

Presidio Trust Meeting, December 13, 2000

Jane Blackstone: ...scoping session for the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan, in large part in response to some [concepts] that we heard on November 15th at our last workshop. There's a tremendous amount of integration [unintelligible]. [We've really had] a lot of content, and we were asked to provide another opportunity for everyone to get together to ask questions and to provide comments in a group forum.

So we're here tonight to do that with you. We have an agenda that includes a very brief review of what we presented at the November 15th workshop. While I see some faces of those who have been faithful attenders of all the workshops, I also see some new faces. And in consideration of those folks, we will go over briefly what we talked about in the past so we all have the same context for the discussion.

We'll take a break, during which we would ask you to write your comments down, if at all possible, particularly questions, so that we can group them and hopefully provide an efficient answer to questions that are on related themes.

There will also be an opportunity at the end of our agenda for comments, more verbal comments, that we will record this evening. We have both a video recording and a tape recording of tonight's session so that all of these comments can be used as we develop the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan draft and the accompanying EIS.

We always start with a little background of Presidio Trust. We are a relatively new federal agency, established by the United States Congress. We have a board of directors appointed by the president, one of whom is appointed by the Secretary of The Interior. And I'd like to acknowledge that Amy Meyer, one of our board members, is here this evening, sitting over here in the corner. I'll introduce her again when it's light and you can see who she is. We really are here to hear from this evening and Amy's a representative of the board.

The Trust is guided by the Presidio Trust Act, the legislation that created the Trust. And we really have been set up as a very innovative governmental entity with a [unintelligible] mission. We are here to preserve and enhance the Presidio as part of the national park system, and we have a special commission that goes along with that primary

mandate. And that's to reach financial self-sufficiency by fiscal year 2013.

We work in partnership with the National Park Service. There are two jurisdictional areas at the Presidio. Area A is the coastal area, and that's under the management of the National Park Service. And Area B, in green on the map here, is the Presidio Trust jurisdiction. We work with the National Park Service very closely on a whole number of initiatives that don't understand jurisdictional boundaries--visitors services, open space and natural resource projects, projects of that sort--and will continue to do so.

Let's go over a little bit of what this Presidio Trust Implementation Plan is. It's known as PTIP for short. It is for Area B of the Presidio only, where 80 percent of the Presidio is managed by the Presidio Trust. It's a plan to update the General Management Plan Amendment that was developed by the National Park Service in 1994 for all of the Presidio. That plan remains in place for the coastal areas of the Presidio, that area that's under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

It considers some of the changed circumstances since the General Management Plan was developed in 1994. I'll go over just a couple of the highlights in the next slide here. It's also anticipated to be a programmatic plan, a very general plan. There will be a whole number of [area sites] specific plans that follow along from this. Mostly we're going to layout a general roadmap for what Presidio Area B will be in the future.

Some of the things that have changed since '94: the Trust Act certainly, the creation of the Trust itself, the split jurisdiction of the Presidio, the financial mandate that the Trust has operated under, and some changes in actual conditions on the ground. For instance, the General Management Plan Amendment assumed that the U.S. Sixth Army would continue to be at the Presidio. That has not come to pass.

There have also been a number of changes as general economics and market conditions since 1994 that cause us to take a new look at some opportunities we may want to take advantage of in today's world of innovation technology, things we didn't know about in 1994.

The General Management Plan Amendment, though, does remain a foundation document, it's something that we will look for the basis for changes and updates that PTIP may bring.

Certainly, some of the aspects of the General Management Plan Amendment--and I encourage those of you, many of you have been a part of the GMP planning process and are very familiar with that document. I would encourage you if you're not, certainly check it out at the Presidio Trust library, call us to ask for a summary of the plan. It does provide a very good foundation for some of the discussions that we've been having.

We'll look at retaining key elements of the GMP like natural resource preservation, sustainability initiatives, historic resource preservation, protection. All of these are some very core, fundamental elements of the Plan that will basically remain in place. We will look at updating other Plan elements where change is indicated. And we're thinking about things like visitor manage, housing, transportation, programmatic aspects of visitor amenities, cultural activities, museums, a range of things that fit into that category.

PTIP is both a plan and an accompanying environmental impact statement because it is a broad ranging plan look at full host of impact topics. We'll go over those a little bit later in the presentation.

The practice itself will extend about 15 months. What you see here on the top, our current schedule; on the bottom, the original schedule. We have extended scoping and the timeline for this planning process in response to a number of the comments and requests that we heard from the public. Right now we're looking at closing this process by September of 2001, and actually publishing a draft plan for you to comment on in March.

Again, this is the fifth of a series of scoping workshops. Scoping is kind of a jargon-y word from the National Environmental Policy Act, but it's basically an opportunity for us to talk with you about what we should study in the draft EIS and what study topics should be addressed.

Do we have the right range of alternatives, and are we studying the right things about those alternatives?

January 15th is the date by which we'd really like to hear from you. Through all of these workshops we've been collecting comments and using them to begin to fund the planned EIS. We appreciate your comments as early as you can give them to us in this process, but January 15th is the formal date for the close of comment. The next opportunity is on publication of the draft EIS, and that's a very formal period for you to provide comments. We then respond to those comments in the final environmental impact statement.

I noted before that there will be very specific plans that follow on from PTIP. You'll see later in the presentation, and those of you who have received workbooks and studied them already understand that we're talking at a very conceptual level in all of these alternatives. You heard a lot of comment about desire for very specific information. Much of that will follow on after PTIP as we envision it at present. So you have a specific plan for the Main Post or for Tennessee Hollow restoration and environmental analysis that may accompany those more detailed plans.

The framework under which we propose to develop this PTIP--and again, these are all proposed concepts for you to comment on this evening. In the workbook that has been mailed out and that's available at the front table, there's a vision statement. This vision statement is an overarching way of looking at what the Presidio will be in the future, what's the vision for how it addresses our needs as a public park. This vision would apply to all the alternatives that we study, except for the General Management Plan, and the alternative which we're looking at is a no action alternative, a plan that would remain in place if PTIP [were to] happen. That alternative has an articulated vision statement that would remain in place for it.

The Presidio Trust has proposed this vision. It has very heavy emphasis on resource preservation and the development of a unique and innovative global center at the Presidio, real identity, and a number of programs, diversity of programs, for park visitors.

There are planning principles that follow on from this overarching vision that are articulated on some of the boards around the room tonight, and I encourage you to spend a bit of time on the break

circulating and looking at them. They're derived in large part from the General Management Plan Amendment, with some modifications, and they would also apply to all of the alternatives. These are out for your comment. We really would appreciate your review and hearing from you about whether these planning principles are appropriate guidance for any plan alternative. They cover such topics as resources, visitor experience, stress the importance of historic and cultural resource preservation, recreational resource availability to the public, and so on.

Following on from the planning principles, we've developed a range of alternatives to study, and have applied vision and principles to each of those to a greater or lesser extent. These alternatives have not been invented out of thin air. A large part we've heard over the last 18 months through a series of planning workshops from you about what you would like us to study, and have attempted to put that down here on paper for you to look at and comment on.

Important to note is that there is not a preferred alternative at this point, and we're really not asking for a vote on these conceptual alternatives either, but rather your comments about what's good and what's bad, if

that's the case, in all of these alternatives, so that we can go on to create a preferred alternative. One that we would identify in the draft environmental impact statement as a preference, and really ask you at that point to focus your comment on that alternative. We expect that it'll be kind of a mix and match of the alternatives that are in front of you and that we developed also, based on scoping comments that we hear through this process.

At this point I'd like to introduce Carey Feierabend, who's our planning manager, to take us quickly through the range of alternatives that's proposed for study right now. Thanks.

Carey Feierabend: Thank you, Jane. As Jane mentioned, these alternatives in this material is presented in the workbooks which, in case you didn't receive one in the mail, we have at the table as you came in the door this evening.

To help set the context for these conceptual alternatives, we have these sort of conceptual alternatives that we've formulated for now during scoping, and there will be a set of alternatives that are presented in the environmental impact statement that will come out later this spring.

But to help set that context there are a series of planning givens. And basically, as Jane said, we're using the GMPA as a foundation document. And coming from that, there are several projects which have already been completed or currently are under way that would be carried forward and then finished off. Many of these projects are in collaboration with the National Park Service, particularly in the area of natural resources management and native plant habitat restoration efforts.

There are several GMPA actions that we would continue to carry forward such as the restoration of the main Parade Ground--there's overwhelming support for that concept--as well as the natural resource area protection activities.

Examples of some of these projects that we would consider as givens include the implementation of vegetation management plan; the trails and bikeways plan, which is currently under development right now--we should have a draft coming out later this spring for your input; the Mountain Lake enhancement plan, which is currently out for review.

We have the environmental remediation program, which is occurring Presidio-wide over the next several years. That'll continue forward. Long-term leases that are already in place would stay in place. The Doyle Drive planning effort for its reconstruction will continue to go forward. And the Letterman Digital Arts Center project would be a given as well.

Along with the plan that will be prepared, the environmental impact statement will be prepared, and this EIS will cover several environmental impact topics. We've started to list out what we think those are, and we'd like to hear from you, are there any other additional topics that we need to study?

The topics have really come from a lot of public input as well as some preliminary screening that we've done. This is a list of those topics. These are included in your workbook. And again, we'd like to ask you, are we missing anything? Are there particular details within any of these subject areas that you think we really need to take a close look at?

At this point in time, as I mentioned, we have some preliminary conceptual alternatives for your input. There are five of them that we have arrayed. These really are a cast of range of alternatives that could be considered, and this is what we want your input on. I'm going to quickly run through these, and again, the details or the information on them are posted at the back part of the room this evening, so you can walk around and talk to staff about those particular alternatives as well as take a workbook.

The first alternative that we're looking at really helps us set a baseline, and that is existing conditions--basically keeping the status quo, what you see here today. There would be very little physical change with the exception of the Letterman Digital Arts Center moving forward. Under this alternative we would basically lease out the buildings as they are with some rehabilitation work. And we know that from a financial perspective that the revenues would meet the expenses that we need without further congressional appropriations after 2013.

Under this scenario, we have currently 5.96 million square feet of built space in the Presidio today within Area B. That would remain the

same. No significant new construction or building demolition, with the exception of the Letterman projects. And the important thing to note in this alternative is it would include the retention of Baker Beach Apartments, which is in the southwest portion of the Presidio. Again, there would be no significant park enhancements and no significant programming beyond what's currently going on. It's really a status quo alternative.

This is a chart that helps to array what the current statistics are in the square foot of 5.96 million square feet and a total of residential units at 1,654. The only change that would occur in open space would be the addition of a seven-acre park that's being considered at the Letterman Digital Arts project.

Alternative A. This is our no action alternative, which is the General Management Plan Amendment's implementation as of 2000 forward, because there have been some changes to that plan since it was prepared in 1994. Under this alternative, the main theme is that the Presidio would become a center for research and learning for those tenants

whose mission really focuses on the world's most critical environmental, social and cultural problems that need to be solved.

Under this alternative, from our preliminary estimates, we know that financial self-sufficiency would not be achieved, and the revenues in 2013 are not sufficient enough to go forward without further congressional appropriations. Under this alternative, this would be our least amount of built square footage within Area B, at about five million square feet. We would carry forward the General Management Plan Amendment, as I mentioned, from this year forward. There would be a medium level of demolition with very little new construction. The housing supply would be reduced, and there would be a moderate level of visitor amenities and programming. Tenants would really be the vehicle for providing the programs, related mostly to their business mission here at the Presidio. Again, this would have a five million square foot built out space, approximately a little over a thousand residential units, and there would be an increase of a hundred acres approximately of open space.

Alternative B, resource consolidation. Really, the main gesture here is that the Presidio in Area B would become an open space haven within an urban setting. The emphasis would be on resource preservation, biological diversity, open space enhancement, and historic preservation. We know that under this alternative the revenues would cover expenses without further appropriations.

As I mentioned, the main gesture here is that there would be significant demolition in the southwest portion of the Presidio and a built square feet at 5.3 million approximately. Under this alternative we would have the greatest level of demolition. There would be some new construction that would occur in the northern portion of the Presidio, infill construction, for those buildings which are demolished. We would really maximize open space and focus again on the open space and natural resource and cultural resource enhancement.

Built square footage: approximately 5.3 million. And the residential units, just a little bit over a thousand. But the significant change here is there would be an increase of 160 acres of open space over current conditions.

Alternative C. This is what we call a sustainable community within a national park. Under this we would establish a live/work community in a park setting where those who are working here really contribute back to the park and participate in public-related park programming. We know that under this one, revenues would cover expenses without further congressional appropriations after 2013. The end state would be approximately 5.7 million square feet. There would be a low level of demolition as we would really be emphasizing on rehabilitating and reusing existing buildings. There would be some new construction to increase the housing supply to have a higher jobs/housing balance. We would really focus again on creating this live/work community, and there would be a moderate level of public programming.

Again, 5.7 million square feet, with an end state of approximately 1,500 housing units. The increase in open space would be approximately 80 acres.

Alternative D, lastly. That's what we call a national and international cultural destination. This would place emphasis on the Presidio being a

national and international destination park and a portal for visitors to the American West and the Pacific. It would really become a center for education, communication and exchange.

We know that under this alternative we would have the strongest financial result of all of these conceptual alternatives. The revenues would cover expenses without appropriations beyond 2013. The end state would be the current building square footage that we have now, at 5.96 million square feet. However, there would be a fair amount or medium level of demolition for placement construction and more infill construction, more lodging opportunities than are currently provided, and it would really focus on public programs--premium programs, we'd like to say, in facilities for the visitor who's coming.

Total square foot: 5.96 million square feet. And a residential unit count of approximately 900 units. The increase in open space would be 95 acres.

As Jane mentioned, at this point in time we do not have a preferred alternative. And in fact, at the back of the room this evening we have

two blank maps for anyone who may get inspired and want to start to draw their own preferred alternative, or start to put Post-its on or make comments about what should really go into the preferred alternative. We also have a response form that you can complete that also has a blank map. You may want to give us your comments on one alternative that you really like or one you dislike, or you may want to mix and match elements from all of these. We want to hear your ideas on these alternatives tonight.

As a reminder--I'm not going to make you read this.

[laughter]

In the workbook is a comparison of the alternatives, which is a good way to start to look at the differences between the alternatives in a snapshot. And to further walk you through the differences between the alternatives, I'd like to introduce at this point in time Jim Meadows, the executive director for the Trust.

Jim Meadows: I'd like to depart from the presentation format for just a couple of minutes and acknowledge Jane Blackstone. Jane was the third employee, I believe, of the Presidio Trust, and has been here for three years. Jane's been working with me for over seven years [unintelligible]. But the work that Jane has done basically for the Trust is just been fantastic, and this is probably her last official public function. We keep dragging her back but officially she's not an employee as of the first of December. She will continue to help us complete this process.

But I would at least like to acknowledge in this public format the credit that she deserves for heading up the team that put all this together, and I hope that you all will join me in that acknowledgement.

[applause]

You know, you just get them trained right and [unintelligible].

[laughter]

Jane's actually going back to become a semi ski bum in Colorado, so I'm envious on one level, but on the other level I'm going to miss her a lot.

We're talking about the implementation planning tonight. Again, this is a scoping meeting. And as we define scoping, we're going to get through this initial process as quickly as we can and then receive questions for answering questions of clarification of what we presented over the past several months that you may have had in the past or may have come up with material you were presented. And also for comments that you may have about the scoping process, and then individual comments you may want to make in general about PTIP process at the end.

Just to forewarn you and to restate what we've said at every meeting, this is not a Q&A session in the fashion of presenting alternative ideas and asking the Trust to really relate to those or to give a specific comment. The idea of the environmental impact statement, the draft, and the idea of our planning process is to answer those basically as part of the written document that we [will forward on].

But let's get back to the alternatives for a moment. The key variables between the alternatives, as Carey already pointed out, revolve around things such as the square footage of improved areas, the amount of open space in Area B, the amount of housing, the jobs/housing balance, the amount of financial self-sufficiency, and the completion of capital improvements and funding of capital replacement funds and programs.

We are required by law to be at the point with FY 2013 that we will no longer be able to receive appropriation from the U.S. Congress or from the federal budget. Our mandate is that any alternative that we move forward with must meet that mandate. That's not true self-sufficiency. We will meet that mandate with any of the action alternatives, and any preferred alternative we put forward, we feel obligated to put forward with a plan that does meet that key element.

But what we're also trying to get everyone to recognize is that just no longer receiving money from Congress does not mean the Presidio is totally self-sufficient. And self-sufficiency includes completing all the capital improvements to the Presidio, and also putting together monies for reserves so that as these buildings, as natural areas, as infrastructure,

as trees, plants, anything else in the Presidio reach their maturity or their full life span, that we have to have our own dollars for that replacement.

Now, there's the common balance, the common challenge between natural area and built area. And I would point out to you that one of the jobs of the Trust--we have a natural environment. We have one of the most beautiful areas in the United States and we plan on preserving that natural area. We also have a built environment which unlike any other or most other national parks in the U.S. park system, and that is the amount of the historic built environment that we have to also preserve. And we have to keep that balance in mind as far as the built environment and the natural environment.

And then finally, we have a history, including a very strong military history which is part of our preservation also is making sure that that history is preserved.

To go through the items that I discussed with you, the square footage--the differences between the existing conditions and the five alternatives is a change between roughly six million square feet and five million

square feet. For those of you who are new to the process, where it looks like a lot of construction and a lot of demolition, I would point out that approximately half of those demolition and new construction numbers in each and every alternative is the Letterman project, and that's the demolition of the existing Letterman buildings and the new construction of the new Lucas project for both.

Open space. Again, it's an area of confusion because of the different areas of management. Look at the first number, and that's the Area B, and you can see the range of open space as it will become under the different alternatives. But add back in the open space into what it is today. Today we have approximately 800 acres of open space, and we're looking at a range of almost a thousand acres to just under 900 acres of open space being added by the various alternatives.

Housing units. Jobs/housing balance. That's been a topic that's been discussed in detail, and it's hard to define like sustainability is hard to define. But the jobs/housing balance is basically people that work and live at the Presidio. So we feel that one of the worst things that could

happen would be having every employee import into the Presidio every person that lives at the Presidio exporting out to jobs elsewhere.

So how much of a jobs/housing balance do we basically achieve? And the range of alternatives--again, I'm not going to read them, but that ranges from just under a thousand dwelling units to as many as 1,600 dwelling units.

And by the way, we are blessed to date, with the number of households we have numbering over 800, we have more than one employee per household of those that are Presidio-based. And so we estimate that as many as 1.2 to 1.25 employees per household will come about as part of the jobs/housing balance. And so when you count number of housing units, in general, you can multiply that by 25 percent to come up with the number of employees [unintelligible].

The financial analysis. We need to demonstrate the plan alternatives meet financial self-sufficiency mandate as well as long-term financial self-sustainability. Self-sufficiency again defined as no congressional, no federal budget input after FY 2012, and sustainability meaning that

we are able to build out all the improvements, both natural and built environment, and also create reserves to make sure that we can replace them when their natural life occurs.

We also have to adjust the assumptions from 1994 to reflect changed circumstances. For all intents and purposes, except for a few government computer people, the Internet did not exist in 1994. Today, I would venture to say that most people in this room are utilizing it monthly, weekly, daily, hourly, or maybe watching the Vice President right now, for all I know. But basically, it is something that's part of our lives as we speak about it today.

The components of the financial model: we have put together a rather detailed model. There's been a lot of discussion about our financial model--how much are we putting together, how much are we disclosing. It's all discloseable. Basically, you have a model that is a very detailed spreadsheet. There's a few people that really care to get into the details. It's really the conclusions--the best part is process. We're here to study land use alternatives. As part of that we're here to study the financial impacts of those alternatives.

But in the details of that model, basically we have put out revenues, operating expenses, programming costs, financing costs, capital costs, and capital replacement funds costs in ever greater detail. And we have the assumptions behind those costs, for we provide those to those who have requested in detail. And we have a book about that thick, literally, that's available in the library if you want to get down to the very basic assumptions that come up behind the financial business plan, that that will be available in the Presidio library, and I think that's available as of today.

The financial analysis assumptions, we had to use the same methodology for all alternatives. Once you start changing, if you remember your high school algebra days and calculus, if you were there, you start changing the unknowns and the alternatives and then you end up with too many unknowns, too many alternatives, and you can't reach any conclusions. So we decided methodology-wise to keep methodology consistent.

The idea of conservative financial planning. There have been questions and comments for clarification about why are we planning such things as the Trust doing all future development. Why are we not giving philanthropic dollars as part of our basic plan? We fully intend to improve upon the financial results of any final alternative that we reach with this planning process by going after all of those particular financial ways of getting more money to the Presidio. But using sound practices, we cannot plan for either philanthropic dollars or plan for an economy in which very well financed, large developers would come in here and be willing to finance a building that might take, for instance, in the Main Post buildings, \$10-15 million per building to renovate.

This is a 20-year model, and because of our requirements with Congress it has a snapshot as of FY 2013. We've made the conscious decision to put all the numbers in 2001 dollars. What that means very simply is that the cost and the revenues are as if we were spending all the money today. We've neither inflated the cost nor inflated the revenues for the sake of this particular model. And then we've provided estimates beyond the year 2020, because in almost every case we don't reach that true sustainability until after 2013.

Financial self-sufficiency. Do we get to the point of being able to operate the Presidio without federal budget input beyond FY 2012? In all alternatives except the update of the GMPA we meet that minimum goal requirement.

Completion of capital improvements, meaning primarily all of the existing buildings, the historic buildings that must be improved, in addition to the infrastructure that must be upgraded, in addition such things as the vegetation management plan. I think we've beat the subject home well enough at this point that over the next 20 years we're going to be replanting the entire forest area.

Everything has a lifespan, and so unfortunately Major Jones is a particular hero of mine who laid out this wonderful place the way he did, selected species of trees that have a credible lifespan of about a hundred years, and he planted them a hundred years ago. With life enhancement procedures we're able to go forward. We will enhance the life of those trees. But over the next 20 years we have to go into an

aggressive vegetation management plan that will allow the Presidio to be a constant place and not in a roller coaster as far as vegetation.

Funding of capital replacements. You can call it reserves, you can call it a sinking fund, you can call it whatever you want, but basically we can't go back to Congress in 55 years when buildings start reaching their age, or 35 years when infrastructure starts reaching its age, and say, "We'd like five, ten, fifteen, twenty million dollars." In the national park system basically there's a huge deficit of deferred maintenance throughout the United States. In the historic building movement, there's over \$4 billion of deferred maintenance for historic buildings throughout the United States. We don't have the luxury of basically being able to call on funds from Congress, from the federal budget, to get our share even of what those might be. So part of our financial plan has to be to create reserves for these replacements.

Presidio programs. This was not discussed much until about a year ago.

Everybody talked about how much money does it take to operate the park, to reach a break-even to basically where we can meet the legal mandates set by Congress. It said nothing about basically how do we

fund a major program that tells the military history of the Presidio. How do we fund a major program that talks about museum quality exhibits of both the military background, the prehistoric background, just the recent background about what's going on at the Presidio such as the Buffalo Soldiers' times or the times when the Japanese Cultural Society wants to have basically part of the program showing both the code breakers that were out here and the internment order that was signed out here. These are all exhibits and programs that cost money. We believe that programs are an essential part of this national park and make it another unique national park compared to other parks.

What you're going to be asked tonight basically are your reactions to the ideas presented tonight, in November, in August, and September. We have had these scoping sessions. As Jane said, I see a lot of faces who have been to most of them, which I really appreciate and staff appreciates. But some of you are here for the first time. Please don't feel bashful about asking a question. Your fresh question, your fresh set of eyes may lead to a new idea within the implementation plan. We want your thoughts on the range of alternatives. Remember, this is a

coloring session, and all you have to do is stay inside the lines. And basically, I know a lot of you never got to that point--I never did.

But basically, this is not choose alternate A, B, C or D. This is what ideas do you have from the various alternatives and what would you put together in a preferred alternative that we can take back and study that. What's important to you? If you believe that natural areas are important, and that reflects a lower square footage of the Presidio, for instance, what would you do to increase the revenues elsewhere? Or do you not believe that increased revenues are required? What's your ideal alternative? What's the ideal place for the Presidio as a national park?

And then these impact topics of what should we study. Next steps, basically we're talking about comments, we're talking about the workbooks that we have available, a preliminary financial analysis and backup data which is available upon request, a response form we put together, and a closed scoping on January 15th.

At this point I'm going to turn it back over to Carey Feierabend, who's going to explain how we're going to utilize the break period, the

question and comment period, and then your final comments this evening. We are going forward to publishing a draft plan, a draft environmental impact statement, and as Jane pointed out, this process is intended to complete by September of next year. It's been a very evolved process. It's been a very public process.

I'd like to thank everybody tonight, as this is our last public scoping session. I'd like to thank everybody's participation and the active number of comments we've received to date. I would also like to ask you, that Jane kind of implored, please don't wait till January 15th to submit your comments. If you have them prepared or you have part of them prepared, we'd like to hear them as quickly as possible. The faster we get the comments in, the more time we can take to study them as part of the implementation of the draft environmental impact statement.

Carey?

Carey Feierabend: Okay. We want to put you to work tonight. But before I tell you what that assignment is, I just want to remind you that how to get your advice/comments. You can give us comments tonight. You can fill out

a response form. You can leave it with us tonight. You can participate in this next exercise and provide us your comments, or you can email us or mail your comments, fax them or hand deliver them to us. So this information is in the workbook. Again, we want to hear from you.

Tonight, what we're going to do. We're going to take a break for about 20 minutes. In the back of the room are work stations with a Presidio Trust staff person at each work station. And each one of those is one of the alternatives that we have presented this evening as well as the blank maps. We have two of those up for you to tinker with if you feel so inspired.

But you should've received when you came in a comment and question card. If you did not, they are at the front desk and I encourage you to get one. We would like you to take a couple of minutes, write down a question for clarification on tonight's materials that were presented, or going back to the July workshop, the September workshop. Or if you don't have a question but you want to have a comment, you can also provide us a comment in writing.

What we will do is we will come back after the break--and also get some holiday cookie treats--and run through the questions for clarification. After we've gone through the questions, we will then allow the opportunity for you to give us comment if it has not been addressed already this evening.

So I would like to encourage you to get a card, write down your question, and please turn in your question at the front desk. There will also be staff floating around collecting cards, so we want to hear from you.

Thanks, and let's take a break.

[End of Side A]

Jim Meadows: ...the primary purpose behind the [unintelligible] is to take a look at the existing proposed alternatives to be spending under the plan, the environmental impact statement, and then to aid the Trust in the making of a preferred alternative that we'll study as we go down the path toward

a final environmental impact statement, and finally toward the final plan.

We're trying to group the questions and comments into several areas, and I'm going to discuss each one because we are recording this session and we're video recording the session, and we do have the fixed microphone in the back.

What we're asking you to do, which is a little bit different, I'm going to read the questions and the comments as they're received to date, meaning this evening. Several of these questions and comments have asked for a time to speak and to make comments. We're going to reserve the last 45 minutes, approximately an hour from now, to make those comments. When we get to that point, I would ask that in deference to those people that also want to make a comment, that you hold your comments to three minutes or less, and that we go forward as we speak.

What we're going to do to make sure it's a matter of public record, I'm going to introduce the questions and basically then talk about the

clarification of those questions or introduce the subject matter of the comment. I would assure you that if for any reason we don't reach all of the questions and comments tonight--because we will cut this off in an hour--that they will be introduced as a matter of public record and they will be addressed in the draft environmental impact statement and the plan can move forward.

The first area I'm going to talk about questions and comments revolves around the financials and the Presidio Trust Act. This is from Bill Henslen. It says, "Is the Trust legally required really to be financially self-sufficient or to become a profit-generating center for the federal government? If it is to become a profit center, isn't the Trust required by law to retain its own profits in investment for its own use?"

There has been some confusion over a very technical paragraph in the Presidio Trust Act, and it has been interpreted by some people erroneously, that we are to become a profit making center and turn over money to the general Treasury. The dollars in the Presidio that we generate at the Presidio are meant to stay at the Presidio and are meant to benefit the Presidio and the programs within the Presidio. There is

no requirement for the Presidio to become a profit-making center per se.

There is a requirement for it to become not using federal appropriations after the year 2012.

Second question from Mr. Henslen: "Given the lack of details in the description of the programs the Trust envisions, how did the Trust arrive at a constant figure of \$8 million per year for the program expenses?"

We believe that the ideal number of programs at the Presidio will far exceed \$8 million. For purposes of modeling we had to use a baseline number. We hope by virtue of the plan selected and by virtue of the other practices that we talked about earlier in the evening, that we'll be able to have more than \$8 million. But specifically within your workbook, there is an area that talks about programs and what those baselines programs [would] be.

And again, I'm not trying to attempt a dialog here tonight, but I'm trying to clarify these for the benefit of others that have asked the question.

This is an unnamed question. "Is it responsibility of the lessees to raise funding for capital improvements of the buildings they will lease? What is the lease term for these long-term leases?"

First of all, during the Presidio Trust Implementation planning process we have refrained from signing any new long-term leases beyond five years, because we are studying the land uses and the building uses. It has been past policy and it may be future policy that at some times basically we will allow third party users to come in and put the money up to basically improve the buildings and bring them up to building code requirements. It's one of those balancing acts again. If we allow them to do that, then basically, typically it's tied to a long-term lease and it's typically tied to a historic tax credit project, which means that lease could be as long as 39 or should be as long as 39 years.

With that, the effect is we have less capital requirement today, but we get less revenue over the next 20 years. And that offset, we can't have so many other people doing the development of the Presidio that we forget our prime second mission--the first mission being preservation,

the second mission being that we have to be financially self-sufficient by 2013, not by 2030.

A question from, looks like Margaret Park. "Is it true that the Trust is obliged by legislation to maximize income to return to Congress?"

And again, we've addressed that, but no. The idea for the Trust is to become financially self-sufficient and to become financially sustainable as soon as possible, but no longer getting federal appropriations after the year 2013.

Finally, this is from [Dan]. The completion dates of the capital projects are quite some time off--2025 to 2030 and 2040, assuming that the Presidio Trust is acting as the developer. Given that the Trust has limited borrowing capacity and that it would be reasonable to amortize any improvements over a 30-year period, how will these timelines be met? Why not have developers who can use private financing, i.e., Lucas San Francisco Film Center and others do so?

But just to the question, that's the third time the question's been asked, and that will be addressed. But again, if you're only allowing people who can afford to bring five, ten, fifteen million dollars to the table, you've frozen out a lot of non-profits, you've frozen out a lot of smaller users that just can't afford to do an entire building. So as far to our basic premise is, if we study the conditions as if we're going to do everything and we're able to have a mix between the two, that will have a beneficial impact on our planning.

Now, switching from financing to housing at this point, from Mary McAllister: "Should Wherry Housing be left at least in the immediate future since it brings in such substantial revenues?"

One reason we titled what's called the existing conditions is the existing conditions we do have Wherry Housing or Baker Beach Apartments in place. They are rented, and yes, they do create substantial revenue.

There is a mandate that starts back from the GMPA, embraced by the Presidio Trust, that the Wherry Housing is to be torn down over a period of time, and to create new open space. We feel obliged to study that alternative, and that will be studied as part of the existing

conditions. We're leaving it to you to tell us if you would like to see that in a preferred alternative, or basically where we go from here. But at this point, we are embracing the concept that was put together that Wherry Housing would come down.

Another question from Bill Henslen. "I understand the Trust has requested bids for repainting the exterior Baker Beach Apartments. Given that the current color scheme of red and white or teal and white basically [turned it] something of an eyesore, why doesn't the Trust use this opportunity to change the muted natural color scheme to sage greens, grays and bufftones designed to blend [in fully with] the surrounding?"

I will freely admit to you that the aqua and white was pretty ugly.

[laughter]

The intent of any paint scheme is to try to make it blend into its surroundings. There is no such thing as a camouflage for apartments.

[laughter]

Basically, there's no easy way to solve that issue. But I would have you take a look at a picture from three years ago and take a look at a picture today, and defy you to say that they're not looking in a much better shape from a paint condition. We chose the colors as best we could, and basically that's where we move forward on.

This is another topic on Wherry Housing. "Do all the alternatives assume that Wherry Housing is removed at the same time?" The answer to that is yes, for clarification. "And how does this differ from the timing considered in the GMPA?"

The GMPA, if you read different sections of the GMPA, had different ideas on demolition because it called for the Sixth Army retaining portions of the Presidio for as long as through 2010. So you can't really reach one conclusion from the GMPA. But basically, all the alternatives except for existing conditions do call for the housing to be torn down.

Again, a map question on housing: "What is the appropriate jobs/housing balance? What are the Presidio Trust goals in the number of housing units offered and the number of jobs expected?"

With all due respect, I'm saying would you all please tell us what you think is a proper jobs/housing balance. We have [branched] around a number as high as 50 percent. 50 percent of what? And the question becomes, what's the employee base? As the number of employees go down, the amount of jobs/housing balance can go up to a fixed number of housing.

We're looking for a mixture of, we talked about in the GMPA of as many as 5,000 employees. We think under current conditions that number could be 6,000 employees. From there, we're looking for your reactions rather than for us to tell you what we think should be on there.

We're looking for public reaction about the jobs/housing balance.

Going from there, and again, those comments that I've already received that do call for making a comment, I'm assuming that you would like to stand up and make your comment be known.

The next and probably largest group of comments involves transportation. And I apologize if I mispronounced anybody's name, but again, William Weider. "Plan C was the adjacent neighborhood [for] traffic, does little for the cultural aspects of the city and is unnecessary since other plans [favor a way]. The placement of the [Area Press] is an example of what should be done with the Public Hospital access."

For those of you that are not familiar with that, there was an article in yesterday's paper. The [Area Press], we have worked very hard with the [Area Press] people to bring them out under interim lease because they were being booted out of their existing place. [Area Press] basically is a group that does the last of the Gutenberg type press and does large artistic type books. It's a one of a kind, and we think when you start talking about technology from Gutenberg to Lucas that you have a fine spread of technology from something [unintelligible] is important.

Traffic. Again, an unnamed. "How will the increase in traffic to the Presidio be controlled? Also, parking, alternative vehicle security maintained with this largest open area."

Traffic is increasing in the San Francisco area with or without the Presidio. Traffic is increasing within the Presidio as we go back to a point we were when it was its active state as a military Army post. I said from day one, I do love my job here. Therefore, I would never propose, nor would I think this board supports the idea of charging for entry fees to the Presidio because so many people are daily, weekly, hourly users. There will be charges for parking at the Presidio because our goal is to deemphasize the use of the automobile and encourage the ideas of alternative transportation.

As far as how will security be maintained in a large open space, that's an area that I think, as a clarification, we certainly will respond to.

Next question is from...I can't read this one. This is a first for me in a public format. I've gone 30 plus years without these, and this is an [unintelligible]. "The use of 14th Avenue rather than 15th..." I suppose that they're asking about that possibility. "Also to allow an entrance to this area. Please, no Wherry Housing. Use the War Memorial rehab," which we are looking at. "Also, [we must] do something special about

the [Launch Platt] building [in] the southwest areas, basically taking a look at traffic." We will certainly take a look at that as we move forward.

Transportation from Bill Henslen. "The GMPA refers to the possibility of San Francisco extending its Muni streetcar service from Fisherman's Wharf through the Marina district into Crissy Field as part of the Presidio's transportation solution. To what extent is the Trust relying or expecting this contribution from San Francisco? To what extent is the Marina district prepared for this? P.S., I'm not a Marina resident."

[laughter]

Again, for clarification I would point out to you that part of our goal [in] planning and part of our planning process, we work very closely with the city of San Francisco, and we are looking at all modes of transportation including increased Muni service--which the city has already helped us with--other alternative methods of transportation, and we support the idea of basically mass transit up to and including Crissy

Field. But in the interim, we're committed to basically having our own programs that will both be an internal shuttle and an external shuttle.

Another question from Mr. Henslen: "Can you please explain more about the Trust's plans for an underground parking garage under the Parade Grounds? Why is it necessary and how much will it cost?"

Again, for clarification, Jane and Carey mentioned that there is a strong commitment to restoring of the main Parade Ground. As it sits today, it's a large parking lot. The only alternative that we know of basically, given existing historic buildings and the need to use those buildings in order to complete the restoration, would be to drive at that parking underground as well as utilizing mass transit to reduce the instance of the automobile. The cost we have yet to determine. It's pretty well studied what an underground parking structure will cost, and it's expensive. But the idea is that's one of our major mandates, not as strong as the mandate for self-sufficiency or preservation, but certainly strong enough that we're going to study the idea of an underground garage at that location.

And then from that, finally, "There are no garage or parking plans suggested in any of the alternatives. While it is recognized that from an economic point of view any garage will have to pay for itself, a park garage will have a very significant environmental consequence and should, if proposed, be evaluated. Why is there no indication of parking areas or circulation patterns identified in the scoping process?"

Again, that's part of the transportation element. Once we've determined the alternatives, basically we'll be studying circulation. As far as the idea of parking garages, again, we're asking for your input, first of all, on the feasibility--not the financial feasibility, but do you believe that that is a mandate that we should be following?

The last question is from Mary McAllister. "Why haven't explicit transportation plans been provided in the workbook?"

Again, until we have finished the scoping session we're now going into and taking transportation, which will be part of the draft environmental impact statement that we will be publishing and you will be able to add

comment to. We're running ahead of schedule, which is good news, or else I'm talking too fast. Oh, we're not ahead of schedule.

[laughter]

The last group of questions that I have, and then we're coming back to basically I've got two more general and scheduling. This is on programs. This is from Ron Townsend from the Letterman Academy. "Alternative D speaks to a center for education, communication and exchange of ideas. How about inviting participating universities to share in this historic environment with some undergraduate educational programs?"

The idea of education runs through the entire concept of the Presidio from the GMPA forward to the Presidio [Trust's thinking]. We fully trust anticipate the idea of education continuing to be a major element, but again, we're looking for comment from the public such as this that says, should education, should undergraduate, should graduate level education be an important component as we move forward? We basically are trying to get public input on that very subject.

A question from Bill Henslen on general planning concepts. "On December 15th San Francisco will officially submit its bid to host the 2012 Olympics. To what extent will the Presidio land use be driven by or shaped by the Olympic-related needs?"

None.

[laughter]

Bill Henslen: "What exactly does the Trust mean by the term 'programs'?"

That's a very, very good question. The PTIP workbook, page six, refers to museums and programs, in some cases with a capital cost of tens of millions of dollars. It's a museum, a program or a building.

"Would a museum's square footage be included in the total square footage cap or be in excess?"

Again, in the idea of clarification, any building use would be counted towards the cap of square footage, and the idea of museums being a cost of operation, yes, they are. They very rarely pay for themselves. Could we charge the museum as part of what we're going to study. But again, there's a balance here between having full access to the widest range of people, and what do you have in the way of museums.

General question from Mary McAllister: "Why offer any alternative proposal if the park will be financially self-sufficient by the year 2013 and be able to offer programs under the existing conditions?"

Again, by the year 2013 on all the alternatives we will no longer require that we have dollars from the federal budget in order to operate the Presidio. We will have still roughly as much as \$300 million in capital improvements to make under the various alternatives to restore the historic buildings to code and to current conditions. We will also have reserves to put in place so that as those buildings reach their maturity, as our sewer systems, our water systems, our roads, our trees, our plants reach their maturity, we have to replace those. So it's not just enough

basically to be not taking federal dollars. We have to plan for our future and well beyond our initial land plan.

Again, Mary McAllister on programs. "If the Presidio Trust finds it desirable to increase the number of cultural programs in the park, why do they refuse lease proposals made by the Exploratorium, California American Indian Museum, High School for the Performing Arts, and the California State Library?"

For clarification, basically, we have ongoing lease programs with different programs. The Exploratorium is attending at the Presidio now. The American Indian Museum is attending at the Presidio now. These are expansion programs and there's no refusal for these programs. So basically long-term leasing or waiting until we finish this PTIP process before we can go forward with any sort of long-term relationship on any museum programs [with anybody].

Question on education and the environment from Joan Steinberg. "Like the education provisions in alternative A, [at Fort Scott], will similar provisions be made for educational groups in alternative C?"

What relates here, she has two questions here. Again, we have created something that [will be] law of unintended consequences. This is not choose alternative A, choose alternative B or choose alternative C. Tell us what you think is the best preferred alternative and the subject of education. It doesn't matter [if we understand] A, B or C or D. It's a matter of what goes into the preferred alternative, and that is a blank slate. And we're starting from scratch and basically saying to you, "Tell us what you think are your highest priorities, and tell us what's the contravening balance." If that priority is going to be less revenue producing, then how do we offset that reduction in revenue?

The second question is, "What environmental uses will be supported in alternative C, especially environmental education?"

The idea of the environmental education, the idea of sustainability runs throughout the Presidio Trust ideas. They're not limited by alternatives.

And I would suggest to you that I would hope that we would have little or no objection to the fact that those two issues, as far as sustainability

and environmental responsibility, would carry forward [in any of the Trust] as we move forward with the Presidio Trust.

Another question from Bill Henslen. "The PTIP document places heavy emphasis on programs, yet the five alternative plans provide virtually no details on level of programming anticipated or allowed under each plan.

Given the programs involved, people, [most] staff and visitors and people require services of transportation, how can any meaningful environmental impact comparison be made among the five plans?"

We chose, for clarification purposes, to show a fixed level of programming among the five alternatives. We hope, as part of your input and as the decision, as we complete this process, we hope that you will help us find ways and ideas to increase that programming, and that is [an] increased [unintelligible] as we move forward.

The last question about programs is the arts in the Presidio from Paula Clark. "I have been in combat with the Presidio for three years"--

Female voice:

Contact!

Jim Meadows: Contact. Thank you.

[laughter]

I feel much better now.

[laughter]

[Unintelligible] combat in 1970.

[laughter]

"I've been in contact with the Presidio." Let's go back to the glasses.

All right.

[laughter]

"I've been in contact with the Presidio for three years now, trying to get studio space both for myself and several other artists, and to find out

about the programs for the arts and artistic studios. The idea of the alternate B is a permanent presence here in the Presidio for the arts." I'm paraphrasing now. "What are [the] plans for the arts in the Presidio?"

Again, the idea for clarification, we have no plans for the arts. We have no non-plans for the arts. The idea is to come out of these scoping sessions with what are our priorities, and that being one of the priorities then that would become in theory part of a preferred alternative if that's one of the priorities which you've studied.

Let's go the next... And again, we're reading these for the record, and also so that it's not a one-on-one conversation. In other words, we'd like everybody to hear what your friends and neighbors have said, and from that they will become a matter of our public record as we go forward.

The next group of questions revolves around scheduling. This is from Mike. "How is one of the alternatives selected? Does the public vote? Do we do straws? Or does the Trust management select the one that

they prefer the most? How is the public assured that the alternatives with the majority support are the ones that get implemented?"

Very clearly, for clarification, the final decision of the preferred alternative and the plan [put forward] rests with the Presidio Trust board of directors. The Presidio Trust board of directors has tried very strenuously--its staff strenuous and the board is the idea behind it--to have a very strong public input into that decision making. But that final decision making does rest with the board of directors. It will not be a public vote, but it will be, as most environmental plans are, with significant public input and basically taking the advantage of that public input to come up with an educated plan that looks to most people's ideas, but also achieve the balancing act that we've talked about over and over again.

Process question from Mary McAllister. "Why hasn't the Trust insisted on giving the public adequate time to review these alternatives for comment during their meetings to date, and publicized these proposals in the press?"

I'm not a lawyer; I'm a lay person in the law. But my understanding of the whole environmental process is basically that these scoping sessions are just to get your ideas. The draft environmental impact statement will take all public comment and put it together in a statement that will get our ideas of what you said. If you don't believe that what we have put into the draft environmental impact statement is reflective, you've got the other opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement before we publish a final environmental impact statement and a record of decision. So you're with us every step of the way, from our public planning processes, which have gone on in the last 18 months, to the start of the scoping process, through comments and the draft environmental impact statement.

And I will say without further comment, we have listened to organizations and individuals who said, "Give us more time to study the workbooks. Give us more time to look at the financial numbers." And we have done that basically by doubling the time, in some cases even longer, for those official processes.

I do have one job as executive director, and that is to make sure that we do two things at the end of the day: preserve the Presidio and make sure that we meet our economic mandate by the year 2013. So we don't have the luxury of an open-ended process. We will bring this to a conclusion by next September, but we hope to do it in a manner that meets everybody's goals. That meets the goals for public input as well as the goals for preservation and financial self-sufficiency.

Public input question from Mary McAllister. "Given that the questions asked in the workbook allow for open-ended questions, how does the Trust envision the responses would be addressed or tabulated? What effect did the Presidio Trust anticipate responses would have on the development of the draft environmental impact statement?"

I think I've just covered that, and I'll let that question rest as far as how our processes [and do they, how to go forward].

Bill Henslen: "In the PTIP workbook dated July 12, 2000, the PTIP schedule called for a public meeting upon the release of the draft EIS and a second public meeting upon the release of the final EIS. The

PTIP scheduled in the new conceptual alternative workbook has eliminated the second public meeting. Why is this, and can a second public meeting to take place on release of the final EIS not be returned to its place in the schedule?"

I'm sorry?

Female voice: [Unintelligible].

Jim Meadows: I've had a hard time [putting] those words out.

[laughter]

Staff's telling me that basically that was an inadvertent error, and that there will be a second public meeting after the completion of the final EIS process. And I apologize for that.

Another question on process from [them]. "The planning process of the implementation plan is an essential document that will guide the development of the Presidio for our future. It must be considered

carefully and thoughtfully. Please consider extending response time to the draft EIS from 45 to 60 days, and response time to the final planned EIS from 30 days to 60 days."

Again, we had to make some choices here, and I will not stand here and tell you that that will not be considered, because it's a request. But the overwhelming request that we got from the public was, give us more time during the [formative session], and basically we need the time now rather than later. The 45 days is longer than what is legally mandated, but basically it is a fixed time period and we believe it's sufficient for giving those answers. We will take the comment into account.

The next section are specific alternative questions. I lied. This has the most so far, and we're still on schedule.

This is from Dianne Scott. "It's important to preserve the environmental vision of the Presidio outlined in the GMPA. So the question the Trust must consider as to how to make alternative A work financially, that may mean reducing the Trust expenditures as well as generating increased income or foundation and philanthropic contributions. It may

also mean retaining Baker Beach Housing or possibly implementing parts of the Public Health Hospital site or the alternative B financial plan, but in support of the GMPA vision."

As Jane and Carey and everyone has talked about, I think the proper term that Jane started using this evening is that the GMPA does remain a foundation. All of the ideas put forward in the GMPA cannot go forward because there are changed circumstances in three substantial areas. Meaning self-sufficiency was introduced by Congress, the Sixth Army was basically marched out of the gates in 1994, and UCSF is not and will not and had not since 1994 been [part] for a scientific and educational research facility. And such things as the economy, which was in the doldrums in 1994, which is a benefit, and things like the Internet did not exist, for all intents and purposes. So we can continue to use the document, but it does require updating, and yes, we will be, for clarification, studying existing conditions as well as the other alternatives.

This is a question. "Is this concept of a sustainable community, alternative C, contrary to the goals and objectives of a national park?"

I know of nothing in my relationship with the National Park Service, with the Department of Interior or with any other federal agency that would say that a national park may not be sustainable. There are different definitions of sustainability. There's extents that we can go that basically could not happen in a Yosemite or Yellowstone. But the idea of a sustainable place, meaning sustainable practices as we define them, meaning not using up our future generations' resources, are things that I think you could strive for in any national park but certainly in this national park in this urban area.

Gene Beardsley: "Alternative C includes substantial housing units at the Public Health site area. What effect will this have on carrying capacity of Lake Street and the environmental [residents] north of 14th and 15th Avenues?"

Again, that's part of what transportation would study as to the traffic impacts. That's one of the core elements of an environmental review, is basically what are the transportation impacts [as we're] going forward.

Public Health Hospital building from Janet [Piori]. "It's not clear how the Public Health Hospital building figures in this plan, or does it? Open space--everyone has their own ideas of what is open space. What is the PTIP definition?"

For clarification, you'll note that the different alternatives do call for different uses within the Public Health Hospital site, from no use, which has its own complications because portions of the Public Health site are historic buildings, to a full use, which basically is studied in one or more of the other alternatives. So again, this is part of our alternatives for study, and will not become part of the preferred alternative we're looking for public input.

The definition of open space. I'll leave it to the EIS to define open space in a more precise manner. But we do rest on another bedrock principle, and that is disturbing non-disturbed areas. Those areas of the Presidio that are natural today will be natural for the future. And those areas that are in disturbed areas basically are the ones we're talking about. There are no plans, there never have been plans, there were no

GMPA plans, there are not any Trust plans for taking natural areas and turning those into developed areas.

Making the GMPA alternative work--untitled. "We'd like to see further consideration of the GMPA alternative. More study and community input went into that plan not supportive of the housing component but of the cultural and community components."

Again, for clarification, that is one of the alternatives being studied, and [we'll go] forward on that.

Question on the preferred alternative. "What process will be used to formulate a preferred alternative, i.e., which directives, which features from the various alternatives will be incorporated in the preferred alternative [and be for] submission to the board members?"

That's what you're doing here tonight, and that's what you were doing in basically October, and that's what you were doing in July and September, an alternate planning process that's stretched out over 18

months now, but we will continue to receive and input through January 15th.

The next question is "Alternative C, the best alternative in order to maintain income level from housing. We need the rental to meet our self-sufficiency budget and steady, dependable income by the year 2013. Will the money to back up..."

Male voice: [Respond].

Jim Meadows: "[Un proceed] future problems." Good point. The idea, again, for clarification, there is no dictate to take Trust monies and to support the general Treasury of the United States. The Trust monies are meant to promote the preservation of the Presidio. When I say preservation, that very long definition, I never can memorize it, but basically it's the natural, cultural, historic and scenic resources. Preservation is preservation and involves all of those areas. And that will be part of all this [new] documentation.

From Mary McAllister on planning: "Why shouldn't the buildings near the park's exits be maintained instead of clustering all the building in the northern part of the Presidio?"

Again, for clarification, that's one of...we're studying as far as the alternative process. There are impacts for traffic, there are impacts for transportation, there are impacts in almost every area of the Presidio by which choice we make or as [where] we cluster the improved areas, but only, again, in those areas that are already built-up areas of the Presidio.

Another Mary McAllister: "Why are alternative proposals A through D so similar in the amount of capital expenditures they require and the revenue they produce? Why isn't there an alternative that costs less?"

I've mentioned this in other contexts, and again, for clarification, not to discuss the point. We have basically three and probably four codes to deal with in historic building preservation. We have buildings have to be brought to current building code. They have to be brought to where they're responsible for the ADA qualifications--Americans With Disabilities Act. They have to be improved for seismic conditions

which are peculiar to San Francisco. And they all have to be done under the context of they are historic buildings and they're being redeveloped with that in mind--meaning walls can't be moved, exteriors cannot be changed, windows must be replaced or repaired.

All in all, it costs as much, if not more, to restore an historic building as it would to build a new building in its place. Just because it's expensive does not mean that the history of the Presidio and these historic buildings basically should not be preserved.

I will digress and give you an editorial comment from the staff, and that is, in the last 18 months, basically we have caused or in our own staffing preserved over \$50 million of historic buildings in the Presidio. You stack that up against the \$4 billion of historic buildings nationally that are going fallow because of not being restored, and basically we're very proud of the fact that we're taking the historic buildings and putting them into stable condition. It is not cheap.

Mary McAllister: "Why has the Presidio Trust presented the alternatives in their workbook in such general terms without giving any site-specific

details on the line item budget prior to December 7th so that individuals and groups would be able to provide informed responses?"

I will represent to you, I think we've gotten some very informed responses. But basically, the idea of the financial backup for what's going into these plans is an ongoing. We've hired the Sedway Group. Several of you met them. Basically, they are professional financial consultants, an outside entity that helps us with our financial modeling. And they are helping us provide those specific numbers.

As far as site specifics go, this is a concept plan. It is not a site-specific plan. And you are assured that as we get to site-specific issues there will be further environmental analysis and planning analysis, as Carey mentioned, using the Main Post as an example, that will be done at the time that that specific planning goes forward.

If we studied each building, each planning area, in very great detail at this point, we would never be able to complete this process in a timely fashion. So the idea is to get a conceptual overlay, to update the

GMPA, and then to move forward on site-specific planning as we go down the road.

Another question on the PTIP proposal from Mary McAllister. "Why in the workbooks do the proposed uses listed for specific areas overlap between the various proposals to such a great extent that no information is given regarding how much of each of the proposed areas is actually being recommended?"

Again, for clarification, we have chosen what we have gotten from input to study these alternatives. The preferred alternative will be a subject matter that can widely vary from any one of the four or five alternatives studied.

Another question from Mary McAllister. "Has the Presidio Trust developed any site-specific preferred alternatives, even a hypothetical one?"

We're waiting to hear your input, basically, before we're putting together a preferred alternative as we move forward.

Question from Bill Henslen. "The GMPA treats Crissy Field, the Main Post and Cavalry Stables as three very distinct areas for land use and program planning. Why does the PTIP lump all three together into one land use which appears destined for uses including hotels, museums, offices and apartments? Shouldn't the Trust separate these three areas and plan for each separately?"

The idea of having a small number of planning areas to have commonality to them was a very specific decision that the Trust staff put together as part of preparing for the PTIP process. There are no preconceptions as to what [would we use] in those areas, and I would suggest to you that that's what the scoping is about.

Bill Henslen again. "Alternatives A through D all seem to call for substantial new development along the entire southern half of the Crissy Field area between Mason Street and Doyle Drive. What specifically does the Trust envision for this prime strip of waterfront property? Will it be mostly natural areas with perhaps an aviation museum and a

couple of small cafes, or other visitor amenities as stated in the GMPA?

Or will it be more along the lines of Sausalito or the Riviera?"

[laughter]

For clarification, I don't think we'll ever be the Riviera. There's a serious intent behind the question, and that is, again, a site-specific planning area. We know from a general concept of what can go in the Crissy Field area. We're asking for your input as to what you think are the best uses. Are they museums? Are they lodging? Are they the different possibilities that exist?

A fourth question from Bill Henslen on the subject. "The GMPA calls for demolition and new construction to be phased in over a long period of time. This will specifically be true of the Wherry/Baker Beach Housing demolition. The Trust's own July 1998 financial management program called for Wherry and MacArthur Housing to be demolished over 30 years. Why does the PTIP's presentation of the GMPA plan now call for the demolition of all of this revenue-generating housing in just the next 10 years, and spending \$25 million building new housing

even sooner, in the next three years? Doesn't this accelerated schedule doom the GMPA no action alternative to failure?"

The GMPA does call for the demolition of Wherry over a shorter period. And to be true to the definition, again, for clarification, we stayed with the definition as outlined in the GMPA.

This is from [Ossa Hanalat], I believe. "Letterman is a 'given.' Does this mean that the plan is 'cast in concrete?' [Unintelligible] public input. Does the present plan provide for a sustainable community for the development?"

The Letterman project was the subject of a separate environmental impact statement for which there is a record of decision. And for purposes of the PTIP planning it is a given.

Natural resources. Basically, we are getting close on time, we're getting close on the [NL] questions.

Sharon Kato, I believe. "One, could you break down the open space [fingers] into natural areas and golf course areas between the buildings?"

Again, this is not a clarification question. We can certainly break that down in the draft EIS.

Second question: "In the EIP, could you show what enlarging the wetlands area in Crissy Field or removing Public Health Hospital would look like? These are exciting possibilities that are just dry on paper."

Again, those are site-specific ideas. But whether or not there is development in the Public Health Hospital area or whether or not there's a wetlands area are things we're looking for from the scoping session as public comments and questions.

This is a student from San Francisco State University. "How do you define recreation activities and resources?" And again, we will answer that in the EIS. "Recreation can be the use of an educational component

using leisure education to enhance play opportunities, recreation growth and education."

Again, this is fine comment for the draft EIS. Recreation can provide a positive experience to community. Thank you.

An unnamed question: "Why don't the alternatives distinguish between open space areas such as the golf course and ball field"--I think we've covered that part--"and the areas that were slated for native plant restoration? What is the purpose of lumping these two different land use [assignments] together?"

There is no lumping per se, but in actuality do not forget there are three natural type areas in the Presidio. There is the forest area, there's the native plants area, and there's the landscaped area of the Presidio. And all three components are part of our study process, again, as clarification.

Again, since we grouped these questions you'll hear dissimilarities here.

"How is open space defined? Shouldn't this category be divided into

natural areas, recreation areas, golf course, ball fields and landscaped meadows?" No comment on that. "Where does the net gain mostly occur?"

The "no comment" was in reference to my last name, not to the question.

The idea here basically, again, is open space defined as areas for which there will not be further development within those three areas of landscape, forest areas, [and within] landscaped areas.

The next group of questions revolve around tenant selection. We're not flying these questions to Tallahassee, but basically they are [unintelligible].

[laughter]

"The financial resources--would you please elaborate on the tenant selection process?"

Again, as a clarification item, we do have a very extensive tenant selection process, and we will address that in the EIS. I would point out that the one element that should be noted. It is not just economics but what they provide to the park and what are the other elements of tenancy?

General topic--this is [unintelligible]. Cooperative media access facility.

"A cooperative international public benefit media access facility (TV and radio production with WWW and satellite distribution) would accomplish a number of important and interactive goals: public education, [unintelligible] acknowledgment for participating organizations, global outreach, cooperation among groups producing and benefitting, and potentially international visitors and governmental meeting spaces."

Again, for clarification, I think this is an area where we fully intend to study, but the Presidio has already embarked on the fact that it's becoming a high technology center, and part of the high technology center is being able to utilize these facilities. Again, I'll put in a plug for several of our ten organizations. The Trust has sponsored four of them,

actually having video conference from places such as Nairobi, where there's United Nations type events that are being teleconferenced back to the Presidio. We've had a few people come and listen every time we've had them.

Another question about the Public Health Hospital area. "Temporary rental for the Jewish Community Center of three buildings in the area. Some innovation's going on. Will this mean the buildings will be useful (after the JCC lease is over with minimal additional innovation)? Or will the buildings be in poor shape and be in need of tearing down anyhow? In other words, does the current work give a new opportunity for usage in the future?"

Again, for clarification, I would point out to you that the Trust does not embark on any interim lease unless we can get a return on the monies we've expended in less time than the lease term. Meaning we want positive cash flow out of that interim lease or it does not make any sense to go through renovations. In the case of the Jewish Community Center, again, for clarification, those leases fall within our interim leasing program, but we are getting monies in excess of the cost of

renovation. And in every set of plans, since we do our own plan approval and our own permitting, we look at every set of improvements that are done by third parties or done by ourselves to see how can the buildings be reused, how can the improvements be reused after the tenancy is up for that particular lease.

Goals of the GMPA. This is a [math] question again [with comment].

"Page six of the PTIP conceptual alternatives workbook indicates the Trust now proposes tenants not necessarily connected to park programs will to a great extent become the means for accomplishing much of [what] the GMPA set out for the Presidio. Not every tenancy would be required to have a mission that serves a specific program theme. This will be a radical departure from the goals stated in the GMPA proposal." It says, "Please explain."

Again, I promised that I'm not going to go into a discussion of the content. I would just suggest to you that it is not our goal basically that our tenants do not have a mission at the Presidio, but that those missions can vary and be of various types. But that will be discussed specifically in the draft EIS.

The next group of questions center around the national historic landmark and the cultural and historic areas of the Presidio.

Question 1: Does the Trust have a list of historic resources that will be retained on all alternatives. The Trust for clarification basically is sensitive to and has a mandate to preserve all effective historic structures and to preserve them and to bring them up to codes for reuse.

The Trust also has the legal authority of within working with the Secretary of Interior's guidelines and working within National Historic Landmark guidelines to take down structures of where they cannot be reused effectively, meaning that they're in such bad shape that they cannot be effectively restored.

Having given our legal authorities, I would tell you our mission is to preserve as many buildings that are historic as is possible. And if that means every building, then that we would try to keep every building. But basically whatever we do with restoration or taking down buildings that are historic in nature, that that will be done with the full public

process that follows the Secretary's standards for historic preservation, and follows the Trust Act and the requirements for how we reuse buildings.

Again, question on cultural destination from the Presidio Performing Arts Foundation. Question: "Should alternative D be elected, what would be the criteria to make the decision on which programs the Presidio Trust would support?"

I would suggest to you that that's a very site-specific question. It's not something that will be studied in PTIP environmental impact statement. It's something that would be studied. We do have an existing selection process in place now. As we complete the PTIP process we may find it necessary to adjust that selection process, and that would be, again, a matter of public comment.

A NAPP question about the new construction. "The Presidio is a national historic landmark. Given the need to respect the landmark and historic status, what studies have been done to indicate where and what amount of new construction could be permitted? All of the alternatives

include renovating and reconstructing significant amounts of building volume. What analysis has been done? Where and in what amount new construction can occur?"

Part of the process you've seen in past public scoping sessions is basically the idea of where things could occur. The first study that we think has to be done is where would you put new construction, if any, and where would it go? And then basically studying that, we would then have to go through a complete process of that particular site-specific project as we move forward with that project.

Down to vision and planning principles. Suggestions for planning principles, map the important sites and building a landscape. Confine new construction to small addition or areas of less historic import. Include the category of stabilizing, reserving to two-year treatments for historic structures. Again, I categorize that in the area of comment that we will put into the public comment period.

The last round of questions I have is in the area of general or miscellaneous. And again, I'm trying to stick to the idea of clarification

here. And I think we're just about on schedule to allow us 45 minutes for public comments.

How much of the final decision is made on the basis of public debate and how much is made behind closed doors? I would suggest to you, in all deference to my professional staff, that we did a hundred of these outreach sessions last year. We'll probably do roughly a hundred this next year. Decisions are made with full public input, and you're welcome to public input for groups 40 and groups 400. We're committed to that process and it does continue.

The second half of the comment is alternatives A, B and D each have some advantages. We vigorously opposed alternative C.

This is a NAPP cooperative planning. Neighbors of the Presidio have been involved with this process since 1990, or at least where is the city of San Francisco, who is the official contact from San Francisco on PTIP? I know San Francisco and the Presidio are legally, administratively different jurisdictions, but what goes on in our area affects the other. And one area affects the other, certainly. San

Francisco should have a person department in touch with this process providing input, maybe even an ombudsman for San Francisco Neighbors of the Presidio.

Something that's not very publicized is the fact that we do have ongoing weekly if not daily sessions with some departments of the city virtually every day of the week, and that involves everything from Doyle Drive planning to ideas of transportation to ideas of traffic and environmental restoration. I think you all are aware that both Crissy Field and Mountain Lake were beneficiaries of monies that came directly or indirectly from environmental remediation required by San Francisco. There is communication, but there is not a single person but virtually every department in the city there's a counterpart in the Trust, and we work together constantly for that clarification.

Question from Doug Kern: "In addition to the EIS, what other documents would come out of the PTIP process, i.e., another GMPA for Area B. The NPS Presidio GMPA went into some detail. Would an Area B revision GMPA provide more or less detail?"

I don't think we know the answer to that until we basically get into the draft of the EIS and the plan itself. Again, we're tearing off the GMPA, using it as a foundation. We're not intending upon replacing the document. So I'm not going to try to write page 17 of the GMPA over again. What we're trying to do is study the differences and what are the changed circumstances.

Bill Henslen has a question: "What is the current legal status of the environmental review for the proposed Lucas development, and how is that product's future dependent upon the outcome of the PTIP process?"

I think I believe that I've already answered that that is a given [with] a separate environmental impact statement and record of decision.

Bill Henslen: "The five alternative development plans as currently presented for public comment are vague, all-inclusive and extensively overlapping. These five plans provide enough detail and clarity to satisfy all NEPA and the California standards for the environmental review."

Again, we will take that into account as a comment. As far as will they certainly to the best of staff's ability and our outside legal and environmental consultants, we'll make sure that all NEPA laws are complied with in the environmental impact statement.

Bill Henslen again: "At the November 15th meeting I asked a Presidio Trust representative at my discussion table how a meaningful environmental impact comparison could be made among the five plans, given the lack of specifics regarding programs--land use, transportation, et cetera. His answer was that the Trust would have to be 'very clever' to be able to do this. Are we proposing to substitute cleverness for clarity in this planning process?"

Very specifically, the answer is no.

Question and comment period from Don Green. "Any way to meet with staff and to discuss our views of..." It's written by Don Green-- "our views for the give and take to better focus on responses."

[Unintelligible] comments and questions are pretty much the same point. When you get more specifics on these, the Fort Scott, Winfield

Scott, Public Health and the Main Post. And we'd like to understand better the need for increased operating, i.e., non-capital costs in the context of higher capital reserve funds. We need a financially viable lower development alternative.

I will represent to you that basically, we put together a plan in 1998 for clarification of this point. We studied a reduction in cost in the last National Park Service budget. After three years of operation, and then going back and studying what it cost to operate the Presidio before the National Park Service took over, we found that it cost more to operate the Presidio than basically what we had taken over as the numbers from the National Park Service because there were a lot of [glitch] items that were not inclusive in an operating budget.

With three years of operation we feel we have a much better handle on what the costs are, and we are committed to lowering the unit costs in every category. But the costs are what the costs are. Basically, operating the Presidio in pristine condition and as a sustainable park in this urban area is expensive. And I think that's one reason the Trust Act

was created in the first place, because of the expense of operating the Presidio. But the fact remains that the costs speak for themselves, and we will study that throughout the EIS.

The topic is the board of directors stability. "The Presidio Trust was appointed by President Clinton. Will the change of administration affect the Presidio effort or disrupt the reappointment of the board of directors?"

The board of directors are appointed by the president of the United States and appointed for specific terms, and to my knowledge as a lay person there'll be no legal ramification of the change of administration, for clarification.

Decision making process--unnamed. "You provide that there are several issues that must be considered throughout this process. Are any of these issues expected to be weighed more heavily than others?"

The only issues that I would tell you would be weighed more heavily than others are preservation of the park and basically financial self-sufficiency by the year 2013.

"How will the issue of public safety be addressed in the development of the Presidio Trust?"

We are blessed with the benefit of public safety programs where we put--and I can use the four-letter word "cops" on the street because my dad was one. So I retain that privilege. We put more cops on the street basically to work in the Presidio than many other neighborhoods in San Francisco. We have a very safe place to live and safe place to work. We intend it to stay that way over the long-term future.

Public safety will be part of what it costs to operate the Presidio. And it's not just police and fire. It's EMS, it's people that repair your drains when it stops up, the people that repair streets when a pothole comes up overnight. There's a 24/7 365-day a year operation going on at the Presidio.

"Why are the capital costs shown for the existing condition alternative as \$31 million, making this the least changes? This now is much greater than the capital costs shown for the other alternatives."

I have to tell you that I can't clarify because I'm not sure what it's referring to, but we'll study that particular point and make it part of the public comment.

The last page [needs] to show the number of units in each housing group in order to evaluate the economic importance of each housing group. Again, we're trying to study the concept of housing, jobs/housing balance, a full range of housing, [really how] housing should be. And then on a site-specific basis in the future we'll study basically the specific housing groups.

The borrowing from U.S. Treasury \$50 million proposed. This is from Mr. Haywood. "The financial summary does not indicate the \$50 million or the schedule of payment on that amount. Isn't that the point of financial self-sufficiency?"

For clarification I would point out the financial model does include maximizing the utilization of the \$50 million in borrowing authority where we have the ability to borrow for 15 years interest only, and then 15 years of payback of principal and interest.

Topic: proposed recreational park and motor vehicles policy. "I would like to request five minutes to speak." Again, I would request that you hold it to three minutes, but basically we're now coming to the last question. There was no plan here, but one of our most ardent participants--this is from [the Reverend Kernan]. "The program level of each alternative is at such a general level as not to be sufficiently informative to allow reasonable decisions with an understanding of the environmental and cultural consequences. More specific information requires square footage of bulk and use in the various areas."

Again, the comment is well taken. I would suggest that we will try to get as specific as possible within the overall definition of this as a conceptual EIS, and we're not trying to get down to site-specific final environmental impacts.

With that, we're one minute behind schedule. We've gone through all the questions as a matter of both for the oral public record, and I would assure these will become part of our public record.

And now I'd like to open things up to comments. Please don't rush the microphone. There will be plenty of time for everyone. I will try to ask you if you're approaching three minutes that, in deference to other people who may wish to speak, that you might want to give them that opportunity. I would ask that you come to the fixed microphone so that we can both audio and video that particular comment. This will not be a Q&A session but it will be basically comments that you wish to make [at this file] for the scoping process.

So I would invite anybody that has a comment to make that now would be an appropriate time. When you come up for comment could you please state your name, and if you have an association with a group would you please give that association also.

Becky Evans: My name's Becky Evans. I'm the co-chair of the Sierra Club's Presidio committee. A few comments, and they will raise some questions.

All the financially viable alternatives [anyone in the] Trust [with the] same level of [total] development in part. \$620 million in capital expenses. None of the viable alternatives present any difference in Trust operating costs or permanent expenses. They are the choices of what activities are to be carried out or the activities are to be, but not a viable choice for the low level activities. I know this [unintelligible] to develop the numbers by the point whatever million square feet; that's the equivalent of seven or eight Transamerica Pyramids. I don't know the numbers [spaces] in front of that, but that's a lot of development in a national park.

We believe--the Sierra Club--the Trust can offer a lower GMPA alternate level parkwide activities [and still] achieve self-sufficiency. To create increased revenues, for example, Baker Housing could be maintained until 2012 as proposed in all the other alternatives, rather than be demolished in 2004. Cost reductions could occur in Trust operating costs and in capital expenses.

The Club requests that the Trust prepare financially viable alternatives [at] significantly lower levels of development--this is something we've been talking about for some time--closer to the GMPA alternative. Since the revenues of the GMPA alternative are so much higher than forecast, previously [unintelligible].

The PTIP alternatives have substantial unexplained consulting, operating and capital expenses over projections provided by the Trust as recently as May of this year. Those earlier lower estimates provided complete self-financing by the year 2013. No explanation has been provided for the adoption of newer, more expensive estimates.

Please explain--and I realize I'm not asking to do this tonight--why the expenses have increased and why there are no financially viable options at the lower level of expense and development. Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you.

Milon White: Members of the Presidio Trust, my name is Milon White, from Truckee. I'm speaking on behalf of the [unintelligible] International, which is the [nursery] organization.

There are two issues here that I'd like to call your attention. First, the lack of a [unintelligible], and then your motor vehicle policy.

In 1997, we submitted a plan for an RV park up to eight acres providing for up to 400 units, and suggested that this be in the Crissy Field area.

We'd like to suggest that you retain the PX and the Commissary for museum and conference purposes and put this park adjacent to level ground.

We would encourage people to arrive between one and three and leave between nine and eleven in order to avoid peak hour traffic. Once they're parked we would recommend that they use the Presidio shuttle system and bus system of the city of San Francisco.

We anticipate that the net revenue to the Presidio would be a million dollars a year.

Our proposal of an RV park campground is encouraged by the one million members of the associations that I mentioned. The RVers are the kind of people I think you'd want to bring to the Presidio. They like adventure, historical sites, [have fun], and they're neat campers.

On the idea of the motor vehicle policy that you seem to have, whether you like it or not most people get around in motor vehicles. In addition [to making] greater use of the San Francisco bus system, the Presidio shuttle should be fully utilized [unintelligible] in the Presidio.

Some of the kinds of people that need vehicles--families with small children, handicapped persons, photographers with their gadget [unintelligible], picnickers with their food and beverage, campers with all their gear, and people with time constraints--the average tourist stays in San Francisco three and a half days and they try to see everything possible.

For example, to attend this meeting tonight my wife and I drove the 180 miles from Truckee. We parked our Airstream in an RV park 80 miles

from here in Isleton, and we'll have to reverse that course tonight.

Because of the late hour of the meeting--six to nine--I was tempted to call somebody to see if we could park our Airstream somewhere in the Presidio overnight, but I figured that somebody would blow a fuse if we even tried, so I didn't try. Most of the eight and a half million RVers in the country would not come to the Presidio if they had to drive 80 miles to and from.

I might say to Jane, you don't have to go to Colorado to get powdered snow. I can show you as we meet you're getting seven inches of new powder up in Donner Pass.

Recommendation--

Jim Meadows: You're approaching your three minutes. Could you wrap it up, please?

Milon White: There are 40 recreational vehicle organizations in the nine Bay Area counties. I'm the director and manager of a pilot program to test the whole idea [of how and appoint five from] each of those RV [parks], provided that [unintelligible] or a catered dinner and lunch [with their

events bussed here to] the Presidio [unintelligible] history of [the fort], [and seminar over the] objectives of the Presidio Trust. [Unintelligible] 400 people, [unintelligible]. Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Meadows: Thank you very much.

Lynn Sheer-Bogotan: I'm [Lynn Sheer-Bogotan], [unintelligible] [for the avengable card]. I was trying to encourage you to include money in the budget for stabilization and conservation, which is one end of the preservation spectrum, but it's not covered in any of your documentation.

I'd also like to encourage you as a practical matter to turn the heat on in all the unoccupied buildings, because if you don't it will encourage [unintelligible] eventually the destruction of the building.

I would like to suggest that you consider using the non-contributory housing that is historically non-contributory as an income stream which could erode gradually over time as fluctuations in the economy and the rental market might dictate. That would help fund the preservation of building not just the adaptive reuse. Because it happens that some of

the most historic structures are probably going to be the most difficult to reuse, but they would have the most potential for becoming historical museums, events, things to draw the public, things to inspire their memories and their imaginations.

I would also like to encourage you to include in the PTIP a map showing you have determined the locations for new construction, because new construction in a historic district is a delicate thing. It isn't covered very well in the Secretary of Interior's guidelines because he doesn't expect you to do that much new construction [unintelligible]. So one has to sort of figure out what are the historic sacred cows, what are the natural sacred cows, and what does that using [in the cards mean system for the overlays]? You could figure out where are the places that can stand reconstruction, and where the ones for new construction should be avoided except as small additions.

Of course in an ideal world, a good preservationist would hope that in a place like the Main Post one would move some of the non-contributory buildings rather than adding new structures there.

Finally, I think you need to include in the PTIP an annotated list of all the structures along the line except the one which is in the GMPA to indicate any changes in how you're planning to treat each structure as it's being demolished or conserved, reused, [unintelligible]. It's a bookkeeping detail which we'll get to, but probably not appropriate in the conceptual discussion. But it's very hard for a preservationist to abide by their concepts without knowing more details about what went into the [unintelligible]. Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you.

Howard Stanzen: Howard Stanzen, Sierra Club. There's one more change that happened in the local environment since 1994 which [had been] mentioned. We finished building a new baseball field down near the bay, and it was built with a lot less parking than anyone had ever imagined would ever be enough. But yet it's working just fine. No congestion. Some nights the parking doesn't even fill up, we understand. Of course there is very good transportation. And of course the parking comes at a very high price, which helps get people to use transit.

This is something that the Presidio has to consider much more carefully.

I understand that you're planning to build a large garage underground which is going to cost a fortune. In Golden Gate Park, in order to get an underground garage, they had to find an outside benefactor to build it free, and there are still going to be hourly parking charges. And then, for a year and a half now we've had this concept where all the funds that come in for parking will go out, be balanced, and then used for transportation, or now we understand you can help pay for this garage.

Well, you're setting yourself up for a real hole. And the Sierra Club would like you to consider that you charge enough for parking and not build this garage. That would end up being able to have less development in many places, much more money for programs, and may set the examples for Northern California and the rest of the world that it's not sustainable to keep driving. And so people, if they have to face substantial parking charges, will figure out which bus is running. They will beat on Muni, they will beat on all the local regional services to provide more service, and will all become a little more sustainable.

And it may be that in order to get sustainable and drive less we will do it for its recreation. That's happening for people who never use the Cal Train now use it to go to see Giants games. So this kind of stuff can happen. And we would hope that the Presidio will take the lead in helping it happen, and that will help you get more sustainable. Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you.

Ronald Townsend: My name is Ronald Townsend. I'm a resident of the Veterans Academy here at the Presidio, that new structure that's just taken place sometime in August or September of this year.

What I'd like you to do just for a few minutes is just use your imagination as George Lucas always puts out. I was thinking that in the Fort Steiner area, if we could think about as a proposal have Ivy League schools or prestigious universities open up extension programs here at the Presidio. I think it would be a great, ideal location, increased exposure for them, and also a great source of income for the Presidio.

I was also thinking when I first moved here in September, I was pretending that I was a university president, and I was thinking about how I would convert all the buildings on the Main Post into a law school [with] a business school [in there], and a medical school in conjunction with UCSF. So this opportunity gave me the opportunity, as I mentioned, that gee, how nice it would be if we couldn't build new structures or we could just have these structures that are already here to be utilized as extension programs either for graduate or undergraduate programs. Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you.

Margaret Zigar: Margaret Zigar. I recall a serviceman speaking at one point here. And he asked for more burial spaces for the veterans. But I notice that we are including open space. I don't know where they're going to put the existing cemeteries. And they are historic features, and they are a program as well. And I think that somehow that should be included in the planning process. And I remember that he was impassioned about what he said and nowhere since have we heard anything about that.

And the second thing, I believe that somehow [unintelligible] the planning process relate to the Presidio to the new GGNRA across the bridge, and take into account the traffic concepts of the bridge, have staging areas here in the Presidio with shuttle transportation across the bridge or ferry transportation or other kinds of ways to get to [West Marion]. And I believe that the trailer parks and the RV parks and campgrounds really could relate in a GGNRA/Presidio context. Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you. Other commenters?

Donald Green: I'm Donald Green from the Sierra Club and the [Northern Lights group].

This question of programs and tenants, and how each of the alternatives by area as well as by topic you've mentioned as the total alternative, maybe you could benefit if you for the next draft of the PTIP alternatives got another matrix which had programs under each alternative. So you had education--whether it be square foot or dollars. Education, culture, arts, commercial tenants, educational tenants and so

forth. And I realize that you use the words for each area--we might have lodging or conference centers or offices. But I think all of us are having trouble with bringing it down to reality. And I know the site-specific ones do that. That's one suggestion.

Also, I'm a little concerned that most of the Main Post now, as I understand it, has been leased out. And I would be curious if you want to tell us now or later how much more office space there is on the Main Post to lease out after renovation. Because aside from Fort Scott, which is a very unique place that may have kind of tenant, and the Public Health Service, which may have one kind of tenant or another in both cases, the only thing we have left to talk about programs probably is the Main Post. And there's a dearth at this point, I think, of what we call education, political and environmental programs. So I'd be interested in having that information presented next time around by alternative, as much detail as you can give us.

Jim Meadows: Thank you.

Diana Scott: I'm Diana Scott. I'm sorry that I missed some of the first speakers' remarks because I was listening to the concession speech.

Just an impressionistic sense, a question I have really is to have a conceptual EIS, or an EIS based on conceptual alternatives to me is sort of a contradiction in terms. I think the process going on here tonight is a very good one. But in fact, an environmental impact statement is site-specific, so that raises some [implications]. Other people have said that, and I just think that is a sense of what I've gotten from what other people have said. And if you are interested in public input, this is something you should take seriously, I would think.

I think also, I've been to many meetings around the Presidio and other processes for public impact, and if in fact decision making--it's one thing to have decision making by groups such as the Trust board, but for that there not to be transparency or any public view of that process is cutting out the public after you've taken something from us that presumably you want or need. So I find that I still would like you to further address that at some point. Not just address it, but take it to heart.

And I think finally--maybe not finally, but the other point I would make now is that I heard a lot about preservation of various kinds but I haven't heard very much about the whole idea of ecological balance. I know in various ways the Trust is trying to address ecological principles, but I think the larger spirit of what was supposed to happen in the Presidio has yet to be really taken to heart in some of these documents. It's around the edges and I'm really happy to see it more talked about, but I think not just historical or environmental preservation--we're talking about a living balance. Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you.

Peter Dumont: Peter Dumont with the Star Alliance World Peace Ethics Initiative. We made the comment earlier about the public access and a media facility that would be so desirable. And I did want to emphasize the word "integrative"--I think it was written "integrative"--because it would seem to be fulfilling a number of purposes at once and tying things together in many ways for the public service organizations, for average tenant [unintelligible] education, [unintelligible]. And possibly income as well

for the Presidio through international promotion and involvement and possibly even contributions from different countries that would be represented, for instance, [as] citizens in residence or [unintelligible] international visitors.

As far as the four alternatives, I think option D would be [our desirable] in terms of the pizzazz and the fun of it, as well as the income. But I like, and I think our group would like aspects of all four plans, and [unintelligible] to the extent possible again. For instance, revenues from the high income level of that plan perhaps could be used to support the beginning stages if not the ongoing stages of the [unintelligible]. International visitors [unintelligible] dialog with a social purpose. [Unintelligible].

And just to wrap up and share a vision and maybe to celebrate a little bit, the last time that we came and participated in these public sessions, [this language] is our symbol for integration and diversity and unity. It's been taken to the summit at Mt. Everest three times by [highly cherished] shareholders--quite a record breaker. Stayed overnight on top, made a new speed record, as opposed to having the most [clients].

Jim Meadows: Thank you. Other comments?

Bill Henslen: Hi. My name is Bill Henslen, and I've been trying to study the financials [and work on] sort of the revenue and expense side of things, and also looking at the capital investment side of things, and I'm really getting confused about alternative A, the GMPA alternative. I'm also confused about alternative A as far as land use because it doesn't seem to be consistent with the GMPA's own plan for land use.

I feel it's important to consider the Crissy Field, Main Post and Cavalry Stable areas as separate areas for planning purposes. The GMPA does this very specifically, and alternative A [unintelligible] PTIP document does not do this. So all three areas are [lumped] together, and all three areas could have hotels or residential uses or office uses or museum uses.

That was the first point of confusion for me about land use. But I also [unintelligible] confused about demolition and schedules. It appears that simply accelerating the demolition of Baker Beach and other

housing, and accelerating the new construction of other housing, those two plans together almost guarantee that alternative A will fail financially. So I did a little work analysis to try to figure out why that might be.

In the existing conditions, we have 1,654 units of housing. If we subtract roughly 560 units of dormitories and roughly 500 units at Baker Beach, we then have to build 450 new units of housing by 2013 to come up with the alternative A total of 1,044 units. So that's a lot of demolition and a lot of construction, and the detailed financial spreadsheets show the effect [of that]. The demolition and construction costs are accelerated dramatically into the near term, whereas the GMPA [in] the Trust's own financial management plan, [is that the] Congress called for that to be phased in over a long range time period.

So that's my comment. I also have a question on the detailed financial plans. [As seen for] alternative A, \$510 million in capital costs, but the spreadsheet for alternative A shows only about \$125 million in capital costs. And I'm trying to figure out where the other millions are. [It's] the other scenarios, the other alternatives, and their spreadsheets are

consistent with the summary page as far as capital outlay. But can anyone shed light on this? Is there an error in the spreadsheet or had I missed something that is right in front of my eyes? So you can address that after I sit down if you'd like.

[laughter]

One final thing financially. I was trying in the last month to come up with an understanding of what revenues are currently coming in and what revenues could come in with just the buildings we have. So I took the figures provided in the [unintelligible] financial summary from November 13th, which shows neighborhood by neighborhood the average rent per unit in existing apartments and houses. I've since looked at your Web site to get the number of units in each neighborhood so I could figure out sort of who are the weighted average. And I've also spoken to some Presidio staff people who were very helpful in helping me understand exactly what is rented and what is not.

But I put together a spreadsheet. I brought extra copies if anyone's interested. And just using your own numbers, it appeared to me that at the current rent levels that the units are generating, we would have roughly \$38 million a year in revenue, and that's from 1,089 units that are currently rented, at an average of \$2,900 per month. Now, whether or not you add another maybe four or five million from whatever potential rental in dormitories or barracks to that total, still \$38 million, I think, gets you a long way toward your annual operating cost needs. But then if you take the 3.7 million square feet of non-residential buildings--and I don't know to what extent those are currently rentable. Maybe all of them need to be rented--

Jim Meadows: Sir, can I ask you to wrap up in about 30 seconds?

Bill Henslen: [Real quick]. If you add in average rent for 3.7 million non-residential square feet at \$12 a square foot, which is the warehouse use rent in your financial projections, your office rents could be much higher--30, 40, 50. But 3.7 million square feet at \$12 a square foot is about \$45 million. If you add that \$45 million to the \$38 million residential rent, you have about \$83 million a year in revenue. And I don't see that

showing up in the alternative A GMPA option, and I don't understand why it's in the existing conditions options and suddenly the revenue is not substantially [relative to they pay].

So I wonder if maybe GMPA could be implemented [with historic leasing] of demolition and the slower pacing of reconstruction. Thanks.

Jim Meadows: Thank you. Other comments? Going once, going twice.

Let me turn to close then on this meeting. We are in a classic scoping mode of both the planning process and the environmental impact statement process. There was a very valuable process that accompanied the GMPA, which I'm told about, and part of the staff was here for and many of you were participants in. I would tell you that from staff and from participants, that the time for it is shorter but the quality of the input has been substantial [unintelligible] help scope the process [for all this] PTIP implementation planning.

We are still utilizing as our foundation the GMPA. It does not go away.

It never was intended to.

But I would like to say thank you for all the participants. We'll look forward to now I can tell staff that they won't be [figuring the evening] except for the long period of time we'll be doing writing the draft environmental impact statement.

It is a lengthy process. We will keep you all informed on our Web site and our library in the Presidio Post. I would welcome your continued input, and Carey promised to hit me if I didn't tell you that basically the planning process doesn't stop with PTIP. And on January 10th, is it, at the Golden Gate Club from six to nine we have our next planning monthly workshop--we're back to those. And [Southern Manor's] going to be--

Female voice: [Unintelligible].

Jim Meadows: The vegetation work plan for the year as an out-shoot of the vegetation management plan. We have under way pilot projects that we're investigating for this next year to get us in a position to know what to do long range for the vegetation management plan as it is finally approved.

I would strongly urge you to continue with the process, to continue input. And thank you very much for coming tonight. Good night.

[applause]

[End of recording]