PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN (PTMP): LAND USE POLICIES FOR AREA B OF THE PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

San Francisco, California

The Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP) Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is comprised of three volumes, each bound under separate cover: the EIS (Volume I), Responses to Comments (Volume II), and the Appendices (Volume III). This is Volume I (see below for contents of all three volumes). The Presidio Trust is the Lead Agency and project proponent. This Final EIS and corresponding Final Plan (PTMP) represent the culmination of a two-year public planning and environmental review process.

This Final EIS describes and analyzes alternatives to update the General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) adopted in 1994 by the National Park Service (NPS) for the area of the Presidio of San Francisco now under the jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust (Area B). The proposed action (Final Plan) and five additional alternatives have been assessed along with a variant of the Final Plan Alternative developed in response to public comment on the Draft Plan and Draft EIS.

Under the 1996 Trust Act, as amended, Congress created the Trust to preserve and enhance the cultural, natural, scenic, and recreational resources of the Presidio for public use while ensuring that the park becomes financially self-sufficient with respect to both annual operations and long-term needs. Each of the alternatives presented in this EIS achieves this differently and has a different emphasis. Principal differences include the proposed total building square footage, the proposed amount of non-residential and residential uses, the amount of open space and the method of delivery of public programs. The maximum overall square footage of 5,960,000 allowed under the Trust Act would not be exceeded under any alternative.

Major impact topics assessed in this EIS include historic resources, cultural landscape, archaeology, biological resources, water resources, visual resources, air quality, noise, land use, socioeconomic issues, visitor experience, recreation, public safety, transportation, water supply, utilities, and Trust operations. Mitigation measures are included to reduce impacts identified in many of these topic areas.

No decision on the Final Plan will be made or recorded until at least 30 days after the publication of notice by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Federal Register that this Final EIS has been filed with the EPA. For further information about this document or the NEPA process, please contact the Trust in writing at 34 Graham Street, San Francisco, CA 94129 or by telephone at 415/561-5300. Copies of all three volumes of the Final EIS and the Final Plan are available at the Trust Library (34 Graham Street), on the Trust website at www.presidiotrust.gov and in local libraries.

VOLUME I: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

VOLUME II: RESPONSE STO COMMENTS

VOLUME III: APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

This is Volume I of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) regarding the proposed management plan for areas of the Presidio of San Francisco (Presidio) under Presidio Trust (Trust) jurisdiction. The Final EIS supplements the Final General Management Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement (GMPA EIS) adopted in 1994 by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Presidio. The Final EIS is prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations at 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508, and the Trust's own supplemental implementing regulations in 36 CFR Part 1010. Volume II contains a summary of the public and agency comments received on the Draft EIS, along with written responses to those comments. Volume III contains technical appendices related to and supplementing the Final EIS analyses in Volume I.

The Draft Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (Draft Plan or PTIP) and Draft EIS were circulated for public and agency review from July 25, 2001 to October 25, 2001, a period of 90 days. During this period, the Trust received over 3,000 comment letters, as well as oral comments provided at two public hearings, and at a public meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Citizens' Advisory Commission. Original comment letters and transcripts are available for review at the Presidio Trust library, 34 Graham Street, in the Presidio.

The Trust carefully considered public comments, and made modifications to the text of the Draft Plan and Draft EIS as a result of those comments. Modifications included re-naming and revising elements of the Draft Plan, inclusion of a variant of that plan in the Final EIS and other modest adjustments to the text and analysis of the Final EIS. These changes are summarized in this introduction and explained further within the responses to comments included in Volume II of the Final EIS.

Following distribution of the Final EIS, and following the 30-day "no action" period required under NEPA, the Trust Board of Directors will consider adoption of a final plan. The Board's action could include, but is not limited to, adoption of the preferred alternative (the Final Plan), rejection of all alternatives, and/or partial or conditional approval of a particular alternative. The Board's action, through a Record of Decision, will describe the scope and basis of the decision, the mitigations or conditions upon which it is contingent, and how the Final EIS will be used in subsequent decision making.

What follows is a summary of changes to the Plan itself (Section 1.1), followed by a summary of changes made in the Final EIS in response to public and agency comments on the Draft EIS (Section 1.2).

CHANGES TO THE PLAN

In response to public input, the Trust's preferred plan (Final Plan or Plan) has been renamed and reorganized. Now titled The Presidio Trust Management Plan: Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco, the revised document more clearly articulates its intended role as a general planning or policy framework that will be used to guide future, more specific planning and implementation decisions. Two salient facts must be borne in mind in reviewing and evaluating the Final Plan: (1) it will reduce development – shown as the square footage of buildings – to significantly less than the status quo; and (2) it will increase open space to substantially more than the status quo. Thus, the Final Plan removes development rather than fostering it. Changes in the Final Plan are summarized below.

VISION AND PLAN ORGANIZATION

The Final Plan document has been reorganized and many sections rewritten to provide greater clarity. Preservation of the Presidio's cultural, natural, scenic and recreational resources for public use is articulated clearly as the cornerstone of the Plan, and therefore its "vision." The preface, vision statement, summary, and introduction section of the Draft Plan have been combined and shortened into the "Overview" of the Final Plan.

Planning principles presented in Chapter 2 of the Draft Plan have been retained in what is now Chapter One of the Final Plan, or included within the land use, transportation, and infrastructure discussions in Chapter Two. The discussion of park programs originally presented in Chapter 3 of the Draft Plan has been modified in response to comments and is now within the

discussion of bringing people to the park in Chapter One of the Final Plan and the discussion of public land uses in Chapter Two of the Final Plan. Planning guidelines originally in Chapter 4 of the Draft Plan remain essentially unchanged in Chapter Three of the Final Plan. Implementation strategies originally in Chapter 5 of the Draft Plan have been updated and clarified in what is now Chapter Four of the Final Plan, which now more clearly articulates procedures for ensuring public input regarding future planning and decision making.

Draft Plan (PTIP) Section	Location in Final Plan (PTMP)
Executive Summary, Vision Statement, Plan Summary, Chapter 1 – Introduction	Overview, Appendix B (Plan Background)
Chapter 2 – Planning Principles	Chapter One: Preserving and Enhancing Park Resources; Chapter Two: Park Land Uses, Transportation, and Infrastructure
Chapter 3 – Programs	Chapter One ("Bringing People to the Park" section); Chapter Two – (public use discussion)
Chapter 4 – Planning Districts: Concepts & Guidelines	Chapter Three – Planning Districts: Concepts and Guidelines
Chapter 5 – Implementation Strategy	Chapter Four – Plan Implementation

CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Trust's commitment to preserve the Presidio National Historic Landmark District (NHLD or NHL District) has been strengthened in the Final Plan, and cultural resources have new prominence at the start of Chapter One. The text has also been modified to reflect execution of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) regarding compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). This agreement was signed in early 2002 by the Trust, the NPS, the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and two non-profit historic preservation organizations. A copy of the PA is included in Volume III of the Final EIS, Appendix D.

The Final Plan also discusses an agreement between the Trust, the NPS, and the Golden Gate National Parks Association (GGNPA) to study potential expansion of Crissy Marsh, and contains commitments that will avoid foreclosing potential expansion options for the duration of the study. Restoration of the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor remains a clear focus of the Plan's natural resources goals, and changes in land use or open space designations have been made to articulate the goal of restoring native plant communities immediately behind the Public Health Service Hospital (PHSH) and in the portion of the West Washington neighborhood where housing is proposed for removal.

HOUSING AND LODGING

In response to comments requesting greater specificity with regard to housing and lodging, the discussions of these issues have been clarified and additional detail provided. A map and numeric summary articulates where the Final Plan expects housing to be retained or removed, and instances where it may be converted to other uses or replaced. Where the precise number of residential accommodations provided in an area or provided via one means of replacement versus another cannot be determined with specificity, a generalized range is articulated. Quantitative, qualitative, and procedural constraints are provided for new residential construction, and the "no net loss" of housing policy described in the Draft Plan has been moderated along the lines suggested by several commentors such that the existing number of residential accommodations represents the maximum limit and not a goal.

A map in the Final Plan also shows preferred locations for lodging, and the text clarifies the Trust's intention to reuse and rehabilitate historic buildings to provide lodging. The Plan clarifies that new construction associated with lodging will take the form of building additions or annexes that make the associated reuse of historic buildings functionally and financially feasible. In response to public comments, the maximum amount of potential new construction in the Crissy Field (Area B) planning district has been reduced from the number proposed in the Draft Plan.

BUILT SPACE AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Final Plan's square footage reduction goal has been revised to be a commitment to reduce existing built space from 5.96 million square feet to 5.6 million square feet or less over time. The role of new construction was also

clarified in the Final Plan to state that non-residential construction would be primarily used to facilitate the effective rehabilitation and reuse of historic buildings, with limited additional replacement construction to be used to meet other Plan goals.

CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Trust's commitment to high quality programming for park visitors remains in place, and is articulated in Chapter One of the Final Plan. Chapter Two of the Final Plan breaks out the discussion of cultural programs from educational uses to provide greater specifics than were available in the Draft Plan regarding the use of building space for public uses. Clarification is also provided regarding the delivery of programs. The Plan's goal is to facilitate delivery of high quality programs by the NPS, the Trust, tenants, and other partners with expertise in program delivery. In response to comments, the Draft Plan's assumption of $10 million annually to park programming has been reduced to a more modest goal ($2 million, increasing to $5 million over time), and the related goal of attracting funding for programs from philanthropic and other outside sources is clearly articulated.

FUTURE PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING

In response to general confusion expressed in comments regarding the role of additional planning and public input in future Trust decisions, the Final Plan clarifies these issues. Chapter Four of the Final Plan summarizes previous and ongoing implementation actions, and provides specific examples regarding the near-term planning and implementation activities that the Trust expects to undertake once the Final Plan is adopted. Because implementation activities that will be undertaken many years from now cannot be described in any detail, a generalized implementation timeline is provided, along with a discussion of overall priorities and strategy.

Before many future implementation activities are undertaken, they will often involve additional planning, environmental analysis, and public input. The nature of additional process is identified for specific classes of activities. For example, the Final Plan specifies that all new construction – beyond minor building additions – will require public input and agency consultation pursuant to NEPA and the NHPA, and summarizes what that will involve.

CHANGES TO THE EIS

In response to public comment and changes made to the Final Plan, the Final EIS was also revised as summarized below.

ALTERNATIVES

The Final Plan alternative has been modified to reflect changes from the Draft Plan, including the reallocation of some potential new building square footage from Crissy Field (Area B) to the Letterman district, and the re-designation of certain areas for restoration as native plant communities in the South Hills district. Land use assumptions have also been revised to reflect the potential location of infrastructure (e.g., a recycled water plant) in the Letterman district, and the potential location of Golden Gate Bridge maintenance facilities in the Fort Scott district.

At the request of commentors who suggested that a variety of new alternatives be analyzed, the responses to comments clarify the spectrum of alternatives captured within the range included in the Draft EIS, and the Final EIS incorporates a variant to the Final Plan Alternative. Designed to be as consistent as possible with a detailed Sierra Club proposal, the Final Plan Variant is more aggressive than the Final Plan Alternative with respect to building demolition, emphasizes the replacement of removed housing units within existing buildings, and provides for no new construction (i.e., none of the removed building space can be replaced).

A few land use assumptions associated with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) have been corrected to reflect cultural/educational rather than office use of about 220,000 square feet in the Main Post planning district, reflecting the 1994 GMPA's identification of the Montgomery Street Barracks as the location of these kinds of uses.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Analysis methodologies associated with the assessment of parking demand, visitation, and utilities were revised to provide more reasonable predictions of future conditions. In response to comments on parking issues, the Trust re-

evaluated and modified methodology related to calculation of parking demand and adjusted proposed parking supply for all alternatives but Minimum Management. Specifically, assumptions associated with the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project were revised to be consistent with the Letterman Complex Final EIS, adjustments were made to better reflect average demand for each planning district, and the demand associated with new residential units was adjusted downward to reflect the smaller size of future units. Other parts of the transportation analysis were also updated to use assumptions consistent with the Letterman Complex Final EIS, and to incorporate the minor adjustments in land use assumptions described above. The results of the transportation analysis were then used to inform adjustments to the air quality and noise environmental impacts analyses. These EIS sections were also modified in response to comments to include carbon monoxide modeling of an additional traffic intersection, and to provide additional background information on the Clean Air Act and noise sensitive areas. None of the changes provided significant new information, resulted in significant new impacts, or substantially increased the severity of an impact that was already identified in the Draft EIS.

The same is true with regard to changes in the visitation and utilities analyses in the Final EIS. In response to public comment, the proposed "cultural/educational" uses were separated and the visitor methodology updated as described in Response VE-1 and Section 4.4.4 of the Final EIS. In estimating visitorship, further clarity was provided by reporting park visitors, instead of all "visitor trips," which include those associated with residences and office uses. In the utilities analysis, clarifications made in response to public requests include an expanded discussion of projected water demand and supply and additional quantification of effects related to wastewater. The analysis in Section 4.2.1, (Historic Architectural Resources and the Cultural Landscape), was also expanded in response to public comment.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The financial appendix presented in the Draft EIS has been updated and expanded to include a number of sensitivity analyses. The updates reflect factual information that has become known or final since the distribution of the Draft EIS, including terms of the agreement with Letterman Digital Arts, Ltd., and Fiscal Year 2001 and 2002 budget figures (expenses and projected revenues). Updates also address changes to the alternatives made in response to comments and extension of the financial planning model from 20 years to 30 years to incorporate the financial implications associated with removal of Wherry Housing over that time frame. The changes related to alternatives included assessment of the Final Plan Variant and modification of assumptions regarding program expenses. In the updated analysis, the program expense assumption for each alternative has been modified to increase gradually from $2 million up to the assumed goal for each alternative (e.g., $5 million for the Final Plan Alternative), rather than assuming an immediate increase in early years. These changes are explained in more detail in Volume III of the Final EIS, Appendix K.

The financial analysis was also expanded to include a number of new sensitivity analyses associated with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the Final Plan Alternative and Final Plan Variant, and the Cultural Destination Alternative. These alternatives were selected for the sensitivity analyses because they together represent the outer bounds of the full range of alternatives plus a mid-range alternative in terms of overall square footage, capital and operating expenses and other issues. The sensitivity analyses provide information that was required to respond to comments, assessing the financial performance of the alternatives when certain assumptions are changed, such as the level of operating expenses. The new sensitivity analyses complement the one associated with declining rents described in Draft EIS (Appendix J) and are presented in their totality in Appendix K of the Final EIS. The sensitivity analyses demonstrate the limitations of any long-term financial forecast, indicating widely divergent outcomes when analysis assumptions are modified. These limitations are clarified in the text of the analysis.

The land use assumptions tables in the financial analysis have also been clarified. One table now summarizes land use assumptions for each planning district in every alternative. These assumptions are also presented in the environmental consequences (land use) section of the EIS, and form the basis of all EIS impact analyses. Another table summarizes the amount of potential new construction assumed in each planning district in each alternative. The data for the Final Plan Alternative are consistent with quantitative limits set

forth in the Plan document, and represents the maximum potential rather than proposed amount of new construction. Finally, the table summarizing the residential program for all alternatives has been revised to clarify assumptions regarding the number of units removed (whether through demolition or conversion) and the number replaced (whether within existing buildings or new construction). The housing goals in the Final Plan fall within the assumptions previously embedded in the Draft EIS analysis and carried forward in the Final EIS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

The Presidio Trust is proposing to update portions of the *1994 Presidio General Management Plan Amendment* (GMPA) completed by the National Park Service (NPS) in 1994. The proposed update is for the areas of the Presidio of San Francisco that were transferred to the Trust's jurisdiction (Area B) by Congress under the 1996 Presidio Trust Act (Trust Act). This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is accompanied by a Final Plan *document entitled Presidio Trust Management Plan; Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco* (PTMP). Together these documents supplement the 1994 GMPA and GMPA EIS, and are tiered from the latter document as well as from the EIS prepared by the Trust for the Letterman Complex. The plan update and supplemental EIS are necessary to reflect the change in administrative jurisdiction of Area B and other substantive changes occurring since 1994, as explained later in this Chapter.

The EIS evaluates the effects of six alternatives, and one variation of the Final Plan Alternative, for the proposed PTMP.

A brief discussion of the following topics is provided in this chapter:

- The Presidio and its Planning Context
- Scope and Type of EIS
- Purpose and Need for this Project
- Changes Between Draft & Final
- Summary of Alternatives Evaluated
- Major Conclusions in the EIS
- Issues to be Resolved

For additional detail on any of these subjects, the reader is referred to relevant chapters within the EIS.

THE PRESIDIO AND ITS PLANNING CONTEXT

The 1,490-acre Presidio of San Francisco is one of the country's great natural and historic sites. It possesses an extraordinary combination of natural beauty, ecological diversity, and historical significance. A military garrison for over 220 years, operating under three different flags, the Presidio is a National Historic Landmark District (NHLD) within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) an extensive national park of more than 70,000 acres that begins where the Pacific Ocean meets the San Francisco Bay.

The Presidio's transition from military post to national park began in 1972, when Congress authorized the formation of the GGNRA. In the legislation that established the GGNRA (the GGNRA Act), Congress mandated that the Presidio would become part of the GGNRA if the Department of Defense ever declared the base to be in excess of its needs. The Presidio was designated for closure on the 1989 Base Closure and Realignment Act list and, in 1994, it was transferred to the NPS.

Following the establishment of the GGNRA in 1972, the NPS prepared and approved in 1980 a General Management Plan/Environmental Analysis (GMP) – a programmatic document that set forth the basic management philosophy for the entire national recreation area and Point Reyes National Seashore. In response to the 1989 Presidio closure announcement and pending transfer, the NPS initiated a supplemental public planning and environmental review effort to update the 1980 GMP with specific management and land use actions for the Presidio. The result of this effort was the final GMPA and corresponding EIS. The GMPA was approved by the NPS in July 1994. While the GMPA laid out specific land use plans for 13 distinct planning districts to guide visitor use, cultural and natural resource management, development and operation of the Presidio, it also assumed that more detailed site-specific plans/designs with supplemental environmental analysis would be needed during GMPA implementation.

Once the GMPA was in place, difficult questions regarding its implementation were raised. The challenges included the innovative approaches and unique authorities that would be needed to manage the transformation (i.e., building leasing, property management, and real estate finance), and the high operating and projected capital costs ($40 million annually and $490-$741 million, respectively) that would be necessary to implement the GMPA. Congress was unwilling to commit the federal monies needed over the long-term to improve, protect, and maintain the Presidio, and instead created the Presidio Trust (Trust) with a mandate to generate the monies needed to meet these specific challenges.

SUMMARY

Two years after the GMPA was adopted by the NPS, Congress adopted the Presidio Trust Act, establishing The Trust as a wholly-owned federal government corporation to transform the military post into a financially self-sufficient park by the year 2013 and to simultaneously protect and preserve its natural, historic, scenic, and cultural and recreational resources. Congress divided the Presidio into two areas: Areas A and B. Area A, which encompasses the coastal areas and Building 102 (about 20 percent of the Presidio), remained under NPS jurisdiction. On July 1, 1998, jurisdiction and management of the non-coastal areas (Area B) of the Presidio was transferred from the NPS to the Trust, which now manages the property in a manner that is consistent with the Trust Act, the purposes of the GGNRA Act and the general objectives of the GMPA.

Although still within the GGNRA, many of the Trust Act requirements for management of Area B differ significantly from those the NPS must meet in managing property under its administrative jurisdiction. These differences prompted the Trust to reexamine the existing land use plan (i.e., the GMPA) for Area B within the context of the Trust's mandate as well as other substantive changes that have occurred at the Presidio since the GMPA was adopted in 1994. The Trust, in consultation with the public and other agencies, determined that the best way to facilitate this needed review and update would be through a public planning and environmental review process. This EIS, and the accompanying Final Plan (incorporated herein by reference), as well as public and agency comments on the Draft EIS and Draft Plan, encompass the results of that effort.

SCOPE AND TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In accordance with 40 CFR 1502.4, this EIS supplements the GMPA EIS and considers the environmental effects of the proposed changes to the GMPA that would occur under each alternative. The EIS is a broad, program-level document that evaluates overall concepts for change, including principles governing the care and management of its varied resources, preferred land uses and programs and activities appropriate in this national park setting. In total, six alternatives and one variation of the Final Plan Alternative (Final Plan Variant) are evaluated in this EIS.

More detailed and site-specific plans will be developed in the future based on the direction established in the selected alternative. In response to public comment on the Draft Plan and Draft EIS, the Trust has incorporated more specificity regarding these future planning efforts into Chapter 4 of the Final Plan. Future activities would be subject to NEPA and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) review, involve coordination with the NPS and other agencies as necessary, and provide opportunities for additional public participation. In accordance with 40 CFR Section 1502.20, where appropriate, the Trust may tier future projects from this EIS. (For additional information on future planning/review activities, also refer to "Type and Scope of EIS" section in Chapter 1 of this EIS, and Chapter 4 in the Final Plan.)

The scope of this EIS was developed based on input received during a 6-month public scoping period, and through the use of the Environmental Screening Form (see Appendix A) which tiers from the GMPA EIS. Additional public input on the contents of the EIS was provided during the 90-day review period for the Draft EIS. Consistent with 40 CFR 1501.7, the scope of the EIS is focused on issues that are significant or that have not been covered by a prior environmental review. Table S-1 presents a summary of the environmental consequences and mitigation measures presented in Chapter 4 of this EIS.

UNDERLYING PURPOSE AND NEED

The Trust is required by the Trust Act to manage Area B of the Presidio to ensure resource preservation while at the same time ensuring that it become financially self-sufficient with respect to both annual operations and long-term needs. If the Trust fails to meet this financial mandate, the Presidio will be transferred to the General Services Administration (GSA) to be disposed of as federal property and deleted from the boundaries of the GGNRA.

The purpose of the proposed plan update is to provide a land use policy framework to guide the Trust's successful implementation of the Trust Act by updating the management concepts and land use proposals for Area B identified in the 1994 GMPA. The plan update must address a variety of issues including the new Trust Act requirements, changes occurring since the GMPA was approved, and new policies and management approaches. A brief

discussion of each is provided below, followed by an overview of the project objectives. For more depth, please refer to Chapter 1 (Purpose & Need).

Trust Act Requirements: The Trust must manage Area B of the Presidio in a manner that is consistent with the purposes of the GGNRA Act and the general objectives of the GMPA, while at the same time meeting the financial mandate outlined in the Trust Act. Beginning no later than Fiscal Year 2013, the Trust must generate sufficient revenues from Area B to support its operations without annual federal appropriations. Thereafter the Trust must also generate sufficient revenues to sustain park resources and operations in perpetuity, which include performing the necessary building, natural resources and infrastructure-related capital improvements and funding replacement reserves.

In addition, the Trust Act requires consideration of a number of other factors that the GMPA did not. Removal and/or replacement of some structures must be considered as a management option in administering Area B. In managing and leasing properties, the Trust must give priority to those tenants that enhance the financial viability of the Presidio and facilitate the cost-effective reuse of historic buildings. Other requirements include obtaining reasonable competition in leasing, considering the extent to which prospective tenants contribute to the reduction in cost to the federal government, and bringing all Area B properties into compliance with federal building codes and regulations. All of these requirements are to be accomplished while managing the Presidio so as to protect it from "development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and historic natural character of the area and cultural and recreational resources." The plan update is needed therefore, not only to carry out the new financial requirements, but also to balance management and leasing activities with the resource protection mandate of the Trust Act.

Changed Conditions: Examples of changes occurring since 1994 include progress made toward implementation of the GMPA, changes in the financial assumptions of the GMPA (i.e., Congress' rejection of the GMPA's fundamental assumption regarding federal appropriations for the Presidio), and the departure of the Sixth U.S. Army, which had been expected to occupy approximately 30 percent of the Presidio's building space for an indefinite period. Other land use concepts presumed in the GMPA have also not been supported by existing conditions or market demand. Changes include failure of the lease negotiations with the University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) at the Letterman complex, and subsequent selection of an alternate user for the site. These and other changes explained in the Purpose and Need Chapter demonstrate the need for a more flexible plan – one that does not require a plan amendment each time a condition (i.e., the market or a land use designation or building treatment proposed under the GMPA) changes.

New Policies and Management Approaches: Because the Trust's mandate must be met largely without federal funding there is a greater need for Area B management and planning policies to consider market principles, financial uncertainties, and changing economic conditions. The Trust needs the flexibility of a programmatic, rather than prescriptive plan to respond to market factors like these. At the same time, the financial requirements of the Trust Act and the Trust's financial management policies and approaches must be balanced against its resource protection requirements, including consistency with the purposes of the GGNRA Act and the general objectives of the GMPA. The plan is needed to provide flexibility while ensuring that an overarching policy framework is established for Area B to guide future activities in a manner that is consistent with the Presidio's national park status.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The goal of this project is to develop, adopt, and implement a plan that meets the following basic objectives to the fullest extent possible.

- Consistency with Trust Act resource mandates (including consistency with the purposes of the GGNRA Act and the general objectives of the GMPA)
- Consistency with Trust Act financial mandates (including achieving financial self-sufficiency by year 2013 and long-term financial sustainability)
- Flexibility to respond to market changes and opportunities (to ensure the Trust is successful in meeting its legislated mandates)
- Consistency with PTMP Planning Principles and District Guidelines
- Clear relationship with existing plans and consideration of public input
- Housing balance (address the demand for housing by park-based employees)
- Desired tenants (tenants that would further the multiple program and financial goals of the Presidio)

- Programs and public uses (expansion)
- Historic compliance (protection of the NHLD)
- Environmental sustainability

ALTERNATIVES

The starting point for the development of all alternatives evaluated in this EIS was the 1994 GMPA and EIS. This EIS analyzes the continued implementation of the GMPA (as updated to current year 2000 conditions) as the no action alternative pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.14(d). With input from the public and interested groups and agencies, the Trust identified five additional alternatives for Area B which were carried forward for further analysis in this EIS. Based on comments to the Draft EIS, a variant to the Final Plan Alternative was also included.

With the exception of the Minimum Management Alternative, each alternative is designed to achieve to varying degrees the PTMP vision, Planning Principles and Planning District Guidelines (see Appendix B) and to fulfill the Presidio's purpose and mission as set forth by Congress in the Trust Act. Each alternative is an example of a possible future for the Presidio. Differences among the alternatives include proposed total square footage of building space; the proposed amount of non-residential, residential, cultural/educational, and other uses; the amount and type of open space; the level of potential demolition and possible replacement construction; retention or loss of dwelling units; and the extent of park programming and approach to achieving park programs. The alternatives evaluated in this EIS are:

- No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)
- Final Plan Alternative (preferred alternative and proposed action) and Final Plan Variant
- Resource Consolidation Alternative
- Sustainable Community Alternative
- Cultural Destination Alternative
- Minimum Management Alternative

A brief description of the alternatives is provided below. See Chapter 2 for a more in depth description of the alternatives.

General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) 2000 Alternative

This alternative would implement the 1994 GMPA for the Presidio assuming current (year 2000) conditions. Tenants and residents would work together to create a global center dedicated to addressing the world's critical environmental, social, and cultural challenges. Cultural and natural resources throughout the Presidio would be protected and enhanced and new programs would be established through public/private partnerships. Historic buildings and landscapes that distinguish the NHLD would be rehabilitated and adaptively reused. Buildings would be removed to increase open space and/or enhance recreational, cultural, and natural resources, and total built space would be reduced from 5.96 million square feet (sf) to 5.01 million sf.

The housing supply would be substantially reduced and remaining units would be used by park center employees, program participants and visitors. Some would be converted to lodging and overnight accommodations. The historic forest, streambed and riparian corridors, native plant communities, and recreational opportunities would be protected, improved, and expanded in some instances. A variety of improvements would be implemented to make the Presidio easy to reach, explore, and enjoy. The Presidio would become a model of environmental protection and sustainable design and a "global center" for people to come together to address the world's most critical problems. Tenants with an organizational mission focused on environmental and social sustainability or skills in education and science, innovative technologies, and problem solving would be selected to lease buildings, and develop and operate programs at the site. Park partners would offer a wide range of programs to inform visitors about the Presidio's resources, discuss global concerns, celebrate cultural diversity, and educate the public on environmental issues. The Trust and NPS would cooperate to provide a base level of interpretive services and education about the Presidio's history and significant resources. Land uses and description of building use preferences are shown in Figures 3 and 4 in Chapter 2 (Alternatives).

Final Plan Alternative

This alternative was developed in response to public comments during the scoping process for this EIS, and further refined in response to public and

agency comments on the Draft EIS and Draft Plan. The alternative is patterned on the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), but includes modifications to ensure its financial viability and to combine a number of concepts proposed in the November 2000 scoping alternatives into a single alternative — the Final Plan Alternative's key components include preservation of historic resources, expansion of open space, reduction in building space from 5.96 million sf to 5.6 million sf, and providing an enhanced level of cultural and educational programs for park visitors.

Under the Final Plan Alternative, the Trust would work together with partners including the NPS, tenants and residents to protect and enhance the Presidio's cultural, natural, scenic and recreational resources. The historic character and integrity of the NHLD would be protected while acknowledging the possibility for limited changes, including some new construction to facilitate the effective reuse of historic buildings or meet other plan objectives. Historic buildings and landscapes that distinguish the NHLD would be rehabilitated and adaptively used. The natural environment would be enhanced and non-historic housing in the southern portion of the park would be removed, resulting in an increase of open space. The historic forest would be protected and rehabilitated, streambed and riparian corridors and native plant communities would be expanded, and recreational opportunities would be and improved.

The Final Plan Alternative would monitor housing demand and provide supply (up to a maximum of about 1,650 units) with a continued preference for providing housing to Presidio-based employees. Non-historic housing that is removed to create open space will be replaced, if necessary. An improved mix of housing units would be achieved through an emphasis on subdividing and converting existing building space, with limited replacement construction of between 200 and 400 units.

The opportunities for diverse and meaningful visitor experiences would be made through an array of cultural, educational and stewardship programs available to local, national and international park visitors. Delivery of quality visitor and public programs would be accomplished through the cooperative efforts of the Trust, NPS, tenants, philanthropic organizations, cultural institutions, and community volunteers. The Trust and NPS would collaborate to provide interpretive services, visitor orientation, and educational programs, and the Trust would seek philanthropic support to supplement a baseline level of program funds. Tenants would be selected on the basis of their; 1) ability to enhance the financial viability of the Presidio and facilitate reuse of historic buildings, 2) contribution to the implementation of the general objectives of the GMPA and visitor experience, and 3) compatibility with the PTMP preferred uses and planning principles. Land uses and description of land use preferences are shown in Figures 5 and 6 in Chapter 2 (Alternatives).

Final Plan Variant

The Final Plan Variant was recommended by several environmental organizations during the public review and comment period on the Draft EIS and Draft Plan. Under the Final Plan Variant, greater building demolition and therefore less built space as well as no new construction would occur. Similar to the Final Plan, the Variant would seek to rehabilitate and reuse historic buildings, adapt non-historic buildings to high priority uses, expand open space, and achieve financial self-sufficiency. In the Variant, there would be proportionately less cultural/educational building use and proportionately more office use in comparison to the Final Plan Alternative. Overall built space at the park would be reduced from 5.96 million sf to 4.71 million sf. Housing options in the Variant differ somewhat from the Final Plan; as in the Final Plan, housing units removed in other parts of the park would be replaced through subdivision and conversion of existing space, but the possibility of obtaining any replacement units through new construction or modifying existing space by adding square footage is foreclosed in the Final Plan Variant. Unlike the Final Plan, tenants would not be selected unless they offered a mission-serving business purpose and park programming; in this respect, the Variant is similar to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Land uses and description of land use preferences are shown in Figures 6a and 6b in Chapter 2 (Alternatives).

Resource Consolidation Alternative

Under this alternative, the Presidio would become an enhanced open space haven in an urban setting by maximizing the increase in open space in the southern part of the park and concentrating development in the north. Overall, building square footage in Area B would be reduced from current levels due to the loss of residential units and building space. A substantial number of buildings would be demolished, including the entirety of the historic Public Health Service Hospital (PHSH) complex, which would affect the integrity of

the NHLD. Open space and natural resource enhancements (endangered species recovery and Tennessee Hollow riparian restoration) would be maximized and recreational opportunities expanded. Tenets of sustainability, biodiversity, smart growth, and preservation would be promoted by preserving and enhancing the Presidio's natural and cultural resources and concentrating building area, including in-fill mixed-use and housing construction in the northern part of the park. Buildings would be rehabilitated for new uses. The primary goal would be reuse of existing structures along with compatible new construction that would generate sufficient funds for open space improvements and park enhancements. Overall built space at the park would be reduced from 5.96 million sf to 5.3 million sf. Park programs would be delivered in a manner similar to the Final Plan Alternative, but at a somewhat reduced level. Programs would focus on the park's biodiversity, including native species and ecosystems, and the history of the Presidio. Land uses and description of land use preferences are shown in Figures 7 and 8 in Chapter 2 (Alternatives).

Sustainable Community Alternative

Under this alternative, the Presidio would become a sustainable live/work community in a park setting and a model of environmental sustainability. There would be an emphasis on creating a Presidio-based community of users offering innovative, state-of-the-art ideas and approaches on environmental sustainability and related subjects.

Open space and recreational opportunities would be expanded, and historic forest and native plant communities improved. Riparian corridors would be restored and the historic forest rehabilitated and preserved as part of the cultural landscape. The historic character and integrity of the NHLD would be protected. A moderately low level of non-historic building demolition would occur to enhance open space and improve native plant communities.

The footprint of the built environment would largely remain in its present dispersed pattern, with an overall reduction in built space from 5.96 million sf to 5.69 million sf. An emphasis would be placed on building rehabilitation and reuse. While the existing number of housing units would decrease, the total number of units would be more than under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Residents would also work in the park, improving the jobs/housing balance, and supporting a sustainable park community. Park programs would be delivered in a manner similar to that proposed by the Final Plan Alternative, but at a somewhat reduced level. Land uses and description of land use preferences are shown in Figures 9 and 10 in Chapter 2 (Alternatives).

Cultural Destination Alternative

In this alternative, the Presidio would be a national and international cultural destination park, a portal for visitors to the American West and Pacific, and a place of international distinction for its programs in research, education, and communication. Historic and natural resources would be protected to preserve the Presidio as a sustainable national park. Open space would be expanded. Native plant communities and riparian corridors would be restored. The historic forest would be rehabilitated and preserved as part of the cultural landscape. Recreational opportunities would be increased. A substantial level of non-historic building demolition in the southern portion of the park would occur to enhance open space and restore critical habitat. Overall built space at the park would stay at its current level of 5.96 million sf. Replacement construction would occur in the northern portion of the park to provide an improved mix of housing units and cluster housing near work and transit.

The Trust would be primarily responsible for delivery of a wide variety of high quality programs in cooperation with NPS, tenants, philanthropic organizations, cultural institutions, and community volunteers. Tenants would support park programming in a number of ways, including directly providing a public program for park visitors, contributing financially, or offering in-kind services to a park program. Tenants would be selected in part for their financial contribution (as required by the Trust Act) and willingness and ability to support park program goals. Land uses and description of land use preferences are shown in Figures 11 and 12 in Chapter 2 (Alternatives).

Minimum Management Alternative

Under this alternative, the existing resources of the Presidio would be managed to the minimum extent needed to meet basic legal requirements including protection of the visiting public and the park's resources. There would be no significant physical change beyond that already underway; no significant park enhancements, no new building construction or building removal would occur. The 1994 GMPA would not be implemented in

Area B. Buildings would simply be rehabilitated to meet essential code requirements consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for historic buildings, and then leased out for the highest and best use. Tenants would have discretion in offering publicly available programs, and preference would be given to those tenants proposing to offer programs or services consistent with the General Objectives of the GMPA. There would be little educational, visitor, or cultural programming beyond what already exists. The Wherry housing complex would remain in use indefinitely as housing. Natural resource systems would not be significantly enhanced. Housing would be improved to meet code and historic preservation requirements and made available for rent by Presidio-based employees and others according to a prioritization system. Anticipated land uses and description of land use preferences are shown in Figures 13 and 14 in the Chapter 2 (Alternatives)

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

The impact topics and major impact conclusions from the EIS are summarized in Table S-1 at the end of this section.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The Trust Board of Directors (the agency's decision-makers) will review and consider the contents of this Final EIS, including the Response to Comments (RTC) volume and Final Plan document. Following review and consideration of these documents, the Board may decide to take action on the project. Such action could include, but is not limited to the adoption of a particular alternative, rejection of all alternatives, and/or partial or conditional approval of a particular alternative. Any action taken by the Trust Board regarding this project will be documented and explained in a Record of Decision (ROD) which will not be finalized until at least 30 days after the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency publishes a notice of availability of this Final EIS in the Federal Register.

Because the EIS alternatives are described at a general or policy level, and the EIS is programmatic in nature, future implementation decisions may require more specific analysis. As the physical and financial feasibility of specific building uses or other projects are determined, their potential impacts will be assessed and compared to the impacts and mitigation measures described in this EIS. The potential for new impacts or impacts that are substantially more severe than described here may necessitate further environmental assessment

Concerns related to future implementation activities and questions about future opportunities for public involvement were a common theme in the public comments received on the Draft EIS and Draft Plan. In response to these comments, the Trust incorporated additional specificity on the future review processes into the Final Plan (see Chapter 4).

Other issues to be resolved include the eventual selection and implementation of an alternative for Doyle Drive, and completion of environmental remediation. As a Cooperating Agency, the Trust will continue to be involved in the planning for reconstruction of Doyle Drive (which runs through the northern part of the park). The proposed reconstruction is intended to correct existing safety and structural problems. The Trust is working with the lead agencies for the project to ensure that the selected alternative provides the Presidio with major transportation benefits, minimizes potential land use conflicts, and provides potential aesthetic and environmental improvements. Because of its location, Doyle Drive could provide a direct entrance into the Presidio, helping to enhance intermodal transit access and reduce traffic that currently uses the Presidio's residential area gates. Several of the preliminary alternatives would also require the removal of multiple historic buildings. The Trust will work with the Doyle Drive project team and NPS to ensure that impacts to historic resources are minimized, and potential land use conflicts and competing uses are also addressed. Reopening of scenic vistas from the Main Post, cemetery, and cavalry stables across Crissy Field to San Francisco Bay will also be promoted. Through its continued involvement in this project, the Trust will ensure that relevant planning activities within Area B are coordinated with the Doyle Drive project.

Based on its historic use as a military installation, there are several areas of the Presidio that have been contaminated by a variety of hazardous substances. To date, a substantial amount of analysis, investigation, regulatory consultation, and public involvement has been completed initially by the Army and now by the Trust, in coordination with NPS, to address these known and potential unknown sites. Issues identified in this process include the location and type of contamination, type of contaminates to be covered by the remediation program, required clean-up levels and future uses. Although clean up has started, it has not been completed and will be an ongoing program in the coming years. Implementation of the proposed land uses, restoration efforts, demolition and other activities addressed in this EIS will be coordinated with the ongoing remediation program.

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.2.1 Historic Architecture and Cultural Landscape								
Individual Buildings and the National Historic Landmark District	Overall beneficial effect on historic resources due to bldg rehabilitation, stabilization and maintenance. No new adverse effect from demolition of 11 historic buildings, would not affect the landmark's status, per analysis in the GMPA EIS.	Overall beneficial effect on historic resources due to building rehabilitation, stabilization, and maintenance. Unspecified building demolition may result in significant adverse effects on individual historic resources; however, the overall status of the NHLD would be protected as in the No Action Alternative.	Beneficial effects due to building rehabilitation, stabilization and maintenance. Adverse effects on individual buildings due to the removal of historic Mason Street warehouses, in addition to the 11 buildings identified in the No Action Alternative. Adverse effects on the status of the NHLD would be avoided.	Beneficial effects due to building rehabilitation, stabilization and maintenance. The effects on individual historic resources would be more severe than the No Action Alternative because up to 1.91 million sf of existing building space would be removed. Demolition of the historic PHSH complex could adversely impact the status of the NHLD.	Beneficial effects due to building rehabilitation, stabilization and maintenance. Unspecified building demolition may result in significant adverse effects on individual historic resources; however, the overall status of the NHLD would be protected as in the No Action Alternative.	Beneficial effects due to building rehabilitation, stabilization and maintenance. Possible significant adverse effects on individual historic resources, like the Final Plan Alternative, but potentially heightened because of greater demolition. The overall status of the NHLD would be protected as in the No Action Alternative.	In general beneficial effect on through the stabilization and rehabilitation of historic buildings, but opportunity is missed to restore areas to their period of significance through demolition of non-historic elements. New construction could not be available for facilitating the rehabilitation and reuse of historic buildings. No adverse effects either on individual resources or on the status of the NHLD.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: CR-1 through CR-4 New mitigation: CR-7

[1] This summary is provided as an aide for the reader and should be reviewed in conjunction with Chapters 3 and 4 of this EIS. This table attempts to summarize complex information into short statements and in the event that there is a discrepancy between Chapter 4 and this table, Chapter 4 text prevails. For a discussion of cumulative effects, see Section 4.8.

[2] For the full text of the mitigation measures referenced (i.e., CR-1), please refer to Chapter 4.

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
Cultural Landscape	Changes would be generally beneficial. There would be a substantial level of non-historic building demolition to expand open space and re-create historic linkages of natural, cultural and visual areas (e.g. Main Post to Crissy Field connection), as well as rehabilitation of the historic forest and vistas, and site improvements.	Similar to the No Action Alternative in terms of treatment of significant features, rehabilitation of the historic forest and vistas, and site improvements.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, except for changes to the historic Mason Street streetscape. Similar to the No Action Alternative in terms of treatment of significant features, the historic forest and vistas, and site improvements.	Would have the greatest amount of building demolition, most notably the removal of the historic PHSH and more new construction. Would result in the most noticeable changes to the Presidio cultural landscape. However, this alternative would also provide for the rehabilitation of the historic forest and vistas, as well as other site improvements.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, in terms of treatment of significant features, the historic forest and vistas, and site improvements.	Similar to the No Action Alternative in terms of treatment of significant features, the historic forest and vistas, and site improvements.	Changes to the cultural landscape would be minimal as there would be no demolition or new construction.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: CR-1 through CR-6. New mitigation CR-7 and CR-8.
4.2.2 Archaeological Resources								
Destruction of, or Damage to, Archaeological Resources	New construction, demolition and/or restoration activities proposed throughout the Presidio have the potential to adversely affect prehistoric and historic archaeological resources.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with higher overall potential to adversely affect archaeological resources based on greater amount of new construction. In particular, there would be greater potential for impacts in the East Housing Planning District where replacement housing may occur within the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor.	Similar impacts to the No Action Alternative except there would be potential for effects due to new construction. Removal of additional buildings on Mason Street has potential to impact significant archaeological area.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with higher overall potential to adversely affect archaeological resources based on greater amount of new construction. Removal of buildings in the PHSH district could impact archaeological resources.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with higher overall potential to adversely affect archaeological resources based on greater amount of new construction.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with higher overall potential to adversely affect archaeological resources based on greater amount of new construction.	This alternative would have the least severe impacts on known or unknown sites, because there would be no major demolition, new construction, or major new habitat restoration activities.	New Mitigation CR-8 through CR-15.

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.3.1 Biological Resources								
Direct and Indirect Effects on Native Plant Communities	Native plant communities could be affected by demolition, new construction, and land uses. Beneficial effects on native plant communities through proposed restoration and a substantial increase in existing open space.	Similar to the No Action Alternative for open space expansion, with slightly more native plant community restoration. There would be less disturbance from demolition, and greater potential for effects from increased construction and land use activities than the No Action.	Similar beneficial effects to the No Action Alternative, with expansion of open space and native plant communities. Increased potential disturbances due to demolition, and no effects due to new construction.	Would have an increased long-term beneficial effect on native plant communities, compared to the No Action Alternative due to substantial increase in open space and planned restoration activities. Would have greater potential for direct effects due to new construction.	Compared to the No Action Alternative, would have a less beneficial effect on native plant communities, due to smaller increase in open space. Would have greater potential for direct effects due to demolition and new construction.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, would have a beneficial effect through provision of additional open space, however, there would be increased potential for effects due to demolition, construction and land uses.	Reduced restoration benefits, compared to the No Action Alternative, as no additional restoration of native plant communities (beyond existing) would occur. Overall would have the greatest direct effect on native plant communities of all alternatives.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-1 New Mitigation: NR-5, NR-6, NR-10, NR-11 and NR-20
Direct and Indirect Effects on Wildlife	Under this alternative, habitat restoration and expansion of open space areas would provide long-term beneficial effects on wildlife and would help to offset effects associated with construction, demolition and increased land use activities.	Similar to No Action Alternative, with greater potential for wildlife effects based on increased levels of construction and land uses.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with more beneficial effects resulting from increase in open space reducing edge effect pressures, reduction of habitation fragmentation due to increased building demolition.	Similar effects to the No Action Alternative, with increased open space reducing some of the edge effect pressures and much of the habitat fragmentation in the southwestern sections of the Presidio.	Similar, but slightly less effects than the Final Plan Alternative. Impacts could include increased habitat fragmentation and increased use levels, potential natural resource conflicts in specific areas.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative, with a higher potential for impact based on greater levels of demolition, construction and use levels.	No new construction, demolition, or habitat restoration would occur. Without habitat restoration and open space benefits to offset increased use, this alternative could result in direct and indirect wildlife impacts.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-2 New Mitigation: NR-5 through NR-9, and NR-12

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
Nesting Habitat	Proposed demolition and construction activities could destroy nests or disturb nesting activities, and would provide an increase in habitat over the long-term.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with greatest increase of open space among the alternatives.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with a reduction in the amount of new habitat.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	No expansion in habitat beyond existing. Potential disturbances would be associated only with building rehabilitation and reuse (no demolition or construction would occur).	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-2 New Mitigation: NR-5 through NR-9 and NR-12)
Wildlife Movement	Wildlife corridors would benefit from proposed habitat restoration activities. However, demolition, new construction and land uses (to the extent they occur in or adjacent to wildlife corridors) could disrupt wildlife movement and migration.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with a greater potential for disrupting wildlife movement (including California quail) in the PHSH Planning District due to reuse of the Nike Missile site.	Similar to the No Action with increased potential of enhancing wildlife corridors, resulting from greater amounts of open space.	Similar to the No Action Alternative; however, this alternative would provide the greatest amount of open space and would therefore have the greatest potential of enhancing wildlife movement in the southern portion of the park.	A greater potential for disrupting wildlife and a reduction in habitat restoration efforts than the No Action Alternative, due to increased new construction and demolition.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative with greater potential for disruption, due to more construction and demolition activities.	No open space expansion would occur and existing wildlife corridors would continue to be fragmented, limiting wildlife movement.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR- 1 New Mitigation:NR-5, NR-6, NR-7, NR-9, and NR-12
Special-Status Plants	This alternative would provide an overall increase in the quality and quantity of habitat for special-status plant species, and most beneficial effects among alternatives on existing open space.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	No demolition or construction-related effects on special-status plants would occur. However, retention of Wherry housing would prelude recovery of a listed plant (San Francisco lessingia) and would have an adverse impact.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-1 and NR-3 New Mitigation: NR-4 through NR-7, NR-9, NR-11 and NR-12

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
Special-Status Wildlife	This alternative would provide an overall increase in the quality and quantity of habitat for special-status wildlife species.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	Similar beneficial effects as the No Action Alternative.	No demolition or construction-related effects on special-status wildlife would occur. However, habitat values would not increase beyond current restoration efforts. Overall, a reduction in potential habitat compared to the No Action Alternative.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-1 through NR-3 New Mitigation: NR-4 through NR-10 and NR-12
4.3.2 Water Resources								
Direct and Indirect Impacts on Wetlands and Other Water Features	Demolition, construction and new land uses proposed could result in wetland degradation and disturbance. Overall, restoration of hydrological processes proposed would offset potential impacts, providing a long-term beneficial effect on wetland resources.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, however, would have greater potential for wetland impacts based on increase in construction and use levels, and reduced restoration activities.	Greater beneficial effect on wetlands than the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with greatest beneficial effect on wetlands among the alternatives.	Similar but slightly less effects than those of the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to Final Plan Alternative, with greater potential for impacts associated with higher demolition, construction and use levels.	No demolition and construction-related disturbances or restoration would occur. These combined would result in an adverse impact.	New Mitigation: NR-13 through NR-19
Water Quality	Demolition, construction, and various operational activities could create indirect downstream impacts from erosion, sedimentation, and discharges of other pollutants.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with increased potential for effects associated with greater level of construction over the 20-year planning horizon.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative, with no potential for construction-related impacts.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Demolition and construction-related effects would be avoided. However, operational activities have the potential to create indirect downstream impacts.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-13 and NR-14 New mitigation NR-15 through NR-19

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.3.3 Visual Resources								
Change in Visual Character	This alternative would preserve and enhance the visual character of the Presidio. Historic vistas and view corridors would be restored, and new construction would be limited and designed to be compatible with historic character of park.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with a higher level of new, compatible construction.	Similar beneficial visual effect as the No Action Alternative, with increased open space.	This alternative would substantially enhance the open space and natural character of the area along the park's southern boundary. New construction would be designed to be compatible with existing character.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	No changes to the existing visual character and no restoration of important views or other beneficial effects associated with the other alternatives.	New Mitigation: CR-5, CR-6, NR-1, and NR-7.
4.3.4 Air Quality								
General Construction/ Demolition Emissions	Operation of heavy equipment and other activities associated with demolition, construction, and rehabilitation would generate fugitive dust and other pollutants that could degrade local air quality.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with higher potential emissions.	More emissions associated with demolition, but overall less potential for emissions than the No Action Alternative due to no new construction.	Higher potential emissions than the No Action Alternative, due to more demolition and new construction.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Higher potential for emissions due to increased amount of new construction compared to the No Action Alternative.	No demolition or new construction. Rehabilitation would generate limited emissions.	Adapted from GMPA EIS: NR-20 New Mitigation: NR-22
Consistency with Regional Clean Air Plans	If job growth outpace the GMPA projections, emissions could be inconsistent with those assumed in the 2000 CAP and would delay attainment of ambient air quality standards. However, future CAP revisions would incorporate anticipated growth.	Housing and employment growth could induce emissions that would be inconsistent with CAP assumptions. However, future CAP revisions would incorporate anticipated growth, Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Adapted from GMPA EIS: NR-21

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
Potential Localized CO Violations	CO concentrations would range up to 5.4 ppm for 1-hour averages and 3.3 ppm for 8-hour averages, which would not exceed ambient air quality standards.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Adapted from GMPA EIS: NR-21
Regional Emissions	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would generate about 175 lbs/day of ROG and 339 lbs/day of NO_X.	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would generate approximately 55 lbs/day more of ROG and 106lbs/day more of NOx than the No Action.	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would not be substantially increase regional emissions of ROG or NO_x above the No Action Alternative levels.	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would generate about 54 lbs/day more of ROG and 104 lbs/day more of NO_X than the No Action Alternative.	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would generate about 85 lbs/day more of ROG and 166 lbs/day more of NO_X than the No Action Alternative.	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would generate about 73 lbs/day more of ROG and 142 lbs/day more of NO_X than the No Action Alternative.	Daily internal and external vehicle trips in 2020 would generate about 81 lbs/day more of ROG and 157 lbs/day more of NO_X, than the No Action Alternative.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-20, NR-21. New mitigation: NR-22
4.3.5 Noise								
General Construction/ Demolition Noise	Noise generated by demolition, construction, and rehabilitation activities would have the potential to intermittently affect Presidio tenants, recreational users, and nearby residences.	Similar to the No Action Alternative with greater potential for construction-related disturbances over the 20-year planning horizon.	Demolition activities would have similar potential to intermittently disrupt tenants, recreational users, and adjacent residences.	Greater potential than the No Action Alternative to intermittently disrupt Presidio tenants, recreational users, and adjacent residences because the levels of demolition and new construction would be greater.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Greater potential than the No Action Alternative to disrupt Presidio tenants, recreational users, and nearby residences because the levels of demolition and new construction would be greater.	No new construction or demolition would occur, so construction noise would be limited to building rehabilitation and stabilization.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-23
Traffic Noise	Traffic noise increases would occur within the Presidio, and would increase within the adjacent neighborhoods.	Traffic noise levels would similar to the No Action Alternative, and would be noticeably higher at three locations within the park.	Traffic noise levels would similar to the No Action Alternative, and would be noticeably higher at two locations within the park.	Traffic noise levels would similar to the No Action Alternative, and would be noticeably higher at two locations within the park.	Traffic noise levels would similar to the No Action Alternative, and would be noticeably higher at three locations within the park.	Traffic noise levels would similar to the No Action Alternative, and would be noticeably higher at two locations within the park.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-24 New Mitigation:NR-25

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
Noise from Stationary Sources	Building operations equipment and increased human activity would increase noise levels but would not exceed the levels articulated in the San Francisco Noise Ordinance.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: NR-23
4.4.1 Land Use								
Changes in Building and Land Uses	Vacant buildings would be occupied, the amount of residential space would decrease, and visitor services would increase. Open space would be expanded. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with more building space used for housing and less for industrial/ support uses. More open space in the South Hills district. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with less overall built space, but more office and residential use. Would create more open space at Crissy Field and the East Housing districts than the No Action Alternative. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	More open space than the No Action Alternative (based on removal of the PHSH), and a greater number of residential units. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	Compared to the No Action Alternative, there would be less open space and more residential uses. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	More open space in the South Hills district, and more residential, office and public uses than No Action. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	Vacant buildings would be occupied, and there would not be a reduction in existing built space at the park (which would occur under all other alternatives except Cultural Destination). There would be more office and residential uses than No Action; and less public uses. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.	New Mitigation: CO-1

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.4.2 Socioeconomic Issues/Housing Supply								
Increased Demand for Housing	New Presidio employment would generate total demand for 2,840 new households, approximately 2% of the new households projected in the Housing Impact Area (HIA).	New Presidio employment would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative, but would differ by maintaining the existing supply of housing. In comparison to the No Action, housing demand in the HIA would be reduced.	New employment in the Presidio would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative and would maintain more of the existing supply of housing but less than the Final Plan. Housing demand in the HIA would be reduced when compared to the No Action.	Presidio employment would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative and would maintain more of the existing housing supply but less than the Final Plan. In comparison to the No Action, housing demand in the HIA would increase.	Presidio employment would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative and would maintain more than half of the existing supply. There would be a negligible change in HIA housing demand when compared to the No Action Alternative.	Presidio employment would generate more demand for housing than the No Action Alternative and would provide the most housing of the alternatives. In comparison to the No Action, there would be a small reduction in HIA housing demand.	In comparison to the No Action Alternative, there would be a net increase in HIA housing demand. Existing on-site housing supply would be maintained.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: CO-2
Jobs/Housing Balance	Would provide the least number of units and contributes the least towards a jobs/housing balance (meets about 36% of Presidio demand) out of the alternatives.	Compared to the No Action and all other alternatives except Cultural Destination, would contribute the most towards a jobs/housing balance.	Would contribute more towards achieving a jobs/housing balance than the No Action Alternative (meets 70% of Presidio demand).	Would contribute more towards achieving a jobs/housing balance than the No Action Alternative (meets about 50% of Presidio demand).	Would contribute more towards achieving a jobs/housing balance than the No Action Alternative (meets about 77% of Presidio demand).	Would provide sufficient housing supply to meet 89 percent of anticipated employees housing demand - the highest among all alternatives.	Would contribute more towards achieving a jobs/housing balance than the No Action Alternative (meets 70% of Presidio demand).	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: CO-2

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.4.3 Schools								
Increased Demand for School Facilities	Would generate demand for facilities to accommodate 48 elementary students, 24 middle school students, and 33 high school students. The San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) could accommodate the school age population.	Would generate greater demand for school facilities than the No Action (about 125 elementary school students, 63 middle school students, and 86 high school students). The SFUSD district could accommodate the elementary and middle school age population. The high school age population would exceed current capacity.	Would generate greater demand for school facilities than the No Action (about 93 elementary school students, 47 middle school students, and 64 high school students). There would be no impact to the SFSUD for the additional elementary and middle schools, but would marginally exceed capacity of high schools.	Would generate greater demand for school facilities than the No Action (about 84 elementary school students, 42 middle school students, and 58 high school students). The SFUSD could accommodate most of the school age population (high school capacity would be marginally exceeded).	Would generate greater demand for school facilities than the No Action (about 114 elementary school students, 58 middle school students, and 79 high school students). The SFUSD could accommodate the elementary and middle school age population. The high school age population would exceed current capacity.	Would generate greater demand for school facilities than the No Action (about 138 elementary school students, 69 middle school students, and 95 high school students). The SFUSD could accommodate the elementary and middle school age population. The high school age population would exceed current capacity.	Would generate greater demand for school facilities than the No Action (about 107 elementary school students, 54 middle school students, and 74 high school students). The SFUSD could accommodate the elementary and middle school age population. The high school age population would exceed current capacity.	New Mitigation: CO-3
4.4.4 Visitor Experience								
Impact on Visitor Experience	This alternative would provide a variety of improvements to interpretive and educational opportunities for the public. Projected visitation would be 5.2 million per year.	Would provide for a greater variety of visitor facilities for the public than the No Action. Projected visitation would be 7.2 million per year.	Similar to the No Action Alternative. Projected visitation would be 5.9 million per year.	Would provide less variety of visitor facilities than the No Action Alternative. Focus of programs on resource protection, sustainability education. Projected visitation would be 7.0 million visitors per year.	Would provide less variety of public facilities than the No Action. Program emphasis on serving local visitors and residents. Projected visitation would be 8.2 million per year.	A greater variety of visitor facilities for the public than the No Action Alternative or any other. Projected visitation would be 7.2 million per year.	Minimal actions would be taken to expand visitor facilities and programming, and in comparison to the No Action, there would be few benefits to enhance the visitor experience. Projected annual visitation would be 6.5 million.	New Mitigation: CO-4 through CO-8.

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.4.5 Recreation								
Impact on Recreational Activities	Recreational activities and related programs would be improved which would be a beneficial effect. Most existing recreational facilities would be retained, however some (i.e. ballfields) may be removed which would have an adverse effect on current users. Implementation of a Trails and Bikeways Master Plan would provide greater access.	Effects would be similar to the No Action Alternative. Options for replacement of facilities that may be removed and additional built indoor and outdoor facilities would be considered.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, except for the removal of one additional ballfield (Pop Hick's).	Effects would be similar to the Final Plan Alternative. Additional emphasis on passive recreational opportunities for stewardship, nature appreciation, and solitude. Closure of some roads would further benefit bicyclists and pedestrian users.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	Similar to the Final Plan Alternative.	All existing facilities would be retained for public use. No new trails and bikeways would be established, and there would be little change in recreational activities and program opportunities.	New Mitigation: CO-9 through CO-11
4.4.6 Public Safety								
Increased Demand for Public Safety Services	Increase in resident and employee populations would increase demand for law enforcement, fire and emergency response services. Services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as development occurs.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	New Mitigation: CO-12

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.5 Transportation and Circulation								
Increased Congestion on Local Roadways	Would generate an estimated 33,822 daily vehicle trips. Of the 37 studied intersections, 7 would operate at LOS E or F under during the a.m. peak hour, and 13 during the p.m. peak hour. Except for Lincoln Blvd/Bowley Ave, Park Presidio Blvd/Lake St and Park Presidio Blvd/California St, all intersections could be mitigated to acceptable LOS.	Would generate 31% more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative. Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action plus 3 in a.m. and 5 in p.m. Following mitigation, all but the three intersections listed under the No Action would operate at acceptable LOS.	Would generate 8% more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative. Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action plus 2 in the a.m. and 3 in the p.m. Following mitigation, all but the three intersections listed under the No Action would operate at acceptable LOS.	Would generate 31% more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative. Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action, plus 3 in a.m. and 3 in p.m. Following mitigation, all but the three intersections listed under the No Action would operate at acceptable LOS.	Would generate 49% more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative. Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action plus 5 in a.m. and 6 in p.m. Following mitigation, all but the three intersections listed under the No Action would operate at acceptable LOS.	Would generate 42% more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative. Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action, plus 3 in a.m. and 6 in p.m. Following mitigation, all but the three intersections listed under the No Action would operate at acceptable LOS.	Would generate 46% more vehicle trips than the No Action Alternative. Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action, plus 8 in a.m. and 5 Following mitigation, all but the three intersections listed under the No Action would operate at acceptable LOS.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: TR-1 through TR-8 New Mitigation: TR-11 through TR-20
Parking Demand and Supply	Would reduce parking to about 7,807 parking spaces and would have an average demand for 7,436 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 371 spaces or 5% above average demand.	Would reduce parking to about 9,165 parking spaces and would have an average demand of 8,729 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 436 spaces or 5% above average demand.	Would reduce parking to about 7,830 parking spaces and would have an average demand of 7,457 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 373 spaces or 5% above average demand.	Would reduce parking to about 8,978 parking spaces and would have an average demand of 8,550 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 428 spaces, or 5% above average demand.	Would reduce parking to about 9,790 parking spaces and would have an average demand of 9,324 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 466 spaces, or 5% above average demand.	Would reduce parking to about 9,582 parking spaces and would have an average demand of 9,126 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 456 spaces, or 5% above average demand.	Would maintain the current parking supply of 11,210 spaces and would have a demand of 10,354 spaces, resulting in a surplus of 856 spaces, or 8% above average demand.	New Mitigation: TR-21 through TR-24
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	Would generate about 10,700 daily pedestrian and bicycle trips, which would be accommodated within existing facilities and proposed future improvements to be addressed in the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan.	Would generate about 16,400 daily pedestrian and bicycle trips (53% more than the No Action), which would be accommodated within the Presidio's improved trail and bikeway network.	Would generate about 12,800 daily pedestrian and bicycle trips (19% more than the No Action), which would be accommodated within the Presidio's improved trail and bikeway network.	Would generate about 15,500 daily pedestrian and bicycle trips (45% more than the No Action), which would be accommodated within the Presidio's improved trail and bikeway network.	Would generate about 18,000 daily bicycle and pedestrian (68% more than the No Action), which would be accommodated within the Presidio's improved trail and bikeway network.	Would generate about 18,400 daily bicycle and pedestrian trips (72% more than the No Action), which would be accommodated within the Presidio's improved trail and bikeway network.	Would generate about 11,600 daily bicycle and pedestrian trips (8% more than the No Action).	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: TR-9

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
Transit Demand	Would generate an estimated 10,340 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT and the Presidio's internal shuttle, on a weekday daily basis.	Would generate an estimated 17,300 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT and the Presidio's internal shuttle, 67% more trips than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate an estimated 13,556 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT and the Presidio's internal shuttle, 31% more trips than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate an estimated 17,062 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT and the Presidio's internal shuttle, 65% more trips than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate an estimated 19,054 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT and the Presidio's internal shuttle, 84% more trips than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate an estimated 19,092 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT and the Presidio's internal shuttle, 85% more trips than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate an estimated 11,213 daily transit trips on Muni, GGT, 8% more than the No Action Alternative.	Adapted from the GMPA EIS: TR-10 New Mitigation: TR-25
Construction Traffic	Construction-related traffic could generate congestion that would require traffic management to minimize potential effects.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	No demolition or new construction under this alternative, so construction-related traffic would be minimal.	New Mitigation: TR-26
4.6.1 Water Supply and Demand								
Increased Demand for Domestic Water	Projected daily water demand would range from 0.6 to 1.78 million gallons per day (mgd). Lobos Creek provides 0.7 to 1.6 mgd, and the proposed water recycling project would provide up to 0.5 mgd of non-potable water. Supplemental (off-site) water would be purchased to meet peak demands.	Projected daily water demand would be slightly higher than the No Action Alternative at 0.75 to 1.93 mgd. Like the No Action Alternative, supplemental water supplies would be purchased to meet peak demands.	Projected daily water demand would be similar to the No Action Alternative (0.61 to 1.86 mgd). Like the No Action Alternative, supplemental water supplies would be purchased to meet peak demands.	Projected daily water demand would be similar, but slightly greater than the No Action Alternative (0.66 to1.98 mgd). Like the No Action Alternative, supplemental water supplies would be purchased to meet peak demands.	Projected daily water demand would be slightly higher than the No Action Alternative at 0.74 to1.85 mgd. Like the No Action Alternative, supplemental water supplies would be purchased to meet peak demands.	Projected daily water demand would be the highest under this alternative at 08.4 to 2.08 mgd, and supplemental water supplies would be purchased to meet peak demands.	Projected daily water demand would be slightly lower than the No Action Alternative at 0.59 to 1.69 mgd; however, supplemental water supplies would still be purchased to meet peak demands.	New Mitigation: UT-1 through UT-3

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.6.2 Wastewater Treatment and Disposal								
Increased Wastewater Generation	Would generate about 0.51 million gallons per day (mgd) of raw wastewater, or 0.11 mgd more than current flows.	Would generate about 0.65 mgd of raw wastewater or 0.14 mgd more than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate about 0.52 mgd of raw wastewater – roughly the same amount as the No Action Alternative.	Would generate about 0.57 mgd of raw wastewater or slightly more (0.06 mgd) than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate about 0.64 mgd of raw wastewater or 0.13 mgd more than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate about 0.73 mgd of raw wastewater or 0.22 mgd more than the No Action Alternative.	Would generate about 0.50 mgd of raw wastewater which is slightly less (0.01 mgd) than the No Action.	New Mitigation: UT-4 and UT-5
4.6.3 Storm Drainage								
Increased Demand for Stormwater Drainage	No increase in stormwater flow, with the exception of Fort Scott. Implementation of a SPPP and associated BMPs to reduce runoff and improve water quality would be implemented as part of this alternative.	There would be an increase in stormwater flows when compared to the No Action Alternative (approximately 8.7 cfs more). Like the No Action, a SPPP would be implemented to minimize runoff and improve water quality.	There would be a net reduction in total runoff when compared to the No Action Alternative (approximately -3.9 cfs more). Like the No Action, a SPPP would be implemented to minimize runoff and improve water quality.	There would be an increase in stormwater flows when compared to the No Action Alternative (approximately 9.4 cfs more). Like the No Action, a SPPP would be implemented to minimize runoff and improve water quality.	There would be an increase in stormwater flows when compared to the No Action Alternative (approximately 8.3 cfs more). Like the No Action, a SPPP would be implemented to minimize runoff and improve water quality.	There would be an increase in stormwater flows when compared to the No Action Alternative (approximately 16.5 cfs more). Like the No Action, a SPPP would be implemented to minimize runoff and improve water quality.	There would be an increase in stormwater flows when compared to the No Action Alternative (approximately 7.8 cfs more). Like the No Action, a SPPP would be implemented to minimize runoff and improve water quality.	New Mitigation: UT-6 and UT-7
4.6.4 Solid Waste								
Increased Solid Waste Generation	Demolition, construction and rehabilitation activities at build-out would generate roughly 114,000 tons of debris over the next 20 years, which constitutes 0.08 percent of the annual regional solid waste stream.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with slightly less (5,000 tons) over the 20-year planning horizon.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with slightly more debris (roughly 12,000 tons) over the 20-year planning horizon.	This alternative would generate the most debris (roughly 163,000) which is 49,000 tons more than the No Action Alternative. Overall, this amount of debris constitutes 0.12% of the regional solid waste stream.	Similar to, but less than the No Action Alternative by about 15,000 tons.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with slightly more debris (roughly 13,000 tons) over the 20-year planning horizon.	Minimal debris would be generated under this alternative (approximately 64,000 tons less than the No Action).	New Mitigation: UT-8

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.6.5 Energy Consumption and Distribution								
Demand for Electricity	Demand for electricity would be up to 47.80 million kilowatt hours annually, with a projected maximum demand of 6,456 kW.	Demand for electricity would be up to 50.24 million kilowatt hours annually (5% higher than the No Action), with a projected maximum demand of 7,646 kW.	The Final Plan Variant would have the lowest electricity demand among all alternatives (6% less than No Action). Projected annual demand would be up to 45.13 million kilowatt hours, with a projected maximum demand of 6,565 kW.	Demand for electricity would be up to 54.72 million kilowatts hours annually (15% higher than the No Action), with a projected maximum demand of 7,412 kW.	Demand for electricity would be up to 53.50 million kilowatts annually (12% higher than the No Action), with a projected maximum demand of 7,871 kW.	This alternative would have the highest demand for electricity (17% higher than the No Action) requiring up to 56.02 million kilowatts annually, with a projected maximum demand of 8,194 kW.	Demand for electricity would be up to 54.14 million kilowatts annually (13% higher than the No Action), with a projected maximum demand of 7,865 kW.	New Mitigation: UT-9 through UT-11, and UT-13
Demand for Natural Gas	This alternative would generate demand for up to 2.1 million therms of natural gas annually, 4.7 million therms below the Presidio's natural gas demand in 1990.	This alternative would generate demand for up to 2.3 million therms annually which is about 12% more than No Action Alternative.	The Final Plan Variant would have the lowest demand for natural gas among all of the alternatives. Projected annual demand would be up to 1.94 million therms annually which is about 5% less than No Action.	This alternative would generate demand for up to 2.2 million therms annually which is about 6% more than the No Action Alternative.	This alternative would have approximately the same demand for natural gas as the Final Plan Alternative.	This alternative would generate demand for up to 2.4 therms annually which is about 19% more than the No Action Alternative.	This alternative would have the same demand for natural gas as the Cultural Destination Alternative.	New Mitigation: UT-12 and UT-13
Energy Consumption	Total energy use would be about 369,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 44% lower than 1990 levels.	Energy use would be about 401,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 45% lower than 1990 levels.	Energy use would be about 348,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 44% lower than 1990 levels.	Total energy use would be approximately 404,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 42% lower than 1990 levels.	Total energy use would be approximately 416,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 44% lower than 1990 levels.	Total energy use would be approximately 436,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 44% lower than 1990 levels.	Total energy use would be approximately 429,000 million BTU annually. Overall, consumption per square foot would be about 45% lower than 1990 levels.	New Mitigation: UT-12 and UT-13.

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
4.7 Presidio Trust Operations								
Presidio Trust Operations	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short-term financial self-sufficiency by FY 2013 and achieve long-term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed by about 2040 and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed in approximately 2045. A relatively low-level ($2 million/year) of public programming would be supported by the Trust, and a portion of non-residential space would be provided at lower rates to mission-related tenants. This alternative would be the most sensitive to decreases in market rents. With a modest decline in market rents, this alternative would not be self-sufficient in 2013. This poor performance could be improved by delaying demolition of Wherry Housing or by utilizing more third-party financing than originally assumed.	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short-term financial self-sufficiency by FY 2013 and achieve long-term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed by 2025 and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed by 2029. A moderate level (stabilized in 2020 at $5 million/year) of public park programming would be supported by the Trust. With a modest decline in market rents, this alternative would be moderately negatively impacted, but less affected than the No Action Alternative. It would remain self-sufficient and sustainable, and the implementation phase would be extended by only about 5 years (to year 2035).	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short-term self-sufficiency by FY2013 and achieve long term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed by about 2035 and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed by about 2045. A relatively low-level ($2 million/year) of public programming would be supported by the Trust and a portion of non-residential space would be provided at lower rates to mission-related tenants. With a modest decline in market rents, the Variant would be significantly negatively impacted (but less affected than the No Action Alternative), have slim operating margins after 2013,	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short term financial self-sufficiency by FY 2013 and achieve long-term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed by about 2030 and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed by about 2040. A medium level ($8 million/year) of public park programming would be supported by the Trust. With a modest decline in market rents, this alternative would be negatively impacted, but less affected than the No Action Alternative. It would remain self-sufficient and sustainable, although rehabilitation of non-residential buildings would be delayed and the implementation phase would be extended by about 20 years (to between 2060 and 2065).	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short-term financial self-sufficiency by FY 2013 and achieve long-term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed by about 2023 and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed by 2029. A medium level ($8 million/year) of public park programming would be supported by the Trust. With a modest decline in market rents, this alternative would be moderately negatively impacted, but less affected than the No Action Alternative. It would remain self sufficient and sustainable, and the implementation phase would be extended by only about 5 years (to year 2035).	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short-term financial self-sufficiency by FY 2013 and achieve long-term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed between about 2030 and 2035, and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed in about 2040. A relatively high level ($10 million/year) of public programming would be supported by the Trust. With a modest decline in market rents, this alternative would be significantly negatively impacted, but less affected than the No Action Alternative. It would remain self-sufficient and sustainable, although rehabilitation of non-residential buildings would be delayed, and the implementation phase would be extended by about 20 years (to year 2060).	Based on the results of financial modeling (Appendix K), this alternative would reach short-term financial self-sufficiency by FY 2013 and achieve long-term sustainability. Capital projects would be completed in 2016 and the implementation phase at the Presidio would be completed in 2018. A relatively low level ($2 million/year) of public programming would be supported by the Trust. This alternative has the strongest financial result and could bear modest to significant declines in market rents and still be viable. It would remain self-sufficient and sustainable, and the implementation phase, extended by only 2 years, would be complete by 2020.	No mitigated required

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation[1]

Impact	No Action (GMPA 2000)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management	Mitigation Measures[2]
			and an extended implementation phase (to year 2060), but would remain financially sustainable.					