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Meeting Summary

I. Welcome/Introductions: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

Jared Goldfine welcomed everyone and asked participants to introduce themselves. Jared stated that some invitees would not be able to attend due to schedule conflicts. All participants and invitees will be sent meeting minutes. Those who could not attend will have an opportunity to comment.
II. Meeting Purpose/Format/Guidelines: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

Jared reviewed the agenda. The group then reviewed the meeting guidelines and discussed the format of the meeting. Jared explained that all mitigation measures that had been suggested heretofore were listed on the flip chart sheets on the wall. Jared explained that all measures should be reviewed by the group and further developed, and the group was encouraged to make additional mitigation suggestions. The group decided that after the overview they would review the mitigation measures and discuss them in the order listed.

III. Overview of Project and Review of Historic Resources and Section 106 Process: Andrew Hope, Caltrans

Andrew Hope discussed the purpose of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project. He then explained the Section 106 Process in relation to the project, and described each of the historic properties that could be affected by the project. Copies of two Caltrans reports, *Historic Property Survey Report* and *Finding of Adverse Effect: Buildings and Structures*, were available to the meeting participants. The historic properties are as follows:

San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge

Yerba Buena Island:

- Navy Building 262 (Torpedo Building)
- Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District
  - (including NR-listed Quarters 1)
- Officers’ Quarters 8, 9 and 10
- Caltrans Garage
- Caltrans Electrical Substation
- Archaeological site, on land owned by the Navy and the Coast Guard

Oakland:

- Caltrans Electrical Substation
- Key Pier Substation

One participant questioned why buildings on Treasure Island that were built for the World’s Fair were not included in the discussion. Jared responded that the project would have no effect on those buildings.

IV. Considerations for Selection of Mitigation Measures

Caltrans presented some considerations for determining the mitigation measures:

- A nexus between the mitigation measures and the historic property affected should be strong.
The extent of mitigation for a historic property should be consistent with the severity of the project's effect on that property.

Mitigation measures must be a worthwhile use of public funds.

The group elaborated on several other factors they felt are important in any mitigation:

- The mitigation should reflect size, scale and significance of the historic resource.
- Accessibility to the public is important; the mitigation should generate enthusiasm about the history of the properties.
- Historic properties that will be lost should be documented in permanent forms.

V. Discussion of Mitigation Measures

A. Salvage components for reuse and circulation/display

Someone suggested that recycling goals be established. There was a request to distinguish between salvage vs. curation of historical memorabilia. There is a need to identify potential places for reuse and ensure that those materials are appropriately reused, recycled or displayed. There was further discussion regarding recovering bridge pilings for display or reuse.

John Snyder noted that there are bridge brokers, such as Bridge Masters, who find new locations for bridges. However, these are typically pin-connected bridges that can be taken apart and reassembled at the new site. The Bay Bridge is a riveted structure that cannot easily be disassembled.

There was discussion of reusing components of the existing bridge as a gateway feature at the Oakland touchdown and reusing parts of the bridge in the construction of the new bridge. There was discussion about reusing steel from the old Bay Bridge; however, the new bridge will be constructed primarily of concrete. Helaine Kaplan-Prentice remarked that steel could be considered an endangered American resource.

B. Museum exhibits on big bridges of the Bay Area

There was a request that the exhibit include information about other bridges of San Francisco Bay. Also, that the display ensure permanence for the public benefit, rather than only a temporary exhibit. Both the permanent and temporary exhibit need greater definition. The feasibility of both temporary and permanent exhibits needs to be explored.
The size of the exhibit should reflect the grandiose nature of the bridge. There is an historic sign near the bridge at the Oakland touchdown that could be included in the exhibit.

C. **Establish a permanent interpretive center**

The site of the exhibit should be easily accessible to the public. The design of the center should accommodate a hands-on experience. Some considerations in developing an interpretative center would include staffing, long term funding, and maintenance.

Suggested sites for an interpretive center include the Key Pier Substation, downtown Oakland, or the former 16th Street train station. Someone asked what the connection was between the 16th Street station and the bridge. John Snyder responded that there is a historic connection, since the Key System trains stopped at the station and then continued to the bridge and across the structure to San Francisco. It was suggested that a TEA–21 grant is a potential funding source for an interpretive center located at the station.

D. **Publication based on HAER documentation**

The HAER documentation explains the design, construction, and history of the bridge. George Lythcott asked whether it was reader-friendly or mostly technical in nature, and John Snyder responded that a well–written HAER document can be clear and interesting to the non–technical reader.

There was a request that the HAER document be made available now, to help in assessing the significance of the bridge. Jared explained that it is in draft form at this point, and therefore not available for distribution.

Gloria Scott suggested that the HAER documentation, as well as other visual information, could be made available on CD–ROM.

E. **Testing and analysis of the existing bridge**

Case studies should be conducted (using both engineering and metallurgical analysis) in order to learn all we can from the bridge, particularly about the effects of age and use on the steel structure.

F. **Artwork in Oakland commemorating the bridge**

Helaine Kaplan–Prentice recommended a representational oil painting of large scale, in the tradition of the noted California landscape painters. Several participants suggested that this is a traditional form of documentation that would capture the essence of the old bridge.
There was a suggestion to explore other media and styles as well. The artwork should be displayed in a location where the public can see it.

G. **Design of the new bridge**
A representative of the City of Oakland stated that an element reflecting the old bridge needs to be incorporated into the new bridge. The City of Oakland and the Oakland Heritage Alliance stressed that the design of the new bridge needs to be equal or better than the quality of the old bridge and that there needs to be a unique design. This is the City of Oakland's most important mitigation measure. Jared stated that this meeting could only focus on mitigation measures apart from the design of the new bridge, but that the minutes would reflect the high level of importance placed on the design of the new bridge to the City of Oakland.

H. **Historical Markers**
The group agreed that historical markers at the Oakland touchdown park and on Yerba Buena Island were a good idea. It was suggested that the markers could include information about the new bridge as well.

I. **Include a gateway feature to signal arrival in Oakland**
The gateway feature would signify arrival in Oakland for eastbound bridge traffic. It was suggested that lighting be incorporated into the gateway feature to be a dramatic element at night as well as during the day. The Bay Bridge Coalition with the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art has offered to sponsor competition to design the park at the Oakland Touchdown, which could include a gateway feature.

J. **Contribute to the rehabilitation of the Key Pier Substations in Oakland**
It was proposed that Caltrans contribute to the rehabilitation of the Key Pier Substation in Oakland. Someone suggested adding the term *reuse* to rehabilitation. Potential new uses for the building should be considered.

K. **Rehabilitate and donate the toll plaza clock**
The clock (about 9' diameter) was originally mounted on the roof of the toll plaza canopy. It currently resides in the electric substation and is not in working order. It was proposed that the clock be rehabilitated and installed in a public place, such as the proposed Oakland touchdown park, or given to a museum. It was suggested that the clock be incorporated into the Toll Plaza redesign project.
L. Documentation of existing bridge

It was suggested that a bibliography be compiled of the Bay Bridge on film. Other suggestions included a professional monograph on the design and construction of the bridge, construction of a model depicting engineering considerations. Other forms of documentation could include videotaping the experience of driving on the bridge and passing under it in a boat.

The documentation should include an oral history and include stories of people involved in the design and construction of the bridge. The role of the bridge in regional development could be further explained. This effort could incorporate old movies and newsreels. The documentation should be in a media other than paper. The image of the damaged bridge following the Loma Prieta earthquake should be included.

M. Protect historic properties during construction

A plan needs to be implemented to enforce and monitor the protection of historic properties. It was explained that Caltrans has experience with construction projects in which the protection of historic properties has been a concern.

N. Events associated with the opening of the new bridge

In association with Bay Area newspapers, issue a souvenir edition upon the opening of the new bridge. Include a replica of the souvenir edition produced in 1936 to commemorate the opening of the original bridge. The group agreed that this was a good idea.

O. Torpedo Building

Concern was expressed that the Torpedo Building be protected from damage during construction, and that any inadvertent damage be repaired. To address the impacts to the building (if the northern alignment were selected) it was proposed that Caltrans would contribute to the rehabilitation of the building.

There needs to be photo documentation of the building and its surrounding landscape, to assist in carrying out restoration. Kimball Koch recommended that HABS documentation be done as well. Someone suggested that the Torpedo Building is a possible site for an interpretive center. Jared noted that specific uses for the building would be identified in the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Reuse Plan.
P. Naval Officers' Quarters

As with the Torpedo Building, it was requested that the Naval Officers' Quarters be protected from damage during construction and that any inadvertent damage be repaired. Also, HABS documentation should be done for the buildings.

The landscape surrounding the Naval Officers' Quarters, should be documented prior to construction, to assist in restoration. Kimball Koch suggested that the landscape be restored to its appearance during the historic district's period of significance, rather than its current appearance.

Q. Archaeological Sites

Caltrans staff stated that a treatment and data recovery plan for archaeological sites on Yerba Buena Island and possible submerged ships is being developed. One prehistoric site which is eligible for National Register listing has been identified on Yerba Buena Island, and important historic sites may be present as well. Mitigation of archaeological sites would include a public interpretation element, including, where appropriate, the public display of artifacts.

Someone asked if any Native American groups have been consulted. It was explained that monitoring by a Native American during excavation of prehistoric sites is standard practice and if Native American remains are encountered, consultation with a "most likely descendant" will be initiated.

"Bin" Items

Bin items are topics that came up throughout the course of the group discussion. These are ideas that, although pertinent to the project, are not directly related to the task of historic property mitigation. These are ideas that the group wanted to be reflected in the minutes and would like to have addressed at some point in the East Span Seismic Safety Project decision process.

- Alignment of the new bridge
- Quality of steel (this issue was discussed in part under mitigation proposal E, "Testing and analysis of the existing bridge.")
- Retain old bridge as an operating element in addition to the construction of a new bridge. (It was explained that this idea was evaluated in the DEIS and was rejected for a number of reasons.)
- A suggestion to retain the existing bridge and use the lower deck for housing and the upper deck for recreation.
- New bridge design should incorporate old bridge's significance
VI. Next Steps

Caltrans staff thanked the group for their participation. Caltrans noted that many comments on design and alignment were received in the DEIS comments, and that these issues will be addressed as a part of the NEPA process. Caltrans summarized the next steps as follows:

- Comments will be attained from invitees who could not attend
- Caltrans will be developing a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Federal Highway Administration.
- The next meeting should move from brainstorming to priority setting based on funding and feasibility of the suggested mitigation measures.
- Future meetings will focus on specific mitigation measures and have individuals with expertise in those areas in attendance.
- Some parties noted that Caltrans will need to determine the alignment for the new bridge before finalizing the MOA.

The next historic properties mitigation meeting is suggested for early 1999. Caltrans will schedule the meeting with the intent of accommodating those individuals and organizations that could not attend the December 10 meeting.
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Meeting Summary (not intended as verbatim minutes)

I. Welcome/Introductions: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans
Jared Goldfine welcomed everyone and asked participants to introduce themselves. He stated that all participants and invitees will receive a meeting summary.

II. Comments from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: MaryAnn Naber
MaryAnn Naber of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), explained the Council's involvement in the Section 106 process, and stated that the Council would comment on project effects on historic properties as well as mitigation measures. The focus of Advisory Council consultation is to avoid or minimize adverse effects to historic properties.

III. Meeting Purpose/Format/Guidelines
Jared reviewed the agenda. The group then reviewed the meeting guidelines and discussed the format of the meeting.
Jared outlined the mitigation measures as written in the Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Jared explained that the group should review all of the measures, and the group was then encouraged to make additional mitigation suggestions.

IV. Overview of Project and Review of Historic Resources and Section 106 Process and Update on Memorandum of Agreement
Andrew Hope provided an additional overview of the historical resources that are potentially impacted by this project. Participants stated that it seems as if Caltrans is assuming that the northern alignment will be the selected alignment alternative; Jared explained that the Draft MOA addresses all of the alignment alternatives. Jared acknowledged that design of the proposed touchdown park is determined in part by the selected alignment. Parties asked how the preferred alternative was identified and announced. Caltrans representatives explained that all comments are considered prior to identifying a preferred alternative. Caltrans held a press conference to announce the preferred alternative.

V. Discussion of Draft Stipulations/Mitigation Measures
There was a general discussion about the proposed stipulations and mitigation measures outlined in the Draft MOA. Participants noted that the mitigation measures were not sufficient for the magnitude of historic resource that will be lost by the removal of the East Span. The magnitude of the project merits more appropriate mitigation measures than those stated in the Draft MOA. Participants said the mitigation measures were not creative enough to compensate the loss.
It was noted that some ideas generated from the December Historic Resource Mitigation Meeting were not included in the Draft MOA; such as reuse of the Key Pier Substation or the inclusion of components of the historic bridge at the Gateway Park Entrance. Participants stated that they would like the MOA to consider the rehabilitation and maintenance of the Key Pier Substation.

ACHP noted that the consultation process needs to 1) look at the significance of the resources; 2) determine the geographic area of impact; 3) define public interest, and 4) evaluate how the mitigation measures relate to public interest. MaryAnn Naber noted that the loss of the bridge will have a significant regional impact on the historic environment of the Bay Area.

Participants noted the historical significance of the structural engineering involved with the bridge project and suggested an educational scholarship to study historic bridges as one mitigation measure. Participants supported the proposal for a museum exhibit, but expressed concern that it would be temporary.

Someone stated that the northern alignment would adversely impact San Francisco's Economic Development Plan on Yerba Buena Island (YBI). A participant asked how the roads on YBI would be affected by the project and if historical structures on YBI would be disturbed by the northern alignment more than by an alternative alignment. Caltrans stated that the S-4 alignment does not directly impact Building 262. Caltrans also noted that there would not be an increase in noise levels from traffic on the new bridge, but there would be construction-related noise. It was suggested that historic buildings may need more protective measures during construction.

The U.S. Navy representative said the Navy will not sign the MOA in its current state. The Navy does not agree with the northern alignment as the preferred alternative. The Navy also does not agree with Caltrans about archaeological resources on Yerba Buena Island, and would issue a permit for archaeological investigations until the larger issue of the alignment is resolved.

The U.S. Navy representative stated that authority over Quarters 8 has been transferred to the US Coast Guard.

Participants asked for more clarification in regards to mitigation measures for archaeological properties. A participant asked if there have been archaeological remains already found.

VI. Next Steps
- Revisit measures based on comments
- Issue a revised draft MOA
- Send minutes of the Oakland meeting to San Francisco participants
- Send minutes of this meeting to all participants

VII. Adjournment
Caltrans staff thanked the group for their participation
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Meeting Summary (not intended as verbatim minutes)

I. Welcome/Introductions/Meeting Purpose: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

Jared Goldfine welcomed everyone and asked participants to introduce themselves. He stated that all participants and invitees will receive a meeting summary.

Jared reviewed the agenda. The group then reviewed the meeting guidelines and discussed the format of the meeting. Jared outlined the mitigation measures as written in the draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Jared explained that all measures should be reviewed by the group.

II. Comments from Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: MaryAnn Naber

MaryAnn Naber of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), explained the Council's involvement in the Section 106 process, and stated that the Council would comment on project effects on historic properties as well as mitigation measures. The focus of Advisory Council consultation is to avoid or minimize adverse effects to historic properties.

III. Presentation and Discussion of Draft Stipulation/ Mitigation Measures and Memorandum of Agreement: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

The participants from the City of Oakland expressed that they felt mitigation measures were modest in light of the regional impact from loss of the historic bridge. They also stated that the mitigation measures lacked permanence.

The Oakland participants reiterated their position that the East Span is very important since it marks the entrance to the city, and suggested replacing the historic bridge with one of similar design. The design of the new bridge is the city's most important issue, and the Landmarks Board traditionally requires that when historic structures are demolished, whatever is built in their place be of equal or greater quality. Caltrans reiterated its position that the design of the new bridge is not an historic preservation issue, and that it is not appropriate to include design review of the new bridge in the MOA. MaryAnn Naber of ACHP stated that if the bridge were in or adjacent to an historic district, then a design that is sympathetic to that context would be a consideration under Section 106. In this case, however, she agreed with Caltrans that the design of the new bridge would not need to be considered a Section 106 issue.

There was a lengthy discussion of the future of the Key Pier Substation. Caltrans stated that the building will not be directly affected by the project, and that future decisions to replace or relinquish this building are not a consequence of the Bay Bridge project. The Advisory Council representative stated that the future of the Key Pier Substation should be addressed in the MOA, since the building is a contributing component of the historic bridge. FHWA expressed concern that, since they are responsible for ensuring that the mitigation measures are carried out, the MOA should not include stipulations based on speculative future uses for the building when FHWA may not be involved in those decisions. Participants from Oakland stated that the Gateway Park concept includes preservation and reuse of the Key Pier Substation.
Discussion of the "interpretive center" idea began with Caltrans stating that it is not willing to operate or staff a permanent museum. A representative of Caltrans also expressed concern about the level of patronage that could be expected at a permanent museum and that it may not be an effective use of public funds. The City of Oakland asked if Caltrans would contribute funds for the operation and maintenance of an interpretive center if another party is found to run the center. Jared Goldfine indicated that Caltrans would be open to that possibility.

The City of Oakland stated that they are interested in finding a new use for the 16th Street Station. The City of Oakland asked if Caltrans would consider using this building as a permanent exhibit space, or provide funds for the acquisition and renovation of the building for that purpose, and assist with the application for a T-21 grant for renovation of the building. Caltrans requested that the City of Oakland provide current information on the 16th Street Station, and stated that the MOA may be able to outline the concept of a future partnership. In order to maintain a permanent exhibit, Caltrans indicated that a partnership commitment from the City of Oakland or some other party might be necessary.

The City of Oakland suggested an oil painting depicting the East Bay span of the Bay Bridge as a mitigation measure. It was explained that oil painting is the traditional format for portraying and documenting history, and the most appropriate way to represent the emotional aspects attached to the historic landmark. Rather than stipulate a form of art, there was a suggestion to hold an art competition judged by the City of Oakland, Caltrans and SHPO.

IV. Next Steps

- Oakland to provide Caltrans with current information on the 16th Street Station
- Oakland and Caltrans to jointly investigate site options for an interpretive center
- Revisit mitigation measures based on comments
- Issue a revised draft MOA
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