

Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study**Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #20*****Meeting Summary******date of meeting: 07/18/06******location:*** San Francisco County Transportation Authority***subject:*** Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting***attendees:***Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees:

Michael Alexander, SPUR
 William Alich, Fort Point & Presidio Historical Assoc.
 Janette Barroca, At-Large
 Lindy Beasley, Presidio Residents & Tenants
 Rich Coffin, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
 Max DelleSedie, Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action
 Paul A. Epstein, Planning Association for the Richmond
 Becky Evans, Sierra Club
 Gloria Fontanello, Narina Neighborhood Association
 Joan Marie Girardot, Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association
 Tony Imhof, Cow Hollow Association
 Redmond Kernan, At-Large
 Ronald Mulcare, At-Large
 Norman Rolfe, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Jackie Sachs, SFCTA, CAC Member
 Patricia Vaughney, At-Large

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees Voters:

Gene DeMartini, At-Large
 Fred Rodriguez, GGNRA Advisory Commission

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

Vera Gates, At-Large
 Michael Marston, Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning
 James Maxwell
 Kate Sears, Marin Commuter

Executive Committee Members

Rick Foster, GGNRA/NPS
 Mark Helmbrecht, The Presidio Trust
 Daniel LaForte, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
 Nidal Tuqan, Caltrans

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Rodney Pimentel
 Lee Saage
 Trinity Nguyen

Other Participants

Ann Clark, SPUR
 Jan Blum, Presidio Environmental Council
 Ruth Gravanis, ACW
 Katherine Howell, SPUR
 Steven Krefting, Presidio Environmental Council
 Robyn Mutobe, MSA
 John Palmer, YMCA
 Justin Roja, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services
 Joe Story, DKS
 Cris Subrizi, MSA
 Remi Tan, SPUR
 Marelo Vargas, HNTB

ARUP

Eugene Lam

MPA Design

Michael Painter

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Gary Kennerley
 Katie Eastham

CirclePoint

Molly Graham
 Lauren Karp
 Julia Salinas
 Kay Wilson

DKS

Joe Story

summary:**I. Call to Order and Agenda Review**

Lee Saage, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (the Authority), reviewed the agenda. Michael Alexander, SPUR, motioned to add SPUR's sustainability policy to the agenda and vote on the issue immediately following the last subcommittee action in agenda item 3. Joan Girardot seconded the motion. Lee recognized the motion and the second and noted that sustainability policy could be discussed, but the committee could

not take formal action because the issue had not been noticed publicly prior to the meeting. The committee voted on the motion to discuss sustainability policy as agenda item 3A. None were opposed.

II. Review of Meeting Purpose

Lee Saage stated that the purpose of the meeting was to recommend a preferred alternative for the SAGGB - Doyle Drive Project. The recommendation will be shared with decision makers for consideration in identifying a preferred alternative.

Lee thanked the members of the subcommittee for their devotion to the project, and recognized that their enduring effort and participation has resulted in a greatly improved project.

Voting Process for Preferred Alternative Recommendation

Lee explained that the recommendation process will follow the three steps outlined on the ballot: 1. Select an Alternative; 2. Select Specific Design Elements; 3. Optional Step to Select Design Refinements. For each step, there will be a brief staff presentation describing the items under consideration. Each presentation will be followed by subcommittee discussion, public comment and then subcommittee action.

Lee noted that the workbook, which each subcommittee member received in their meeting packet, will serve as the primary decision making tool. The workbook includes a matrix that provides a staff evaluation how each alternative meets project objectives. Lee asked each committee member to carefully consider how each design feature satisfies project needs. Lee explained that after the completion of the decision making process, the subcommittee may consider other issues and potential mitigation measures in preparation for the development of the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/R).

III. Guided Discussion through the Decision Process to Recommend a Preferred Alternative

Step 1: Selection of an Alternative

Staff Presentation

Gary Kennerley, Parsons Brinckerhoff, presented an overview of the alternatives. Gary described the staff evaluation of how each alternative meets the criteria outlined in the evaluation matrix (refer to page 6 of workbook). Alternative 1: No Build does not meet the project purpose. Alternative 2: Replace and Widen improves the existing facility to meet traffic needs and seismic safety, but does not satisfy several project criteria. Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway proposes to rebuild the structure to meet the project purpose and satisfies at least twelve of the design evaluation criteria.

Michael Painter, MPA Design, provided a description of Alternative 5. He stated that the development of this alternative has been an eighteen-year process. The alternative features landscaped medians that separate traffic, reduce noise, and allow for unobstructed views of the city and the Golden Gate Bridge. Michael commented that this alternative provides a roadway that compliments the scenic park setting of the project.

Subcommittee Discussion

Lee Saage opened subcommittee discussion.

Norman Rolfe commented that in his view none of the proposed alternatives are acceptable, and if the vote occurs tonight, he would vote for Alternative 1, No-Build. He expressed concern that the auxiliary lane in Alternative 5 is unnecessarily long. He also commented

that the large shoulder-widths in Alternative 5 could accommodate an additional lane in the future. Norman stated that although the wide shoulders and merge lane are intended to enhance safety, narrow lanes and shoulders would serve to successfully slow traffic speeds. He recommended delaying the decision until a revised design, which featured a shorter merge lane, turnouts instead of continuous shoulders, and narrower lanes, was presented to the subcommittee.

Redmond Kernan asked for clarification about the potential for converting Alternative 5 into an eight-lane roadway. Lee Saage replied that it is possible to restrict future changes due to the nature of land ownership in this project. In order to complete the project, the Presidio Trust, which is the primary land owner, will provide a permit for building that is restricted to the facility described in the environmental document. If a desire exists, the environmental document could include more stringent restrictions to limit future changes to the approved facility. Norman Rolfe commented that including further restriction in the environmental document would not sufficiently prevent the future expansion of the roadway.

Patricia Vaughey commented that there is risk of lead and cadmium entering Tennessee Hollow and the Presidio watershed during the disassembly of the high viaduct. She inquired about planned mitigation measures for lead and cadmium. Lee Saage replied that mitigation for deconstructing and rebuilding the high viaduct is included in the environmental document. Gary Kennerley commented that the viaduct would typically be encapsulated during deconstruction with a negative-pressure condition to contain all paint flakes and contaminants. Gary noted that the deconstruction process and mitigation of contaminants had received significant consideration.

Patricia Vaughey expressed concern that the proposed alternatives will not satisfy the needs of all involved agencies, stakeholders, and neighborhood groups. She inquired as to why it was necessary to make a decision at this time. Lee Saage replied that the current alternatives have been extensively studied, reviewed, and revised, and the project team believes the best possible alternatives are being presented. Lee noted that the decision allows the project team to better focus their efforts on refining and improving a single alternative to achieve the optimal design for the roadway. The subcommittee and involved groups will continue to provide input as the design progresses.

Max DelleSedie inquired if Alternative 5 were selected, would Alternative 2 be eliminated. Lee clarified that once an alternative is selected, all other alternatives will be dropped from consideration. Max commented that the recommendation is premature because the subcommittee has not yet reviewed responses to comments on the DEIS/R. He explained that the residents of Cow Hollow prefer Alternative 5, but only if certain design options are selected. Lee Saage clarified that the subcommittee could make a conditional recommendation.

Gloria Fontanello commented that neighborhoods surrounding the project area are not benefiting from the project. She stated that in April 2006, over 3 million cars, mostly single occupant vehicles, crossed the Golden Gate Bridge. She stressed the importance of investigating causes of increasing traffic volume and that wide shoulders on Doyle Drive are a potential problem.

William Alich commented that Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 do not satisfy the project criteria, and he would like for the environmental process to proceed with a recommendation from the subcommittee.

Joan Girardot stated that in her view - the vote is premature. Alternative 5 is advantageous for the Presidio, but provides no benefit for the neighborhoods of the Marina District. Alternative 5 increases the traffic capacity of the roadway and enables the future addition of a seventh lane. Joan explained that, although outside the scope of the Doyle Drive Project, Alternative 5 does not address the heavy flow of traffic volume across the Golden Gate Bridge from Marin County. Joan stated her belief that the project conflicts with shoreline roadway specifications outlined in San Francisco's General Plan. She noted that design

refinements to address these issues could have been incorporated if she had been invited to recent design workshops. Lee Saage reiterated that reducing commuter traffic from Marin is outside the scope of the Doyle Drive Project. Lee mentioned that the San Francisco County Transportation Authority is considering a study for congestion pricing on Doyle Drive, which could involve imposing a toll and addressing traffic volume concerns.

Redmond Kernan commented that by making a recommendation, the subcommittee will allow the project to move forward. The public can urge changes to the project during the FEIS/R review period. Redmond noted that the selected alternative will continue to be refined, and he recommended the subcommittee take action. Michael Alexander stated that SPUR is prepared to take action.

Public Comment

None.

Subcommittee Action

Lee Saage explained that a roll call vote would occur. Each subcommittee member's name would be called and, at that time, they could register their vote for Alternative 1: No Build, Alternative 2: Replace and Widen, or Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway.

Kay Wilson read each subcommittee member's name and tallied the votes. Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway was selected. For details of the vote, please see *Table 1: Voter Results* at the end of this section.

Step 2: Selection of Specific Design Elements

Staff Presentation: Merchant Slip Ramp

Gary Kennerley provided a brief presentation about the Merchant Road Slip Ramp, the first specific design element under consideration. Gary explained that, if included, the slip ramp would provide improved access, and would result in a larger footprint, the removal of four buildings, and \$8.6 million of increased costs.

Subcommittee Discussion: Merchant Slip Ramp

Rich Coffin, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, commented that this design element would provide little benefit, cause a larger footprint, increase traffic in the Presidio, and raise costs. Michael Alexander expressed agreement with Rich's statement.

William Alich inquired which four buildings would be removed. Gary Kennerley clarified that four non-historic residential apartment buildings along Armistead Road would be removed.

Janette Barroca inquired who would benefit from the inclusion of this design element. Lee replied that the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway Transit District would benefit from the option because they believe it would improve traffic merging. Lee noted that both the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service oppose the option.

Public Comment: Merchant Slip Ramp

None.

Subcommittee Action: Merchant Slip Ramp

Kay Wilson conducted a roll call vote and all votes opposed the inclusion of the Merchant Slip Ramp.

Staff Presentation: Presidio Parkway Interchange

Gary Kennerley provided a brief presentation comparing the three options for the Presidio Parkway Interchange: Hook Ramp option, Loop Ramp option, and Existing Interchange Configuration.

Subcommittee Discussion: Presidio Parkway Interchange

Patricia Vaughney commented that the option to maintain the existing interchange configuration is new and people who submitted absentee ballots may not have been familiar with the option. Gary clarified that information regarding the option was provided in the workbook. Michael Alexander commented that the existing interchange configuration had not been included in the DEIS/R, and SPUR voted to support the Hook Ramp option. He noted that the existing interchange configuration option is more accurately described as a modified Hook Ramp design and should be treated as a refinement. By acknowledging the new option as a modified Hook Ramp, those representing groups could vote in favor of the design and still respect the choice of their respective groups.

Gloria Fontanello inquired if the Loop Ramp would be safer due to its greater width. Gary Kennerley clarified that all the configurations have been designed to the same safety and speed standards, and the options differ in their footprint and costs.

Public Comments: Presidio Parkway Interchange

Mark Helmbrecht, Presidio Trust, reiterated that the existing interchange configuration is a refinement of the Hook Ramp option. He stated that the Presidio Trust supports the Hook Ramp, and although the existing interchange appears superior, a decision should first be made between the Hook Ramp and the Loop Ramp and then the refinement could be considered.

Subcommittee Action: Presidio Parkway Interchange

Kay Wilson conducted a roll call vote, during which subcommittee members stated their preference for Loop, Hook, or Modified Hook/Existing Interchange Configuration. Kay Wilson tallied the vote and the Modified Hook Ramp/Existing Interchange Configuration option was selected. For details of the vote, please see *Table 1: Voter Results* at the end of this section.

Staff Presentation: Presidio Access

Gary Kennerley presented information regarding the Presidio access options: Circle Drive option and Diamond option. Michael Painter described the Diamond and Circle Drive options. Gary Kennerley noted that it would not be possible to maintain the current condition of Lyon Street if Circle Drive were selected, and the project team has received strong public input to maintain Lyon Street in its existing configuration.

Subcommittee Discussion: Presidio Access

Michael Alexander commented that Circle Drive was intended to meet the concerns of several involved groups. He stated that Circle Drive has not received support from the Presidio Trust or the neighborhood groups who would benefit most if it were selected.

Joan Girardot inquired about the area of park land lost if the Diamond option were selected. Michael Painter replied that a fairly modest area of about 8000 square feet would be lost.

William Alich requested clarification about plans for the swimming pool and Building 230 if the Diamond option were selected. Michael Painter stated that Building 230 would be removed, but the pool could potentially be rebuilt in another location. Lindy Beasley commented that the pool building is a valuable resource. Joan Girardot inquired where the pool building would be relocated to if it were removed. Lee Saage clarified that there is no legal requirement to replace the pool, only to compensate the owner for the value of the loss. The Presidio Trust would have to decide to rebuild the pool.

Redmond Kernan commented that he favored the Diamond option, however the project team should continue to study mitigation possibilities for the visual impact caused by roadway adjacent to the Palace of Fine Arts.

Public Comment: Presidio Access

Steven Krefting, Presidio Environmental Counsel, commented that if the pool building were to be removed there would be pressure to relocate it near the existing YMCA building, an action that could impact the Tennessee Hollow restoration area. The comment was

supported by another member of the public, who stressed the importance of preserving natural areas.

Subcommittee Action: Presidio Access

Kay Wilson conducted a roll call vote and Diamond option was selected. For details of the vote, please see *Table 1: Voter Results* at the end of this section.

Step 3: Optional Design Refinement

Staff Presentation

Gary Kennerley provided a brief presentation describing each of the optional design refinements: Move Girard Intersection South, Restrict Lyon Street Connection from the Presidio and Reserve Right of Way (ROW) for Connection from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive. Lee Saage explained that these three issues have received much discussion within the neighborhood groups, and as the closest representative to the residents, the subcommittee should have the opportunity to provide input on the issues. If the subcommittee wishes to express an opinion on these issues, it may be influential. Additionally, the subcommittee may decide to abstain from expressing an opinion.

Subcommittee Discussion

Paul Epstein, Planning Association for the Richmond, commented that neighbors would like the Lyon Street connection from the Presidio to be eliminated completely. Gary agreed that public comment has supported the elimination of the Lyon Street connection. However, the Presidio Trust has not yet agreed to eliminate the connection, but they have considered restricting access.

Michael Alexander inquired if the proposal for the Marina Boulevard connection would require an environmental evaluation. Lee Saage replied that some environmental analysis would be required to add a lane. Lindy Beasley inquired about who would lead the environmental review if an additional lane to the Marina Boulevard connection was added. Gary replied that the Presidio Trust would be the lead, because the road would be on their property. Gloria Fontanello inquired who supported the additional lane. Gary replied that residents and groups from Richardson, Cow Hollow, Presidio Heights and others were concerned that increased traffic on Richardson Avenue and potential Bus Rapid Transit on Van Ness would result in more traffic needing to access Doyle Drive via Marina Boulevard. Tony Imhoff commented that Cow Hollow residents favor the added lane, because it allows flexibility for future planning.

Lee Saage suggested that, in the interest of time, the subcommittee should vote for or against further consideration of the optional design refinements. Paul Epstein motioned that the committee should vote on the issues. The motion was seconded and 11 committee members were in favor of proceeding with the vote. Kay Wilson commented that eleven is a majority and the option to consider the design refinements would be voted on after public comments were provided.

Public Comment

None.

Subcommittee Action

Kay Wilson explained a roll call vote would occur, during which subcommittee members would be asked if the committee should consider each of the three optional design refinements. Subcommittee members would respond with a “yes” or “no” for consideration of each of the three refinements. Kay Wilson tallied the votes and the subcommittee voted to consider all three of the design refinements. For details of the vote, please see *Table 1: Voter Results* at the end of this section.

Lee Saage announced that the Subcommittee recommendation was complete. The subcommittee applauded Michael Painter for his commitment and efforts over the years.

Table 1: Voter Results

Subcommittee Member	Step 1: Select Alternative	Step 2: Select Design Elements			Optional Step: Design Refinements		
	Alt. 1: No Build	Merchant Slip Ramp	Modified Hook Ramp***	Presidio Access	Move Girard Intersection	Restrict Lyon Street Connection	Reserve ROW
Michael Alexander	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Circle	Yes	Yes	Yes
William Alich	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	No	Yes
Janette Barroca	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lindy Beasley	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	No	Yes
Rich Coffin	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Circle	Yes	Yes	No
Max DelleSedie	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond**	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gene DeMartini*	Alt. 5	No	Hook	Diamond	Yes	Yes	Yes
Paul A. Epstein	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	No	Yes
Becky Evans	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	Yes	No
Gloria Fontanello	Alt. 5**	No	Existing	Circle	No	No	No
Vera Gates	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Joan Marie Girardot	Alt. 5**	No	Hook	Circle	No	No	No
Tony Imhof	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Circle	Yes	Yes	Yes
Redmond Kernan	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	No	Yes
Michael Marston	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
James Maxwell	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ronald Mulcare	Alt. 5**	No	Hook	Circle	Yes	No	No
Fred Rodriguez*	Alt. 5	No	Hook	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Norman Rolfe	Alt. 1	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	Yes	No
Jackie Sachs	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Circle	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kate Sears	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Patricia Vaughey	Alt. 5	No	Existing	Diamond**	Yes	Yes	Yes
RESULT:	Alt. 5: Presidio Parkway	No	Existing	Diamond	Yes	Yes	Yes

* absentee ballot

** vote under protest for Alternative 5 because the ballot material and ballot do not provide for a vote on specific design elements and refinements desired by this voter

*** it was agreed that the term “modified hook ramp” was a more accurate title for “existing interchange configuration” as used in the workbook.

■ no vote submitted

III A. Discussion of Sustainability Policy

Lee Saage explained that prior to the meeting SPUR circulated to subcommittee members a memorandum recommending the adoption of a sustainability policy statement for the Doyle Drive Project. Lee commended the SPUR Sustainability Committee for their effort, and noted that the Authority is supportive of sustainability. Lee explained that since the statement has not yet been reviewed by staff, subcommittee action on the statement is premature. Lee recommended that SPUR follow the established process to work with the Authority to receive input and analysis regarding the policy suggestions, after which the issue can be presented to the subcommittee.

Paul Epstein motioned to defer the discussion until the appropriate process was followed and the motion was seconded. Michael Alexander noted that immediate review of the policy is important because SPUR would like to ensure the sustainability principles are included as required qualifications in the current RFQ being circulated for the Doyle Drive engineering contract. Redmond Kernan commented that the Doyle Drive Project should be as sustainable as possible, but the statement provided by SPUR should undergo the appropriate review and consideration before being presented to the subcommittee. Patricia Vaughey remarked that she had not had an opportunity to thoroughly review the memo. Lindy Beasley inquired when the issue would be revisited if the subcommittee voted to defer discussion. Lee replied that SPUR's Sustainable Development Committee has been invited to meet with Authority staff regarding the statement and timing of when the issue would be presented in not certain.

Michael Alexander noted that the initial request to address the policy was made two weeks prior and the RFQ closes in August. He stated there is no time to defer the discussion. Lee Saage remarked that it is misrepresentative to insinuate that the Authority staff ignored the report for two weeks. Lee explained that he received an email from Kathy Howard two weeks ago, he had indicated that presenting the report directly to the subcommittee would not follow the appropriate review procedure, and requested that arrangements be made to review the document with Authority staff.

Public Comment

Katherine Howard, SPUR Sustainable Development Committee, apologized for not providing the subcommittee with a larger timeframe to review and consider the statement. She explained that the current RFQ for the Doyle Drive Project had just been brought to her attention, and SPUR hopes the subcommittee will make a commitment to sustainability early in the design process.

Ann Clark commented that she believed the preferred alternative selected by the subcommittee satisfied only 8 of the project evaluation criteria. The alternative is neutral for five evaluation criteria regarding sustainability. She urged the subcommittee needs to make a statement in support of sustainability.

Ruth Gravanis commented that the sustainability policy is not on the agenda, and the subcommittee should not take action. She urged the subcommittee to amend the motion to address the issue at their next meeting.

Remi Tan commented that it is very important for the consultants involved with the project to have an understanding of state and local sustainability requirements, particularly for this project which is set within a national park.

Cris Subrizi stated that all design decisions made now should take into account the decommissioning of the corridor in approximately one hundred years. It is important to be able to maintain the functionality of the corridor when the facility needs to be rebuilt.

Subcommittee Action

The subcommittee discussed several possible actions for what to do regarding sustainability at this meeting. To conclude the discussion, Redmond Kernan suggested that Lee Saage take the SPUR sustainability memo through the normal process, and noted that Lee understands the subcommittee has a particular interest in the issue. Lee replied that he would approach the Authority's Executive Director with the request to incorporate appropriate sustainability requirements into the RFQ that he also would put the memo through the normal staff review process and bring the item back to the subcommittee at a future meeting, date to be determined.

Kay Wilson asked for a show of hands from subcommittee members who were in favor of deferring discussion of sustainability policy as outlined by Lee. Kay confirmed that a majority was in favor of deferment.

IV. Overview of Value Analysis/Cost Reduction Concepts

Lee Saage explained that there had been concern that Alternative 5 was costly and there could be incentive to pursue Alternative 2 because of the cost savings it offers. The project team has undertaken an effort to reexamine construction staging and techniques to find less expensive methods without changing the end result. Lee stated that he hopes to report a lower cost that could increase the likelihood that the project is built. Lee commented that sustainability objectives will not be specifically included, because the analysis primarily examines capital cost but does include long-term operation and maintenance costs. Lindy Beasley requested that a report be prepared on the subject. Lee replied that a report will be produced and circulated.

VI. Public Comments

Paul Epstein inquired about the current status of his request to consider extending the project limits to the MacArthur Tunnel and to receive the safety ratings of structures within the corridor. Gary Kennerley provided the score of various structures and explained that Doyle Drive high viaduct is 2 out of a possible 100 points. The low score reinforces the urgency of the project. Gary explained that he is working with Caltrans to prepare a memorandum on the sufficiency rating of the Kobe viaduct including consideration of integrating any needed improvements with the Doyle Drive Project. Paul explained that the safety of the connection between Doyle Drive and the MacArthur Tunnel is very important to residents. Lee mentioned that Caltrans is working on the issue and he is hopeful that the issue will be resolved.

Lindy Beasley thanked Lee Saage and the project team for the many years of work they have dedicated to the project and offered compliments for reaching this milestone.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
7/18/2006	Approach the Authority Executive Director regarding incorporating sustainability in RFQ.	Lee Saage		Addenda to RFQ posted on 7.27.06
7/18/2006	Circulate report regarding Value Analysis/Cost Reduction Concepts	Gary Kennerley	Next Meeting	
7/18/2006	Provide memo regarding the potential for to have work on the Kobe structure coincide with Doyle Drive project	Gary Kennerley	Next Meeting	

Distribution:

All Subcommittee Members
Leroy L. Saage
Jose Luis Moscovich
Gary Kennerley
Sissel Heber
John Karn
Kay Wilson