

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH
ADMINISTRATION, SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER;
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION;
AND
THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER**

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center (SFVAMC) has developed a Long Range Development Plan (Undertaking or LRDP) for its facility located at 4150 Clement Street that includes new development and the retrofit of existing buildings and in two main phases over a 15-year time frame, through the year 2027; and

WHEREAS, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 USC §470f, and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR §800, (Section 106) require federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on those undertakings; and

WHEREAS, implementing the Undertaking is a critical part of meeting the mission of the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), one of three major Veterans Affairs branches, and the needs of Veterans in the San Francisco Bay Area and the North Coast of California over the next 15 years; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC has developed the LRDP in a way that meets its mission and seeks to preserve historic properties under its control through continued use of and reinvestment in buildings contributing to the SFVAMC Historic District, and to avoid or minimize adverse effects related to new construction by seeking to incorporate the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the LRDP will include various actions, but is not limited to, rehabilitation, new construction, demolition, and site preparation, and SFVAMC will be the Responsible Entity for complying with NHPA Section 106 requirements; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC has consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) about the Undertaking; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC provided the public an overview of its NHPA Section 106 compliance responsibilities at National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping meetings held on October 26, 2010, and April 26, 2011, and a joint NEPA/NHPA meeting to collect and consider commentary on September 20, 2012; SFVAMC published advertisements on its website and in the *San Francisco Chronicle* to obtain the views of the public regarding the Undertaking and its effects on historic properties for the LRDP alternatives; SFVAMC published information regarding the Undertaking on its website; SFVAMC established a dedicated e-mail address for distributing information to Consulting Parties and to collect their comments; and SFVAMC held meetings with Consulting Parties to discuss resolution of adverse effects on December 10, 2013 and March 13, 2014; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC notified the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA); the City and County of San Francisco; the National Trust for Historic Preservation; the California Preservation Foundation; the Board of Directors of the Northern California Institute for Research and Education; the University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine; the Palace of the Legion of Honor; the Planning Association for the Richmond; the Friends of Lands End; and the People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area; of the Undertaking and they have accepted SFVAMC's invitation to participate in this consultation as Consulting Parties and are invited to concur with this agreement in accordance with 36 CFR §800.6(c)(3); and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC notified the San Francisco Veterans Affairs Commission; the Western Regional Office of the National Park Service; the San Francisco County Veterans Service Office; and the Presidio Trust of the Undertaking and the opportunity to participate in this consultation, but they either did not respond or declined to participate; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission in an effort to identify and consult federally recognized Indian tribes that may attach religious and/or cultural significance to the SFVAMC property; and SFVAMC determined that there are no such federally recognized tribes; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC, in consultation with the SHPO, has determined the area of potential effect (APE) for the Undertaking to be the entire SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, which encompasses the construction footprint and all construction activity areas and any buildings or structures adjacent to those areas where potential LRDP-related effects may occur. Because of the proximity of the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District directly east and west of the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, the APE also includes all GGNRA land included in the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District (Attachment A); and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC, in consultation with the SHPO, has identified the following historic properties within the APE that may be affected by the Undertaking: the SFVAMC Historic District and the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District (Attachment A); and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC, in consultation with the SHPO and consideration of views from Consulting Parties, has determined that the Undertaking will adversely affect historic properties; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC notified the ACHP of the adverse effect and the ACHP has elected to participate in consultation for this Undertaking pursuant to 36 CFR §800.2(b)(1); and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC, through consultation with the SHPO and ACHP, has determined it will fulfill its NHPA Section 106 responsibilities for the Undertaking through the development and implementation of a PA under 36 CFR §800.14(b), including §800.14(b)(1)(ii), which recognizes that a PA may be used when effects on historic properties cannot be fully determined prior to approval of an undertaking; and

WHEREAS, SFVAMC, the SHPO, and ACHP will execute this Programmatic Agreement (PA) as Signatories;

NOW, THEREFORE, SFVAMC, the SHPO, and ACHP agree that implementation of the following stipulations evidence that SFVAMC has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties, and this PA evidences compliance with NHPA Section 106 in accordance with 36 CFR §800.6(c) and 36 CFR §800.14(b).

STIPULATIONS

I. APPLICABILITY

- a. SFVAMC is responsible for ensuring implementation of the stipulations in this PA associated with the Undertaking.
- b. The stipulations of this PA describe treatment measures for historic properties being demolished or altered as part of the LRDP, including specific mitigation measures for the overall effect of full implementation of the LRDP and a review process for individual projects within the LRDP.

II. GENERAL

- a. All parties will send and accept receipt of official notices, comments, requests for further information and documentation, and other communications required by this PA by e-mail.
- b. Time designations are in calendar days. Failure to comment within specified time designations will be treated as concurrence.
- c. SFVAMC will ensure that a federal, State, or contractor staff who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, as determined by VA's Federal Preservation Officer, participates in the decision-making required as part of this PA. In addition, where individual project reviews are performed and require adherence to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, SFVAMC will ensure that a staff member or contractor who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards is included in the design process.
- d. The review procedures for individual LRDP projects reference different stages in SFVAMC's process for project design. VA's Schematic Design is roughly equivalent to 30 percent design; Design Development is roughly equivalent to 60 percent design, and Construction drawings are roughly equivalent to 90–100 percent design.

III. REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR INDIVIDUAL LRDP PROJECTS

SFVAMC will review individual LRDP projects during the design phases, according to the procedures set forth below, with the goal of avoiding or minimizing potential adverse effects to historic properties, wherever feasible.

As the degree to which individual LRDP projects may adversely affect historic properties is directly related to their location, the applicable review procedure is determined by whether the project is located within the SFVAMC Historic District, adjacent to the SFVAMC Historic District or the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District, or outside of and out of visual range of either historic district. SFVAMC created a table of individual LRDP projects with an indication of each project's relation to the historic districts and an indication of the review category or categories that apply (Attachment B).

- a. REVIEW CATEGORY A: Projects Located within the SFVAMC Historic District
 - i. Before completing Schematic Design, SFVAMC will initiate project review under the terms of this agreement, with reference to Review Category A, by providing the SHPO a written

description of the proposed project, including any ways in which the project differs from what is described in the LRDP Finding of Effect.

1. SFVAMC will post the initiation of project review to the SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website and notify all Consulting Parties within 30 days of transmittal to the SHPO.
 2. Within 30 days of receipt of the submission, the SHPO will acknowledge the initiation of project review in writing and provide initial comments or guidance specific to that project, as the SHPO deems appropriate.
- ii. Before completing Design Development, SFVAMC will document the measures taken to avoid or minimize adverse effects on the SFVAMC Historic District.
1. Documentation will include, but not be limited to:
 - a. Written description of how the project applies the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.
 - b. Written statement of whether the net result of the project will be a contribution to the adverse effect on the Historic District.
 - c. Drawings including site plans, elevations, sections, and renderings illustrating the existing conditions and proposed project.
 2. SFVAMC will distribute the above documentation to all Consulting Parties for a 30-day review and comment period.
- iii. If prior to the conclusion of the 30-day review and comment period, the SHPO informs SFVAMC that a meeting between SHPO staff members and SFVAMC is necessary to discuss the project and develop additional measures for adhering to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, SFVAMC will schedule a meeting. The SHPO will work in good faith with SFVAMC to schedule such meeting. If comments are not received within 30 days, SFVAMC may proceed to Step III.a.iv.
- iv. Before completing Construction Drawings, SFVAMC will summarize the results of the Review Category A consultation, including measures to avoid and minimize adverse effects. SFVAMC will submit this report to the SHPO for final concurrence on the project. The SHPO will respond within 30 days with either concurrence or a request for additional information or consultation. If additional information is requested, the SHPO will have 15 days to review new information from SFVAMC. Once the SHPO concurs, SFVAMC will post the final summary report to its LRDP Section 106 website and notify all Consulting Parties.
- b. REVIEW CATEGORY B: Projects Located Adjacent to the SFVAMC Historic District
- i. Before completing Schematic Design, SFVAMC will initiate project review under the terms of this agreement, with reference to Review Category B, by providing the SHPO a written description of the proposed project, including any ways in which the project differs from what is described in the LRDP Finding of Effect.
1. SFVAMC will post the initiation of project review to the LRDP Section 106 website and notify all Consulting Parties within 30 days of transmittal to the SHPO.
 2. Within 30 days of receipt of the submission, the SHPO will acknowledge the initiation of project review in writing and provide initial comments or guidance specific to that project, as the SHPO deems appropriate.

- ii. Before completing Design Development, SFVAMC will document the measures taken to avoid or minimize adverse effects on the SFVAMC Historic District.
 - 1. Documentation will include, but not be limited to:
 - a. Written description of the proposed project, including any ways in which the project differs from what is described in the LRDP Finding of Effect.
 - b. Written description of how the project affects the integrity of the SFVAMC Historic District, with special attention to the integrity of feeling, association, and setting.
 - c. Written statement of whether the net result of the project will be a contribution to the adverse effect on the SFVAMC Historic District.
 - d. Drawings including site plans, elevations, sections, and renderings illustrating the existing conditions and proposed project.
 - 2. SFVAMC will distribute the above documentation to all Consulting Parties for a 30-day review and comment period. SFVAMC will forward all comments received within the 30-day review period to the SHPO.
- iii. The SHPO will provide SFVAMC with written comments on the Design Development documentation within 30 days. If comments are not received within 30 days, SFVAMC may proceed to Step III.b.iv.
- iv. Before completing Construction Drawings, SFVAMC will summarize the results of the Review Category B consultation, including measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on the SFVAMC Historic District. The documentation will be posted to the SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website, and notification will be sent to all Consulting Parties. This documentation shall be evidence of the completion of the Section 106 review of the project. The documentation will include, but not be limited to:
 - 1. A summary of the comments received from the SHPO, ACHP, and Consulting Parties.
 - 2. Written and graphical descriptions of how the Design Development drawings were modified to further avoid or minimize adverse effects, if warranted in light of the comments received.
 - 3. A statement of the net effect of the project on the integrity of the SFVAMC Historic District.
- c. REVIEW CATEGORY C: Projects Located Adjacent to the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District
 - i. Before completing Schematic Design, SFVAMC will:
 - 1. Provide GGNRA with a written and graphic description of the conceptual design. SFVAMC will also invite GGNRA to meet to discuss the proposed project and conceptual designs. GGNRA will provide written comments to SFVAMC within 30 days of the meeting; and
 - 2. Initiate project review under the terms of this agreement, with reference to Review Category C, by providing the SHPO a written description of the proposed project, including any ways in which the project differs from what is described in the LRDP Finding of Effect.
 - a. SFVAMC will post the initiation of project review to the SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website and notify the Consulting Parties within 30 days of transmittal to the SHPO.

- b. Within 30 days of receipt of the submission, the SHPO will acknowledge the initiation of project review in writing and provide initial comments or guidance specific to that project, as the SHPO deems appropriate.
 - ii. Before completing Design Development, SFVAMC will document the measures taken to avoid or minimize adverse effects on the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District.
 - 1. Documentation will include, but not be limited to:
 - a. Written description of how the project applies the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.
 - b. Written statement of whether the project adversely affects the Historic District, with special attention to the integrity of setting, feeling, and association.
 - c. Drawings including site plans, elevations, sections, and renderings illustrating the existing conditions and proposed project.
 - d. Summary of coordination efforts with GGNRA, including full copies of written comments received from GGNRA.
 - 2. SFVAMC will distribute the above documentation to all Consulting Parties for a 30-day review and comment period. SFVAMC will forward all comments received within the 30-day review period to the SHPO.
 - 3. If the project is located within the SFVAMC Historic District, SFVAMC may combine this documentation into one package with the documentation for Review Category A.
 - iii. If prior to the conclusion of the 30-day review and comment period, the SHPO informs SFVAMC that a meeting between SHPO staff members and SFVAMC is necessary to discuss the project and develop additional measures for adhering to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, SFVAMC will schedule a meeting. If the SHPO determines that such a meeting is not warranted, it will confirm this via an e-mail to SFVAMC. If a meeting is held, GGNRA will be invited to participate. If comments are not received within 30 days, SFVAMC may proceed to Step III.c.iv.
 - iv. Before completing Construction Drawings, SFVAMC will summarize the results of the Review Category C consultation, including measures to avoid and minimize adverse effects. SFVAMC will submit this report to the SHPO for final concurrence on the completion of Section 106 consultation for the project. The SHPO will respond within 30 days with either a statement of concurrence or a request for additional information or consultation. If additional information is requested, the SHPO will have 15 days to review new information from SFVAMC. If the SHPO does not respond within 30 days, SFVAMC may assume concurrence. Once the SHPO concurs, SFVAMC will post the final summary report to its SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website and notify all Consulting Parties.
- d. REVIEW CATEGORY D: Projects Located Outside of or Out of Visual Range of Historic Districts
 - i. Before completing Schematic Design, SFVAMC will request SHPO concurrence on SFVAMC's finding of no adverse effect under the terms of this agreement, with reference to Review Category D. The request will include a written description of the proposed project, including any ways in which the project differs from what is described in the LRDP Finding of Effect.

1. SFVAMC will post the request for concurrence to its LRDP Section 106 website and notify the Consulting Parties within 30 days of transmittal to the SHPO. SFVAMC will forward all comments received to the SHPO.
2. The SHPO will concur or request additional information within 30 days. If additional information is requested, the SHPO will have 15 days to review new information from SFVAMC. If the SHPO does not respond within 30 days, SFVAMC may assume concurrence. Once the SHPO concurs, SFVAMC will post the SHPO concurrence to its SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website and notify all Consulting Parties.

IV. MITIGATION MEASURES

- a. Public Interpretation: SFVAMC will design and implement a public interpretation program related to the history of SFVAMC as mitigation for the LRDP's adverse effects on historic properties, including its proposed demolition of Buildings 18 and 20, proposed new construction within the SFVAMC Historic District, and the cumulative effects of the LRDP as a whole.
 - i. Within 18 months of execution of the PA, SFVAMC will prepare a written work plan for the public interpretation program. The Interpretation work plan will define the objectives of the interpretive program, specify the interpretive media with which the program will be developed (with consideration of typical media such as oral history recordation, displays, traveling exhibits, popular publications, and/or websites), and define the interpretive themes that will be conveyed by the program. In addition, the Interpretation work plan will specify the time frames for implementation of the program and preparation of the individual media and will provide an estimate of associated costs.
 - ii. SFVAMC will post the Interpretation work plan to its SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website for comment by the Consulting Parties and notify them of the posting via e-mail. SFVAMC will finalize the Interpretation work plan after considering the comments received within 30 days. SFVAMC will implement the program in accordance with the final Interpretation work plan.
 - iii. SFVAMC will post the final Interpretation work plan to its SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website and notify Consulting Parties of the posting via e-mail.
- b. Historic District Design Guidelines: SFVAMC will prepare design guidelines for the SFVAMC Historic District, interpreting the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* in the context of the significance, integrity, and character-defining features of the SFVAMC Historic District. SFVAMC will ensure that all projects occurring within the SFVAMC Historic District adhere to the design guidelines during design development.
 - i. Within 12 months of execution of the PA, SFVAMC will prepare a work plan for development of the Historic District Design Guidelines. The Design Guidelines work plan will specify the contents of the design guidelines, the methods and standards for preparing the design guidelines, the process for reviews by Consulting Parties, a timeline for completion of the design guidelines, and an estimated cost.
 - ii. SFVAMC will post the Design Guidelines work plan to the website for comment by the Consulting Parties and notify them of the posting via e-mail. SFVAMC will finalize the Design Guidelines work plan after considering any comments received within 30 days. SFVAMC will post the final Design Guidelines work plan to the website and notify Consulting Parties of the posting via e-mail.
- c. Historic Landscape Report: SFVAMC will prepare a Historic Landscape Report (HLR) for the SFVAMC Historic District to document the landscape qualities of the Historic District and to

identify opportunities for the restoration and/or enhancement of landscape features and historic resources for the overall health and improvement of the Historic District. The HLR will also consider vegetative screening along the boundaries, and whether such screening would improve the historical integrity of the SFVAMC Historic District and/or the Fort Miley Military Reservation Historic District.

- i. Within 18 months of execution of the PA, SFVAMC will prepare a work plan for development of an HLR. The HLR work plan will specify the contents of the HLR, the methods and standards for preparing the HLR, the process for reviews by Consulting Parties, a timeline for completion of the HLR, and an estimated cost.
- ii. SFVAMC will post the HLR work plan to its SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website for comment by the Consulting Parties and notify them of the posting via e-mail. SFVAMC will finalize the HLR work plan after considering the comments received within 30 days. SFVAMC will prepare the HLR in accordance with the final HLR work plan.
- iii. SFVAMC will post the final HLR work plan to its SFVAMC LRDP Section 106 website and notify all Consulting Parties of the posting via e-mail.
- d. After the execution of the PA and as Mitigation Measures a, b, and c are being developed, SFVAMC may initiate consultation on individual projects in accordance with Stipulation III of the PA.

V. RESOLVING OBJECTIONS

- a. If the objection cannot be resolved through consultation, SFVAMC will forward all documentation relevant to the objection to ACHP, including any proposed resolution identified during consultation.
- b. If ACHP does not provide SFVAMC with recommendations within 15 days, SFVAMC may assume that the ACHP does not object to its recommended approach and will proceed accordingly.
- c. Any recommendation provided by ACHP will pertain only to the subject of the objection, and the responsibilities of SFVAMC to fulfill all actions that are not the subject of the objection will remain unchanged.
- d. Any objection regarding National Register eligibility that is not resolved pursuant to this Stipulation will be resolved in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.4(c)(2).

VI. ADMINISTRATION AND DURATION OF THIS PA

- a. This PA will become effective immediately upon signature by all Signatories. For all Signatories, this PA will be executed in counterparts, with a separate signature page for each Signatory, and SFVAMC will provide each Consulting Party with a complete copy of the executed PA including all signature pages.
- b. This PA will remain in effect for 15 years from the date of execution, unless extended for a 2-year period by written agreement negotiated by all Signatories.
- c. The Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 USC §1341, prohibits federal agencies from incurring an obligation of funds in advance of or in excess of available appropriations. Accordingly, the parties agree that any requirement for the obligation of funds arising from the terms of this agreement shall be

subject to the availability of appropriated funds for that purpose, and that this agreement shall not be interpreted to require the obligation of funds in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

- d. SFVAMC will provide all Consulting Parties with annual Interim Progress Reports, which will be prepared every year from the execution of this PA. The Interim Progress Reports will include updates on implementation of the mitigation measures, as well as the status of individual project reviews that were conducted in the reporting period.

VII. AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION

- a. Any of the Signatories to this PA may request an amendment. The PA may be amended when such an amendment is agreed to in writing by all Signatories. The amendment will go into effect on the date of the signature by the final Signatory.
- b. If any Signatory to this PA determines that its terms will not or cannot be carried out, that party shall immediately consult with the other Signatories to attempt to develop an amendment per Stipulation VII.a, above. If within 30 days (or another time period agreed to by all signatories) an amendment cannot be reached, any Signatory may terminate the PA upon written notification to the other Signatories. Should consultation fail, SFVAMC will notify all Consulting Parties in writing of the termination.
- c. Upon termination of the PA in accordance with VII.b, above, SFVAMC will comply with 36 CFR §800.6(c)(8). This PA may be terminated without further consultation by the execution of a subsequent agreement that explicitly terminates or supersedes this PA.

EXECUTION AND IMPLEMENTATION of this PA, pursuant to 36 CFR §800.14(b), evidences that SFVAMC has afforded the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on the Undertaking and its effects on historic properties, that SFVAMC has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties, and that SFVAMC has satisfied its NHPA Section 106 responsibilities.

For all Signatories, this PA will be executed in counterparts, with a separate signature page for each Signatory. Consulting Parties that have been invited to concur with the PA shall indicate concurrence on the page provided through a representative signature. SFVAMC will provide all Consulting Parties with a complete copy of the executed PA including all signature pages.

This PA is effective immediately upon filing with the ACHP following signature by all Signatories.

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH
ADMINISTRATION, SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER;
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION;
AND
THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER**

Signatory:

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION,
SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER**

By: _____

Date: _____

Bonnie S. Graham
SFVAMC Director

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH
ADMINISTRATION, SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER;
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION;
AND
THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE

SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER**

Signatory:

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

By: _____

Date: _____

Milford Wayne Donaldson
ACHP Chairman

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH
ADMINISTRATION, SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER;
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION;
AND
THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER**

Signatory:

CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: _____

Date: _____

Dr. Carol Roland-Nawi
State Historic Preservation Officer

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH
ADMINISTRATION, SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER;
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION;
AND
THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER**

In accordance with 36 CFR §800.6(c)(3), the following parties have been invited to concur with the PA:

CALIFORNIA PRESERVATION FOUNDATION

By: _____

Date: _____

Cindy Heitzman, Executive Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: _____

Date: _____

Tim Frye, Preservation Coordinator

FRIENDS OF LANDS END

By: _____

Date: _____

Julie Burns, Co-Founder

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA

By: _____

Date: _____

Bob Holloway, Curator

LEGION OF HONOR

By: _____

Date: _____

Diane Wilsey, President of Board of Trustees
at San Francisco Fine Arts

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

By: _____

Date: _____

Brian Turner, Senior Field Officer and Attorney

NCIRE (THE VETERANS HEALTH RESEARCH INSTITUTE) BOARD OF DIRECTORS

By: _____

Date: _____

Robert Obana, Executive Director

PEOPLE FOR A GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

By: _____

Date: _____

Amy Meyer, President

PLANNING ASSOCIATION FOR THE RICHMOND

By: _____

Date: _____

Raymond Holland, President

USCF SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

By: _____

Date: _____

Sam Hawgood, Dean and Vice Chancellor
for Medical Affairs

ATTACHMENT A

LRDP Area of Potential Effect

(including NRHP historic districts)



Source: compiled by AECOM - February 2014

LRDP Area of Potential Effect

ATTACHMENT B

SFVAMC LRDP Projects with Preliminary Section 106 Review Category (Revised January 2014—Combined Scenarios A and B)

Table B-1. SFVAMC LRDP Projects with Preliminary Section 106 Review Category

Phase	Building	Action	Relation to SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	Section 106 Review Category
1.1	Building 211 (Emergency Operations Center and Parking Garage)	Construction	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD and Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	B and C
1.2	Trailer 17	Removal	Within SFVAMC HD; noncontributor to District	A
	Building 41 (Research)	Construction	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD	B
1.3	Buildings 5 and 7	Seismic Retrofit	Within SFVAMC HD; contributors to District	Previous Section 106 Consultation resulted in finding of No Adverse Effect. SHPO concurred 8/27/09
1.4	Buildings 9 and 10	Seismic Retrofit	Within SFVAMC HD; contributors to District	Previous Section 106 Consultation resulted in finding of No Adverse Effect. SHPO concurred 8/27/09
	Building 22 (Hoptel)	Construction	Within SFVAMC HD; new construction would be located behind two contributors to District	Previous Section 106 Consultation resulted in finding of No Adverse Effect. SHPO concurred 8/27/09
1.5	Parking Garage Extensions (Buildings 209 and 211)	Construction	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD and Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	B and C
1.6	Building 203 C-Wing Extension (Ground Floor Patient Welcome Center) and Drop-Off Area with Canopy Structure	Construction	Building 203 C-Wing would be located adjacent to SFVAMC HD; Drop-Off Area would be located within District boundaries, adjacent to a contributor to District	A and B
1.7	Building 200 Expansion (Operating Room D-Wing)	Construction	Located outside SFVAMC HD; proposed development would introduce new visual elements adjacent to District, but construction would not substantially alter existing scale and character of District	B
1.8	Building 20	Demolition	Within the SFVAMC HD; contributor to District	A
	Building 24 (Mental Health Clinical Expansion)	Construction	Within SFVAMC HD; adjacent to a contributor to District; adjacent to the Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	A and C (in progress; Section 106 initiated 8/27/10 but put on hold pending Section 106 review of the LRDP)
1.9	Building 18	Demolition	Within SFVAMC HD; contributor to District	A

Table B-1. SFVAMC LRDP Projects with Preliminary Section 106 Review Category

Phase	Building	Action	Relation to SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	Section 106 Review Category
	Building 14	Demolition	Within SFVAMC HD; noncontributor to District	A
	Building 21	Demolition	Within SFVAMC HD; noncontributor to District	A
	Trailer 23	Removal	Within SFVAMC HD; noncontributor to District	A
	Structure 206 (Water Tower)	Installation	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD and Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	B and C
	Structure 206 (Water Tower)	Removal	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD and Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	B and C
	Building 40 (Research)	Construction	Proposed new building would be located adjacent to and within boundaries of SFVAMC HD; construction would result in demolition of a contributor to District	A
1.10	Building 207 Expansion (IT Support Space)	Construction	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD and adjacent to a contributor to District	B
1.11	Trailer 31	Removal	Within SFVAMC HD; noncontributor to District	A
	Building 43 (Research and Administration)	Construction	Within SFVAMC HD; adjacent to contributors to District	A
1.12	Trailer 36 (New Modular)	Installation	Not within SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD and outside visual range of Districts	D
1.13	Building 23 (Mental Health Research Expansion)	Construction	Within SFVAMC HD; adjacent to contributors to District; construction would result in demolition of a contributor to District; adjacent to Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	A, C
1.14	Building 203 Extension (Psychiatric Intensive Care Unit C-Wing)	Construction	Not within SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD and outside visual range of Districts	D
1.15	Trailer 24	Removal	Not within SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD and outside visual range of Districts	D

Table B-1. SFVAMC LRDP Projects with Preliminary Section 106 Review Category

Phase	Building	Action	Relation to SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD	Section 106 Review Category
	Building 208 Extension (Community Living Center and National Cardiac Device Surveillance Center)	Construction	Not within SFVAMC HD or Fort Miley Military Reservation HD and outside visual range of Districts	D
1.16 (under Scenario A) and 2.2, 2.3, and 2.1, respectively (under Scenario B)	Buildings 1, 6, and 8	Seismic Retrofit	Within SFVAMC HD; contributors to District	A
1.17 (under Scenario A) and 1.16 (under Scenario B)	Building 12	Demolition	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD	B
2.1 (under Scenario A) and 2.4 (under Scenario B)	Building 213 (Clinical Addition Building)	Construction	Adjacent to SFVAMC HD	B