

4 Consultation and References

The PTMP, the comprehensive land use plan for Area B of the Presidio upon which the PHSB project proposal is based, was itself subject to an extensive public process.¹ In responding to public comments on the Draft PTMP and EIS, the Trust made several refinements to the PTMP and EIS, including addressing issues specific to the PHSB district. The responses to public comments resulted in adding greater specificity to the PHSB district, stating a preference for residential uses within the main hospital building, and committing to commemorate the former Marine Hospital Cemetery. The PTMP also committed to continued public process as the plan was implemented. This Draft SEIS affords the public that opportunity for the PHSB project proposal.²

The PHSB project now under review in this Draft SEIS is the first major historic building rehabilitation and potential new construction project within the NHLD since the Trust's adoption of the PTMP. The Trust initially announced the PHSB project in a feature article in the April/May 2003 Presidio Post, the Trust's bi-monthly newsletter with over 17,000 readers interested in park activities. The Presidio Post article made known the Trust's proposal to revitalize and reuse the PHSB district's buildings, and to solicit offers from qualified organizations interested in redeveloping the project site and rehabilitating some or all of its historic structures.

Since the first announcement of the project in April/May 2003, the PHSB project has been the subject of substantial public input, including first a detailed EA and now this SEIS. In addition, although not required by the NEPA, the EA was the subject of public scoping, public comment, and a public hearing, such that the entire review process will include two full sets of opportunities for public participation. A detailed summary of public input during the concurrent leasing and environmental review process for the PHSB project is provided below, along with a summary of agency consultation.

4.1 CONCURRENT LEASING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The Trust is engaged in a concurrent leasing and environmental review process aimed at rehabilitating and leasing buildings within the PHSB district in a manner that is consistent with the management direction and level of intensity presented in the PTMP and analyzed in the PTMP EIS.

In 1999, prior to the PTMP planning process, the Trust had issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the PHSB and received 14 proposals. At that time, the Trust elected not to proceed with the project. In the course of developing the PTMP, the Trust set clearer land use parameters and management options for the PHSB district that were also responsive to and consistent with the comments received from the adjoining neighborhoods. The PTMP identified rehabilitation and leasing of the PHSB buildings as an

¹ For a chronological discussion of the public involvement program for the PTMP and EIS, refer to the Record of Decision for the PTMP (Trust 2002).

² For a detailed discussion of the public comments, responses, and changes made to the PHSB district during the PTMP planning and environmental review process, refer directly to Responses to Comments PG-4 through PG-9 in the PTMP Final EIS (Volume II), pages 4-87 to 4-90.

important “next step” because of the serious physical deterioration of the historic buildings and the Plan’s policy commitment to pursue conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use.

4.1.1 Start of Leasing Process / 2003 PHSB RFQ

In April 2003, the Trust began seeking development teams qualified to undertake the rehabilitation and reuse of the buildings within the PHSB district. The Trust distributed the RFQ and accompanying draft Planning and Design Guidelines (see PHSB EA Appendix A) to more than 5,000 individuals and/or organizations (Trust 2003a and 2003b). Approximately 100 people attended the Trust’s public pre-submittal meeting on May 6, 2003 for a project briefing and tour of the site. The Trust has also engaged in more than 30 public meetings and briefings with neighborhood groups and other interested parties, as described further below.

On June 23, 2003, the Trust received nine responses to the PHSB RFQ. Evaluation of these submittals focused on team qualifications and on narrowing the field from which to request detailed proposals. In evaluating qualifications, the Trust considered broad criteria, including experience with similar projects and historic building rehabilitation, as well as the use of historic tax credits, financial capability, proposed public outreach efforts, compatibility of the project concepts with the Presidio’s NHLD status, and responsiveness of the initial project concept to the Trust’s goals and objectives for the project.

Following an evaluation of the responses by Trust staff, the Trust Board of Directors invited Forest City Development, the John Stewart Company and the Related Companies of California, and Avalon Bay Communities, Inc. to submit detailed proposals by October 27, 2003. Avalon Bay subsequently chose to withdraw from the process.

4.1.2 Start of NEPA Process / Scoping the EA

On August 27, 2003, the Trust issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to the three qualifying teams and also began its environmental review process pursuant to the NEPA (Trust 2003c). Using the PHSB district planning framework developed in the PTMP, the Trust defined a range of possible alternatives for the project. The range of alternatives was informed by early public input during the RFQ process and by the conceptual proposals offered by RFQ respondents.

The Trust encouraged the participation of interested individuals, organizations, and agencies as part of the scoping process for the PHSB EA. An announcement in the August/September 2003 Presidio Post urged members of the public to join the project mailing list to receive PHSB announcements and the EA.

Notice of the project and EA was also published in the Federal Register on September 9, 2003 (68 FR 53205). Scoping for the project began on August 27, 2003, at which time the Trust widely distributed for public review and comment its notice to prepare an EA and an information packet describing the project, issues, potential impacts, and potential alternatives to be addressed in the EA.

As part of the scoping process, the Trust held two public Trust Board meetings. At the first meeting on October 29, 2003, the Board accepted oral scoping comments, announced a second public meeting, and extended the public comment period (68 FR 64151). Of the approximately 166 individuals attending the first public meeting, 27 spoke. The meeting was summarized in an article that appeared in the November/December 2003 Presidio Post. At the Board's second public meeting held on December 10, 2003, approximately 114 individuals attended and 35 speakers directly addressed the Board with comments on the PHSH project.

In addition, during the scoping period, the Trust presented the project at a number of other meetings, site visits, building tours, and activities with government agencies, City supervisors of districts adjacent to the Presidio, neighborhood associations, natural resource conservation organizations, historic preservation groups, city planning organizations, neighbors, and others (see Section 4.3, List of Persons and Agencies Consulted, for a partial listing). At these forums, the Trust listened to public concerns about the project and answered questions where possible. The Trust also provided timely information updates and notices concerning the project through postings on its website at www.presidio.gov.

4.1.3 Continuation of Leasing Process / Receipt of Proposals

Two teams elected to present proposals. The Forest City and John Stewart/Related Companies teams submitted their proposals on October 27, 2003, and presented them at a public Trust Board of Directors' meeting on October 29. The teams were directed to submit proposals consistent with the range of alternatives described in the scoping materials, and each did so.

The Forest City team submitted two proposals. The first would remove the non-historic wings of the PHSH, rehabilitate the historic portion of the building and other historic buildings for residential use, and construct new residential units in the northern portion of the PHSH district at Battery Caulfield. The second proposal would rehabilitate the PHSH, including its non-historic wings, for residential use without any new construction at Battery Caulfield. Forest City has identified the second proposal as its preference. The John Stewart/Related Companies proposal is similar to Forest City's preferred option, and would rehabilitate the PHSH while retaining the non-historic wings. The John Stewart/Related Companies proposal states that the team considered a project that removed the non-historic wings without replacing the lost square footage, and determined that it would not be financially feasible for them nor would it generate rent for the Presidio.³

4.1.4 Revision of EA Planning Alternatives Based on Leasing Proposals and Scoping Comments

The extended scoping period, which originally would have expired on November 26, closed on December 10, 2003. The Trust Board offered almost four months (105 days) of public scoping to provide greater opportunities for public and agency participation in the project planning process. By the end of the

³ In a later communication dated January 9, 2004, the John Stewart/Related Companies team revised this statement to indicate their belief that the smaller alternative would be financially feasible if Building 1801 were reused as leasehold condominiums.

scoping period or shortly thereafter, the Trust had received about 250 written and oral comments, including a total of about 195 written comment letters and two petitions with 69 and 18 signatures, respectively.⁴

After carefully considering the public's comments and the proposals submitted, the Trust revised the alternatives included in the August 27, 2003 scoping materials to those that were being studied in the EA. Most notably, in response to public scoping comments and the developer proposals, the Trust reduced the proposed unit count – or size – of EA Alternatives 2 and 4 by 10 to 20 percent. The comments also led to other changes, including definition of the Park Presidio Boulevard Access Variant, identification of a preferred alternative that did not include development at Battery Caulfield, and numerous textual discussions and analyses in Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the document.

4.1.5 Developer Selection and Distribution and Comment on the EA

The Trust made the EA available for public review on March 1, 2004 (69 FR 9651) and furnished the document to interested persons, organizations, and agencies. The Trust also widely circulated a summary of the EA in a project update (Trust 2004c). The public was invited to provide oral comment on the EA at a public Trust Board meeting on April 14, 2004, at which 132 individuals attended and 44 spoke. At a subsequent meeting, the Board selected Forest City Development Partners as the developer team with whom to enter exclusive negotiations for the project. The Board's selection of a developer does not indicate a commitment to approve or execute a project identical to the developer's specific physical proposal. Negotiations are expected to result in a project that falls within the range represented by the alternatives in Section 2 of this Draft SEIS, and will not be concluded until the environmental review process is complete.

By the close of the extended public review period on April 30, 2004, the Trust had received written and oral comments from 2 public agencies, 2 elected officials, 11 organizations, and 135 individuals (see Table 26). Of the individuals that provided written comments, 82 (61 percent) included addresses with ZIP codes bordering the Presidio and could be considered "neighbors."

Based on the impact analysis in the EA and a review of public comments received on the document, the Trust determined that a full EIS process would best achieve the NEPA's goals because of the potential significance of traffic impacts identified. The Trust used many of the substantive comments received on the EA to help scope the relevant issues that were addressed in this Draft SEIS and identify any additional environmental analyses or information that would be appropriate. A summary of the comments received is provided in Appendix A, along with responses to issues raised and an explanation of resulting differences between the analyses in the EA and this Draft SEIS.

⁴ These letters are available for public review at the Presidio Trust Library, 34 Graham Street (Main Post).

Table 26. Public Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Commenting on the PHS EA

Public Agencies	United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (NPS)
	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 4
Elected Officials	Michela Alioto-Pier, Member, Board of Supervisors, District 2, City and County of San Francisco
	Jake McGoldrick, Member, Board of Supervisors, District 1, City and County of San Francisco
Neighborhood Organizations	Friends of Mountain Lake Park (2)
	Lake Street Residents Association (LSRA)
	Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning (NAPP)
	Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR) (2)
	Richmond Presidio Neighbors (RPN) (2)
	Sixth Avenue Neighborhood Watch Association (petition with 60 signatures)
Natural Resource Conservation Organizations	Golden Gate Audubon Society
	People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area (2)
	Presidio Sustainability Project (2)
Historic Preservation Organizations	California Heritage Council (CHC)*
	Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association (Fort Point)*

Individuals

Alazraqui, Ed	Donohoe, Chris	Jonas, Eloise
Alcadez, Mary	Donohoe, Robin	Judd, Jeffrey (2)
Atlas, Linton	Eng, Wai-ling	Judge, Campbell
Beall, Mary Dee*	Farner, Cynthia	Karrels, Jim
Blum, Jan (2)	Feierabend, Carey	Keenan, Richard (2)
Bogatay, Lucia*	Ferris, Christine	Keene, Michelle
Brockway, Anna	Fieber, Bill	Kernan, Redmond*
Brook, Marvin	Forsyth, Carolyn and James	Kind, G.M.
Bunhim, Dave	Foster, Cornelia	Kiss, Patrick
Callander, Bruce (2)	French, Muriel Talbot	Knoell, Gretchen
Carlson, Dale*	Frostestad, Lanette	Knox, Aliza
Castner, Kevin	Frostestad, Roland	Lantz, C.
Chang, Rhoda	Gen, Gloria*	Lee, Eva and James
Cheever, Julie*	Gray, Jon*	Lee, Henry and Carole Jan
Chernick, Peter and Rommie	Haber, Ira	Leider, Emily
Chin, Karen and James	Harrison, Robert	Lerner, Edward
Chiuchiarelli Family	Helding, John	Lerner, Leslie (2)
Chow, Richard	Henslin, Bill*	Levy, David
Cleek, Karen	Hidy, Paul	Lewin, Andrea
Cole, V.R.	Higbie, Mark (2)	Ling, Charles
Courlang, Steven	High, Ken & Gail (2)	Lynch, Neil
Crawford, Caroline	Hulka, Judith*	Maccabee, John
Daniels, Elaine	Hunt, Marcia and Jay (2)	Matso, Chris
Dawdydiak, Leanna (2)	Jackson, Bruce	Matso, Maria
Desai, Helen and Raj (2)	Johnson, William	Matz, Jennifer on behalf of
DiDonna, Shannon (2)	Johnston, Ann and Scott Pew	Michela Alioto-Pier*

McCrae, Glenn
Meng, Peter (2)
Minkowsky, Robert
Monfiglio, Carlos (2)
Mooney, Michael
Muldoon, Madeline
Nath, Sandra
Palmer, Sally
Paulsen, John
Peek, Stephanie
Portaro, Elizabeth (3)
Portaro, Sal
Ripple, Kate and Zeb (2)
Sagee, Geffen*
Sahl, Michele
Sam, Michele*

Scal, Woody (2)
Schlueter, James (2)
Schwartz, Scott
Sears, Geoffrey (2)
Semler, Christopher
Shannon, Kevin (2)
Shapiro, David
Shepard, William*
Shough, Michael (2)
Smith, Bradley (2)
Stark, Karen
Stone, Daniel*
Sullivan, Lynda
Swagel, Eric (4)
Sweedler, Sara
Tellini, Mark

Tsiu, Sharon
Van Dyke, Mike*
Vanneman, Sal
Watts, M-M
Weinstock, Alana*
Weinstock, Ann (2)
Weinstock, Mark (2)
Whelan, Scott
Wilderman, Vicki
Wilkinson, Lawrence
Wong, Evelyn
Wu, S.
Wyatt, Nathaniel*
Young, Herb
Zegart, Margaret Kettunen (2)
Zlatunich, Matthew

Source: Presidio Trust 2004.

Notes:

*Oral comments only.

4.1.6 Scoping for Draft SEIS

On May 25, 2004, the Trust published a notice of intent in the Federal Register that it was commencing preparation of the Draft SEIS for the PHS project (69 FR 29773). The Trust also made its decision to prepare an EIS known in a special June 2004 issue of the Presidio Post, in local newspapers, and through the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2003082132) and direct mailings. These notices also described the Trust's scoping process for the project, including accepting oral comments from the public on the issues and choice of alternatives to be considered in the Draft SEIS at a Trust public meeting, which was held on June 29, 2004 and attended by 64 individuals, of whom 17 provided oral comments. Shortly before and during the scoping period, which ended on July 7, 2004, Trust staff also attended several neighborhood organizations' meetings to answer questions about the project and the SEIS.

By the close of the scoping period or shortly thereafter, the Trust received written comments from 1 agency, 7 organizations, and 106 individuals, including two form letters that were submitted electronically by 36 and 38 individuals, respectively (see Table 27). The Trust considered the key issues raised during the scoping period, together with the comments received on the EA above, to be the principal areas for study and analysis in the Draft SEIS. In response to these comments, the Trust expanded on the analysis presented in the EA by including the Requested No Action Alternative, by including more comparison of all alternatives, by including substantial additional information and analysis related to transportation issues, and by making many other changes to the text and analysis that had been presented in the EA. A summary of the comments received during scoping is included in Appendix A, together with responses that indicate where the comments have been addressed in this Draft SEIS.

Table 27. Public Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Commenting during Scoping for the PHS Draft SEIS

Public Agencies	United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (Resubmittal of EA Comments)
Neighborhood Organizations	Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning Pacific Heights Residents Association Planning Association for the Richmond Richmond Presidio Neighbors
Natural Resource Conservation Organizations	Golden Gate Audubon Society
Historic Preservation Organizations	California Heritage Council Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association

Individuals

Alazraqui, Edward	Green, Don	Koch, Richard
Alexander, Michael	Hamrich, Mary*	Meyer, Amy
Ayer, Phyllis	Hayward, Winchell	Peek, Stephanie (2)
Blum, Jan	Henslin, Bill	Perlstein, David
Bull, Mary	Higbie, Mark*	Stephens, Sara
Christman, Caroline	Hockett, Christopher	Tsiu, Sharon
Crawford, Caroline	Howard, Chris	Tucker, Suzanne
Cruther, Lawrence	Hultgren, Julian	Watts, Mary-Michael*
Danydiak, Leanna*	Kato, Sharon	Weinstock, Ann
Eng, Steve	Keene, Michelle and Mark	Weinstock, Mark
Epstein, Paul	Tellini	Wernick, Andrew
Ferris, Christine and Kevin	Keenan, Richard*	Zalatunich, Mark*
Walsh	Kernan, Redmond*	Zegart, Margaret Ketteunen

Form Letters	No Condos in a National Park (Submitted by 36 Individuals)
	Support the Position of Richmond Presidio Neighbors – Downsize the Project and Solve the Traffic Issues (Submitted by 38 Individuals)

Source: Presidio Trust 2004.

Notes:

*Oral comments only.

4.2 INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

As directed by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA Regulations (Section 1502.25(a)), the Trust coordinated preparation of both the PHS EA and Draft SEIS to the fullest extent possible with other applicable environmental reviews or consultation. To integrate NEPA requirements with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law (or Trust practice), the Trust actively solicited the participation of various agencies, including the National Park Service, the California Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service, and the City and County of San Francisco. Consultations with these agencies are discussed below. Copies of all relevant correspondence are available for review as part of the formal public record.

4.2.1 National Park Service (NPS)

The Presidio Trust Act, as amended, describes the statutory framework for the relationship between the Trust and the NPS. The NPS manages Area A of the Presidio, including Lobos Creek immediately west of the PHSB district. The NPS is also a signatory party to the Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Area B of the Presidio (see Section 4.2.3 below). To facilitate early coordination with the NPS in the Trust's NEPA process, Trust staff presented the PHSB project at the NPS bi-weekly Project Review Committee Meeting on September 24, 2003. At the meeting, NPS staff had the opportunity to raise project issues and environmental concerns early in the process. The Trust also toured the project site with interested NPS staff on September 8, 2003 and again on November 7, 2003. Trust and NPS staff with expertise in the biological sciences organized a roundtable discussion with interested groups and outside experts on November 25, 2003 to exchange technical information and opinions and to discuss possible ways to minimize potential impacts of the alternatives on natural resources.

The NPS submitted scoping comments during EA preparation. In general, the NPS expressed support for the project as it "provides the opportunity to arrest the physical deterioration of the buildings, improve the appearance and vitality of the PHSB district and contribute toward both the protection of the [NHL] and the important natural values at the site while contributing to the generation of revenues for the long-term operation of the Presidio as required by the Trust Act." The NPS requested that the EA evaluate project impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods and important wildlife communities and natural habitats within the PHSB district. The Trust met with the NPS on January 20, 2004 to review their comments and describe how their comments were given consideration in the EA.

Following the Trust's release of the EA, the NPS commented that, "[i]n general, GGNRA's scoping comments and comments from scoping workshops with Natural Resources staff and consultants were incorporated into the EA." The NPS also expressed its "strong preference" for Alternative 3 and provided reasons supporting its position. The NPS resubmitted the same comments during scoping for the Draft SEIS.

4.2.2 California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

In a letter dated September 16, 2003, Caltrans responded to the Trust's request for scoping comments and indicated their desire for a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) with specific components for proposed new access directly to Park Presidio Boulevard, a state highway facility. Section 3.2 of this Draft SEIS includes information regarding existing traffic conditions in the site vicinity, as well as a thorough analysis of potential transportation impacts of future project alternatives, both with and without the Park Presidio Boulevard Access Variant. Project alternatives are assessed in the context of cumulative traffic growth. Technical studies cited in the Draft SEIS are also available to reviewers.

All activities that involve a need to perform work or implement traffic control measures within a state right-of-way require approval from Caltrans. Construction of the Park Presidio Boulevard Access Variant would qualify as an activity requiring Caltrans approval. On January 5, 2004, representatives of the Trust and the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) met with Caltrans staff to discuss the Park Presidio Boulevard Access Variant and to ask for Caltrans support. Caltrans staff stated that they saw “no fatal flaws” with the proposal, and described the agency’s process for considering improvements of this nature. In a letter dated March 15, 2004, Caltrans suggested that the Trust pursue the proposed Park Presidio Access intersection by preparing a combined Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR), which will include information typically within a TIS (information that is also available in Section 3 of this SEIS). On June 3, 2004, representatives of the Trust met with Caltrans staff to discuss the proposed parameters for preparation of the PSR/PR, including alternative design parameters. The Trust is currently preparing detailed engineering data requested by Caltrans.

4.2.3 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) / California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 requires the Trust to take into account the effect of its undertakings on historic and cultural resources, including the NHL. The Trust has entered into a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the ACHP, the SHPO, and the NPS that applies to all undertakings under its jurisdiction. The National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association are concurring parties to the PA. The PA provides a framework for reviewing the project effects internally and for consulting with other parties under certain circumstances.

Consistent with the PA and ACHP regulations that suggest early integration of Section 106 compliance with NEPA and other agency processes, in April 2003 the Trust toured the PHS with ACHP and SHPO representatives and provided copies of the draft Planning and Design Guidelines and other early project information. In September 2003, the Trust requested preliminary comment and early input from the agencies regarding potential alternatives to be evaluated in the EA, the draft Planning and Design Guidelines, or other matters germane to the historic compliance of the undertaking. By the end of the scoping period, neither agency had commented on the project. Concurrent with the issuance of the EA, and in accordance with the PA, the Trust submitted a “consultation package” to the agencies. The consultation package included public comments received during the public scoping period, the EA, the draft Planning and Design Guidelines (see Appendix A of the EA), and a request for review and comment pursuant to the PA.

Following the decision to prepare this Draft SEIS, the Trust complied with requests from the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association and the National Trust for Historic Preservation and deferred consultation until the Draft SEIS and a cultural landscape assessment (called for in Mitigation Measure CR-7) could be prepared. These materials will be forwarded to consulting parties in September 2004 so that a NHPA consultation meeting can be scheduled per the PA. No detailed design or final decision on the proposed undertaking will occur until consultation under the NHPA has been concluded.

4.2.4 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

The EPA reviews Draft EISs prepared by other federal agencies and makes those reviews public by publishing summaries of those comments, generally every Friday, in the Federal Register. As part of its review, the EPA rates Draft EISs using a rating system that provides a basis upon which the EPA makes recommendations to the lead agency for improving the document.

The EPA reviewed the PSHH information packet that the Trust distributed at the outset of scoping for the EA and recommended that the PSHH project expand wetland features and functions on the upper plateau. One of the PTMP policy goals is to preserve and enhance to the extent feasible the natural and beneficial values of wetlands within the Presidio. Expansion or enhancement of wetland features within the PSHH district are part of ongoing actions and may also be subject to future enhancement projects and proposals. For example, the freshwater wetland north of the PSHH is being restored under the Presidio's Park Stewardship Program that is funded by the Presidio Trust. Other ongoing activities include invasive plant removal, planting, seed collection, and wildlife and plant monitoring. These activities are being conducted outside the previously disturbed areas of the district and separate from the proposed PSHH project.

During scoping for the Draft SEIS, Trust staff met on-site to brief a representative of the EPA's Federal Activities Office and responded to questions regarding EPA matters of interest in the project.

4.2.5 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires federal agencies, in consultation with the USFWS, to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of endangered and threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of these species. According to the Recovery Plan for Coastal Plants of the Northern San Francisco Peninsula recently published by the USFWS (August 8, 2003), the only federally endangered listed species within the PSHH district is the San Francisco lessingia (*Lessingia germanorum*), occurring in two areas north of the PSHH. On July 23, 2002, following the conclusion of formal consultation, the USFWS issued its Biological Opinion (BO) on the PTMP. The BO determined that the long-term plan for the Presidio described in the PTMP, with the proposed mitigations, would not likely adversely affect the habitat of this species.

During scoping for the EA, the USFWS stated that, where existing buildings would be reused, direct impacts on the San Francisco lessingia appear unlikely, as long as construction vehicles are excluded from its habitat. Based on the review of the proposed development plans, mitigations identified in the BO and the PTMP EIS, and further site-specific analysis and mitigations in this Draft SEIS, project implementation is not expected to cause any loss of or adverse effects on existing habitat. Furthermore, the project would be confined to previously developed or "disturbed" areas of the PSHH district. In addition, the project scope would be constrained in such a way to ensure no direct or indirect adverse effects on the San Francisco lessingia during construction or operation. The Trust will continue to implement the appropriate recovery measures in the recovery plan and protection measures in the BO. The project site for PSHH buildings has been defined to exclude San Francisco lessingia locations and

habitat. The “Hospital Buffer” reinforces the separation, as does restoring coastal dune grassland or scrub vegetation suitable for the expansion of San Francisco lessingia populations north of the buffer zone. The Trust will continue to coordinate with and provide additional information to the USFWS during project planning and implementation, and will reinitiate formal consultation if required.

Following the USFWS’ review of the Trust’s notice of intent to prepare an EIS for the project, the USFWS indicated that they had no comments on the proposed action.

4.2.6 City and County of San Francisco (CCSF)

Trust staff met with CCSF Department of Parking and Traffic staff on December 18, 2003. DPT has agreed to work cooperatively with Caltrans and Richmond district neighbors in planning for the potential new access to the project site off Park Presidio Boulevard. DPT has urged the Trust to consider not only the engineering feasibility of this access, but also the issues of cost, Caltrans approval, schedule, and the source of funds for the improvement. Trust staff also consulted with the CCSF’s Department of the Environment regarding solid waste generation within the PSHS district, and periodically updated the Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services regarding the project and environmental review process.

4.3 LIST OF PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

Mort Azimi, California Department of Transportation

Jan Blum, Presidio Park Stewards

Ric Borjes, Chief of Cultural Resources and Museum Management, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Peter Brastow, Restoration & Stewardship Coordinator and Natural Resources Specialist, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Kathy Bunger

Karen Cantwell, Environmental Protection Specialist, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Bert Carlson, NPS Communications Manager, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Laura Castellini, Environmental Protection Specialist, Environmental Programs Office, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Jim Chappell, President, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

Charles Edwin Chase, Executive Director, San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Doris J. Cimagala, Records Clerk, Records Section, San Francisco Field Office, U.S. Park Police

Jane Crisler, Historic Preservation Specialist, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Shanna Draheim, Federal Activities Office, Cross Media Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Kevin Drew, Residential and Special Projects Recycling Coordinator, Department of the Environment, City and County of San Francisco

Gordon Duhon, Senior Program Manager, Commercial New Construction Program Customer Energy Management, Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Debby Dunn, Marketing and Community Relations, Golden Gate Disposal and Recycling Company

Becky Evans, Co-Chair, Sierra Club Presidio Committee, San Francisco Bay Chapter, Sierra Club

Rudy Evenson, Chief of Special Park Uses, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Sharon Farrell, formerly with Aquatic Outreach Institute

Arthur Feinstein, Director of Conservation, Golden Gate Audubon Society

Holly Fiala, Director, Western Office, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Rick Foster, Landscape Architect/Transportation Planner, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Erika L. Gabrielsen, Managing Director, Reputation LLC (representing Richmond Presidio Neighbors)

Thomas Gardali, Wildlife Biologist, Point Reyes Bird Observatory

Jared Goldfine, California Department of Transportation

Ruth Gravanis, Golden Gate Audubon Society

David Gutierrez, District 2 Liaison, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services, City and County of San Francisco

Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Totton Heffelfinger, Point Reyes Bird Observatory/Sierra Club

Diane L. Hermann, President, Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association

Christine Hodakievic, Captain, U.S. Park Police, San Francisco Field Office

Mark Higbie, Richmond Presidio Neighbors

Tom Holly, Office of Transit and Community Planning, Caltrans District 4

Alan Hopkins, Golden Gate Audubon Society

Judith Hulka, President, Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning

Jeff Judd, Richmond Presidio Neighbors

Matt Kiolbassa, Fire Protection Inspector, Presidio Fire Department

Steven Krefting, Presidio Sustainability Project

Jim Lazarus, Planning Association for the Richmond

Garrett Lee, Natural Resource Management Specialist, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Claudia Lewis, President, Richmond Presidio Neighbors

Jake McGoldrick, Supervisor, District 1, City and County of San Francisco

Mansue Mamoodi, California Department of Transportation

Jennifer Entine Matz, Reputation LLC

Dr. Knox Mellon, State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation

Bill Merkle, Wildlife Ecologist, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service

Ron Miguel, President, Planning Association for the Richmond

Lawrence Ng, Senior Project Manager (Rule 20), San Francisco Project Services, Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Hon. Gavin Newsom, Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

Rodney Oto, California Department of Transportation

Tim Phipps, Fire Chief, Presidio Fire Department

Colleen Prince

Frank Rihtarshich, Chief, Fire Prevention, Presidio Fire Department

John Rizzo, Co-Chair, Sierra Club Presidio Committee, San Francisco Bay Chapter, Sierra Club
Gerald Robbins, Transportation Planner, San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic
Leroy L. Saage, PE, Doyle Drive Project Manager, San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Greg Scott, President, Pacific Heights Residents Association
H. David Seriani, California Department of Transportation
William Shepard, Lake Street Residents Association
John Thomas, California Department of Transportation
Sharon Tsiu, Presidio Park Stewards
Ann Weinstock
Mark Weinstock
Kate White, Executive Director, Housing Action Coalition
Randy Zebell, California Native Plant Society

4.4 LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

4.4.1 Document at Large

Celeste Evans, NEPA Compliance Specialist, Presidio Trust
B.A., Environmental Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz

John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Manager, Presidio Trust
M.C.P., Environmental Planning, University of California, Berkeley
B.A., Urban Planning, Rutgers University

4.4.2 Historic Resources and Visual Resources

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning, Presidio Trust
M.S., Historic Preservation, Columbia University
M.A., History of Art, Yale University

4.4.3 Archaeological Resources

Sannie Osborn, Historic Archaeologist, Presidio Trust
Ph.D., Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
M.S., Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
B.A., Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento

4.4.4 Air Quality and Noise

Brewster Birdsall, PE, QEP, Senior Associate, Aspen Environmental Group
M.S., Civil Engineering, Colorado State University
B.S., Mechanics and Mechanical Engineering, Lehigh University

4.4.5 Utilities and Services

Mark Hurley, Engineering Manager, Presidio Trust
M.S., Environmental Engineering, Loyola Marymount University
B.S., Civil Engineering, Loyola Marymount University

James Kelly, Utility Manager, Presidio Trust
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of the Pacific
B.S., Engineering Management, University of the Pacific

4.4.6 Geology and Soils

George Ford, Manager of Remedial Construction, Presidio Trust
M.S., Engineering Geology, Stanford University
B.S., Geology, Stanford University

4.4.7 Hydrology, Wetlands and Water Quality

Kenneth Schwarz, Associate Principal, Jones & Stokes
Ph.D, Geomorphology, University of California, Los Angeles
M.A., Geography, University of California, Los Angeles
B.A., Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley

Jill M. Sunahara, Water Resources Specialist, Jones & Stokes
B.A., Earth Science, University of California, Berkeley

4.4.8 Biology

Marcia Semenoff-Irving, Ecologist, Jones & Stokes
M.A., Museum Studies, San Francisco State University
B.S., Forestry, University of California, Berkeley

John C. Sterling, Wildlife Biologist, Jones & Stokes
B.A., English, Humboldt State University

Brook S. Vinnedge, Environmental Scientist, Jones & Stokes
M.S., Environmental Science, Washington State University
B.A., Psychology, University of California, Berkeley

4.5 AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE DRAFT SEIS WERE SENT

4.5.1 Public Agencies

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area

United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

California Department of Transportation, District 4

California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse

California State Historic Preservation Officer

Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

City and County of San Francisco Department of Planning

City and County of San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic

4.5.2 Elected Officials

Hon. Gavin Newsom, Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

Michela Alioto-Pier, Member, Board of Supervisors, District 2, City and County of San Francisco

Jake McGoldrick, Member, Board of Supervisors, District 1, City and County of San Francisco

Leeland Y. Yee, Assembly Member, 12th District

4.5.3 Neighborhood Organizations

Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action

Friends of Mountain Lake Park

Lake Street Residents Association

Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning

Pacific Heights Residents Association

Planning Association for the Richmond

Richmond District Neighborhood Center

Richmond Presidio Neighbors

Sixth Avenue Neighborhood Watch Association

4.5.4 Natural Resource Conservation Organizations

Golden Gate Audubon Society

People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Presidio Sustainability Project

Sierra Club

4.5.5 Historic Preservation Organizations

California Heritage Council

Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association

National Trust for Historic Preservation

4.5.6 Libraries

San Francisco Main Public Library

San Francisco Public Library, Marina Branch

San Francisco Public Library, Presidio Branch

San Francisco Public Library, Richmond Branch

University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Governmental Studies

4.6 REFERENCES

Altman, B. and R. Sallabanks

- 2000 Olive-Sided Flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*). The Birds of North America, No. 502 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc. Philadelphia, PA.

Architectural Resources Group (ARG)

- 1991 Assessment of the Public Health Services Hospital, San Francisco Presidio. Prepared for the National Park Service. San Francisco, CA.

- 1995 Guidelines for Rehabilitating Buildings at the Presidio of San Francisco. Dated March.

Aspen Environmental Group

- 2003 Short-Term Ambient Noise Measurements.

Bailey, Susan et. al.

- 1981 Public Health Service Hospitals. Dated March 18.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)

- 1999 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans. Revised December.

- 2000 Letter of Exemption for Operating Equipment at the Presidio, Building 1802. Dated December 18.

- 2003 Toxic Air Contaminant Control Program, Annual Report 2001. Dated July.

California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey (formerly California Division of Mines and Geology)

- 1996 Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California. DMG Open-File Report 96-08. Sacramento, CA.
- 1997a Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the South Half of San Francisco North and Part of the Oakland West 7.5-Minute Quadrangles, San Francisco County, California. Open-File Report 97-05.
- 1997b Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California. Special Publication 117. Sacramento, CA. Adopted March 13, 1997 and updated May 28, 2002.

California Department of Education

- 2004 Fact Book 2004 – Handbook of Education Information.
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/fb/yr04scholfacil.asp>. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Fish and Game

- 2001 Natural Diversity Database Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes and Lichens List. Dated January.

California Department of Health Services

- 1997 Letter from Clifford L. Bowen, District Engineer, San Francisco District, Drinking Water Field Operations Branch to Brian O'Neill, Superintendent, GGNRA. Re: Presidio of San Francisco Domestic Water Supply Permit No. 02-04-97P-3810700. Dated May 9.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

- 1999 Review of Preliminary Proposals for Providing Access to Park Presidio Boulevard (State Route 1) from the Public Health Services Hospital in the Presidio in San Francisco. Letter from Rodney N. Oto to Richard Tilles. Dated June 18.

California Integrated Waste Management Board

- 2003 Solid Waste Information System (SWIS), <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/>. Dated November 14.

Calkins, J.D., J.C. Hagelin, and D.F. Lott

- 1999 California Quail (*Callipepla californica*). The Birds of North America, No. 473 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Cannings, R.J. and T. Angell

- 2001 Western Screech-Owl (*Otus kennicottii*). The Birds of North America, No. 597 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc. Philadelphia, PA.

Castellini, Laura and Gretchen Coffman

- 2003 Presidio Wetland Resources: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and USFWS Potential Jurisdictional Wetlands.

City and County of San Francisco

- 1993 Citywide Travel Behavior Study: Employees and Employers. Prepared by the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. Dated May.

- 1994 Mutual Aid Agreement Between the San Francisco Fire Department and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for Fire Protection Services. San Francisco Fire Department. Approved December 23.
- 1999 Resource Efficiency Requirements for City-Owned Facilities and City Leaseholds. Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Administrative Code), Chapter 82. Approved June 2.
- 2001 Memorandum of Understanding Between the Chief, San Francisco Police Department, and the Chief, United States Park Police, and the General Superintendent of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Dated September 11.
- 2002a MUNI Bus and Metro FY2001-2002 Weekday Conditions. Prepared by San Francisco Municipal Railway.
- 2002b Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review. Prepared by the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. Dated October.
- 2003 Housing Element. Final Draft for Public Review. Prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department. Dated September.
- 2004 Traffic Collision History Report. Prepared by the City and County of San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic. Dated January 6.

City of San Diego

- 1998 The City of San Diego Draft Trip Generation Manual. Prepared by the City of San Diego Transportation Planning. Dated September. San Diego, CA.

Dames & Moore

- 1994 Presidio of San Francisco Storm Water Management Plan. Prepared for the National Park Service Department of the Interior, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center. (Contract No. 1443CX200092035.) Draft Work-in-Progress. Dated October.

DKS Associates

- 2002 Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study: Traffic and Transit Operations Report. Approved by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority. Dated June.

Doherty, Tim

- 2002 Special-Status Plant Monitoring Report. Submitted to Presidio Natural Resources, GGNRA.

Eckerle, K.P. and C.F. Thompson

- 2001 Yellow-Breasted Chat (*Icteria virens*). The Birds of North America, No. 575 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc. Philadelphia, PA.

Faye Bernstein & Associates

- 1999 Structural Engineering Report for the Presidio Public Health Services Hospital. Dated June.

Fong & Chan Architects

- 1990 Reactivation Master Plan for the U.S. PHS, San Francisco, California. Prepared for the City and County of San Francisco.

Gardali, T.

- 2002 Monitoring Songbirds in the Presidio: 1999 to 2002 Final Report. PRBO Conservation Science Contribution No. 1065, 4990 Shoreline Highway, Stinson Beach, CA.

Grinnell, J. and A. Miller

- 1944 The Distribution of the Birds of California. Pacific Coast Avifauna No. 27. p. 615.

Institute of Transportation Engineers

- 1997 Trip Generation Manual-Sixth Edition.

Harley, J., T. Gardali, and Cody Martz

- 2003 Conservation of California Quail in the Presidio of San Francisco: Quail Monitoring Report. PRBO Conservation Science Contribution No. 1100, 4990 Shoreline Highway, Stinson Beach, CA.

Heady, P.A. III and W.F. Frick

- 2003 Interim Report for Bat Assessment Survey for the San Francisco Presidio. Prepared for Presidio Trust. Aptos, CA.

Institute of Transportation Engineers

- 1987 Parking Generation Manual, Second Edition.

John Stewart Company and Related Companies

- 2003 Proposal for the Public Health Service Hospital at the Presidio. Submitted to the Presidio Trust. Dated October. San Francisco, CA.
- 2004 Letter to John Fa from Jack D. Gardner, President and CEO. Re: Responses to Follow-up Questions. Dated January 9. San Francisco, CA.

Jones & Stokes

- 1997 Presidio of San Francisco Natural Resource Inventory and Vegetation Management Options. Prepared for Golden Gate Recreation Area, National Park Service, Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA.
- 2003 Technical Memo–Field notes from hydrologic investigation at Battery Caulfield. Prepared for the Presidio Trust. Dated December. Oakland, CA.

LSA Associates, Inc.

- 2001 Golden Gate Audubon Society's Save the Quail Campaign – Plan for Restoring California Quail in San Francisco. Submitted to Golden Gate Audubon Society. Dated November 14. Berkeley, CA.

Lowther, P.E., C. Celada, N.K. Klein, C.C. Rimmer, and D.A. Spector

- 1999 Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia*). The Birds of North America, No. 454 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc. Philadelphia, PA.

Maniery, Mary L., PAR Environmental Services

- 1994 Summary of the San Francisco Marine Hospital Cemetery, Presidio of San Francisco, California. Submitted to US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.

Manolis, T.

- 2003 The Dragonflies and Damselflies of California. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

Marks, J.S., D.L. Evans, and D.W. Holt

- 1994 Long-Eared Owl (*Asio otus*). The Birds of North America, No. 133 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc. Philadelphia, PA.

Montgomery Watson

- 1996 Draft Basewide Groundwater Monitoring Plan for the Presidio of San Francisco, California. Attachment F.9. Walnut Creek, CA. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.
- 1999 Nike Missile Facility Groundwater Monitoring Program Annual Summary Report. July 1998-April 1999 Quarterly Monitoring Periods. Presidio of San Francisco, California. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District. Dated October. Walnut Creek, CA.
- 2000 Groundwater Monitoring Program Annual Summary Report. Winter 1999 Quarterly Reports for Landfill 8. Presidio of San Francisco, California. Prepared for the Presidio Trust. Dated May. Walnut Creek, CA.

National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA)

- 2004 Presidio Trust Financial Analysis and Organization Study. Dated January.

National Fire Protection Association

- 2001 Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations and Special Operations to the Public by Career Fire Departments. Prepared by the Technical Committee on Fire and Emergency Service Organization and Deployment. Approved August 2.

National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Department of the Interior

- 1992a The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties.
- 1992b The Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.
- 1999 Presidio of San Francisco Vegetation Management Plan and Environmental Assessment. Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- 2004a E-mail from Ric Borjes, Chief, Cultural Resources and Museum Management, GGNRA to Hillary Gitelman, Planning Director, Presidio Trust. Subject: PHSW Walk-through on March 17, 1994. Dated January 15.
- 2004b EA Review Comments for the US Public Health Hospital Complex. Prepared by Presidio Fire Department. Dated January 9.

2004c Incidents January 2002 – May 2004 Public Health Service Hospital. United States Park Police Records Section, San Francisco Field Office. Records search prepared by Doris J. Cimagala. 21 pages. Dated June 4.

NPS and Presidio Trust

2003 Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan & Environmental Assessment. Dated July.

NPS and URS Corporation

2003 Presidio Wetland Resources. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Potential Jurisdictional Wetlands and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wetland Habitat on the Presidio of San Francisco. Dated April. San Francisco, CA.

Park, Sharon C., AIA

1993 “Mothballing Historic Buildings,” National Park Service Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief Number 31.

Phillip Williams and Associates, Ltd, Harding-Lawson and Associates, Inc., and KCA Engineers

1995 Restoration Plan for Lobos Creek. Prepared for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, CA. Dated December.

Presidio Trust (Trust)

1999 Request for Qualifications for the Public Health Service Hospital Complex.

2001 Watershed Sanitary Survey: Presidio Water Treatment Plant. Presidio of San Francisco, California. System 38–700. Updated by the Presidio Trust. San Francisco, CA.

2002a Presidio Trust Management Plan – Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco. Dated May.

2002b Final Environmental Impact Statement. Presidio Trust Management Plan – Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco. Volumes I, II, and III. Dated May.

2002c Record of Decision. Presidio Trust Management Plan – Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco. Dated August.

2002d Presidio Trust Comments on Draft Recovery Plan for Coastal Plants of the Northern San Francisco Peninsula. Letter from Craig Middleton to Field Supervisor, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, USFWS. Dated April 25.

2002e Presidio California Quail Habitat Enhancement Action Plan. San Francisco, CA.

2003a Request for Qualifications – The Public Health Service Hospital at the Presidio of San Francisco.

2003b Public Health Service Hospital Draft Planning and Design Guidelines. Dated March.

2003c Request For Proposals – The Presidio Trust Public Health Service Hospital Complex. Dated August 27.

- 2003d Revised Feasibility Study for Main Installation Sites.
- 2003e Access Study at 14th/15th Avenue Gates. Draft dated February 11.
- 2003f PHSU Utility Summary and Cost Estimates memorandum. Written by James Kelly to John Fa. Dated November 21. San Francisco, CA.
- 2004a January 2004 Presidio Trust Determination and National Park Service Concurrence pursuant to Stipulation VI(C) of the “Programmatic Agreement Among the Presidio Trust, National Park Service, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Presidio Trust Management Plan and Various Operation and Maintenance Activities for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.”
- 2004b Environmental Assessment. The Public Health Service Hospital at the Presidio of San Francisco. Dated February.
- 2004c Project Update for the Public Health Service Hospital, Presidio of San Francisco. Dated February.

Robert Peccia and Associates

- 1999a Presidio Bus Management Plan – Support Document. Prepared for United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Presidio Project Office. Dated September. Helena, MT.
- 1999b Draft Technical Memorandum: Presidio of San Francisco, 1999 Pedestrian and Bicycle Count Program. Dated November.

Rosegay, M.L.

- 1996 The Presidio of San Francisco in San Francisco Peninsula Birdwatching (C. Richer, ed.). Sequoia Audubon Society, 30 West 39th Avenue, Suite 202, San Mateo, CA.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

- 2001 Urban Water Management Plan. Dated February.

Shuford, W. D.

- 1993 The Marin County Breeding Bird Atlas: A Distributional and Natural History of Coastal California Birds. California Avifauna Series 1. Bushtit Books. Bolinas, CA.

Transportation Research Board

- 2000 Highway Capacity Manual. Prepared by the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council.

Treadwell & Rollo, Inc.

- 2003a Geotechnical Feasibility Study for Battery Caulfield Development at the Presidio, San Francisco, California. Prepared for the Presidio Trust. Dated May 19. San Francisco, CA.
- 2003b Draft Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report. First and Second Quarters 2003. Presidio-wide Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Program. Prepared for the Presidio Trust. Dated October. San Francisco, CA.

URS Corporation (URS)

- 2003 Letter to Cheryl Widdell Reporting Discoveries of Human Skeletal Remains at Landfill 8. Dated February 11.

Urban Watershed Project

- 2001 Lobos Creek Water Quality Investigation and Management Plan. Presidio of San Francisco, California. Prepared for the U.S. National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Resource Management and Planning. Dated February. San Francisco, CA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

- 2002 Memorandum from Acting Field Supervisor, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Sacramento, California to Superintendent, GGNRA, NPS, San Francisco, California. Subject: Formal Consultation on Four Projects at the Presidio of San Francisco and GGNRA, San Francisco, CA. Dated July 23.
- 2003 Final Recovery Plan for Coastal Plants of the Northern San Francisco Peninsula. Portland, Oregon.

Vasey, Michael

- 1996 Baseline Inventory of Terrestrial Vegetation on Natural Lands of the Presidio of San Francisco, California.

Wilbur Smith Associates

- 1999 Presidio Public Health Service Hospital Transportation Study. Implementation Planning for the Presidio. Dated July 6.
- 2002 Presidio Residential Neighborhood Parking Study. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated January 11. San Francisco, CA.
- 2003 Presidio Public Health Service Hospital Transportation Study: Additional Alternatives Analysis. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated December. San Francisco, CA.
- 2004a Public Health Service Hospital Site Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Technical Memorandum No. 1, Expanded Existing Conditions. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated August.
- 2004b Public Health Service Hospital Site Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Technical Memorandum No. 2, Expanded Travel Demand Assumptions. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated August.
- 2004c Public Health Service Hospital Site Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Technical Memorandum No. 3, Expanded Transportation Impact Analysis of Alternatives. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated August.
- 2004d Public Health Service Hospital Site Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Technical Memorandum No. 4, Existing and Project Transportation Impact Analysis of Alternatives. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated August.

2004e Public Health Service Hospital Site Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Technical Memorandum No. 5, Sensitivity Analysis for Trip Assignment and Generation. Prepared for The Presidio Trust. Dated August.

Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities

2002 Summary of Earthquake Probabilities in the San Francisco Bay Region: 2003 to 2032.

Yosef, R.

1996 Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*). The Birds of North America, No. 346 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc. Philadelphia, PA.