly where it will play out is in the development of a programmatic agreement for this, where a process either for subsequent identification -- in other words, ground truthing the predictive models, may be a part of the program, or protocols for discovery and treatment of archaeological materials.

No information is not going to be used just because it was part of the '93 one or it's part of this. Collectively, it will be part of the decision-making process, and you'll see that play a larger role probably during the process of developing the agreement documents.

Boyd de Larios: Excuse me. I would like to ask a specific question that --

Female Voice: Boyd.

Boyd de Larios: -- Boyd de Larios, DAPE -- Lucia raised. On the lodging, on the matrix which we have been working with, it specifically states that [in] the lodging, no, it would not conform because it impacts Area F9. Then it goes on to make the statement, "However, research value of F9 may be of lower value than other unique sites because this information is available at other sites." Now did I understand you to accept or reject that statement?

Brian Ramos: That comment came up in our last meeting in this room, I remember. Maybe I shouldn't speak for you, but the El Presidio site is a unique resource, and it's different than other resources. It's not to say that those other locations are not valuable; it's just to say if you're in a situation where you're making decisions about archaeology, you don't typically say, "This is more important than this," but you have to look at that when you're looking at a resource like the El Presidio site that's unique.

Boyd de Larios: Excuse me. Thank you very much for your answer. However, it's one of those [ones] that I find non-responsive, because you didn't answer my question. Whether you agree with this or not, you said the Civil War period is of less significance than the Spanish period. I got that part out of there.

Brian Ramos: That's not what I said.

Boyd de Larios: Okay. I'm trying to nail it down here. I can't believe that.

Eric Blind: Boyd, let me see if I can help.

Brian Ramos: No, I didn't say that.

Boyd de Larios: Okay.

Eric Blind: In the documentation, the Park Service was explicit in saying that they were not going to value on a graded scale the different kinds of archaeological resources that they predicatively listed to contribute.

Boyd de Larios: Okay.

Eric Blind: They were not saying one was more important than the other, or that this one was an "A," and this one was a "C."

Boyd de Larios: Okay.

Eric Blind: The only real way to do it without trying to value between either periods of histories or types of cultures is what Brian is starting to get at, I believe, is what is the scarcity of these resources? Is this one of 100? Is this one of two? Is this the last one? There is an ability to say, "Okay, if it's the last one, we have to look at it as if

it's the last one." Those are the kind of ways that you may weigh these things.

Boyd de Larios: I still don't think that's responding to the issue --

Eric Blind: Okay.

Boyd de Larios: -- which is that this is either an important site or not. And if it is of significant impact to the Spanish period, then this statement doesn't hold. If it is a significant Civil War site, then why would it be downgraded? And if it is significant to both, why would it be permitted to put the lodging there, with the implication that the information is available elsewhere; that it's therefore not required [unintelligible]? I read it as we're throwing this site away because we don't need it.

Eric Blind: No.

Male Voice: No.

Rob Thomson: Let me jump in maybe real quickly. Anybody correct me if I'm wrong, but the essence -- and this will be articulated in the Finding of Effect document -- is that the site here is a National Register contributing resource, as is El Presidio, as is the building next door, and so forth. So any diminishment of its integrity would be an adverse effect.

Boyd de Larios: Mm-hmm.

Rob Thomson: It will be registered as an adverse effect through the 106 consultation process. And part of that consultation process that we are continuing to engage in is that we will look for ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those adverse effects. So it is a resource, just like the buildings around here are resources, and El Presidio is a resource.

I think Eric was explaining some of the nuances that are in the study of those resources, but rest assured we will register any diminishment of the integrity of the archaeological site here as an adverse effect in the same way that we are any of the other resources.

Boyd de Larios: Okay. And my second comment that I wanted to make is that it was very reassuring to hear you say that you will take all the stuff into account --

Rob Thomson: Yeah.

Boyd de Larios: -- and all [unintelligible] will go into it. However, the difficulty I think that we have in the process is that we haven't heard statements of that sort. We haven't heard the recognition that we are saying things that the staff is listening to.

I would hope that the revised documents reflect some of these things, and give us specifics to operate on, fully describe this new Undertaking, without leaving us to wonder what the heck you're going to do next; and being told that something is a draft and therefore we don't have to take the details to heart, because we do need to take them to heart. We need to know what you're doing in order to make any sort of intelligible statements about them.

Rob Thomson: Yeah, thank you for that comment, Boyd. I absolutely will say again that we've registered your confusion about the naming and the sequence of release of documents, and we'll do our best in the coming weeks between now and mid-January to clarify the sequence of release of those documents.

I do ask you to think back to Craig's opening remarks, which were in essence that the Undertaking has changed, and it's changed directly as a result of comments received through the consultation process. And they're not all the comments, and not everybody is getting everything that they had asked for included in this new alternative. But the important part is that the 106 process is moving along, it's incorporating comments, and things are changing as a result.

Becky Evans: Isn't it still a Proposed Undertaking? Do you call it an Undertaking or Proposed Undertaking?

Brian Ramos: Draft Undertaking.

[Crosstalk]

Becky Evans: Draft?

Craig Middleton: Yeah. Don't get hung up on that nomenclature. "Undertaking" is a word that triggers the 106 process.

Becky Evans: Right.

Craig Middleton: Is it an Undertaking? Undertakings include a planning aspect of it.

Becky Evans: Okay.

Craig Middleton: So while we're talking about concepts here, planning concepts, things that will still have a great amount of detail to be worked out, that's an Undertaking, and that's what triggers the 106 process. And I want to echo what Rob said, is is that if you don't feel at this point that you're influencing this process, I don't know what to tell you, because we're having this meeting here and you're looking at something that looks very different that what you were presented a year ago or longer.

It became evident to me -- and I can't cite the specific examples -- but where the Presidio was kind of being criticized for doing things that were specifically done in response to public comments. We're kind of getting at that point. What should all be clear to you is that

this process -- it can't be an absolute consensus process in which we take a vote and everybody says, "Okay, should we paint it green, or should we paint it purple?" It can't work that way. The process works by you folks providing input, which you've been doing very willingly --

[Laughter]

Female Voice: [Unintelligible].

Craig Middleton: -- and the agency is listening to that. So I hope that you feel some satisfaction in this process. The 106 process was depicted in that visual, in the evening meeting that we had a few weeks ago as a linear process, and it's really not. It's been described as an iterative process the whole time we've been going. And you're seeing those iterations, and those iterations are confusing and they create frustration. But let's keep our eyes focused on where we've gotten already. We've gotten far. Things have changed. People's voices have been heard. That's all I have to say.

Female Voice: It's dynamic.

[Crosstalk]

Redmond Kernan: Would you like a different perspective on that?

Craig Middleton: I know there's 30 of them.

Female Voice: Look at the hands go up.

[Crosstalk]

Rob Thomson: I think we need to --

Craig Middleton: I see people fidgeting. I know we told people it would be over by 2:30. I just want to take -- I know I may see some of you on Tuesday night.

Female Voice: Yes. I wanted you to address what was going to happen [crosstalk].

Amy Meyer: I can't hear.

Craig Middleton: We're going to have a public meeting on Tuesday night, 6:30 at the Palace of Fine Arts.

Female Voice: Will the trustees be there?

Craig Middleton: The trustees will be there.

Female Voice: And you'll make a presentation of this?

Craig Middleton: We will have a presentation of essentially what you've seen.

- Female Voice: Are you going to do something to allow public comment so that every group gets an opportunity to have comment, and that one group doesn't get 80 people there in the beginning of the evening and then nobody else gets to participate?
- Female Voice: Like the school? [Laughs]
- Female Voice: Or that people who participated in the --
- Donald Green: Or the Fisher Group.
- Female Voice: -- previous process, but come after people who haven't had a chance to participate?
- Female Voice: First come, first serve.
- Craig Middleton: Well, we're going to try to figure out a way [unintelligible] diversity of opinion. I will say that numbers don't really matter that much in this process. What matters is the quality of the comment. We're looking for substance, not necessarily substance times 2,500.
- Female Voice: How will people be informed of this preferred alternative so they can make comment regarding this preferred alternative, which most of the public -- myself -- were not aware of until we came in this room?

Craig Middleton: Yeah, right. Well, we're going to talk about this on Tuesday, and then that's not the only opportunity for public comment. Obviously the comment period goes on until probably sometime in February.

Rob Thomson: Let me just say -- if you take one thing away from this meeting, please take away the fact that you will receive a new batch of compliance documents, as Tia said, a supplement to the SEIS, a Draft Finding of Effect, and a Revised Main Post Update.

Redmond Kernan: We're talking about Tuesday.

Rob Thomson: Okay.

Craig Middleton: That's not for Tuesday. [Crosstalk].

Rob Thomson: Not for Tuesday. That will all happen --

Redmond Kernan: We're talking about the Tuesday public meeting --

Rob Thomson: Right.

Redmond Kernan: -- where people who followed the cooking school --

Rob Thomson: Right.

Redmond Kernan: -- thought maybe it would look a little like one of the cooking school things, and now it's quite different. So there won't be

anybody there who has any idea, and it's a question of how you present this in a way that people understand what they may want to make a comment on.

Rob Thomson: Right.

Female Voice: Just post it on your Web site, and then the public can see it, [so they have a clue] before the meeting.

Male Voice: Yeah.

[Crosstalk]

Female Voice: Are there other agenda items that night, Craig?

Craig Middleton: I don't think so. I think there may be an update by me on some of the projects we have.

Male Voice: You might say at the beginning of the meeting, "Ladies and gentlemen, I'm presenting this. And when you make your three-minute comment, I'm sure a lot of you have been basing it on other stuff."

Craig Middleton: Yeah.

Male Voice: "But if you can mentally make a shift, try and give us your response to that."

Craig Middleton: That would be great. And there will be a lot more opportunities [crosstalk].

Redmond Kernan: You need real good visuals, somewhere where people come in that they have an idea what it is that is being commented on.

Male Voice: Even a picture or something like that.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Craig Middleton: Well, I know I'll see you on Tuesday, but before everybody starts to leave --

Female Voice: Not me.

Craig Middleton: -- I'd like to wish you happy holidays --

Female Voice: Thank you.

[Crosstalk]

Female Voice: Thank you.

Craig Middleton: -- especially for those who I won't see on Tuesday. Thank you for coming.

Female Voice: I won't be there.

Craig Middleton: Is there anything you need to do additional?

Rob Thomson: No. That's all. Thank you.

Female Voice: [Unintelligible]?

Male Voice: Thank you.

Rob Thomson: Come talk to me, if you want, or [unintelligible].

[Crosstalk]

Female Voice: -- whoever's on the line.

Rob Thomson: Yeah, thanks.

[End of recorded material]