

Presidio Trust Meeting, 11.15.2000

Jane Blackstone: Good evening. We'll be getting started in just a few minutes if you'd like to migrate to the seats up front. Thanks very much.

I think we'll get started. Thank you very much for coming out on this rainy evening for this workshop. We really appreciate your participation in our Presidio Trust Implementation Plan process.

The subject of our workshop tonight is the discussion of a proposed vision and a range of conceptual alternatives for the future of Area B of the Presidio--that portion of the Presidio that's in the Trust's jurisdiction.

We'd like to start with a little refresher course for those of you who are new here or who have been away for some time about what PTIP, the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan, is. Present a proposed vision for the Presidio; look at a series of planning principles, and then a range of alternatives, alternatives that are to be studied in the upcoming environmental impact statement and plan document that will come out in the early part of 2001.

We'll break out then, take a little break, get a cup of coffee, and then distribute ourselves at a series of tables so that we can hear from you tonight about your reactions to what's presented this evening. And then allow you to come back and report, one reporter from each table, to the group as a whole, about what the discussion was at your table.

Starting first with the Presidio Trust. We're a relatively new federal agency established by the United States Congress in 1996. We have a seven-member board of directors that oversees our activities. And we're guided by the legislation that established us, the Presidio Trust Act. We're a unique agency with some unique mandates and unique authorities among other federal agencies.

The Presidio itself, under the Trust Act, has been divided into two jurisdictions. Area A is the coastal area of the Presidio. Its jurisdiction is managed by the National Park Service. And the Trust has jurisdiction over the interior portion of the Presidio, about 80 percent of the Presidio.

What's important to note is that while the Trust Act sets out this boundary between the jurisdictional areas, it's intended to be seamless. The Park Service and the Presidio Trust work together on a whole series of projects. Open space and interpretive and visitor activities are certainly among the subjects that we work together most closely on.

PTIP--what is the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan? After ten years, the General Management Plan Amendment developed by the National Park Service for the management of the Presidio after its long life as a military installation has become dated. We're looking now to updating the view of the future for the Presidio, now that we're in the year 2000 and moving ahead under the new mandates and opportunities that the Trust has.

The General Management Plan itself is a very conceptual document. It presents a framework for the future of the Presidio, and provides some programmatic direction and concepts by planning area for how the Presidio will transform from post to park.

The Presidio Trust Implementation Plan applies only to Area B of the Presidio--that interior portion of the Presidio. It's a very focused plan. It will only update some aspects of the General Management Plan. It does not change that plan for Area A. The General Management Plan Amendment remains the plan for the coastal areas of the Presidio under the jurisdiction of the Park Service.

What it does to is consider some change circumstances, not the least of which is the Presidio Trust itself. A mandate of financial self-sufficiency and change circumstances, like the 6th Army no longer being here at the Presidio.

It is intended to be a programmatic level plan, meaning we're not going to see building by building proposals for reuse. We'll see very broad concepts for how areas of the Presidio might be reused in the future.

Those portions of the General Management Plan Amendment that remain in place have mostly to do with natural resource preservation,

sustainability, environmental sustainability, and cultural resource protection, the protection of the historic resources of the Presidio.

The update that we are here to talk about this evening will focus on programs that serve park visitors, housing, other visitor amenities such as lodging and transportation.

This is a plan that's done under the auspices of the National Environmental Policy Act. As a federal agency, we must study a range of alternatives before we take action. So there will be a draft environmental impact statement that comes out on the alternatives that we discuss tonight, and on a new, preferred alternative that will actually be developed as a result of this scoping process. That environmental impact statement, and the study of various topics, will help inform a final decision after you've all had an opportunity to review that document and comment on it.

Our process to date began in July with a scoping workshop. We had a second workshop in September, and are now at November 15th,

the last of a series of three workshops at which we're presenting proposed study topics.

Our process has changed a little bit, perhaps, since some of you were last here. It has been lengthened. The timeline on the bottom of this slide shows a completion date of June for this. We received a number of public requests to extend a scoping period; hence we have a fifteen-month process now, ending roughly in September with publication of the draft EIS in the March time frame.

The subjects which we've covered already and which are available for you to review on our Web site, at our library, or on request through a series of documents and notes from these past meetings are planning principles, a real in-depth overview of the change circumstances that we're studying; financial concepts, how a financial self-sufficiency mandate really needs to be reflected realistically in any view of the future; and then tonight, vision and conceptual alternatives, what we will study in this PTIP process.

Again, our scoping period has been extended to January 15, 2001.

We'll have a whole lot of materials for you to take away tonight.

And we hope that you study them and react and respond to them and provide input to us by January 15, 2001 so that input can be incorporated into the draft EIS and plan.

Once PTIP is done, there will be more site-specific work. You'll see tonight that the alternatives proposed for study are quite general.

They propose very broad concepts. We still have a lot of work to do after PTIP to put those concepts into realization on the ground. So you'll see site-specific planning, and you may see additional formal environmental analysis. An example might be the main post--a site plan for how the buildings and their new uses hang together there with the transportation program, circulation and so forth. Or in a natural area, something like the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor restoration plan, another example of a site-specific plan and study.

Once again, there is no preferred plan at this time. You'll see a range of alternatives tonight. We're not here to vote on those alternatives but rather to get some information that will help the

Trust develop a proposed preferred plan for the Presidio for you to react to and respond to in March, when the draft environmental impact statement and plan comes out.

So we look forward to your ideas, not only about the alternatives that are presented tonight, but what your ideal combination of those alternatives might be.

Talk a little bit about the framework in which we're planning. At the top of this slide, the Presidio Trust Act. We, of course, need to conduct all of our planning activities subject to the mandate of that law and the proposed intent of that law, to preserve and protect the Presidio as part of the national park system.

From the Act we have a vision that certainly responds to the mandate and the intent, a series of planning principles to guide our work. And then the conceptual alternatives that ultimately become one preferred alternative, and an adopted plan for the Presidio.

Vision derived from the General Management Plan Amendment.

We haven't lost much of the background and vision for the future that came out of a very long planning process that many of you here participated in. The vision here has just been updated to reflect the Presidio Trust itself, and the requirements of the Trust Act changed circumstances and so forth.

It sets forth a really overarching and broad view of the future of Area B, and it would apply to any of the alternatives, with one exception.

The General Management Plan Amendment alternative that we'll describe to you later would still be governed by the vision that is contained in that 1994 General Management Plan Amendment.

The vision for the Presidio. It's in writing in the workbook materials that you'll receive later this evening. I encourage you to look at it. It is a proposed vision. It sets forth an idea for a park that has resource preservation as a core goal; that envisions a dynamic community of tenants, residents and visitors that is an inclusive global center dedicated to excellence and innovation across a whole range of subject areas.

We also see a diverse Presidio, a place where there are a number of different kinds of programs responding to the diversity of visitors that will come to the Presidio over our future years.

The vision translates into a series of planning principles that are a little bit more specific. And [they are right] around the room here. I hope during the break you have an opportunity to go and look at them. They've changed a little bit since you first saw them in July. We took your scoping comments and incorporated them into a revised set of principles. They're still draft. We still look forward to your input.

These principles apply to all alternatives studied, again, except what we're calling "no action" or a continuation of the General Management Plan Amendment, which of course would be guided by the principles contained in it.

These principles cover a whole range of subject areas. I won't read them all, but clearly resource preservation is very key, and

overarching concepts and principles like transportation, environmental sustainability, and of course financial sustainability as well.

The alternatives that you'll see this evening have, of course, an ultimate goal of meeting the Presidio Trust mission and purpose as Congress has set forth to us. But they also are intended to study a broad range of potential options for the Presidio. So they purposely are arrayed across a whole series of subjects with different levels of intensity. And what we would like to hear tonight is, is this the proper range to study? Have we missed any items that ought to be studied in the draft environmental impact statement?

And then ultimately, we arrive at the preferred alternative. I noted before, the end result of this is really a single plan that incorporates the best elements of the alternatives you see together tonight.

I'd like to introduce Carey Feierabend, who's the planning manager for the Trust. She'll take you through the conceptual alternatives that have been arrayed for you tonight.

Carey Feierabend: Thank you and good evening. First off, to let you know, Jane mentioned that there is the context of the General Management Plan Amendment completed in 1994, which really set forward some actions which have already been implemented--projects that are very important projects for resource preservation and enhancement.

Those projects that have been implemented would carry forward, as well as those which are currently under development right now will carry forward. I'd like to mention that many of those projects are in collaboration with the National Park Service, especially for several open space project areas and natural resource enhancement projects.

In addition, there's several actions that were identified in the General Management Plan, such as the restoration of the main parade ground, that with additional public comment and work that we've done, we know that we would like to carry forward into the future and continue to do. Those will become some of our planning givens.

In addition, there are some specific projects which we will also consider as givens. These include the vegetation management plan, which is coming to completion and will be moving into an implementation phase this next year; and the Presidio-wide trails and bike ways master plan, which is a project under way in collaboration with the National Park Service. And we should have a draft plan coming out this spring as well. The Mountain Lake enhancement plan, which is currently out for review right now in public comments. And we plan to move into implementation this next year.

In addition, there's the environmental remediation program, which is currently under way and will be so for the next several years. It's a tri-partied agreement between the Park Service, the Trust and the Army.

There are also long-term leases which are in place, and those would stay in place. In addition, there's a very important planning project currently under way, the Doyle Drive reconstruction planning. And

that will be going on over the next year. There's certain assumptions about that project that will carry forward.

In addition, there's also the Letterman Digital Arts Center at the Letterman complex, a 23-acre site, which an environmental impact statement was prepared for, and that project will be moving forward as well.

So you can start to see that there are a lot of givens already under way here at the Presidio. So what will we be studying? Some of the key topics that we need to get into will be addressed in the environmental impact statement. I know that there are many issues and questions about what will happen with traffic and transportation, as an example. Well, that technical study will occur in the EIS. It will study the potential environmental consequences, and a lot of the topic areas that we will study will come from you. We've listed out some projects or topic areas that we need to look at. And we'd like to hear tonight, are we missing anything? So that's an important question we want to hear from you tonight, as well as through January 15th.

Some of the topics we've identified include things such as the regional economy, native plants and wildlife, noise, the recreational resources, energy, and the financial analysis, which we will get into a little bit later this evening. Again, we want to know are we missing any key topics that need to be studied?

There are tonight presented five conceptual alternatives for purposes of the scoping period under NEPA. The five topics or the five conceptual alternatives are in existing conditions: a GMPA 2000 no action, a resource consolidation, sustainable community in a national park, and a national and international cultural destination. These are arrayed in the back of the room this evening for you to take a look at. And we will also be handing out a workbook at the end of the evening that you can take home that include maps and information about each of these alternatives.

With regard to the existing conditions alternative, this would be maintaining the Presidio as you see it today, with very little change.

There would be no new construction, no additional demolition,

except for the Letterman Digital Center moving forward. And it would basically be the status quo.

The fiscal year of 2013, the revenues that would be generated would meet our expenses without additional congressional appropriations. Some of the highlights of this alternative is that it would maintain the 5 million square feet area that we have today.

As I mentioned, there would be no new construction and no building demolition. Buildings would be rehabilitated and leased. And the housing--one important aspect is the housing--the Baker Beach Apartments would be retained. So there would be no demolition of housing, and existing housing would stay in place.

There would be no significant park enhancements, as I mentioned, and very little public programming beyond what currently exists.

As far as the build square footage, as I mentioned, it would stay at where we are today, which is 5.96 million square feet. The housing would stay as it is today, with a total of approximately 1,600 units,

that includes apartments as well as dorm rooms. And open space would stay as it is today, with the exception of the seven acres of open space being added at the Letterman site, with the Letterman Digital Arts center.

Alternative A, the GMPA 2000 no action. This would maintain the vision that's set forth in the General Management Plan for developing a center for research and learning, to house tenants whose mission really centers on solutions to the world's most critical environmental, social and cultural problems that we face today.

Under this alternative, we know that financial self-sufficiency would not be achieved, that the revenues that would be generated in 2013 would not be sufficient enough to go without congressional appropriations.

Some of the highlights under this alternative are that would have an end result of 5.01 million square feet. There would be a fair amount of demolition with some new construction. It would take all of the events and changes which have occurred up till now, and those

would be givens. And it would continue forward with implementing the General Management Plan as it is outlined in that plan and detailed in that plan.

The housing would be significantly reduced. There would be a moderate level of visitor amenities provided. Tenants would provide the programs, the public programming related to their mission as well as Presidio themes.

As I mentioned, under this alternative the net result would be approximately 5 million square feet. The residential units totaled would be about a thousand units. And there would be a net increase in 100 acres of open space. And again, these are statistics only for Area B that are being presented tonight. The General Management Plan Amendment would continue to apply to Area A of the Presidio under the Park Service jurisdiction.

Alternative B, called this resource consolidation. What do we mean? This means that the major gesture here would be significant demolition in the southern portion of the Presidio to really enhance

open space and concentrate development in the northern portion of the Presidio. It would be an open space haven in an urban setting, really emphasizing resource preservation, both cultural and natural, as well as recreational.

We know that under this alternative the revenues would cover our expenses without congressional appropriations in 2013.

Some of the highlights of this alternative is approximately 5.3 million square feet in the end. It would have the highest level of demolition. Again, the major gesture--now have the map up--as you can see, the large green space in the lower half of the Presidio where there would be significant demolition of existing housing as well as the public health service hospital complex.

There would be a fair amount of new construction, mostly in fill construction in the northern portion to make up for some of the housing which has been demolished. And the focus, again, would be on the resource preservation and enhancement of the park setting.

The end result: 5.3 million square feet, approximately a thousand residential units, and a net increase of 160 acres of open space.

Alternative C. A sustainable community within a national park.

Under this scenario the emphasis would be on establishing a live/work community in a park setting for those who are living here, work here and support development of public programs related to park-wide interests. In FY 2013--FY being fiscal year--our revenues would cover the expenses without congressional appropriations.

The result under this one would be a 5.7 million square foot scenario. There would be a low level of demolition and an emphasis of reuse of existing structures, keeping with the theme of sustainable community--to really convert buildings to accommodate additional housing units and additional or new uses.

There would be some new construction to provide some additional housing, in fill construction. And the emphasis would really be on the live/work community established here. There would be a moderate level of programming provided for visitors and tenants.

Again, the result is a 5 million square foot result with approximately

1,500 units of housing--a combination, once again, of dorm rooms and houses and apartments. And there would be a net increase of 80 acres of open space within Area B.

Lastly, alternative D, a national and international cultural destination. Under this scenario the Presidio would become a destination park for both national as well as international visitors--really a portal for visitors to the American West and the Pacific. It would be a center for education, communication and exchange.

We know that under this scenario it would present the strongest financial result of all of the action alternatives, and again, would meet our expenses without additional congressional appropriations in 2013.

Some of the highlights under this scenario: it would be a 5.96 million square foot result, which is what we have here today.

However, there would be a fair amount of demolition and replacement construction. There would be a lower level of housing between the alternatives--not as low as the General Management

Plan 2000 no action. And there would be more lodging than in other alternatives.

The focus, again, would really be on the premium visitor program and facilities--the net result, again, 5.96 million square feet, total residential units around 900 units as a total, and a net increase of 95 acres of open space.

Once again, the preferred alternative is not determined at this point in time. And this is why we want to hear from you tonight about specific elements of each of these alternatives. What do you like? What don't you like? What should be considered a preferred alternative? Are there additional impact topics that we need to look at tonight? I want you all to read this very closely.

[laughter]

Take a mental note. This is a spreadsheet which is included in the workbook that you will get this evening. And it will raise each of

the alternatives side by side so you can start to see the differences--
the similarities and the differences.

At this point, I would like to introduce Jim Meadows, who is our
Executive Director for the Presidio Trust, to describe the financial
analysis.

Jim Meadows: As Carey mentioned, there's a lot of numbers being thrown up here.
Everything that you've seen on a slide so far, and everything that you
will see, is in the workbook that you'll be presented this evening, that
you can take home with you, and hopefully, that you'll be able to
pore over, if you need a good reason to fall asleep at night, basically,
to take a read. It's very long, it's very detailed, and it also provides a
basis for how we're moving forward.

The financial impact of each of these alternatives is one of the key
questions that we had to anticipate that if we didn't ask ourselves
we'd be asked by you this evening and asked to evaluate. It basically
has to first demonstrate that the plan alternatives meet the financial
self-sufficiency mandate where no more federal appropriations will

come to the Trust as of FY 2013. It also studies the long-term financial sustainability. And those are two different terms, and I will try to go into that a little bit this evening.

It adjusts for the assumption changes from 1994 to reflect change circumstances, financially the most important of which is that the 1994 GMPA contemplated a continuing congressional appropriation of anywhere from 13 to 17 million dollars on into the foreseeable future.

Each alternative will be analyzed for its long-term financial impact on both self-sufficiency and self-sustainability. Analysis shows the relationship between finances, self-sufficiency and long-term financial sustainability.

Basically, you're looking at, as simply as it can be put, that the revenues minus the cost equals the financial impact--the cost of operation of the park subtracted from the revenues supported by the park. That's either in a deficit, that's either a break even or a financial surplus.

That cash flow, the financial effect will determine how much of a program that there is in the Presidio as this national park. The components of the financial model are obviously revenues generated operating expenses, program costs.

Basically, we have not taken the assumption in the GMPA that programs are all paid for by the tenants. But there's a certain level of programming that is basic to this place as a national park in an urban area, and there's a larger amount of programming that we would like to see at the park, and we'd like your comment of which of those programs you'd like to see at the park.

The financing costs. We have the authority from Congress to basically borrow \$50 million. It is not interest-free. Guess what? We basically are borrowing from the federal government, we have to pay back the federal government, and the financing costs are included as a cost to operation.

The capital costs. Depending upon the alternative, and how much new construction, and how much rehab construction there is of historic buildings, there's between 400 and 600 million dollars that basically is required in capital costs to make the Presidio financially self-sustainable as we move forward.

And then capital replacement funds. You've heard this talk over and over again, but as of FY 2013 we do not have any more federal appropriations. We do not have taxing authority. So in addition to basically finding monies for the operations, which all these alternatives do, we have to find monies for the replacement of buildings, or the replacements of tenant improvements inside of the buildings; replacement of roads and water systems; and even replacement of trees, grass and plants, as they reach their lives.

And then finally, basically, is the analysis of how all these funds interrelate. The assumptions, basically the methodology we used is the same for all alternatives. So you can look from one alternative to the other and know that you're looking at the same methodology.

Conservative financial planning principles. We're in a red hot real estate market--probably, as noted nationally in the newspapers, the hottest market in the United States. Five years ago, we were in a doldrums market that basically was in the national newspapers as one of the doldrums areas in the United States. So we cannot do a financial plan based simply upon today's red hot market. We've applied the principle of conservatism, and basically we're taking a five-year average, and taking our revenues to make sure we don't overestimate our surpluses and underestimate our costs.

We've put together a 20-year model, basically, from the year 2000 to the year 2020. Every financial assumption that underlies that model you will have to take with you this evening. What was the basis for rents for office space? What's the basis for our rents for housing? What was the basis for our costs of operation?

And then on or before December 15th, we will provide the detail spreadsheets for the entire 20-year model. Basically, you'll have it available to you to take a look at as you wish. I guarantee you that if

you're not a numbers person that just loves to delve into something like that, it will put you to sleep if the PTIP plan did not.

The 20-year model also has a snapshot, and in the analysis you see this evening is a 2013 snapshot. That's basically 12 years into the plan. Why? Because that is our mandate. That's the legislation that says we will be financially self-sufficient by the year 2013.

And then we go into estimates, because in some cases financial self-sufficiency, which I'm going to define here in a moment, does not happen until well after 2013.

This is a financial analysis snapshot just showing basically how this plan moves forward. It shows total revenues, and basically in some cases we have a short cash surplus from one year to the next. That's total revenues less operation expenses, less program costs, less financing costs, which gives you a line item and says, "Cash available for capital expenditures." What does that mean? Basically that means simply that's the money we have available to expend on all the capital improvements that we have to do at the Presidio

including the using of our Treasury borrowing because that's factored into our revenues.

And then because we're spending everything we can to bring all the buildings to financial self-sufficiency, meaning they're all in current code condition, the net cash flow after those capital costs will be zero in each year.

The cash available for capital replacement fund contribution, basically meaning those reserves for future building, is zero for the first 20 plus years of operation. The reason for that is we're putting all the available excess cash that we have into bringing the buildings, these historic buildings, these culturally, historic portions of the Presidio, back into code and back into a current condition where they can be maintained.

In this case basically we're showing example of a total capital investment of \$621 million. And roughly half of that will be able to be expended by the year 2013. And from 2013 forward, we still have roughly half to spend towards financial self-sufficiency.

Let me go back and discuss that for a moment because I've confused myself in the process. Basically, financial self-sustainability, we're required by Congress to be able to operate the Presidio without further appropriations by the year 2013. In every alternative we're studying, every action alternative, we do meet that financial self-sufficiency by the year 2013. That means the cash we receive in will pay for all the operations and the programs, the basic level of programming that we're moving forward.

What each alternative will show you is that basically on a variety of degrees each alternative will, on a faster or slower pace, build out all the capital improvements of each and every building, historic building, at the Presidio, or building that's to stay.

That, in some cases, will occur as late as 2035 to 2040. That's one additional item of self-sufficiency. The second item is self-sustainability. The second item is basically that we have to create these reserves. And once the buildings are brought in, the infrastructure is brought to pristine condition, we have to put in

monies in a sinking fund to allow for the replacement over 20-year life in some cases, 65-year life, even 75-year life of some buildings. And so we have to retain those additional items.

Now, the Presidio programs are basically essential to the Presidio's success. The Trust feels it's very important that Presidio programs basically are part of the Presidio's future. You're here tonight to tell us which of those programs, how many of those programs, and how they should be part of the Presidio's future in your opinion. Those include but are not limited to museums, educational and learning centers, special events and activities, and hands-on demonstrations.

The National Park Service will have a key role in the interpretive functions in the Presidio, and the Presidio Trust will be working with the National Park Service.

The tenants are the means to programs versus tenants are the programs. The tenants will help us in putting these programs together, but they're not the key ingredient.

The key variables between the alternatives are, as Jane and Carey mentioned, the square footage of buildings that remain at the Presidio upon completion, the amount of open space that remains at the Presidio and the location of that open space, and the amount of housing and the type of housing that will remain at the Presidio.

Financial self-sufficiency. Basically, we will reach where our revenues exceed our costs of operation by the year 2013. But how fast do we take the buildings and improve all the remaining buildings? How fast do we create reserves for future replacement? That is a studied alternative or studied impact of the various alternatives.

Just to review what Carey pointed out to you, basically the existing conditions, where we are today, plus the idea of the Letterman Digital Arts Center moving forward is where we were before, it's 5.96 million square feet, roughly 6 million square feet where we are today.

Alternative A, which is the GMPA 2000--meaning full implementation of the General Management Plan Amendment plus what is already in existence--would reduce that square footage to 5 million square feet. And then the various action alternatives B, C and D are a wide variety of square footages between 5.3 and 6 million square feet.

The open space, again, the existing conditions--where we are today in Area B only. If you're trying to add up the numbers to 1,480 acres, you don't get there because we're talking about Area B only. 702 acres in the existing conditions, and ranging between 775 and 855 acres in the action alternatives in the GMPA 2000 alternative.

Total housing units--how do they vary? The existing conditions today, a combination of housing units and dormitory units that can be converted, or single room occupancy units, we have 1,654 units. The alternatives range from 918 to 1,449 units as we move forward.

Financial self-sustainability. The GMPA 2000 alternative, meaning the original General Management Plan Amendment plus what has

been leased to date within the Presidio Trust, will not meet the financial self-sustainability that is required by Congress by the year 2013.

All the other alternatives that we're studying do meet that initial cash flow requirement by Congress that we seek no more federal funding.

In a variety of degrees they meet or don't meet the concept of building all buildings, putting them into a pristine nature, and also creating reserves for capital improvements.

Again, the capital improvements, over time, under existing conditions, let me point out something. We did not study this to try to raise an issue that is already in most of your minds and been settled. But existing conditions, there's one key element that you must understand what is existing is existing. And that is Wherry Housing or Baker Beach Apartments under that alternative, basically, or that existing condition would remain. That's why you achieve capital improvements, self-sufficiency much faster, because you have those monies available well into the future, when

otherwise, all the other alternatives study Wherry Housing being taken down as being put into the GMPA alternative.

Capital improvements. The GMPA alternative never reaches steady state of improving all the buildings at the Presidio. The other three alternatives, it ranges between 2030 and 2040.

Funding of capital replacement fund. Reserves for future construction at the Presidio to replace buildings and infrastructure, as well as natural areas, trees and grass and plants. Basically the existing conditions reaches that steady state in 2021. The GMPA never reaches there. And the others, between 2040 and 2050.

So basically, the question that I'd be asking--and I've been through these slides maybe a dozen times now. If I were seeing them for the first time, and as I was going home to look in my workbook: wait a minute, I thought the Trust had to be self-sufficient by the year 2013.

The Trust Act basically does call out, and the Trust is studying and will mandate that we achieve, at 2013, that we can operate the Presidio without receiving any more federal funding as of that date.

Depending upon the alternative selected, and the alternative drawn-- actually, because we're not choosing. This is not a contest of let's choose D, let's choose B, let's choose C. We're drawing an alternative. And we want your input tonight to that. But depending upon that final preferred alternative, the timetable for reaching where every building is completed to capital improvements completed and a reserve put in place will vary from ten to twenty years.

So now we're going to go back to basically talking about scoping questions for tonight, and how we're going to proceed from here forward. So I'll turn it back over to Jane.

Jane Blackstone: Thank you. At the breakout tables, which we'll get to in just a few minutes, we'd like to ask you to react to these alternatives. Help us a little bit with your response to, is this the right range of alternatives? Are there other subjects that should be studied? What's the ideal alternative from your perspective? How might some of the concepts presented be recombined into a new alternative?

And then certainly the impact topics that are to be studied in the draft EIS. You saw them earlier and they're listed in your workbook, too: transportation impacts, air quality, et cetera. Do we have the right range of study topics in front of us so that the draft EIS that is published really responds to all of the anticipated questions that you'll have about these alternatives?

So again, we'll break out. We look forward to hearing your comments this evening. But we will have this workbook available for you to take away. Because there's so much material it needs some digestion. We look forward to receiving your comments subsequent to this meeting. But please, before January 15, 2001.

There are a number of ways that you can provide your comments. There's actually a pull-out in this workbook that you can mark up, bold, stamp and send back to us. You certainly can email your comments to us: ptip@presidiotrust.gov. And we do have a fax, 561-5315. Any way is good. Please address your comments, though, to PTIP. And John Pelka is our National Environmental

Policy Act coordinator. He'll be sure that all those comments are maintained and tracked for this PTIP planning process.

We'll break out now and look at the alternatives, discuss them together. We'll have staff and consultants available to answer any clarifying questions, just understanding what's presented to you this evening. But mostly we're here tonight to hear from you. We don't have answers to all the questions tonight. A lot of the answers will come out in the draft EIS and the analysis within that document.

We would like to ask the tables to report back. I think that's important so everyone can understand what was happening at the table around the corner, where you weren't able to sit there and hear that discussion. And typically, there's a different focus depending on the range of people sitting at a given table. So we hope you stay with us to hear that feedback from your fellow members of the public.

I would like to close by noting that although our next opportunity for a public meeting on this subject will be at the publication of the draft

EIS in March, we will continue to have workshops on other subjects that are ongoing.

In January, we're planning a workshop around the vegetation management plan, the pilot programs, projects that are on the work program for 2001. We know there's a lot of curiosity about the range of projects you see out there on the ground. We'd like to present them all at once for your information and for your feedback.

And then we have the trails and bikeways plan that is pending. That is a likely topic for February workshop.

I think we'll go back to our second Wednesday of the month format. We're reserving venues for those meetings. And we'll keep you posted through the Presidio Post.

While our time is a little bit limited, and I want to get back to tables, we can take a few minutes to answer any general questions just to clarify what might have been presented tonight. But then there will be lots of opportunities to continue that dialog at the tables. We'll

have resource people floating around. So can I take any initial questions? Clarifying questions? Yes?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: The projected operating expense as of our snapshot date of 2013 basically as put on here is roughly \$44 million. I would point out, I jumped right into that, but the idea of this particular time period is to answer technical questions or confusions you might have about the presentation so far. We're not going to get into substantive Q and A as far as specific comments because we want everybody to have the opportunity to share, not just the people that are here tonight. But we're mailing out the same workbook to our entire mailing list of approximately 8,000 people. So this is a scoping session. It's for comments, primarily.

And the current questions--Patricia, I see your hand. The current question and answer session is to clarify items on the presentation that you might not have understood. Patricia?

Patricia: The one thing that I'm going to ask you is three of the four of your alternatives, have the majority of development on the north end of the Presidio. I'm seriously questioning this for the sheer factors that currently Lombard Street, as of last week, was 102 percent over maximum capacity. And we've got a real parking and traffic problem in that area. Have you considered spreading this out to alleviate some of the transportation element problems in the long run?

Jim Meadows: Thank you for your question. In general, in clarification, what I want to point out again, these alternatives are for a range of study. And basically, what we're asking before we study a preferred alternative, we want your input tonight to take a look at just those facts.

Should more development be in the northeast? Should there be a southwest component? Should there be more development along the areas closest to the beach front? Or should it be consolidated? How much should be in the main post?

We're looking for your input as to those alternatives. Please, please, please don't take this as a voting measure, and there's no dimple ballots and there's not half-torn chads, and there's no three-quarter chads on this. We're not voting on A, B, C or D. We're saying, here's a range of alternatives that are either existing or basically looking to what possibly could happen. Now you tell us, basically, what your concepts are for that range of alternatives. Whitney?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: Because you're very closely aligned with one of our public facilities, one of our best public facilities, which is in Area A, I would say that you're 95 percent right. It talks about all of the public facilities in Area B only. What is very definite is that the programming, basically that you saw on numbers, are the programs that we're asking you to analyze this evening. That's one of the questions.

All the funds for those programs basically come from the operations budget of the Presidio as it moves forward. The total operations, and that's not just the cost of maintenance, but basically the cost of

programs. We believe there's a minimum level of programming, and we believe there is an optimum level of programming. We're asking you to tell us what's the optimal level of programming. Yes, sir, here on the aisle?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: Well, the clarification here, and the clarification is a good point. Go back to our planning principles and go back to our mission. Our mission is protection and preservation of the natural, cultural, historic and recreational resources of the Presidio.

The natural resources of the Presidio, the open space, is a given. We also have a mandate of things that are not disturbed today will remain not disturbed. And so there is no implied idea within any range of alternatives being studied that we are going to discount the natural or the cultural because we also have historic preservation to deal with as well as the natural elements of this particular national park.

This is a unique park. It's one of the few parks that has the historic cultural component as strong as the natural component. And we have to balance both of those. But there is nothing in either the title or in the study that talks about either ignoring or reducing basically the natural resources and not equally protecting them. Yes, sir?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: No, sir. Again, for clarification, the question, if everyone couldn't hear, is is the national park-managed area, Area A, that funded out of the Presidio Trust funds? And that is not funded out of the Presidio Trust funds, that's out of the Department of Interior budget as part of GGNRA budget.

Jane made a very good point early on. Most of our programs are seamless, and there's very little difference between a program that might have the building in Area A and most of the activity in Area B. You can't draw a fine line there, paint a white line on the road and say that basically this is going to be.

But the programs are primarily Presidio-wide. There will be some programs that are specific to Area A. The Crissy Field programs, Fort Point is another program area. But the transportation impacts of those programs will fall into Area B as well as Area A. So we certainly take those into account.

And again, I'm trying to hold these to clarification questions. I think they're excellent questions so far, but I'd like to have you all stick to those questions. In the back. Yes, ma'am.

Female voice: I just thought it would be helpful if you clarified the color coding on the plans for everyone who might not be familiar with what they are.

Jim Meadows: That is in the workbooks, and basically rather than trying to pull back up, try to remember it's something you can't see anymore. I would suggest it's a quite comprehensive workbook. And basically, and by the way, I'm very proud of the amount of work that staff has put together on this. They're still a little warm, the ink is still a little wet. They were working right up to the last minute to make sure that everything was as accurate, as complete as possible. But

basically there's a very comprehensive book. It has, again, there's an appendix that shows the financial conclusions that we've reached as far as the impacts. It also shows the financial assumptions that went together to make those conclusions. Then we will be producing, at our library and upon request, basically the detail spreadsheets that follow that for the entire 20 years on or before December 15. Ron?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: Absolutely. I don't think we can say that enough. We tried to basically, the idea of showing a blank screen for the preferred alternative. We anticipate that basically it will choose the best elements of each of the studied alternatives. But we're required by law to basically study a range of alternatives, as well as a preferred alternative. That preferred alternative, we hope, with your public input, will not be any one of the alternatives that's listed up there tonight, but will be some composite of what those alternatives bring. The best elements that each of them bring to the table.

They have different things that they study, and different emphasis.

Yes, sir?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: Absolutely. The question is, can you bring to the table portions that are not in the alternatives? That's what scoping is all about. We hope that you will bring new ideas, fresh ideas, say, where we've come up short. We'd also like a pat on the back where you think we've hit the mark. But basically new ideas is what scoping is about and that's to bring new ideas to the table. Yes, sir?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: Actually study both. The question is, will the traffic impact study be just alternative to alternative within the Presidio? Or will it study the larger area of San Francisco?

We're not carrying forward to the entire city. But it will study the impacts of the surrounding areas of San Francisco and how they're impacted by the Presidio. Yes, sir?

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: Again, for clarification, the question becomes as far as sustainability, that there seems to be a bias. If I understood the question correctly, again sustainability. Let me correct and clarify that, again, just like I did on the natural area and open space.

On a daily basis, on a yearly basis, the Trust is practicing, it's projecting, it's producing sustainable projects, and one of our key elements is sustainability--one of which is financial sustainability but the other of which is sustainability for future generations.

There is no intent, and I think when you read carefully the alternatives, you'll find no biases for or against in any of the alternatives. The names were simply we felt like that it was just

calling it A, B, C and D. We wrestled with this. One, two, three and four, or 72, 45, 33. It just didn't resonate.

So we tried to put a name to which that alternative most closely resembled. But just like natural sustainability, preserving natural resources, preserving cultural resources are basic elements of the Trust, sustainability is one of those core elements. And because we're not starting over again, and we are taking and moving forward with elements of the GMPA, one of those key elements that we will continue as a bedrock of the Trust is sustainability as our broader definition, which includes not only sustainability from an environmental standpoint, but from a cultural standpoint and a financial standpoint.

We're going to take two more questions, and then we're going to break out. And again, I'm trying to hold these to clarifications of things that you may have found confusing. But I hope that you will make your questions very to the point and very detailed as you respond back to our scoping session through your workbooks. Yes, ma'am.

Female voice: Just wondering what the criteria were that you used in developing these alternatives. My apologies if it's in the document. I'll just go and read it, of course. I can't comment on that. But when you develop a plan, you have to have kind of a series of filters or screens through which the ideas fall. And I wondered, what were the overarching goals that you used to develop these alternatives?

Jane Blackstone: I think if you do look in the workbook, and in some of the materials that are arrayed around the room, you'll see the set of planning principles. And those really are the values under which these alternatives were developed and under which any ultimate plan would be realized.

I think that forms as much as a guiding foundation as any other element. We're dealing with a built environment. So clearly, we started with a set of existing conditions and some opportunities on the ground that both present constraints and opportunities for the range of alternatives.

It's a good question, and it's a good question to think about at the breakout tables. Is it the adequate range of alternatives to study? Did we miss something as we ran it through that filter?

Jim Meadows: As a matter of already responding to public comment, basically several groups and individuals approached us and said this is the key time. Commenting to the draft environmental impact statement, the preferred alternative is important, but it's more important that we give you adequate time to respond to have we studied a proper range of alternatives, and what you'd like to see in the preferred alternatives. That's why we extended the time basically through January 15, which is about a 45-day extension, a 60-day extension. A six-month total period, but a 60-day extension, to allow you at this critical juncture to take a look at those alternatives and how we move forward.

We can take one more technical question if you have one. If you really need some coffee, basically we're ready to break out. Yes, ma'am.

[unintelligible question]

Jim Meadows: The question was basically Wherry Housing having a large difference in the financial differences among the alternatives. And again, I would hasten to point out, we are not raising the issue tonight of let's not take down Wherry. We're saying one of the range of alternatives is to study the existing conditions. Wherry is there today. It is occupied, it is revenue producing. It is probably producing a net revenue of almost \$14 million a year towards our total sustainability. So it is what is.

But within the General Management Plan Amendment, which we do support, that also has changed circumstances. It calls for Wherry being torn down and replaced by open space.

So all of the other alternatives, other than the existing conditions, show Wherry coming down. As far as the other elements, the large dollar components, there is no question that housing in general basically produces a larger percentage of our revenue than does the space that's being used for non-residential purposes. But there is no

other single element, other than the Letterman Digital Arts project, which is a ground lease. There's no other single element that has the single impact that the Wherry Housing does. So it's there, it's under existing conditions, it's something that we feel obligated to point out. It does have a very dramatic financial impact upon how we move forward.

So with that, I'd like to invite you to... Michael?

[unintelligible dialog]

Jim Meadows: As we study the...the question is--and this is where I didn't want to go this evening--is basically debating the pluses and minuses of Wherry.

To quote a not totally pleasant period in our history, what "is" is. And basically existing conditions are what we're studying with the Wherry Housing. Per Michael Alexander's pointing out, it does have transportation impacts. It does have costs of operation impacts,

and yes, those are studied and will be studied as part of the transportation and the environmental impact statement.

But we're not here advocating a completion or a continuation of Wherry Housing. We're saying that we feel compelled to study what is on the ground today as one of the alternatives, as an existing condition of what is today. And that will be part of that study as the transportation impact.

To answer your question, Michael, it will come out. And I would suggest that you bring that question and comment forward, and that will be a response in the environmental impact statement. Thank you very much, and if we could take a break?

Jane Blackstone: We'll take maybe a five or ten minute break, and when you reconvene, please look for a table that has an empty seat. They're arrayed around the edge of the room, and we'll be breaking down some chairs here and setting up a couple more. Thanks.

[break]

Jim Meadows: This is a good news/bad news time of the evening. We have ten tables, which means if we're going to get out of here relatively on time, you're going to have to make a very short presentation. I would ask as your table, if you're repeating data that has already been reported on, then I would suggest that you'd just briefly note it and move on.

The real comment is that that's the bad news; we have a short amount of time remaining. The good news is the reason that we had a Trust employee at every table is we will be doing a report format of everybody's comments. Basically, your comments will get recorded. It's not necessary that they automatically have been talked over in the group tonight for them to be reported. So Jane, are you or Carey going to go from here? Okay.

Jane Blackstone: All right. Why don't we start with Easy Access? The group that is working on this report--we're not numbered tonight. May I have the spokesperson? Do I have a spokesperson? Going once? How

about the second board? Existing conditions alternative? Crissy Field educational facility? Okay, let's start there then.

George Yamasaki: I suppose this is applicable to all the tables. As we understood it, we were not charged to reach consensus, and we certainly did not. But we feel that it's important to present the ideas that came forth.

To quickly highlight them, there's a lot of sentiment for the Wherry Housing to at least remain in play. That is, it should receive consideration since it generates so much revenue. It may be that it should ultimately be modified, replaced or whatever. But the notion that it must be demolished was rejected, at least for the time being.

Philosophically, there is sentiment for the GMPA because it was the vision that brought us to the point that we are. And again, bringing in Wherry, if Wherry were left standing for a period of time as a revenue generator, then the philosophy of the GMPA might be retained.

I apologize for the people who actually had these thoughts, because I know I'm not paraphrasing them correctly. Doyle Drive--I'm not following the sheets. But Doyle Drive was a consideration. The levels of the roadway and the configuration were a concern.

And finally, to be very quick, the vegetation management plan, especially as it relates to the restoration of Tennessee Hollow, and there again, there is concern about the effect of any replacement housing on the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor. There are lots of other things, but obviously there are other reporters.

Jane Blackstone: Thank you.

Ian Moore: Our table spent a good deal of time addressing larger questions of financial management. So I'll go over those quickly before I get into our comments on alternatives.

So the first big question is why does it take 20 to 40 years to become economically sustainable to the underlying financial assumptions of

the model? Next issue is what other financing mechanism sources can be used such as bonds or third party funding?

Several people commented that prioritized full occupation and rehabilitation as quickly as possible with buildings ties into the why so long, but in that context should be careful of giving away too much control.

Again, on financial, study the possible use of federal rehabilitation tax credits by the Trust. Is something being lost by the Trust being the primary developer as opposed to having the lessees take advantage of this rehabilitation tax credit? These leasing activities should not be just large campuses like Lucas, but should vary in size.

Another issue: how's the jobs side of jobs/housing balance determined?

Another important point overriding, once again, community use of the space has been marginalized. Should give priority to those

opening their space or contributing to programming, give priority to those lessees.

Then finally, what kind of criteria or screening is being used to determine private leasing or occupation? And the alternatives themselves, we didn't have a great deal of time to spend on those. But for the existing conditions alternative, the comment was made that we should consider a different mix of uses within the existing physical infrastructure.

An overriding comment that should be addressed under all alternatives is how's traffic planning going to be pursued? I'll leave it at that. We have traffic planning under every alternative. So I'll pass it on to the next board.

Jane Blackstone: May I ask before you do that you state your name? We're actually recording all of the comments.

Ian Moore: My name is Ian Moore.

Jane Blackstone: Thanks, Ian. And the first gentleman who reported? Your name is George Yamasaki. Thank you very much.

Okay, do we have the recorder for the colorful group here?

Bill Shepherd: My name is Bill Shepherd. I'm not sure I understand all these items but I'll try to make it up as I go. Issues that we felt should be studied in the EIS include--the one that was emphasized the strongest was staging and sequencing of development of transportation both during construction and then afterwards, when you take into consideration the impact of all the activity that is brought on in the Presidio during the development process, and then what the residual transportation activity is after the development is completed.

Another item that we thought should be studied in the EIS is the impact of the tree removal on the climate of the Presidio. And the third was an individual was concerned about identifying which buildings, historic buildings will be demolished and which ones will be reused. To identify the specific buildings, rather than just generally.

Under concepts and program ideas, a member of our group felt the golf course is not environmentally compatible with the goals of the Presidio and should be removed. There are some real environmental issues with that, so hopefully the management of the golf course will be environmentally conscious.

Then there was a lot of interest in focusing on community-based art, and having creative work produced on the Presidio. And to think broadly in presenting programs, bringing in broader programs and tracking broader audiences with art-related programs.

Our group felt that we should minimize the level of lodging and conferencing and restaurants to keep things on the small scale. Again, there was a congestion concern over using the Presidio.

There was an interest in expanding the Presidio as an art center for music, theater, performance, fine arts. There was an interest in studying the subdivision of housing for diverse incomes and needs. And I believe what that meant was designing rental housing to be

more densely used by multiple occupants; instead of large one-bedroom or two-bedroom facilities, you have more cooperative and group living and settings.

Another idea is to have a world class environmental center, which I think is a focus of the Presidio Trust. We had a difference of opinion about kind of a conflict in wanting to have more open space as presented by alternative B, I think it is. Removing buildings in the southwest corner so we have less of a suburban sprawl in the Presidio, and have the development concentrated more. And the concentration being specifically in the northern part of the Presidio.

Of course that creates congestion in the north, and that was the countering balance issue there of how do you relieve the congestion in the north when you remove the development and focus all the development there.

Jane Blackstone: We have this next one, number one, two, three, four recognize it. We should have color-coded you.

Mark Weinstock: I guess the first thing that people were talking about is they wanted to extend the scoping period so that once everyone had looked at these books, because we didn't really have much of a chance to digest the information, that then we could get together in groups and kind of hash out some ideas. As opposed to looking at these books for about 20 or 30 seconds, and then trying to hash out some ideas. That was kind of difficult.

I guess the main thing that I heard from our group as far as the different alternatives is less is better than more. It seemed like people were real in favor of more trees, less development. And on that theme, that there could be demolition without new construction, as per the GPMA.

We had some people who wanted to make sure we had a strong emphasis on the historical and especially the cultural aspects to be developed in the park.

Jane Blackstone: Thank you. Okay, how about Chris [Ottoway], Cynthia, Carey Grant's group, spokesperson? Great.

Arthur Feinstein: Hi, we had a wide range of comments. I'm Arthur Feinstein. I'm with the Golden Gate Audobon Society. And so I'm just going to plow through these because a lot of them have not been talked about.

We did have an advocate for maintaining Wherry Housing, and asked why should we build new construction. One of our major comments has been that the public hasn't had adequate access to the financial data and we'd like to see more detail on the financial data so we can come to determinations of what alternatives really do meet the congressional requirements.

Has there been analysis of income from income sources other than development? For example, recreational programs, nature experiences, things like that. I suppose the arts would also work.

Parking revenue as part of that component, too. Has that been adequately analyzed? There was a suggestion we have a public

school on the site--a particular one that addresses environmental education as the focus of the curriculum.

Again, looking at the finances, looking at museums as revenue generators--have you done enough of that? Each alternative should analyze its impact on the National Historic Landmark District.

There was a comment that the alternatives are too constrained. Each one is too individual. For example, in all of the alternatives there should be a natural resource component dealing with enhancement and restoration. For example, the Crissy Field wetlands needs to be expanded. That should be in all alternatives. Tennessee Cove should be in all the alternatives, and I've been told that it is now.

If you've driven here and you saw the signs that said, "Watch out for quail," you know that there's a big emphasis going on--we hope and we think there is, and we're appreciative of it--to restore our native California quail to the Presidio. That should have been in all alternatives.

Need to address transportation. I think you'll hear that a lot. There was a real concern about the view shed. The aesthetics of the park on neighbors, neighboring communities around the Presidio.

We deal with the vegetation management program. A very strong comment was that there was no compelling reason presented for any of the alternatives, and that it was overly ambitious. No emphasis on cutting the expenditures of the Trust itself. We needed a more clear breakdown of the cost of the program.

Another comment on historic buildings, and you'll see this one. I'm not familiar with this person and what they're saying. Ensure there is a cultural integrity, especially the Native American community.

Make sure they're incorporated into the programming. And also a comment that there's not enough emphasis on addressing the diverse communities that are in our city. Are they being adequately considered when deciding how we're going to redo the Presidio?

Thank you.

Jane Blackstone: Okay, the Brown group. With request at the very top.

Ron Miguel: I'm Ron Miguel. This was briefly mentioned in a previous presentation that prior to the 15th of January that this group or a similar group assemble again when we have a chance to actually take a look at the materials. And that at that time, some type of a matrix be available to us that would set forth all of the possible alternatives and we would be able to pick and choose between them, and make much more of an informed choice on everything.

A study needs--again, financial analysis came up heavily. The concept of providing some subsidized rents for both residential and non-residential such as non-profit organizations, and how that ratio would play out in the final financials. There's an insufficient focus on the planning level regarding historic preservation. Or at least appearing from the material.

Other issues to study are the employee/resident ratio for each of the alternatives, which wasn't really in the materials we have. Services and amenities that are required to support the alternatives, compared in the sites. Reliable transit, which has already been mentioned.

And the normal services that a community that is living on-site would have.

Obviously, we didn't comment on each of the alternatives individually. We wanted to maximize the open space and revenue at the same time. And minimize traffic, that seems to flow through everyone's concept here as much as they can be put together.

Again, accommodate as many non-profit and social benefit programs. And questioning about the removing of non-historic buildings as much as possible in order to create more open space. Clustering new development in the existing developed areas, again, in order to preserve the open space.

Basically create more of an individual village situation within the Presidio. That would enable the transit system to work much more efficiently, with much more efficiency. Using the non-historic buildings for revenue generation. Removing them to the end of their basic economic life. And maximizing the jobs/housing balance.

There was also a comment about, of course, minimizing automobile use, which would depend on internal transit and how everything is laid out. The appropriateness of tenants as to the programs and benefits that they actually provide the Presidio.

Jane Blackstone: Thank you, Ron. I can't see what's on the front of that. Better liaison with the city? Do we have the reporter for that?

Lea Hoadley: Well, we had eight passionate people at our table. I think all of us had a different idea. There is no limit to opinions in the room. And the areas that we can deal with seem to be infinite. So I'm going to look at this sheet, but I may have to go on my memory and on these notes as well.

We talked about we need to have a better liaison with the city, and the relationship with the city needs to be close. I'm going to go off my notes.

While open space was a great idea--I think we all love the idea of open space--we worried about removing revenue sources such as

Wherry Housing or Baker Beach Apartments, because then revenue will be shifted over to the other tenants that remain, both the commercial and the residential side. And we know it's high enough as it is.

We were kind of split on whether or not there should be a visitor destination. Do we actually need more people coming through here? Does it benefit us in any way? We were kind of tossed up on that one.

Also, on reviewing the alternatives, A, B, C, and D, I think we need more time. We all need to look at it a little bit more closely. The areas look like they're the same if you look at the colors. But if you look at the wording, it's quite different. So we all need to look at that and spend more time on it.

And there are so many more alternatives besides A, B, C and D. We felt kind of limited by them. Of course traffic, parking, and transportation is an issue and it's too big for any of us to deal with right on our table.

With housing, we looked at providing more senior housing, possibly in the public hospital area, as an alternative to doing any type of grade school or high school. Just the thought of seniors making a less impact on the park than maybe high school kids would. Not trying to put down high school kids here.

With Trust programming and planning, and I'm not sure where that part would be, but there's lots of non-profits currently doing programs and education here in the park. And I don't know that we need the Trust to take that on and create more expense for themselves. Maybe just reach out to the tenants that are here on the commercial side and partner with them.

We need to attract more non-profits. Not because we want to get less revenue, but because companies that are concerned with an idea rather than just making money tend to lend a different atmosphere.

I think we, across the board, didn't want any new construction. We wanted to preserve historic buildings. And we were concerned

about the utility consumption of big business not matching with the appropriateness of a park. I think that's it about this summary, but we could go on and on.

Jane Blackstone: Thank you. Okay. This just happens to be group number eight, the blue group.

Jeff Lucas: My name is Jeff Lucas. We had some pretty strong opinions in our group, so I'm worried about my tires when I walk out if I don't say everything right.

I'll go through it one by one. Essentially, for the existing conditions, there's general consensus that the historical character and the cultural aspects of the whole Presidio need to be kept. And then there was also a general consensus that the more underground parking that we can get on the main post and at Fort Scott is a good thing.

One concern about existing was that there was no gain of open space. For alternative A, one of the complaints was it says "no action" but there really is action. And most of the revenue, the one

idea that came out of this is get as much revenue as we can while the opportunities are there, rather than relying on new buildings and whatnot.

Alternative B, the density should stay the same. This alternative lacks residential. There was a general consensus that it's good because there's a lot of open space, but there's not enough residential and it doesn't really keep with the live/work idea of the Trust.

There was also a concern about in-fill housing. The general idea was that the way the Trust is now, when you walk down the buildings and there are spaces between the housing and whatnot, it gives it more of an open feel. And if we pack everything in, then we're just going to be densifying it too much.

As far as alternative C goes, was Wherry Housing came up in this area. And as a general to all of them, Wherry Housing, we think that we should keep it and generate as much revenue as we can, and then maybe look at demoing it later when we're more self-sufficient.

And then finally, as far as live/work, we wanted the Trust to consider live/work loft areas where you're actually living and working in your same building, rather than having to walk to work because you could drive anyway. That's it.

Jane Blackstone: Thanks very much. And the red group; there's an easy one.

Craig Alciati: Craig Alciati. I don't know if we have anything really new. Everybody's kind of gone over the stuff that we talked about. I guess--and we didn't even group it in these--these are some of the issues we talked about.

Inclusion of other people in the city, and making it more accessible to everyone in the city. Some of the outlying areas of the city don't really have a chance to participate in the park at this point.

One of our themes was preservation of the spirit to balance the use. We don't really want a 3Com Presidio. To try and keep it not so commercial but at the same time realizing they have to generate revenue to support the place.

I think there was some uncomfortableness with the concept of open space. We wanted to define that a little bit more in terms of the wild space--that there's a difference between where animals live versus just a lawn in front of a building being counted as open space.

What's natural, we want to keep that natural. Not really necessarily include the open space in front of a building as part of the open space.

As far as the destination, I think everybody was a little bit uncomfortable with the idea of turning it into a Disneyland kind of place. We want people to be able to enjoy the park, but not make it so high-use that it damages the park. Rather than hotels, it would be more environmentally friendly--bed and breakfast. Using the existing structures for visitors to stay in rather than building new structures.

There was some interest in intentional communities, whether or not that would be building a new neighborhood or trying to incorporate the concept of intentional community within clustered housing at

this point. Possibly looking at outside groups that are already involved in intentional housing, or intentional communities to submit proposals to the Trust.

I guess that's kind of the summary. Alciati.

Jane Blackstone: Good. Okay. And this is the map group.

Owen Lang: I want to thank George Yamasaki; we used your name tag to paste our plan. And this is Steve, our volunteer. And we made it hard for him because we didn't write words.

Steve Kellenberger: I'm Steve Kellenberger. We discussed about five general items about the park. We like the fact that some of the commercial development should be along the Crissy Field area.

We talked a little bit about the Wherry Housing. We felt that the historical structures should be retained, but some of those that didn't really have lasting, redeeming value maybe should be replaced, but with the same use. Maybe more dense housing.

We discussed the jobs/housing balance. There is a concern about reducing traffic, certainly commute traffic, through the Presidio as much as possible, with some speed controls.

We talked a bit about public health facilities. We think that there should be a study taking a look at historic building use. What would be the highest and best uses to retain the existing buildings. And we talked also about senior access to some of the more desirable areas-- certainly the beach areas within the park.

Traffic was an issue of concern. Everybody is interested in trying to retain the park for its natural use. The commute impact really kind of degrades from that.

We talked about the fact that the Trust needs to take a careful look at that balance. It's really a question of balance between sustainability, use, preservation of the natural resources, and also being able to enjoy the park.

The Trust should take a look at some facilities which will allow people to enjoy the crown jewel of the city as much as possible. So for visitors to be able to come in and enjoy it, local residences. And then people from around the Bay Area. Anything else?

Jane Blackstone: Thank you. I think that's all the groups. What happens next with this, we hope you take your workbooks home. There is a lot to digest. We recognize that.

Please use the response forms, or any of the other vehicles that we noted. Emails, fax your comments in. We will get together again on this subject on the publication of the draft EIS. But again, we've got some workshops coming up in January and February on the other subjects that remain ongoing here at the Presidio: vegetation management and site restoration programs. And in February, trails and bikeway planning.

So please join us for those. If you're not on our newsletter list, please be sure you tell folks at the front desk on your way out

because that's how you can find out about these upcoming activities.

Thanks a lot.

[applause]

[End of meeting]