

## **Implementation Plan Public Hearing October 16, 2001**

### **Presidio Trust**

James Meadows: Go ahead and take your seats and we'll get started. I would like to welcome everyone the Presidio and to the public hearing on the Presidio Trust Implementation planning process. This is the second public hearing that we have had on the subject. The first one was the Trust Board meeting on Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup>. As most of you probably recall, the original schedule for this particular meeting was on September 11<sup>th</sup> and based upon the tragedy of that day, it was obviously postponed. But I think that there's probably no better example of basically doing life as normal and not letting it get to us, as has been said by the President, in the fact that we are engaged in the public process this evening. And I welcome you all to participate in that process.

I would like to acknowledge at this point we have two of our Board members here. The Chairman, Toby Rosenblatt, and Amy Meyer from our Board of Directors are here observing the public meeting this evening. Again, this is the second formal public hearing on the Draft PTIP Plan and the associated Draft EIS.

The purpose of both meetings is to receive public comments on the draft documents. Tonight's hearing is a formal step in that process. It's one of the means for us to hear from you and to document your comments on the Draft Plan or the Draft EIS for the record and can basically be placed as part of the administrative record.

Because we are to here to listen to you and to your comments we'll not be responding to questions this evening. Instead, individual subsequent comments will be responded to in writing in and may result in changes to the Draft Plan and the EIS. All comments we receive from whatever source, whether orally given this evening -- and, by the way, this evening is recorded. And I need to ask at this point -- is anyone here accompanying someone that might be in need of interpretive services? If so, raise your hand or let us know. We do have an interpreter person obviously up here to my right. And she will be here and if anyone walks in needing those services, if you'd let us know -- if not, we're going to the release her in probably 30 minutes or so.

As I started to say, all comments that we receive, whether they be orally this evening -- and we are video taping and audio taping tonight's process -- or written documents received on or before the close of the comment period on October 25<sup>th</sup>, will be logged into the formal administrative record and will inform the preparation of the final Plan and the final EIS. We anticipate release of this final Plan and final EIS in the spring followed by a record of decision.

On behalf of the Board of Directors and the staff of the Presidio Trust, I'd like to acknowledge and thank you for the over 2,000 comments that we've received so far in various forms and formats in response to this Plan.

At this point, I'd like to read a short excerpt from a statement that was made at the public Board meeting by one of our Board members, Bill Reilly. His statement embodies really the spirit and the mission of this evening and of this planning process. And these are the comments of Mr. Reilly that I'd like to share with you.

Quoting Bill,

"I'm very conscious of my service on this Board of the fact we are writing a new chapter in the history of the national parks. And it struck me we are probably a short phase in this long history. We have been given a charter, a statute, which says we are supposed to promote the self-financed preservation of the national park. We're writing it very slowly; we've never done this before. And we very much need ideas. We're trying to do something very important. And we're trying to do something very much in dialogue with you. We have listened to the comments we've received. And as we continue to sort through this process, bear in mind that to some degree it is a reactive process.

One reason we're not as specific as some of you might like us to be is that we too are dealing with what is proposed -- what we can do in the present market, what is offered to us, and what is available. We'll continue to do that, I think, with the value that to a large degree we all share and I think we all -- we will do so in the spirit of dialogue. I for one have appreciated very much the comments that have been made, and we all look forward to continue to work to realize the enormous possibility of this very beautiful place."

Those are the words of Mr. Bill Reilly at the public Board meeting on September 16<sup>th</sup>.

This evening we're going to conduct a formal public process. And Carey Feierabend, the Trust Planning Manager, and John Pelka will be conducting the meeting. John is a Trustee and Compliance Officer and they together will be conducting the hearing this evening, following a brief introduction.

We're here to listen to you and to listen to your ideas. Above all, we ask that you join us in respecting each of those ideas and how they may differ from one to the other.

Planning the future of the Presidio has always engendered strong emotions and we have and will continue to receive heartfelt comments expressing a variety of experiences and a variety of ideas and a variety of feelings. We would like tonight's hearing to be a forum of constructive ideas and to try to keep moving at a quick place.

Basically, at this point, I would like to turn the meeting over to Carey Feierabend, who will give you a brief introduction and then we'll move forward from there. Thank you very much.

Carey Feierabend: Good evening. I'm Carey Feierabend. And I would first like to acknowledge that [Hillary Gittelman], our Deputy Director for Planning, could not be here this evening. She is actually taking a well-deserved vacation at this moment in time.

I'm Carey Feierabend, the Planning Manager. And you have probably seen me before, doing a lot of planning here at the Presidio. What I'm going to do is give a very, very, brief overview -- where have we been, where are we now, where are we going -- and highlight some of the Draft Plan proposals and as well some of the comments that we've heard to date over the course of this 90-day public review period.

First off, where have we been? The PTIP planning process -- the Presidio Trust Implementation planning process -- began back in

July of 2000, when we kicked off the public scoping period. That public scoping period was a six-month period. We heard from many of you that helped to influence some of the alternatives that are presented as the Draft EIS as well as in the Draft Plan.

The Trust decided to embark on doing PTIP as a result of many changed circumstances that have occurred since 1994, when the General Management Plan Addendum was prepared for the Presidio by the National Park Service.

One of the major changed circumstances was the establishment of the Presidio Trust under the Presidio Trust Act with a mandate for self-sufficiency for eighty percent of the Presidio, which is under the jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust, to be achieved by the year 2013. Hence, this is one of the major incentives for moving forward in doing an update to the General Management Plan Amendment document.

The Draft Plan is then presented as of July 25<sup>th</sup> of this summer was an introduction of the Plan, as well as the five alternatives that are

analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement. As I mentioned, there's a 90-day public review period, which closes on October 25<sup>th</sup>. And to date we have had a lot of very constructive public input and we look forward to hearing from you this evening.

Some of the highlights about the Plan, the Draft Plan -- again, the draft is open to public review and comment and will be manipulated due to public comment, and the final Plan issued this spring.

But a lot of genesis for this Draft Plan comes from the 1994 General Management Plan Amendment. But at that point in time in '94 it was done for both Areas A and B. Area A is the coastal areas, which are managed by the National Park Service. Area B is that area which is under the jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust. And this Plan is for Area B. It is a general plan.

This may cause some frustration for some folks but, like many cities that have city plans that set forth the policy framework and guidance for the future, that is what this Plan is about. And it speaks to the some of key core Park values that have been

expressed by the public in acknowledgment as being even part of the National Park system. Some of those core values center around preservation of historic resources in the national landmark district -- protection and enhancement of those natural resources found here in this real treasure, and overall preservation and protection of this place as part of the national treasures that are here in America.

There are four key components of the Draft Plan that have been presented that I would like to highlight. Number one is that the Plan proposes for an increase overall in open space of 100 acres in Area B, very similar to that which was proposed under the General Management Plan Amendment. In conjunction with the increase in open space there would also be an increase in built space.

Currently today you have approximately 6 million square feet of built space within the Presidio in Area B. And that would go down to 5.6 million square feet over time.

In conjunction with this, there would also be no net loss of housing. We're currently at 1650 units and that's what we propose would remain in the future. Along with this would also go an increased

commitment in both space and finances towards cultural and educational programs for park visitors -- again, to emphasize the national park setting that we have here.

As I mentioned, it's a general framework plan, it's a policy document, it has guidance for future planning -- by no means is this the end-all. We intend to keep on doing some additional planning but will provide more details as we move forward with implementation, and this document will be the guiding framework for those implementation activities. And we're going to be back -- we're going to be back for more public input as we move forward.

In fact, I would like to throw a pitch right now that both on November 6<sup>th</sup> and December 4<sup>th</sup> we have two planning workshops coming up for specific planning activities that are going on. In November we are going to be focusing in on Tennessee Hollow, which is a concept that was introduced in the General Management Plan Amendment and is carried forward in the PTIP document. And we intend to keep moving forward with the planning for the restoration of the riparian corridor in the Presidio.

Then in December, we are going to be doing a review of the work accomplished this last year for the Vegetation Management Plan implementation and looking ahead to the next year. What projects are we going to be undertaking? We're getting public input on how are we doing, how can we improve and do better.

To highlight some of the themes that we have heard to date with all of the public forums that we have been having during the public review, it's very clear that the Presidio is very near and dear to everyone's heart -- that there are some core values here that need to be protected and respected. What's interesting is there is not always consensus on all of the issue topics and there has been some very healthy debate going on which we appreciate, and we especially appreciate the specific ideas and comments given on each of the alternatives in the Draft Plan. This can help us better refine the final document

There are four themes that I would like to just touch upon and give some sense of what we've heard to date. The first one is about

housing and open space and the relationship between the two. As a refresher, the Draft Plan calls for no net loss of housing. However, to do that, we also promote the removal of Baker Beach Apartments and other non-historic housing units within the Presidio in order to restore open space and some of the natural resources.

To achieve the no net loss of housing, we would then look towards reusing existing housing stock, potentially some building conversions to accommodate additional units, and some very limited new construction for replacement housing in previously disturbed areas.

Along those issues are the concepts presented in the Plan. There are two different types of views coming up. There are comments that clearly support this perspective, but then suggestions that go towards more aggressive retention and reuse -- a whole lot more housing than is currently proposed for demolition, and really limit new construction.

Another perspective we heard is go for more demolition -- take down more, create greater open space connectivity area and reduce your housing quantity or perhaps keep it the same with even more aggressive reuse and conversion.

On the program theme, we've heard a lot of comments on Chapter 3 in the PTIP documents. And some of those very constructive comments are -- provide us with more clarification and definition. What do you mean by programs? Give us more information on the types of programs that might happen. Where might they be? At what scale? What types of impacts might these have on visitor experience? Why don't you pursue more innovative funding approaches, really be more aggressive towards philanthropy?

There are also many comments asking for more public involvement in the decision-making process as we go forward with selecting programs and activities that occur here.

Another comment theme that we have heard is, "Why can't you just simply implement the 1994 GMPA?" Well, the simple answer for

not being able to literally implement the 1994 General Management Plan Amendment is, as I spoke earlier, establishment of the Presidio Trust and the Presidio Trust Act to achieve self-sufficiency by the year 2013. There have been several changed circumstances which really warrant an update to that Plan.

Hence, in the Environmental Impact Statement, there is one alternative called the GMPA 2000, and that was our best effort to carry forward the 1994 planning concept up to current circumstances and relay what would happen if that Plan was implemented.

Well, the results from that alternative are that there would be less square footage than we see today -- about 5 million square feet -- less activity as a result of that lesser which is substantial loss of housing units with an increase towards lodging, no real increase in commitment of funding towards programs, and an implementation program that would have to be stretched out to fifty to sixty years due to the financial constraints.

However, many commenters have started to make suggestions -- and we welcome them this evening -- for how the GMPA 2000 can perhaps be further refined in the final Environmental Impact Statement

Lastly, as a comment theme, we have heard many comments around: "What's your process for the future, for future input? Clarify for us which decisions in the future will warrant public input, what level of additional planning can be anticipated." Even on the program side, as I mentioned, there is a request for clarification -- more public input on the types of programs we'll be doing.

So these are the types of comments that we actually can work with, that we can really incorporate into the Plan. And we look forward to hearing from you tonight -- just asking that, if you can be as specific as possible, it helps us in responding and incorporating comments. For instance, tell us aspects about different alternatives, not only the Draft Plan but other elements within each of the

alternatives that you really like or dislike and would like further clarification on.

Again, we are here to hear from you, and this is not the end of planning. As I mentioned, we will be back and we'll keep coming back, and we'll see you in November for the Tennessee Hollow kickoff workshop.

I would like to now pass the mike over to John Pelka, and he's our Compliance Coordinator.

John Pelka: Good evening. My name is John Pelka. I'm the Compliance Manager for the Presidio Trust and it's also the project manager for the Environmental Impact Statement.

I see a few unfamiliar faces, so I would like to quickly review the ground rules for tonight's proceedings.

If you choose to speak tonight, make sure you fill out a speaker request card. So far we have over 40 speakers, and what we do is

call you in the order that we receive your card. There's a microphone in the center of the room. Please approach that and speak very clearly because we have Daryl, our court reporter, and we want to make sure that we get every single word for the administrative record.

I will call three people at a time. And the first person, of course, will speak and the second two, in the spirit of this evening, will be on deck waiting.

There is a speaker staging area. There are four seats that should be behind where there's a yellow poster. I see people are not getting out of those. [laughter] Thank you, Patricia. And you can comfortably wait there to wait your turn before you're able to speak.

Please begin your remarks by stating your name. If you have a difficult name, please spell it out and then any organization that you are representing. I want to make sure once again that our court reporter makes sure that your names are correct.

Tonight, as Jim said, we won't be responding to any comments.

We're here to listen. I know that for some of you that's contrived.

But please rest assured that we are taking into account all your comments and we'll be responding to those as part of the final EIS.

If you are a little nervous like I am and you don't want to speak tonight, you can certainly -- we would encourage you to write in your comments by letter, fax or e-mail. You're certainly welcome to do that until October 25<sup>th</sup>. Please send your comments to me -- that's John Pelka at Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, 94129. And during the break, I have business cards and you can each get those.

Tonight each of you will have three minutes to speak. Celeste is one of our timers and will give you a one-minute warning after your three minutes, so at that point you should be summarizing. And then Claire will sound the bell, which means that you should have concluded your remarks. Our timers take their jobs very seriously, and if you choose not to obey them you're on your own.

If there's time left at the end -- we want to break at 7:30 and we will see whether, time permitting and if the public has the patience, you can go back up to the mike and spend some more time with us.

Please, please, please, no applause. It only cuts into the time everybody has to speak, and it does not get entered into the record. So we would really appreciate that. And again -- I don't see Audrey, our signer, but does anybody need any signage? Please raise your hand. I don't see any hands so Audrey, wherever you are, thank you for your time.

And before we proceed, are there any questions about how we are going to run the meeting? I don't see anybody.

So let's start the meeting. The first person is Alan Ohashi, followed by Anthony Imhof and then Mr. Winchell Hayward. Please, Mr. Ohashi --

Alan Ohashi: Alan O-h-a-s-h-i. I'm an architect with my own practice in Berkeley and I'm an advisor to the Board of the National Japanese American Historical Society.

First, I would like to commend the Presidio Trust for what has been, for me, an open process in terms of the Plans of the Presidio. As an instructor in the Department of Architecture at University of California Berkeley, my design studio has been given full access to the staff and the material of the Presidio Trust, which has proved possible an invaluable experience for our design project -- which I will talk about -- and which is the adaptive reuse of the Building 640 at Crissy Field.

I am also a third-generation Japanese-American who has found that there is much history for Japanese-American people at the Presidio. In particular, I am concerned about this aircraft hangar Building 640. It is deteriorating, standing unused; but in November 1941 it was a training center for the first class of Nisei, second-generation Japanese Americans, to be trained by the military intelligence service for duty against the Japanese in the Pacific during World

War II. This event has resulted in a memorial stone and a description of the events outside of the building.

More importantly, I would like to see the building occupied and feel that its best use would be in service to the Japanese-American community. So built as an aircraft hangar for the postal service in the 1920s, the National Trust has recognized Building 640 on the list of structures for the Trust for historic preservation because of what occurred there in 1941.

I also feel that the best organizations to maintain and perform an adaptive reuse of the structure is also the Japanese-American Historical Society based in Japantown in San Francisco.

The National Japanese American Historical Society -- or NJAHS for short -- has created historic and historical archives of important photographs and memorabilia for the Japanese-American community. They have created numerous exhibits about the MIS experience and most recently opened the Enemy Alien Files exhibit, bringing together internment stories of the combined Japanese,

German, Italian and Latin American experiences throughout World War II.

Regarding PTIP, I am in agreement with Chapter Three as it provides interpretative programs at the Presidio that preserves the site's legacy in terms of its military history and at the crossroads of culture. I'm also very much in favor of Chapter Four, the planning district findings, designating the Crissy Field Area B district for museum, visitor and cultural facilities and educational programs celebrating the area's diverse historical, cultural and natural resources.

In 1912 my grandparents first came to America and Angel Island, in clear view of Building 640. And in 1941 General DeWitt signed Executive Order 9066 in the Presidio not more than a mile away, incarcerating over 100,000 Japanese Americans -- including my grandparents. A more appropriate building site organization does not exist for the purpose on the site. Thank you.

John Pelka:

Thank you -- Anthony Imhof, followed by Winchell Hayward.

Anthony Imhof: My name is Anthony Imhof. I'm giving comments for the Cow Hollow Association.

The Cow Hollow Association represents the interests of approximately 1,100 homeowners in the area bounded by Lyon, Pierce, Greenwich and Pacific which are directly adjacent to the Presidio.

As outlined in our January 15<sup>th</sup> 2001 letter the Cow Hollow Association has long maintained the position that development of the Presidio incorporate the concepts of the highest and best use with the least impact. In that spirit, we've reviewed the Trust Draft Implementation Plan and have the following comments.

Cow Hollow Association supports the spirit and vision of the 1994 General Management Plan. We realize that this Plan requires updating in several areas in order to reflect realities of the Trust Act, as well four years of experience with potential tenants' interest and program support.

We feel, however, that the extent of the changes called for in your preferred alternative are both unnecessary and in many ways detrimental. The demolition of Wherry housing could be deferred as long as is necessary and feasible. Phase demolition of Wherry in order of thirty years would allow some construction above current levels as required for park development.

In general, however, new construction should be kept at an absolute minimum and reuse of existing structures made a first priority. We concur with some augmentation of the cultural and educational park programs as necessary, commensurate with the Presidio's national charter and the vision of the GMPA to create a global center dedicated to addressing the world's most critical environmental and social and cultural challenges.

These should be designed with public input and avoid duplicating and competing with existing resources in the San Francisco area. We recommend that there be specific guidelines established in the area of tenant selection to strictly limit the tenants who are not Park

partners so as to mitigate their number and their impact, both on the Park and the surrounding neighborhood.

There should be no tenant selection based strictly on their ability to pay. The Presidio is too important to be turned into a business center. There should be no new construction for housing. The use of existing buildings and potential reconfiguration of existing housing can add additional inventory and should determine the ultimate housing count.

We do not feel that a stated policy using an artificial ratio of jobs/housing balance has any place in the national park. If, as stated, the purpose of housing is only for employees on site, all existing houses should be employee occupied before even the reuse projects move forward. We suggest including [residential] conference, bed and breakfast and lodging bids in your count of residential units and keeping up the former temporary use of many of these structures.

The process for determining future Presidio direction and development within the district plan must include specific requirements and methodologies for public input, review and comment as well as established dialogue and [so date] responses to public comment.

Individual district plans and the related EIS must be sufficiently detailed to address proposed changes of use. An example would be the impact adding [residential] [to former] warehouse or [other] vendors.

We'd like to see the Presidio evolve into national park according to the vision and objectives set forth in the GMPA. We do not wish to see the Presidio turned into either a residential community or a haven for non park-related business. Updating the 1994 GMPA [it's inevitable] what changes should be measured and in keeping with the historic nature of this national treasure.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you -- Winchell Hayward, followed by Perry Matlock, followed by Robert Leefeldt. Mr. Hayward, thank you for your letter today.

Winchell Hayward: You're quite welcome. It was a pleasure to write and even though it's five pages long I hope you managed to wade through it all.

I'm going to try to summarize what I perceive to be the main points in that letter, the most important points. And that is I think in your zeal to develop multiple plans for the Presidio, you may have overlooked some of the basic legislation that set up the Presidio Trust in the first place.

And particularly, I think this Draft Implementation Plan is at odds with what the Trust Act says, and I quote of what the Act does say ... this is concerning the national program.

"All selection of the management programs" -- you've got six alternatives. That's what it says here in the Presidio Trust Act.

"Such programs, i.e. the Management Program, shall be designed to

reduce [expansure] by the National Park Service and increase revenue to the federal government to the maximum extent possible."

Now, at the end of the DEIS, there is tabulation of the financial piece along with the six alternatives. And those -- very much the bottom line, the bottom figure, which I believe is the criterion for determining whether you have met the maximum revenue objective is the net cash flow, the total net cash flow. For the minimum Management Plan, the total net cash flow in the year 2020 is about \$220 million dollars.

For the other five alternatives the net cash flow for those twenty years is either zero or something less than \$300,000. So in order to comply with that stated requirement of the Presidio Trust Act, I can't see how you can do other than to adopt a minimum management plan because it does have the maximum revenue to the federal government. To do otherwise is to violate that requirement.

And there are other things. The demolition should conform to Section 104C1, which says the demolition of structures which cannot be effectively rehabilitated -- that's okay. But take the Wherry Housing, which is across the [lay bay] -- those really don't need to be rehabilitated at all. They just need to have painting and fix the plumbing or wiring. There's no rehabilitation job involved. So to suggest taking down Wherry Housing and other housing -- it's not warranted by this particular clause in the Act.

And since my time is up -- surprisingly -- there's new construction. New construction is limited to replacement of existing structures of a similar size and existing areas of development. You're trying to take the square footage and move it around and that clearly is not the intention of the Presidio Trust Act. The whole tenor of the Presidio Trust Act is preservation, not development.

And with that, I'll have to end. But please do read my letter in detail. Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Hayward. Perry Matlock followed by Robert Leefeldt and then Sue Smith.

Perry Matlock: Good evening. My name is Perry Matlock. I was born and raised in San Francisco. I've lived all my life in the Richmond district. I'm a professional trade show installer. I'm also the elected trustee and treasurer of my trade union Political Action Committee.

I'm a volunteer with the International Indian Treaty Council. Tony Gonzales could not make it tonight, so I'm going to read a letter from April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1992.

"To all concerned local state and federal officials: The International Indian Treaty Council, a non-governmental organization advocating for the rights of Indigenous Peoples, the United Nations, supports the inherent land rights of all Indigenous Peoples. This right to territory is recognized under international law.

The IITC recognizes that the Muwekma Ohlone people of the San Francisco area have survived a bitter history, which has

disenfranchised them from their ancestral lands and denied them recognition of a distinct and independent people.

This history includes enslavement in mission communities in the early 1800s, forced removal and stealing of traditional land, cultural destruction and ongoing desecration of burial grounds and sacred sites. It's a critical aspect of their struggle to implement their basic right to self-determination. The Muwekma Ohlone people are currently seeking federal tribal recognition, along with more than thirty other California Indian nations that have been relegated to the tragic and genocidal status of landless Indians.

The Muwekma Ohlone have also initiated the process of regaining a portion of their traditional land base. Currently their priority is the return of the area in San Francisco known as the Presidio, soon to become unused federal land, when the military pulls out.

Under federal law, this land must be returned to the original owners, the Muwekma Ohlone. This act is simple and straightforward justice -- to carry it out at the earliest possible date will be a

significant step in reversing the policy of genocide through which many California Indian people have been pushed to the brink of extinction.

The California Indian Nation has become homeless in their own homeland. The IITC strongly encourages all cities, states and federal officials have a part in the decision-making regarding the future of the Presidio, to take immediate action towards its return to the Muwekma Ohlone.

The IITC also supports federal recognition for Muwekma Ohlone tribe as a critical step in their ability to engage in government-to-government relations and to exercise self-determination as a sovereign people. The IITC will continue to support the efforts of the Muwekma Ohlone people to reclaim their traditional land, including the Presidio in San Francisco.

1992 is the year for healing the wounds that have been inflicted upon Indigenous Peoples. This healing will not begin until justice is done. Respectfully, William [Anians]."

I agree with this letter. I also think it's an act of terrorism of the United States government to deny Indigenous Peoples homelands and also not to protect their gravesites. I encourage the Presidio Trust to abolish and [explains] all of them and to implement everything it can in its power to return the Presidio to the Muwekma Ohlone Nation. To deny them their homeland is a hate crime in itself. And if the Presidio Trust takes the path of denying the Muwekma Ohlone their homeland, then they are committing a hate crime which is an act of terrorism right here in the United States government.

Thank you for your time.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Matlock. Robert Leefeldt followed by Sue Smith and then Diane Garfield.

Robert Leefeldt: I'm Robert Leefeldt, co-founder and co-president with Judy [Retschnider] of the Presidio Performing Arts Foundation.

In 1998 the Presidio Performing Arts Foundation was formed as an international coalition to recommend that the Presidio Trust consider dedicating a portion of the Presidio to performing arts education, training and performance opportunities for children. We are committed to preceding future generations to provide them with the ability to have a greater appreciation of dance, music and theater.

The Foundation particularly wishes to serve diverse communities of the Bay Area by identifying their rich dance, music and theater traditions, as well as preserving, enhancing and presenting them on stage. A variety of professional and cultural community arts groups support the establishment of such a performing arts center in the Presidio. We urge the Presidio Trust to consider our proposal to establish a Presidio children's center for the performing arts.

We have participated in several Presidio special events here in San Francisco and have featured children from our own public schools in our outreach program. Eighty-two percent of them came from

mixed cultural backgrounds and seventy percent of the participants are at the lowest economic level in our city.

Arlene Ackerman, Superintendent of the San Francisco Public School System, was a special event guest, spoke about her appreciation that the Presidio Trust had opened its doors and created educational opportunities for students from the San Francisco School District at no cost to either families or schools.

Last Saturday our Presidio Children's Dance Theater performed at the opening of the Japanese Exhibition. The Dance Theater will also be featured on the second Presidio community night for children. We will co-present with the San Francisco Taiko [Doljo] Children's Drummer Group and the Suzuki Violin School.

The Presidio Trust Implementation Plan suggests that more space and financial resources be used for educational, recreational and cultural programs. We believe in the Plan's Principles 13 and 14. The Presidio Trust Cultural Programming Division has already

provided a significant leadership role in enhancing the Presidio visitor's experience.

We suggest that the concept of the Presidio Trust play a significant role in future performing arts programs. We commend the professionalism that has been exercised by Kay [Spobovich], Director of Cultural Programming. Through her attention, assistance and guidance, the partnership we are mutually developing with the Presidio is an example for the future.

The Presidio Children's Dance Theater has received numerous invitations for performances, due to the unique Presidio exposure. The press has named our children "San Francisco's smallest ambassadors." We anticipate that the Implementation Plan will enable the Presidio to become an unqualified, unequaled venue for understanding the diverse cultural riches of our region and will become a model of community involvement and outreach to an under-served community in the City of San Francisco.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Leefeldt. Sue Smith followed by Diane Garfield, followed by Lori Hayward.

Sue Smith: I'm Sue Smith. I live on Russian Hill. I want to talk about an area I walked on Sunday on Tennessee Hollow and up above the Serpentine Grasslands, a very important part of the native plant community in the Presidio.

I was probably the first earth and native plant restorer for the Army in the '80s and led groups of two to three to five people around all of the rare plant sites. I have been the chair of the North Bay Wetlands Coalition for [a safe] San Francisco Bay Association. And I have been very concerned with wetlands all over the Bay Area -- the tidal marshes, etc.

So in walking around at Inspiration Point I saw the [bank] weed-eat species I'm afraid have been there for twenty years. And I realize that not nearly enough money is being allocated or personal time is being allocated to protect the pristine -- or lacking in pristine --

qualities of the 150 acres of the pre-existing native plant communities. They may have been there for 1,000 years or 100 years or half a century or more.

But it needs to be done -- that is a high priority. And I think in terms of natural resource protection, everyone agrees you work first with what exists and you use it -- each site is different. Each of those 150 acres is different.

But in fact what seems to be happening is a huge amount of time and money and resources are being spent on what I would just call native plant landscaping. And that's where Tennessee Hollow comes in. When I walk up the Hollow I notice that the mature willow tree species form a nice plant community all the way up to the slope. And yet that's exactly the plant community that's supposed to be so important in Tennessee Hollow.

I walked up through small houses, very well kept and being lived in by families with small children. They were out enjoying the wonderful day we had. And then at the end, which was all filled

with Tennessee Hollow, there was a broad area where a large group were having picnics and enjoying that area.

But what is the water source for whatever creek would be -- try to be -- installed there is [El Polin], [El Polin was dry]. And it has a -- whatever water resources are developed below that slope will be at the risk and at the expense of the Serpentine Grasslands, which is a rare and endangered species, federally and state listed species, and a very important plant community.

We need full-time resource people. We need native plant gardeners who are full-time on that area to protect species and in all the other sections of the Presidio.

So I would urge you to re-look at those priorities. They are going to recreation -- they are not going to protection of what we have.

Thank you.

John Pelka:

Thank you. Diane Garfield followed by Lori Hayward and Tamara Cooper.

Diane Garfield: My name is Diane Garfield and I'm a public school teacher here in San Francisco. And I'm here tonight to represent Mark Linder, who's President of Food, Land and People.

Food, Land and People is pleased to have its headquarters located in the Presidio National Park. Since 1998, the volunteers and staff of Food, Land and People have participated in many community meetings to discuss the future of the Presidio. In addition to our office, Mark also leases a home here in the Presidio.

Over the past several months, Mark has attended various meetings to review the Draft Plan. He's especially intrigued and supportive of the idea that Presidio based non-profits could apply for a partnership with the Presidio Trust, where the Trust would assist in presenting in organizations various educational programs.

This would be very helpful to non-profits that have limited financial resources. Food, Land and People sponsor the [jobs] to Farmer Program, where we bring representatives from agriculture and

conservation communities to the Presidio to promote dialogue between rural and urban sectors of our society. Mark sees the partnership helping us expand our annual "Building Bridges of Understanding" symposium -- where environmental, agricultural and education leaders from across the nation come together to discuss interdependence of food production, environmental quality and human need.

Last August Christine Todd Whitman, administrator at the [GTA], came to the Presidio and co-taught a lesson to a group of fifth graders. The Presidio National Park helped with the details for this visit.

In encouragement of the live/work environment of the Presidio, the leadership of Food, Land and People would like to suggest that the Presidio Trust provide an incentive package for non-profit organizations that encourage their employees to work and live in the Presidio. We believe that a financial incentive would help minimize transportation concerns and provide encouragement for non-profits to continue to be based here. Perhaps a non-profit

employer could receive a reduction in office rental and non-profit employees who live in the Presidio and could receive a reduction in housing rent.

Finally, I would like to propose the establishment of an endowment fund, which would enable people -- especially members of the San Francisco community -- to contribute to the financial self-sufficiency goal of the Presidio by 2013. This could add another source of revenue and perhaps take some of the pressure off the rental income requirements on both office and residential units.

Food, Land and People looks forward to working with the Presidio National Trust, the National Park Service, and the Bay Area community in making the Presidio National Park a truly unique wonderful place to live, work, learn, and enjoy.

Thank you.

John Pelka:

Thank you, Ms. Garfield. Lori Hayward followed by Tamara Cooper and then John Hodges.

Lori Hayward: Good evening, everyone. The letter I'm going to read is about different [tentative] organizations this evening, I'm a little nervous ... and their involvement in the planning [input].

I'm Lori Hayward, the Education Director for Swords to Plowshares Veterans Academy, a residential education and job training program that prepares San Francisco's formerly homeless veterans to become more self-sufficient. The curriculum changes regularly. It presently includes classes in computer skills, vocational preparation, writing and art.

I wanted to say a word in support of the Presidio Trust Financial to continue partnering with the National Park Services, Presidio tenants and residents, educational institutions and other organizations in creating and implementing a variety of programs, events and activities.

I would like to applaud the Trust for the efforts they have been made in this area already and the Park Services for the wonderful

programs that they have available to the public. There is also a plethora of diverse organizations in this park who are committed to sustainability, education, cultural, social and environmental issues.

Some of these organizations come together for monthly tenant/council meetings. If the Trust, the Park Services and the tenant organizations work together in collaborative partnership to provide programs for visitors of many backgrounds and interests, together they could possibly create dynamic and accessible programs that could draw a diverse public and continue to do that.

Some examples of how Swords to Plowshares has been involved with programming is residents from our program worked in the Buffalo Soldiers Recognition Celebration last year and may be involved again in the near future. They also work with volunteers from Community Impact, a local volunteer agency, and a stewardship project at the pet cemetery and have been involved in other stewardship projects with the Presidio Resource Center.

Part of the Swords to Plowshares initiative is to educate society about the effects of war. War causes wounds that last far beyond the battlefield. A couple of years back a staff member at Swords organized high school kids and Vietnam veterans into discussion groups where they spoke about the effects of violence on individuals in society, in an effort to decrease violence in the San Francisco public schools. I give this example as a case of how organizations can be involved in the community around us in a variety of ways.

I look forward to working with the Trust, the Park Services and other Presidio organizations in a collaborative effort to create inspiring educational experiences for the public that are compatible with the ideal mission of sustaining this amazing natural environment and minimizing human impact.

Thank you for your time.

John Pelka: Thank you, Ms. Hayward. Tamara Cooper, John Hodges and then Mike van Dyke.

Tamara Cooper: Good evening. My name is Tamara Cooper and I represent San Francisco Beautiful.

San Francisco Beautiful has been a consistent supporter of the transformation of the Presidio from a military post to a national park. We have reviewed the Draft Plan and Environmental Impact Statement submitted by the Presidio Trust and believe that the EIS adequately addresses the potential benefit and environmental impact of the Draft Plan and alternatives.

The Presidio Implementation Plan and the EIS are useful tools in providing broad development parameters. These documents will also streamline subsequent analysis for detail design.

SFB supports the Draft Plan with modifications, including the removal of all non-historic housing units -- including the South Hills [corridor] and MacArthur Avenue development to permit restoration of contiguous natural open space. We also support a no net loss of housing units as proposed in the Draft Plan. In addition,

housing should be located in areas efficiently served by public transportation.

More specific comments pertaining to the Draft Plan and EIS will be addressed in written comments submitted to the Presidio Trust soon. Thank you very much.

John Pelka: Thank you, Ms. Cooper. John Hodges, Mike van Dyke and then Dr. Sue Walima.

John Hodges: I'm John Hodges, President of California Heritage Council for architectural preservation of our security buildings and sites. Thank you to the Trust for these forums.

First, San Francisco is going to lose much more than it can afford if we do not protect our architectural heritage. Now, it is true there are only several hundred [masterpieces] but there are literally thousands of buildings and historic sites, including the historic [timber] [stands] at the Presidio that have merit, deserve our

protection and contribute to the atmosphere and feel of our unique community.

Secondly, let's talk about indifference. These old park structures cannot last forever -- but they do last for a very long time in the right hands. The biggest enemy of significant buildings and beautiful landscape is the runaway staff developer who both in the name of civic improvement or righteous bureaucracy is simply acting according to ruthless but legal process of following mindless legislation.

The replacement of the old by newly constructed simulations of the real thing cannot be viewed with indifference by CHC. Many of the characteristics of the Minimum Management Plan -- MMP -- illustrate the best alternate plan. We believe in going slow and doing the least harm. In particular, the Commissary, PX, Wherry Housing and other buildings should not be torn and reconstructed elsewhere until the Trust is sure that they are no longer needed for alternative uses or financial gain.

It appears that new housing density will adversely affect the Presidio. Before a decision is made to remove Wherry and other housing we need the additive studies which have not been provided. A decision to remove any of the Tennessee Housing should be delayed until the analysis and full assessment is made. We acknowledge the November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2001 meeting starts this process.

New construction should not be allowed until and unless environmental studies are made that would support compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act in this, a national landmark district. There's also a financial burden of the tearing down and the reconstructing of buildings, and the loss of the Presidio's character in the process. The cash flow of the existing albeit non-conforming housing will pay for the activities of the park.

CHC would like to see programs designed to bring people here -- events of international importance, museums, preservation of the Presidio's character not impinged upon by new construction, the protection and preservation of the integrity of the historic district interpretation of the Presidio's history.

Currently, there is an appearance of not being in compliance with the origination of the Trust Act in the minds of many people.

Focusing the [staff] of the Trust on the basic elements covered in this brief three-minute position statement will go far with the people this [charter] was designed to serve. A detailed business letter to the Trust will follow.

And in closing, may God bless this United States national park and all who visit and work here.

John Pelka: Mr. Hodges, thank you. Mike van Dyke, followed by Dr. Sue Walima and then Ron Miguel.

Mike van Dyke: Hi -- I'm Mike van Dyke and I'm [founder] of [Impacts] [unintelligible] and I live out there on [Quarry] Road. And, as you know, last time I spoke to you about the community.

I really enjoy being part of this community and I volunteer [as] the mayor and also at the community desk. It's important to keep this community open and diverse.

And I also want to talk to you tonight about more important thing, I think, and that's [your community] throughout the nation.

I was very impressed with the Presidio Trust having a meeting a couple of Fridays ago at the Boys and Girls Club downtown.

Asking us to come together with ideas of new programs that could be done. And I do stuff on a national basis with conferences. I talk to student leaders, work with student governance and also YMCA programs and other things. And I went ahead and gave about three dozen of my colleagues a call throughout the nation.

And I wanted to share with you how impressed they were that you're looking at different programs out here for students and youth, and how important that is -- because for me, I got started when somebody said democracy [goes through] generation. And now that's why I do it for a full-time living. That's why I teach that.

Because other people may commit their lives to do that too, and we know that something like the Presidio could be a facility that will help people's futures incredibly.

There's one person working for the Discovery Camp, and I think there will be somebody talking about that a little bit later on. But they spent over \$600,000 annually this last time of their [minimal] budget just to get the facility to help overhead students and foreign students. And that's an incredibly large amount of programs if this facility could help out [a lot].

There's also YMCA Program that does two. And there's a guy named Sam, that does two programs that are 1,000 students each. One does it on government; the other does it on youth values. And they do at YMCA Campuses . It's booked up three years in advance. It takes them a long time to get these facilities, and it costs an immense amount of [parts of] their budget.

And they can bring these [multi-content] programs here to the Presidio and make the Presidio not only a place for our community

locally, but also for a national community -- where these students can take programs that will affect their lives and they'll take it back to their communities and really help people out. And I know this is possible because I've seen it happen throughout the nation.

But the limitation that Sam tells me about, and the majority of most of my colleagues say, is that there's not enough space out here. Space is so hard to get.

There's another gentleman who works in Florida. And that's the East Coast -- it's really far away. But he says that half the facilities with quality programs people will come from all over the nation. He's been doing it for twelve years. He actually went to a professional conference center. He said these centers just are not designed to be able to do the non-profit or youth program because they're either trying to be done in hotels or done in universities because studies aren't appropriate for it.

This community out here is the right place to do these things. We have the ability. You put it in the Plan. I am so proud that you

have, and I want you to make sure it becomes part of it and you help these youth of America. Because this is where our future is -- and, as we know from September 11<sup>th</sup>, their future is going to be much different than ours and they need to learn democracy and learn about it right. And this is the place to do it. Thank you so much for making the [steps], to keep those in the Plan.

John Pelka: Thank you. Dr. Sue Walima, followed by Ron Miguel and then Steven Gordon.

Sue Walima: Hello -- my name is Sue Walima. I am speaking -- well, I am here as a member of the California Heritage Council, but I'd like to speak from the standpoint of being a Professor of Interdisciplinary Studies at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley.

I'm a second-generation Finnish-American as well, and I want to just acknowledge that Finland, as a country, perhaps has the finest record on the planet for knowing how to manage healthy forests in a way that allows the elders to be there and for new growth to arrive.

I'd like to quote a person who spoke just a few minutes ago --

"Work first with what exists." I am here to speak in favor of the Minimum Management Plan for the following reasons.

Minimum management sounds like doing very little. It's actually maximum preservation. History is more than buildings. The environment must be protected and preserved in order to protect the context of the history we wish to honor in this very, very special national park.

Speaking as a professor of interdisciplinary study, I would like to emphasize that perhaps it's an artificial division to look at a Vegetative Plan as something that's separate from the buildings that exists within the vegetation. There is a need to look at -- of course -- space, buildings, square footage and use. But historic preservation of a park means preservation of a historic planting and landscaping, even if that is not politically correct in this environment. I would like to suggest that replacing existing growing things -- growing trees, plants of any kind -- with something that is now called a

native plant is perhaps the equivalent of ethnic cleansing inside the vegetative world.

So, in conclusion, I would like to suggest that San Francisco save expense, that the federal government save expense, and that in saving expense we also save access to what is the genuine history of this park, this place. I agree with the Japanese-American individual who spoke before me and those people who want to support minimum demolition and minimum rebuilding and maximum preservation of nature.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Professor. Ron Miguel, followed by Steven Gordon, followed by Bill Hoff. Good evening.

Ron Miguel: Good evening. I'm Ron Miguel. I'm President of NAPP, the Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning. This is a coalition of 11 community organizations that surround the Presidio

and started meeting in 1989. We've met at least monthly ever since having into the GMPA.

Our comments I gave to Carey Feierabend earlier -- [provisional] to you, John, and also copies for each of the Trust Board members.

And by the way, [I recorded a comment] a week ago [for next week] and I understand that the Trust Board members have not received it as yet.

Aside from that, as far as NAPP is concerned, I would just quote a few things from our comments. We feel that the over-arching request of NAPP is to have a Draft Plan that will closely reflect the General Management Plan by reducing the level of new construction operating costs and placing a priority on leasing buildings to GMPA mission-related tenants.

We would like to have the Plan revised to permit new construction only for projects for which there is a demonstrated need relating to park themes, to reduce the level of annual operating expenses. And we comment that the flexibility allows, under this Plan, a range

from having an ideal national park to an unwelcome private business and residential park. It's far too flexible in the manner in which it's structured.

We request that no new replacement construction should occur for any non-residential structures without a demonstrated programmatic need and, of course, public review. We go into several particular sites, which I won't mention now. The final Plan request is no new construction for housing, with the possible exception of the public health service area.

Let me say that right now there are at least two leases in the public health service site. Both of them have restrictions on transport and traffic. Those restrictions have been ignored for months, and the Trust has done absolutely nothing about it -- which just goes to prove that housing is what should be there.

And final remarks to you, Mr. Pelka, which are strictly personal -- I hope I do not see a numerical review of comments in your final output. NAPP represents approximately 3,000 households

surrounding the Presidio. If you count that as one and you count an individual letter coming in as one, you will have done what statisticians sometimes do, and that's completely disregard facts.

Thank you.

John Pelka:

Thank you, Ron. We have no intention of doing that. Steven Gordon, followed by Bill Hoff, followed by Dan Clark.

Steven Gordon:

Hi -- my name is Steven Gordon, and I have three brief points to make. First, I just want to say that the Presidio Trust public input process has worked very well from my perspective. I was lucky enough to host a coffee at my home in Noe Valley, at which the Presidio Trust representatives reached out to residents all across San Francisco, all of whom have an interest in this beautiful Presidio.

The representatives clearly presented the ideas in the Plan and they actively sought the perspectives and opinions from the attendees, who came from all different parts of the city and who brought all different backgrounds.

Many of those who attended the session asked afterwards:

"Well, I agree with all those goals and those plans. I don't have to comment, do I?" Well, I'm here on their behalf. Seeing this process up close really gave us the confidence that the Presidio Trust has gathered all the best ideas from the community, the broad community, and will do the right thing with this national treasure.

Second, I want to emphasize that private fundraising should be essential to the financial planning for the Presidio going forward. Achieving financial solvency does not mean only collecting rent. Many people both in San Francisco near the Presidio as well as all across the city and across the country would love the Presidio and love to donate funds to help maintain the Presidio and develop programs and pay for operating costs. Private funds should be raised through a non-profit foundation or endowment. As an example, universities don't rely solely on tuition to pay costs, but have large endowments that offset the expenses.

No extra development should be required in the Presidio and no programs should be sacrificed just because the rent is not sufficient alone to cover the budget.

Third, I briefly want to emphasize that walking trails should be a high priority for enhancements to the Presidio. Too many people drive through the Park but don't stop to walk around. What we need is a unified network of trails. When I walk around the Presidio I sometimes get lost. We need much better signs and we need trails that don't end up on roads so pedestrians and hikers don't have to compete dangerously with traffic but can have a total unified set of trails. There's no reason this can't be the best place to hike and walk around within San Francisco.

So those are my three points. The process has been terrific. Private fundraising is important, and some new walking trails.

John Pelka:

Thank you, Mr. Gordon. Bill Hoff, followed by Dan Clark and then Francisco DaCosta.

Bill Hoff: Thank you.

I would think we would all have to agree that the Park Service subdivision of the [Center for Total Cooperation] perhaps is needed more now than ever. I had to begin to implement the GMPA, and that's to invite internationally-recognized experts to meet with representatives of Bay Area universities, colleges, institution and corporations to identify the world's most critical environmental and social challenges. And assess how we could mobilize, international, state, local and national resources to meet these challenges through public, private and other programs at Presidio.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Hoff. Dan Clark, followed by Francisco de Costa and then Lucia Bogatay.

Dan Clark: Yes -- my name is Dan Clark. I'm a neighbor but not a member of any organization.

My comments concern lodging in the Presidio, and I'm highly skeptical of what is contained in the draft document. Principle 12 is the only part of the document that has anything of substance in it, and it is very favorable when it speaks of lodging in the Presidio. However, it lacks all kinds of specifics.

I am skeptical on what may lie beneath that because in other places in the document things are talked about in relation to lodging, about something like new construction of compatible lodging and new in-fill development south of Mason Street when talking about Crissy Field. That might be paranoia, to limit or to link those two things together.

But there were other things that give me reason to be suspicious. There are guidelines stated in the document that talk about limiting building height so the ridge lines can be seen from certain locations, which sounds like a good thing. However, it also indicates that some sort of planning is being done for this new construction and this planning might be quite advanced.

As has been mentioned here earlier there is talk about the square footage -- zero [some gain] to 6 million square feet, that if some warehouse or housing is demolished somewhere, there's an open budget for new construction of anything -- and that could well be lodging.

There's also very small mention about capital funding for it. There is only a small amount allocated, which would say that maybe there won't be new hotels, etc. being built. However, realize that a private enterprise would put up the capital and the Trust will collect the leases from it. So it's a low investment, high return on investment plan -- which is nice if it didn't spoil the Presidio by making it just like every place else.

The Presidio Trust has three things that it says about why housing is needed. It talks about people coming to the Presidio as a destination or coming for a focused stay or some vague and called "tenant leaves." I really want to ask the question: is the destination that is spoken about something that is already there or it is

something that is being created by making lodging facilities, conference facilities, etc.?

I think that a focused stay in the Presidio is a nice idea but probably not very realistic. I think people who come if they stay in the Presidio are also going to go to San Francisco and come in and out. And I guess the bottom line of why I think housing is not a good idea is it has some heavy disadvantages. The high worker content for every guest that comes, the night use of the Presidio for entertainment and use that really doesn't happen now will be increased.

And lodging in the Presidio means that the Presidio is just like every place else in San Francisco -- the whole thing is being homogenized and its uniqueness has fallen away.

Thank you for listening.

John Pelka:

Thank you, Mr. Clark. Francisco Da Costa, followed by Lucia Bogatay and then Dale Champion.

Francisco de Costa: My name is Francisco Da Costa and I've been connected with the Presidio for a very long time. I've already submitted my written comments to you, and I would like to point out a few issues here.

Firstly, because I've been connected with the Presidio, because I worked here and I believe I understand the operations of the Presidio. I sincerely believe that the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan was created to circumvent the final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Study. And I have said that oftentimes.

There is no place in a national park that belongs to every American for a monster building like what has been proposed by tearing down the Letterman Army Hospital. I know nobody says it as blunt as I do, but I have to state it here -- because I think this is going to be one of the last times I am going to participate in an open meeting like this.

The Presidio Trust Implementation Plan is not inclusive. It takes one region and pits it against another region, unlike the General

Management Plan and Environmental Impact Study that had so much input from good experts and people from all over San Francisco and standard Bay Area.

And I would request the Trust to look into issues like energy, water -- we don't have a sewage plant or yet at the Presidio, yet with a population of thousands and thousands we intend to pump all our sewage to the [Bayview] District. And I was just before the Board of Supervisors today at City Hall and I brought that issue to them.

Finally, as one of the speakers said earlier, we need to pay attention and respect the Native Americans and also the Buffalo soldiers. Thank you very much.

John Pelka: Thank you for your comments. Lucia Bogatay, followed by Dale Champion, and then Jan Blum.

Lucia Bogatay: Good evening. I'm Lucia Bogatay, a member of the Fort Point Presidio Historical Association and Chair of its Architecture

Committee. And we are submitting written comments, but I wanted to mention a few of the highlights of our concerns.

While it is clear that the ambiguities in the PTIP are part of the strategy for maintaining needed flexibility, the effects of the proposed undertaking and thus the very issues that require Section 106 compliance cannot be identified from the information provided until detailed treatments of individual buildings and sites are provided.

That's why it is so important that the PTIP clearly state that district plans *will* be prepared in the EIS -- I think it says "may be" prepared -- and guarantee through a clearly-delineated process that the public will have a consulting voice in this detailed planning.

There is a fundamental conflict between the goal of economic sustainability as required by the Presidio Trust Act and the treatment required by law for a National Historic Landmarks District, as outlined in Section 110[F].

The Act permits demolition of historic buildings if they are not economical to reuse. The EIS says these demolitions of additional historical buildings not originally approved in the GMPA could adversely effect the district. Although the [NEPA] rules permit mitigation of an adverse effect, there is no mitigation for such adverse effects in a national historical landmark as regulated by NHPA. Sorry to be so wordy here, but you get my drift.

Mitigation is a NEPA concept which is less restrictive than NHPA. And in a case where NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act disagree, one assumes that you'll go with the more restrictive legislation -- we hope.

In any case, the PTIP and the programmatic agreement both mention issue-oriented plans, and we want to encourage you to do many of those and to involve the public in the review of them.

Also, we think the PTIP should place more emphasis on stabilization and maintenance of historic buildings. This process will both help conserve scarce resources by making later

rehabilitation less costly and by making it easier to attract appropriate tenants.

Stabilization and maintenance are also required by Section 110[A2B] of the NHPA. In any case, I do support Sue Smith's notion of "work first with what exists." That certainly applies in the historic preservation business. And if you rent out everything that exists, then decide if you need to build anything -- maybe do a little fundraiser.

Anyway, we know it's hard work. Good luck. Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, too. Dale Champion, followed by Jan Plum, and then John Holding.

Dale Champion: I'm Dale Champion and I'm with the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association.

And my comments are directed at the Planning Principles of the Draft Plan. And first I want to speak about the tenant selection

criteria and the fact that they do not comply with the Presidio Trust Act. That Act requires tenants that "facilitate the cost-effective preservation of historic buildings through the reuse of such buildings" should be favored. The criteria must be amended to reflect this statutory [or] requirement.

Number two, the commitment to retain 1,654 housing units is premature in our opinion. Decisions on housing should be deferred until there is a comprehensive housing plan and it's been completed.

Further, in keeping with Section 110, no new construction for housing or other purposes, except perhaps the Lucas project, should be considered unless and until an inventory of historic buildings that can be used or adapted or reused is complete and tenants have been selected for those structures. This would permit the additional income needed to be more accurately determined and operating expenses to be kept at reasonable balance.

And then finding the best conjunction of tenant and program use within a historic building is a delicate and uncertain process. Its

chances for success will change over time. Rather than simply demolishing buildings which cannot be cost-effectively reused, such buildings should be mothballed for historic purpose until new uses of programs can be found.

Architecturally, there is a wonderful description for this project, which is "making the problem into an opportunity." We hope you will take note of that.

It takes vision, patience, and creativity -- as no doubt the framers of the NHPA were aware. And lastly, since purchases are the strongest witnesses of intent, budget processes should include adequate notice and meaningful public involvement to increase public confidence in them.

Thank you very much.

John Pelka:

Thank you, Mr. Champion.

With two very good employees that I've got to my left and right, my most important impact this evening is to announce that there's a black BMW that has its lights on in the parking lot. Basically it's license plate 2EPY312.

We'll continue again. In about five minutes we're going to take a short break.

Jan Blum:

My name is Jan Blum, and I am a long-term volunteer at the Presidio in Habitat Restoration. And I'm happy to say that I was there almost at the beginning of the restoration of Crissy Field. So I spent a lot of time on my hands and knees, in sand, pulling weeds. Putting in some of the 100,000 plants that we have down there that we're all enjoying so much.

I would like say as an opening remark that it's difficult to comment on the Draft Plan, as it only concerns itself with Area B. And I think we're all aware here that the Presidio Park is comprised also of Lucas, which is an enormous area, as well as Area A -- which means a great deal to a great many people, myself certainly among

those. So I'd really like to direct my comments to my concerns about Crissy Field and what becomes of it because to me that is the entry for most of our visitors and most of the recreational users in San Francisco.

This is an area that right now is undersized. It is only about eighteen acres and the hydrologist reports when we were done said the minimum acreage needed to be about thirty acres. So in order for it to be functioning correctly as a marsh, it needs to be expanded greatly.

And I would tell you my personal opinion -- that is, I would very much like to see it expanded across Mason Street into Area B where currently the PX and Commissary parking lot reside. Remove those.

And, backing up a little bit, I think that I am asking a commitment from the Trust to protect, develop, and enhance the Crissy Marsh/Crissy Field area. To me, this is one of the premier educational opportunities we have for all San Franciscans and all

visitors in the aspect of environment and things that are natural, you just need to be out there and look at them.

I'm also asking you to proactively get involved and make a plan to preserve the Crissy Marsh/Crissy Field expanded area from what could be a disastrous Doyle Drive reconstruction. All of those areas are intertwined.

This is the most beautiful part of San Francisco to me, is the coastline -- and I'd really like your support in seeing that it stays that way. Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you for your time and comments, Ms. Blum.

Finally, John Holding -- and then we will break for about 10-15 minutes.

John Holding: Hi. Thank you. My name is John Holding. I'm a sixteen year resident of San Francisco. And I'm also a Presidio native habitat restoration volunteer.

I am going to focus my comments tonight on the Crissy Field area, similar to what Jan just did. When I started to read the Draft Implementation Plan, I was quite excited by Planning Principle number one -- which said habitat protection and enhancement would be prioritized, that the Trust would work in conjunction and partnership with the NPS to create a self-sustaining ecosystem through restoration and management and accomplished in part through long-term community and volunteer activities.

Great news, I thought. This is fabulous, because Crissy needs to be expanded to be self-sustaining ecosystem. And there's a large community of volunteers aligned around Crissy and devoted to it.

So I read on with enthusiasm, but then got discouraged and confused when I got to the Planning Principles for the Crissy area. Instead of native habitat restoration and protection, I saw the call for a mixed-use area of recreational and cultural facilities. Instead of an expanded Crissy marsh and a commitment to that, I saw a call for a reinforced southern Mason Street edge and retaining buildings

that were described as post-war automobile-oriented buildings -- out of scale and out of context with existing historic structures.

I really would like not to be discouraged about what's going to happen in the Presidio. I would really like my large volunteer community that I'm a part of to continue to have a commitment to this great park. And I'd hate to see a wonderful opportunity missed to create a world-class saltwater marshland.

I strongly urge the Trust in this Plan to commit to embracing Planning Principle number one -- not only for the Southern Dune highlands, not only for Tennessee Hollow, but also for Crissy Field. There are plenty of places where you can put museums and necessary indoor cultural activities. There is only one place where you can commit to enhancing and expanding marshland -- specifically, commit to the expansion of the Crissy wetlands.

Two, commit to removing the PX, the Commissary and the parking lot.

Three, identify and reserve potential marsh expansion areas on the Land Use Plan.

Four, as Jan said, aggressively work towards Doyle realignments that allow the optimal chance for a sustainable Crissy marsh.

And five -- a personal request -- I'd really like to see the elimination of any reference to reinforced street edges on Mason Street or anywhere else in this great national park.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Holding. We'll take a short break. There are some beverages, caffeine, cookies in the adjoining room. When we get back, it will be Ruth Gravanis, Don Green, and then Kate White.

[Pause for break]

John Pelka: Before we get started, we have two new timekeepers. And if you thought the first two were rigorous, wait until you hear these two.

The first speaker tonight after the break will be Ruth Gravanis, followed by John Green and then Kate White.

Ruth Gravanis: Good evening. I'm Ruth Gravanis, and I would like to talk about water. Sunday I was at the Golden Gate Club for a very nice event, and I stepped off the pavement onto the lawn and found myself wading in an inch of water. And I know that there are some wonderful mitigation measures in the EIS for water conservation, but I don't know what we're waiting for. Why not pump-start now? Overwatering our lawns is something that there's really no excuse for.

There are some other good measures in the EIS about water conservation. One of them is metering. I think it's absolutely essential to meter as many individual buildings as possible and I hope that we place a high priority on that.

Another thing we need to do is reduce the ornamental horticulture that we use in our landscaping and gradually move more and more

towards using those species that are appropriate to our grass and the climate. And those species happen to also be the ones that have the most value for our local wildlife.

I was very pleased see that the Trust is showing an interest in evaluating an on-site water reclamation system, partly to save water -- we should not be using any portable water for landscaping. But I also applaud this move, because the Presidio should be treating all of its sewage on site. It should not be sending any of its sewage into the City system and especially not to the already overburdened Southeast Treatment Plant and the Southeast community. So I think that we should be stating as a goal for our water reclamation complete treatment of the Presidio sewage on site. That's the sustainable way to do it.

I also want to talk a little more about stormwater. There is nothing in the EIS that talks about the need to treat stormwater runoff before it goes into the Bay and the ocean. Lots of good best-management practices for reducing stormwater runoff -- nothing that acknowledges the importance of non-point source pollution runoff

as one of the factors that impacts our Bay and ocean. And we need to do something about that.

We can address all of these issues of better meeting our water needs without using portable water for landscaping, treating our own sewage, treating our own stormwater, if we reduce the total amount of development and if we increase the total acreage that we devote to ecological restoration.

Thanks.

John Pelka: Thank you, Ruth. Don Green, followed by Kate White, and then Charlie Dicke. Mr. Green, how are you tonight, Sir?

Don Green: Very well, thank you. I am with the Sierra Club and I wanted to acknowledge first of all the very close working relationship with have with [Hillary Gittelman] and [Joan Marquetta] and Harry [Haglin], who sat down with us many times in the last several months, along with some of the Board members.

We have examined the data that's available. We looked at the appendices, some of the housing reports and the current budget. We've recreated the GMPA for today's circumstances. We find out that we can run the Park with four point six million square feet, way below the five point six that you're suggesting. We can do it with about a 13-million dollar a year surplus, which adds up to 180 million by the end of the twenty years. We'll use that money to not build the Lucas project -- we don't need that six million dollars a year. We will use it to expand the marsh at Crissy Field -- which has to be done to restore Tennessee Hollow -- and to do some of the other required capital projects.

We don't have to use the surplus, as the Trust proposes, to build new museums, lots of new apartments and new hotels. We also suggest that the Park draw up planning studies for housing, museums, office and parking should be completed before the EIS is completed -- because it doesn't make any sense for us to comment on something that doesn't tell us what you're going to do park-wide in these areas.

And also the EIS should have a Lucas no-build alternative because when you said it was not feasible when we did it a year or two ago, certainly it's feasible now. Revenues are up seventy million dollars, not the thirty-five that you anticipated. You're going to be earning close to seventy million within two or three years and there's lots of money to go around.

So I hope you pay as much attention this time as you did last time when we had our conversations and spoke of the document. And we're looking forward to submitting it and working further with you people in the future.

Thank you very much.

John Pelka: Thank you, as always, for you time, Don.

Kate White, followed by Charlie Dicke, and then Katie Gutierrez.

Kate White: Good evening. My name is Kate White. I'm with City CarShare.

City CarShare is the latest San Francisco environmental success story. I'm proud to say that 850 people are now sharing thirty cars. Car sharing is a mobility service that allows members to have access to a vehicle on a per-use basis -- just pay how much you use it -- without any of the hassles and costs associated with owning a car.

And car sharing could allow many residents and employees in the Presidio to not own cars. We believe the Presidio is a great place for car sharing and have been talking a little bit with your staff about actually implementing it here. And we believe that car sharing can help meet the Presidio Trust's environmentally sustainable mission, and we urge you to explicitly integrate car sharing into the Presidio's Plan.

Thank you.

John Pelka:

Thank you, Ms. White. Charlie Dicke, followed by Katie Guitierrez, and then Greg Dalton.

Charlie Dicke: I'm Charlie Dicke -- it's D-i-c-k-e. And I'm a neighbor of the Presidio.

I just wanted to read something from the Trust Act in your implementation document. "The Presidio's significant natural historic, scenic, cultural and recreational resources must be managed in a manner which is consistent with the sound principles of land use planning and management, and which protects the Presidio from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and historic and natural character of the area and cultural and recreational resources."

It is my feeling that the Presidio is not being properly protected by the new Draft Implementation Plan. I would like to express my concerns over the new building that's been proposed and the density of this building. I'd also like to express my concern over the financial risk that's involved with the capital commitment in the new Plan.

Our programs are important to the Presidio. However, it seems that programs have been raised in size and priority, which has led to [miniscule amounts] of development against what this Presidio Trust Act states.

I would like to ask the Trust how it approached the tradeoff between funding the new programs versus traditional development in the Park and came to a conclusion that more development should be done to fund these programs. And I would like to ask that the Board reconsider extending the Presidio's program budget in light of the amount of increased new development it requires to fund and also the financial risk which it adds to the Presidio's self-sufficiency.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Dicke. Katie Gutierrez, followed by Greg Dalton, and then Courtney Cuff. Katie? I think Katie has left for the evening. Greg Dalton, Courtney Cuff, and then Patricia Vahey.

Courtney Cuff: Good evening. My name is Courtney Cuff. I'm the Pacific Regional Director for the National Parks Conservation Association. We're a non-profit organization dedicated to preserving and protecting the national parks for current and future generations.

I would like to begin by thanking the Trust Board and the staff of the Presidio Trust. It's been very welcome working with you all. And, while we oppose the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan in favor of the GMPA 2000, we certainly hope that the dialogue we've had thus far will be reflected in the final that comes out.

We oppose the PTIP because we feel that it in essence gold-plates a diamond -- that there is really no need to have the hundreds of thousands of new square feet that the PTIP proposes, that the operating budgets are far in excess of what we need.

The public has spoken and has said overwhelmingly that less is more at the Presidio, so we certainly hope you take heed to that.

Having said that less is more, there is an area that I would like to focus on tonight where in fact more would do more. And that is when we look at the options outlined in PTIP we feel that there are not enough specifics, that we don't know exactly what the use is of various buildings are going to be, and how to prioritize what those uses would be and in fact public input in environmental review would benefit from more specifics. Certainly with the public hospital and see that there have been four different possible uses proposed there, and understand that when we're thinking of things like educational, conference, housing, etc., having a priority use on one and a fall-back opportunity would allow flexibility and also help out with the definition of what's to come.

The other thing I would like to mention is that while this is a Plan that needs to have nuts and bolts to it, it's possible to go back and amend the Plan -- so that if you decide to prioritize the use for one area and realize that's not going to work, going back to amend the Plan is done in other people's processes and I think would engender more public trust to this process.

I'd like to thank you for all your hard work and I look forward to seeing the outcome and working with you better.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Ms. Cuff. Patricia Vaughey, followed by GL Hastings and then Mr. Redmond Kernan.

Patricia: Patricia Vaughey, Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action, Marin Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants and Planning Association for the Divisadero -- which are over 24 groups, larger than that.

I agree with what NAPP said. I agree with what Cow Hollow said.

But I am very concerned about the Plan itself. The Plan is nebulous, to the point that it's almost impossible to give an answer to. It does not correlate with the EIS. There are many places in the EIS that are not addressed, i.e. Doyle Drive, i.e. the transportation element. The LOS schedules do not add up. Whoever did the study -- what methodology they used we can't figure out.

We are concerned about the northeast quadrant because it's not going to be a park. It can't be a park with what you're planning on building there. We're losing the majority of our green space from Lombard and Doyle. We are not going to have the way to walk to Crissy Field unless we go the long way, because we will be walking through buildings with no green spaces.

Is this a park? I don't think so. Why do you need 150,000 square feet of lodging and conference space in that northeast quadrant?

What is the need of it? We priced the Presidio around 1994 and we should have been able to bring 42 million dollars in with the existing buildings and have them retrofitted that year.

Retail, realtors, land management people -- we all worked on that program. 1996 prices -- you should have been able to bring in 50-60 million. 1998 prices, before the big boom -- you should have been able to bring in 70. Why are we having to do all of this building and all of this development when it's not necessary?

My other problem is I'm having problems with the process of the Trust. On Sunday, a man shows up on the corner of [Lyon/Borgus] from Caltrans with a drawing of that entrance that none of us has seen -- not on any of these, not in the EIS, not on anything that has been presented to us. But it had "Presidio Trust" on the top of it.

We find a letter from the Planning Department concerning a waste management program right next to our neighborhood. We have never been informed. How can we open up the lines of communication when we're having all of this secrecy? My question is what can we do to make this a better park that is more economically feasible with less building, less demolition and sustainability? And I'm not seeing it, and right now I feel that Phil and Sarah Burton must be rolling over in their graves.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Patricia. GL Hastings, followed by Redmond Kernan and then Bill Henslin.

GL Hastings: I'm GL Hastings. I used to work at the Presidio from 1980 to 1993.

I will say the Presidio looks in a lot of ways better than when I used to work there. I see a lot of things got accomplished. But I am concerned a lot about people complaining about the Trust, like the last nice lady said. I saw that Parkside school where I used to go in the Sunset District where people went behind our backs and did things -- the Board of Education -- without telling us, you know, [putting] teachers' housing.

So hopefully we can learn that the word of the Presidio Trust can be trusted and that you will do the right things in the future so that people will understand that you're doing the right business.

I am glad that Mr. Pete [Erlich] came over from the City Gardeners. I'm a city gardener by trade with the City and fixing up your forests here and future vegetation. I hope he's doing a good job.

I just hope that you'll implement and do the right thing here, that you'll have your buildings open so that people can rent them out for

different job opportunities. Hopefully diversified and help increase employment.

It looks like a lot of things are happening in the right direction but hopefully they are not going to be playing games but doing the right thing.

So far it look good and I hope you can keep on the right track, and I hope that's the way it will play.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Hastings. Redmond Kernan, followed by Bill Henslin.

Redmond Kernan: I'm Redmond Kernan, and I'm speaking for myself this evening. I'm sorry -- you were reading one more name.

John Pelka: I was going to say you couldn't help yourself tonight, could you, Mr. Kernan? [Laughter]

Redmond Kernan: I couldn't.

Observations and then a suggestion -- and it's the suggestion that led me to talk.

The observation is where do you select the Draft Plan -- it's so broad that within it I could have a Presidio I would love and a Presidio I would hate. It's a question of where you go after you select the Draft Plan.

And there are indications of future planning processes but they aren't sufficiently defined -- e.g. Fort Scott will have a district plan, but it doesn't say that each district will. So I would suggest that you be very, very clear about the future processes and that each district should have a plan -- either district, sub-district or area. It might be a combination of districts within a drainage basin.

But within that, I think you will also need subject plans, such as conference lodging, because you can't decide on a district basis

where that goes -- you need to decide on a Presidio-wide basis. The same would be true of museums and cultural facilities.

And the other one would be residential. And residential, with all the groups I've met with, has caused the most angst, nervousness, distaste and plain confusion. Residential is, of itself, good if you're using an existing building. To the extent you're removing buildings to create natural area, that's good. But the problem is saying that you will replace them in another area and build it new -- and not being able to see the effect of that new construction, even though you indicate that it will have to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act, which is required by law.

My suggestion is that the residential element be accomplished indicating which buildings will be rehabbed -- and I would suggest the public health service hospital is one of those -- and which buildings could be -- which aren't residential could be converted to residential as existing structures. And that all of that -- the removal, the conversion -- be seen in totality. If then you need new buildings, that those would be indicated in the residential element

so that one might see if we remove this here it will be replaced over there. Without being able to see it, it's impossible to sort of accept that because you're accepting two elements -- one, a number of replacement; two, a removal; and three, an uncertain judgmental decision about what's appropriate.

So I would urge before any decision is made committing to removal and/or committing to a number of jobs housing that there be a complete residential element with public involvement.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thanks, Redmond. Bill Henslin, followed by Kathleen Diohep, followed by Beverly McCallister. Good evening, Mr. Henslin.

Bill Henslin: Good evening, John. I'm Bill Henslin, a member of the Presidio Committee of the Pacific Heights Residents Association and a co-founder of Friends of the Presidio National Park-dot-org. I'd like to speak tonight about success, failure, and a clear choice for the future.

I want to commend the Presidio Trust for your recent successes in the past few years. I think you've done a great job renovating housing and done a great job putting the housing to use -- to rental use. You have 950 rentable units which, at an average rent of \$2,800 per unit, gives you roughly 30 million a year in potential revenue. Your 2001 budget also shows that you have another 8 million or so this year in other revenue. So you have almost 40 million a year already in operating revenue, and I think that's commendable and I take my hat off to you.

I also want to congratulate you because the General Accounting Offices do a report on the Presidio. It just came out and is available on their Web site. It shows that all six of the PTIP alternatives are projected to be financially self-sufficient by year 2013, as required by Congress. And that's even with revenue projections that the GAO suggests are rather conservative -- for example, new revenue projection for Class B office space is \$30 a square foot. GAO notes that San Francisco Class B office space rents for \$60. So I commend you for your financial success.

However, I believe the PTIP Draft Plan has failed to meet the Trust Act's mandate, excuse me, that the Trust implement your plans, according to the general objectives of the General Management Plan of 1994. The [view is] central objective and mission is to create a national park and environmental study center dedicated to addressing the world's most critical environmental, social and cultural challenges. In short, a former military base is to become a base for peace. Especially now, what could be a more fitting vision for the Presidio?

But your PTIP Draft Plan does not commit to that vision. In fact, you've committed to abandoning that vision. Instead of that vision, you seem to have launched on what the Chronicle recommended you do in an editorial, which is send out a charm offensive to charm the City into accepting your Draft Plan. Your presentations to the public have been giving us half-truths and half-facts. It's great and charming to tell us about open space and reducing built space. But it's really not very fair to the public to not tell us about 2.2 million square feet of new construction, to tell us about more visitors park-

wide than Fisherman's Wharf receives. It's not fair to us to not mention the feelings of overcrowding that the EIS says on Page 309 would be experienced by the public under the Draft Plan.

I urge the Trust to abandon the Draft Plan, respect the public, be honest with us, and adopt the GMPA revised as little as possible, and return to us for our review and our enthusiastic approval.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Henslin. Kathleen Dioheop, followed by Beverly McCallister and then Thomas Malone.

Welcome, Kathleen.

Kathleen Dioheop: Hi -- I'm Kathleen Dioheop and I'm with Art House. Art House is a joint project of the San Francisco Arts Commission and California Lawyers for the Arts.

My remarks today are intended to augment and in some places the correct remarks made by [Olga Robinson] at a GGNRA

Commission. Unfortunately, I misread the really fine print in the EIS and gave her a wrong numbers when she spoke of that vision.

So one of the first things we wanted to do is acknowledge the Trust Board for identifying arts facilities as one of general objective of a GMPA and PTIP for arguing for providing arts facilities as, again, a general objective -- and acknowledge that the Trust Plan calls for 900,000 square feet of cultural and institutional space.

That's equivalent to what's being called for for the above-ground portion of the Lucas development -- 900,000 square feet. It's a significant amount of space.

And then looking farther into the documents, you see that the assumptions are made that this space will lease for \$9.00 a square foot -- which coupled with the Park Service district charge, means that arts or cultural groups would pay a dollar a foot a month -- which is exactly the rent level that those groups can support. San Francisco studies, [Stenson] Foundation and groups have been studying the rents that non-profits and other arts groups can support

in the City, and we really commend that the Presidio has identified in a financial plan, leasing space to such groups at a dollar a month.

The problem is those are just the financial points. As Carey said, what you're adopting is a general land use plan that guides land use decisions. There isn't a specific leasing criteria. And there isn't a commitment to leasing that rent that could be achievable. In fact, the Presidio hasn't leased anything anywhere near a dollar a foot a month. The last time the Presidio went out with a state leasing rate it was double that level. And now there are only a few buildings -- most buildings have been office leased for considerably more.

We really want to see the Presidio as a place where arts groups, non-profits and others can foster and create the vision of the Park.

Finally, you really have in place a base -- with LDA, with the housing revenue -- to reach for the home run, reach for the win, and go for the programs and vision called out within the GMPA.

There are members of your Board ready to achieve those aims in raising substantial funds for the restoration of Crissy Field. I'd like to call to the Trust to shoot high and do well by providing an outstanding record in this Park.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thanks, Kathleen. Beverly McCallister, followed by Thomas Malone and then Mark Zier.

Beverly McCallister: Good evening. My name is Beverly J. McCallister. I'm a member of the Pacific Heights Residents Association Presidio Committee, the Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning, Friends of the Presidio National Park, and the City of Presidio and the Neighborhood Representative Work Group.

The Pacific Heights Residents Association recommends retaining the National Park Services 1994 General Management Plan with minor revisions. Two major revisions of this would be no new

construction and placing a priority on the reuse of existing buildings for park employees as needed.

This Plan is financially self-sufficient and will pay for capital improvement. This Plan will provide for more open space than the Presidio Trust Draft alternative. It protects the Presidio's national historic landmark district, the Presidio's environment and the archaeological resources more than the Presidio Trust Draft alternative, according to the Presidio Trust's own document.

The Draft alternative is not GMPA Plus -- it is GMPA Less. It lacks the GMPA central vision for world peace and it lacks the central vision for addressing the global environmental problems. The Draft Plan lacks a plan to implement any vision.

By the Presidio Trust's own admission, their Plan is not a Plan at all, but a conceptual framework. There is no plan in this Plan.

The Presidio Trust claims that their framework will give them the flexibility, but the Draft Plan is so vague that there is little to be

flexed. But the GMPA honors the Presidio Trust Act mandates to protect the Presidio from development. GMPA revised offers no new construction. The Draft would build 2.2 million square feet of new construction including a 115-unit new lodge in Crissy Field area. The Draft will lease space to private companies, which will reduce the amount of public space, as well as public service in the Park.

The Presidio Trust wants to be a primary program provider for 80% of the Park, replacing the National Park service of eight decades of programming experience with the Presidio Trust's three years of experience.

In the Draft Plan, the Presidio Trust will deliver programming instead of having tenants providing programming. But shouldn't a diverse culture that's connected with the Presidio have the right to tell their own story in their own way as tenants. The GMPA will provide a wealth of programming.

Finally, the Draft alternative of the Presidio Trust would decide who leases space in the Park without public input. The Presidio Trust claims the 1994 GMPA must be replaced because of the changed economic situation. But less has changed between 1994 and 1996 than has changed in the last two years. Please keep the GMPA with minor revisions.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Beverly. Thomas Malone, followed by Mark Zier, and then Vincent Badia.

Thomas Malone: My name is Thomas Malone. My organization is Swords into Solutions. And I ask you first of all to please abide by the GMPA. I feel that if you do that in a true manner the things that I am very interested in will be perhaps solved. Perhaps you could do them.

The thing that upsets me the most about the process, about your Plan, is it appears the lack of a vision as magnificent as the Presidio itself. I think -- there are some things that I know that the world

needs -- perhaps America needs it too -- and that is something to unify everybody in the world. I think it's very necessary. Every time I see Letterman Hospital and the construction that's happening it seems like a crime. Because if Letterman Hospital wasn't going to be a hospital, it should have been a schoolhouse -- for teaching students from around the world.

Now, that is the kind of vision that I really think you should consider. I think you could find ways to make it self-sufficient. I could say that it is what the world needs -- and, believe me, they would know. Perhaps it's too late for Letterman to become a school, a university for students throughout the world. Perhaps it's too late for the Presidio. But I do ask that you consider that. And if not Letterman, then perhaps some other space in the Presidio could be found to do something like that with real meaning and real values.

And I can say this -- in the City of San Francisco the general perception is the Presidio is being stolen. One way or another, by hook or by crook, the people running the Presidio -- they just want

to get their hands on the property and develop the hell out of it. Right? That's the perception, and it's up to you to change that perception. What they want -- the people of San Francisco, I think, generally want something really good to happen in this place, the Presidio. As magnificent as the Presidio is, if you can fulfill that, then more power to you and I wish you luck in that regard.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank Mr. Malone. Mark Zier, followed by Vincent Badia and then Paul Okamoto.

Mark Zier: Hi -- my name is Mark Zier and I am a member of the Friends of Presidio National Park. And I understand the format tonight is presentations with questions to you. I'm sorry that there isn't any time for questions and answers. We -- that is to say, the Friends of the Presidio National Park -- are sponsoring an event on Thursday at 6:00 at the Waldorf School on Washington Street where there will be more time for give and take. And you are all cordially invited to come and attend.

In a previous meeting those who were in attendance were encouraged to use their imaginations when reading the report and not look for too many details. I said at an earlier meeting that that actually was kind of scary for me, in what I would see when I looked at the Plan that way, with my imagination. And I raised a number of questions. I haven't heard any answers yet. I understand that may be forthcoming. So my imagination is still scaring me.

One of the things that has come out in the meantime, in the last few weeks, has been the GAO report that's been noted here by a couple of other speakers, that suggests that if you read between the lines if the Trust were to pursue this aggressive financial policy, that they would be awash in money. In fact, excess revenues would start to become a concern.

I still have some other questions. And I guess I wonder how is it that a federal agency like the Presidio Trust should continue to have -- as we know from the pickets that have been out at various public meetings and so on, and information that's been distributed -- how

the Presidio Trust as a government agency should have such a problem with labor issues with its union?

I'd also like to know -- the question I asked, I think it was back at the GGNRA meeting -- what is the 10 million dollars in the annual budget for Fort Scott? What's it going to be used for? That seems like an awful lot of money. Now, I don't imagine that you would write me a blank check so I'm wondering why I should write you a blank check, or at least approve of the blank check that you seem to be writing. I don't believe -- from staffers, I understand that there is at this point no one in charge of educational programs on the staff. So I guess it's a pretty blank check, if you ask me.

Also, as you heard, the 115-room lodging facility that will be located in the Crissy Field area -- it seems books involved -- gives me pause.

A comment -- just a brief comment, again, on the financials and something that puzzles me, leading to a question as well. Newly-constructed buildings won't be major rent revenue generators for the

Trust. For example, the deal with Lucas works out to about \$5.50 a square foot -- whereas if you're renting out rehabilitated buildings you're getting a whole lot more than that, even from the non-profits. So in fact, these land grants are not going to be major generators. And I wonder why that is and who really benefits from that.

Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you for your questions, Mr. Zier.

Vincent Badia, followed by Paul Okamoto, and then Michael Alexander.

Vincent Badia: Good evening. I think my mother would have liked to have had those cards and that bell when we were growing up -- although she had six kids, so I don't think she had enough arms to have done it.

But anyway, I'm new coming into this process and I really like the meeting. I made up an initiative called the Garden Party Initiative, which I'm going to mail in this week. I wanted to have the high

school students be involved in the Presidio. Any further details that I am going to talk about might not all be practical.

The crux of the idea is to set aside some land that high school students can landscape and garden. I think introducing some competition into it would create a better result -- for instance, taking the high schools and dividing them into north, south, east and west and the north high schools get a certain area, etc.

I called it the Garden Party Initiative because there would be some type of judging and competition maybe around this time of the year and the one that was the best would get more money and they could spend it on a party the following April before their prom or something like that. And the other three would get pretty much money, but the one that did the best or was the most creative would get the most.

I have all kinds of ideas in here and I'm not so naïve to think that even if the idea -- if you were interested in it that these ideas would really be a part of it. But the general crux of the idea is to set aside

in the landscaping part some area for the high school students, get them involved, get some faculty coordinators involved, get some experienced horticulturists and gardeners -- people that own gardening businesses, perhaps -- to advise them and come up with something beautiful.

This would also, if it were successful, bring the demographic age of people coming into the Presidio -- make it younger, which would be good. You know, everyone has money -- including young people. And I know that the park has to be self-sufficient by a certain year. I am just sort of reading in the paper -- this is my first meeting here, not my first political meeting.

But anyway, that's about it. Just get kids involved and I think it would help the overall vision of the Presidio. Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you for your idea, Mr. Badia. Paul Okamoto, followed by Michael Alexander and lastly somebody's name -- very uncommon to me. I think it's David Lindfors. Doris Lindfors -- sorry.

Paul Okamoto: Thank you. My name is Paul Okamoto. I'm an architect planner and a resident of San Francisco. And I am here to support the Implementation Plan.

I've been following this process since the early '90s and we've been making similar recommendations over those years. We would also like to expand on some of the development recommendations and I'd like to outline four expansions.

One would be first expand the open space in the South Hills district. We think the Washington Boulevard non-historic housing units are the most inaccessible and transient, and we believe that area would be better served as being restored to open space and wildlife.

Two, expand the open space in the non-historic housing in the East Housing district for the same reason -- to increase bio-diversity and remove inaccessible housing.

Three, to take those removed housing units and relocate those to the Main Post and Letterman mixed-use community areas -- in this

case, following the Historic Landmark District Guidelines but also trying to increase the mixed-use diversity within those developed areas.

And four, increase the job/housing balance in those mixed-use areas to achieve a goal of two-thirds, or sixty-six percent.

We believe by expanding on these four recommendations we can enhance a sustainable Plan revision for the Presidio. We can increase open space. We can increase the job/housing balance and, at the same time, increase pedestrian and public transportation access. And we believe by really using planning recommendations like these in the Presidio will enhance your vision and the Implementation Plan.

Thank you.

Michael Alexander: I had not planned to speak tonight, and I realized there was an issue that I felt was one that was worthy of being stated in public.

It involves the eastern portion of Crissy Field and the northern portion of the Tennessee Hollow area. Crissy Field -- the eastern portion in particular -- has some of the most complex issues and conflicting priorities of any area in the Presidio -- expanding the tidal marsh; restoring the Tennessee Hollow to the tidal marsh; providing for new growth that doesn't destroy the tidal marsh in connection with Tennessee Hollow or a number of historic buildings; provide for many more visitors; address cut-through traffic; address where cars park. And in light of that I have to say that last -- the other day, Saturday, was an absolutely magnificent day at the Presidio with activities everywhere and a feeling of activity and aliveness that I have not experienced on any day before at the Presidio.

But it had a problem. There was a two-block long backup of automobiles on Mason Street at 3:30 in the afternoon trying to exit the Presidio. The parking area -- east parking -- was completely full and cars were spilling out all over Mason Street and across Mason Street -- just as an example on you deal more aggressively with traffic issues in that area.

And finally, more broadly, how will this corner of the Park, which is next to the City, announce to the visitor that you're entering a national park? How will the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service of San Francisco County Transportation Authority, CalTrans and Highway Administration and a host of other agencies -- who all have interests, some of them conflicting and some of them coming from different directions -- coordinate their activities as this area develops?

My proposal is this: that the northern portion of Tennessee Hollow and the eastern portion of Crissy Field be designated as a special management zone, in the same way that the GMP designated the southwest corner of the Presidio as a special management zone, because of the complexity of the issues involved in the area.

Thank you.

John Pelka:

Thanks, Michael. As always, good comments.

And lastly -- and I'm sorry that I couldn't read your handwriting --

Doris Lindfors.

Doris Lindfors: Good evening. My name is Doris Lindfors. I'm here tonight as a San Francisco resident of almost fifty years and one who was at Presidio for the last thirty, even Lincoln Heights.

Although I am speaking as a private citizen, I am on the board of two environmental groups.

Partnering is the key word for the Park Service, and tonight I want to highlight the partnership of San Francisco and the Presidio Trust -- both now and in the vision of the PTIP. Revenue-producing facilities such as the ballfield; the YMCA with its gyms, swimming pool and tennis courts -- including the many programs for adults and children; the golf course, which previously was not open to the general public; and the four childcare centers, among them the San Francisco Unified School District and the Jewish Community Center -- although I am not representing anyone, I would wager that if I questioned the parents at childcare centers in the Y, ninety-five

percent of them would support this Plan. Not many national parks can offer local residents such opportunities.

When I worked on the local coastal plan at Stinson Beach, I remembered GGNRA, using another key phrase -- "providing visitor-serving facilities." I am pleased to see the PTIP offer in their vision, eating and sleeping facilities, interpretive sites and related museums, such as immigration and aviation.

Although I have talked about the San Francisco Presidio partnership, I am cognizant that the Park is not our own private preserve. Coming home from the Presidio recently on the 45 Muni, I struck up a conversation with two tourists who had been to the Park and were extolling its wonders and its proximity to their downtown hotel. I thought -- their tax dollars as well as mine are paying for this park. And they are also generating much-needed tourism dollars for San Francisco. Their interests were not mine, but that's the beauty of the PTIP -- it meets the needs of all ages, backgrounds and abilities.

The big debate seems to be about buildings, where housing for Presidio employees looms large. I note that the PTIP has a net loss of square footage, mostly from the removing of non historic buildings. I certainly do not agree with the PTIP opponents who say reduce the duplexes to become fourplexes so more families can be squeezed in. If you are of moderate or low income, you should have less living space? The Presidio Trust has more humane programs, preferred rental programs with Presidio-based employees with modest incomes and affordability programs for housing subsidies for fire and safety personnel.

John Pelka: I think that concludes our speakers list.

Male voice: There's one more.

John Pelka: There's one more? Yes, Sir -- could you state your name and --?

Arthur Feinstein: Sure -- I'm Arthur Feinstein. I'm the Executive Director of the Golden Gate Audubon Society. And we've spoken previously at previous meetings about the omission of a commitment to complete

Crissy Field wetlands. We're sure that was just an oversight on your part, right? It just undermines the credibility of a national park to have a treasure like that and see it disappear -- which it will -- from the [consultant]. So I'm sure that in the next iteration we'll see a Crissy Field force completion of the Tennessee Hollow restoration.

Since we all really care about wildlife, as a national park you obviously care about wildlife. That's one of the reasons we have national parks. So we're not only concerned about Crissy Field/Tennessee Hollow but we're also concerned about the upland habitats. And we have a great opportunity to restore major elements of habitat if we are willing to take out things like East and West Washington Housing, along with the Wherry Housing. We're very pleased to see that you are proposing to remove Wherry Housing, but we think you need to also remove East and West Washington.

We are not sure that you need to commit yourself to a no net loss of housing. If you do, however, then I suggest -- and I really

appreciate the fellow who made comments on this -- if you need to keep your no net loss of housing and you take down the East and West Washington as we propose -- because it is really most appropriate for a national park to do so -- then any new housing you have to create should be placed in places that will have no other impacts on natural habitats. So putting them in like the Main Post and places like that where there are these existing constructions would be most appropriate. You'll still have to face the problem of the impacts of that housing, but at least it will be in terms of more water use, traffic and things like that. But at least you will not be destroying existing habitats.

So we just urge you, again -- Crissy Field. Don't forget -- you've heard it a million times so far. It must be getting through. And other habitats -- this is a national park. People come here to escape in many different ways, but getting back to nature is one of the major reasons that we have national parks. And it's one of the major reasons that people come to them. You have a great opportunity to restore natural habitats here.

That's it. Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Feinstein.

We have two more speakers, and then -- correct me if I'm wrong, if there are any more. We have Jules Levaggi and Charles Minster.

Jules Levaggi: I am a native San Franciscan, and I really feel you all are doing wonderful work in trying to present the Presidio as functional. And I am in agreement with a lot of things that you are planning but there is one concern that I did not hear. And that is the fact that I am concerned about the war that we're in, and I'm concerned -- to say postpone, maybe for five years, any economic change. We have a nice amount of [income] that are coming with the additional facilities. But what I'm trying to communicate here is that some nefarious people have said that the Golden Gate Bridge would be a great symbol to destroy, and the San Francisco Airport.

And so we may be needing it, at some future date, this Presidio to be used as an airport, or a certain portion of it. And I'm wanting

you to also factor in that there is a war going on and how can this land use also be protected?

Now, this was an oasis in the 1906 earthquake, and we may need it again. And I just hope you all can consider that. Thank you.

John Pelka: Thank you, Mr. Levaggi. And finally, Charles Minster.

Charles Minster: I'm Charles Minster. I represent the National Park Public Employees, Local 1141, that represents the maintenance and administrative staff here at the Presidio. I'm also an elected member on the negotiating committee and a delegate to the Labor Council of San Francisco.

First off, I would like to let the community, the environmental and neighborhood groups know that we continue to listen, sympathize and support many of your concerns and visions for the future of Presidio. And we look forward to working with you and bringing your ideas to different offices and facilities in San Francisco and the country.

We look at the Presidio and the development of the Presidio as something that the entire country has to look at because it affects the entire country. This can be a future of what's going to happen to national parks in this country. And we know the [planning] is a very dangerous precedent, some of the things that are occurring here.

Just [this] alone, we'll tell the general public that the Trust continues to deny collecting parking rates. You've denied our right to discuss any ways of hiring, firing, promotions. And this is in an organization that's got complete funding from you -- the taxpayer -- that all its capital investment was guaranteed by the National Park Service turning over equipment that they bought for them, including also some old Army equipment -- and I've been here about sixteen years.

And they don't pay any taxes today on anything. They don't pay any taxes to the City of San Francisco, the State of California or to the United States government. And yet they want complete and

free reign. So I think we have to look at the legislation that created this Presidio Trust. It could be a very big danger to the people of this country when it takes away rights that we have fought for and died for.

Concluding, just a simple thing -- on a former military installation when a veteran's privileges are denied him, something is called for. You know, really, guys died for -- and this trust still refuses to honor that. So remember that in all your dealings with this organization. They're not very friendly to the workers that are here. Basically they're hiring -- it's based on nepotism and favoritism, and promotion is based on your relationship with the supervision or personalities. So think about that and all your other stuff.

Thank you.

James Meadows: Are there any other speakers that were wanting to sign up that didn't get signed up?

Very well. I'd like to just add a personal comment, that through this process that we're just starting to wind down, the public comment process, through October 25<sup>th</sup> we received before tonight over 2,000 comments -- and excellent comments, again, this evening.

As you can tell, we get a variety of opinions that fall on both sides of the same discussion point. And so one of the difficulties, but also the enjoyment, is to be able to hear a lot of public input to help us inform our decision-making as we move forward with Presidio Trust Planning.

I'd like to thank everybody from all viewpoints for your input. I would like to encourage you, if you have not already done so, to make sure that your comments -- either those recorded this evening or followed up in writing -- are in by the 25<sup>th</sup> so that we can make them part of the administrative record of this planning process and accompanying Environmental Impact Statement.

On behalf of the Board of Directors and the staff, we really do value the input. And I think those of you who have been following this

closely -- and a lot of you are in this room -- your impact has already been felt and it will continue to be felt in the process. These things do evolve and the Plan has evolved thanks to the public input today.

Thank you for coming, and we will look forward to hopefully seeing a lot of you at our monthly planning processes. And that's November 6<sup>th</sup>, where we are going to be starting our next generation of planning. So thanks again.

[End meeting]