

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

### 4.4 THE COMMUNITY

**T**his section evaluates potential impacts of the alternatives on land use, socioeconomic issues/housing supply, schools, visitor experience/interpretation and education, recreation, and public safety.

#### 4.4.1 LAND USE

##### **METHODOLOGY**

This analysis involved identifying current land uses at the Presidio, as well as current land uses in the surrounding community and in Area A. Proposed changes in building and land uses were compared to existing uses to determine the potential for incompatible uses. Proposed changes in building and land uses were then compared to uses proposed in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

For the purposes of this analysis, incompatibility would occur if a new use could conflict with adjacent land uses or compromise the nature and character of the Presidio or surrounding neighborhoods. Other impacts from new land uses (such as adversely affecting historic properties or increasing traffic and noise) are discussed in their respective issue sections within this EIS.

In response to public comment on the Draft EIS, additional information is provided on the land uses assumed in each alternative and the maximum level of demolition and new construction that could occur in each (see Tables 39 and 40, respectively). For purposes of analysis, the following definitions apply to the building use categories for use in Table 39:

**Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure:** Industrial operations such as printing, vehicle service and repair, workshops of various kinds, and general storage and warehouse use. Structures and facilities specifically related to the operation of the park's utilities (water, electric, sewer, gas, telecom), public safety services (fire, police, emergency), and maintenance functions.

**Office:** Office uses including non-profit, for profit, Trust, and NPS. Includes medical offices and clinics.

**Retail:** Services including shops, restaurants, cafes, financial, postal, convenience and support services.

**Lodging/Conference:** All types of overnight accommodations from small hotel, bed and breakfast, dormitories, hostels, to short-term residences. Also includes meeting halls, clubs and assembly venues.

**Recreational:** Those buildings used for the express purpose of recreation. This includes exercise facilities, bowling alleys, recreation/community centers, and clubhouses.

**Cultural:** Includes such things as visitor facilities, chapels, interpretive sites, exhibit space, museum use, performing arts facilities and non-commercial theaters, community facilities, and artists studios.

**Educational:** Includes education centers, schools, universities/colleges, institutes, training facilities, libraries, archives, classrooms, and child care facilities.

**Residential:** All residential units and associated garages including houses, duplexes, apartments, efficiencies and other unit types. This includes SRO/dormitory units.

**Military:** All surviving specialized military/defense facilities including batteries, and powder magazines no longer in service as defense structures. Generally used for interpretation and storage.

##### **POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

###### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

###### ***Changes from Existing Building and Land Uses***

The general pattern of land use would not change under this alternative, although currently vacant buildings would be rehabilitated and reoccupied, the amount of residential space would decrease, and more lodging and visitor serving uses would be introduced. Intensively used areas concentrated in the

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## The Community

Table 39: Summary of Proposed Building Uses by Planning District (sf)

Building Use	Existing	GMPA 2000 (No Action)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management
<b>CRISSY FIELD</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		170,000	30,000	20,000	0	10,000	10,000	230,000
Office		100,000	50,000	40,000	200,000	210,000	210,000	180,000
Retail		0	20,000	0	0	40,000	0	150,000
Lodging/Conference		0	140,000	0	0	0	240,000	0
Recreational		0	40,000	20,000	0	90,000	0	0
Cultural		70,000	280,000	230,000	230,000	220,000	290,000	50,000
Educational		50,000	80,000	30,000	110,000	110,000	100,000	0
Residential		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>610,000</b>	<b>390,000</b>	<b>640,000</b>	<b>340,000</b>	<b>540,000</b>	<b>680,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>610,000</b>
<b>MAIN POST</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		40,000	40,000	40,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	40,000
Office		400,000	570,000	530,000	650,000	560,000	620,000	630,000
Retail		110,000	50,000	50,000	80,000	90,000	80,000	60,000
Lodging/Conference		70,000	50,000	130,000	120,000	140,000	110,000	30,000
Recreational		30,000	50,000	70,000	60,000	80,000	110,000	30,000
Cultural		300,000	210,000	70,000	180,000	210,000	170,000	50,000
Educational		30,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	10,000	30,000	30,000
Residential		220,000	250,000	220,000	250,000	270,000	200,000	280,000
Military		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>1,150,000</b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>1,240,000</b>	<b>1,130,000</b>	<b>1,380,000</b>	<b>1,380,000</b>	<b>1,340,000</b>	<b>1,150,000</b>
<b>LETTERMAN</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		150,000	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	60,000
Office		1,060,000	1,070,000	1,210,000	1,470,000	1,080,000	1,090,000	1,150,000
Retail		40,000	110,000	40,000	110,000	130,000	120,000	50,000
Lodging/Conference		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreational		30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	30,000	20,000
Cultural		0	30,000	0	30,000	40,000	40,000	0
Educational		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential		80,000	200,000	30,000	100,000	80,000	410,000	80,000
Military		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>1,360,000</b>	<b>1,360,000</b>	<b>1,490,000</b>	<b>1,320,000</b>	<b>1,750,000</b>	<b>1,340,000</b>	<b>1,700,000</b>	<b>1,360,000</b>
<b>FORT SCOTT</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		170,000	70,000	50,000	110,000	50,000	90,000	130,000
Office		50,000	90,000	70,000	90,000	50,000	90,000	100,000
Retail		0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0
Lodging/Conference		300,000	60,000	60,000	200,000	150,000	90,000	0

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The Community

**Table 39: Summary of Proposed Building Uses by Planning District (sf)**

Building Use	Existing	GMPA 2000 (No Action)	Final Plan	Final Plan Variant	Resource Consolidation	Sustainable Community	Cultural Destination	Minimum Management
Recreational		20,000	20,000	30,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	30,000
Cultural		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational		0	100,000	250,000	90,000	210,000	100,000	0
Residential		280,000	530,000	320,000	340,000	270,000	510,000	510,000
Military		30,000	20,000	10,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	30,000
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>900,000</b>	<b>790,000</b>	<b>770,000</b>	<b>770,000</b>	<b>920,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>
<b>EAST HOUSING</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office		10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Retail		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lodging/Conference		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreational		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cultural		0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	10,000
Educational		60,000	0	0	0	0	10,000	0
Residential		480,000	600,000	530,000	620,000	720,000	600,000	630,000
Military		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>650,000</b>	<b>550,000</b>	<b>620,000</b>	<b>550,000</b>	<b>640,000</b>	<b>740,000</b>	<b>620,000</b>	<b>650,000</b>
<b>SOUTH HILLS</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		30,000	60,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	60,000	30,000
Office		40,000	30,000	40,000	20,000	30,000	30,000	40,000
Retail		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lodging/Conference		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreational		20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	20,000
Cultural		0	0	0	20,000	20,000	0	0
Educational		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential		240,000	180,000	180,000	0	240,000	0	860,000
Military		40,000	30,000	40,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	40,000
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>990,000</b>	<b>370,000</b>	<b>310,000</b>	<b>310,000</b>	<b>120,000</b>	<b>370,000</b>	<b>130,000</b>	<b>990,000</b>
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	30,000
Office		0	0	0	0	50,000	0	300,000
Retail		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lodging/Conference		170,000	10,000	0	0	0	10,000	0
Recreational		10,000	0	0	0	10,000	0	0
Cultural		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational		70,000	190,000	50,000	0	20,000	220,000	0
Residential		20,000	200,000	200,000	0	330,000	170,000	70,000

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## The Community

**Table 39: Summary of Proposed Building Uses by Planning District (sf)**

<b>Building Use</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>GMPA 2000 (No Action)</b>	<b>Final Plan</b>	<b>Final Plan Variant</b>	<b>Resource Consolidation</b>	<b>Sustainable Community</b>	<b>Cultural Destination</b>	<b>Minimum Management</b>
Military		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	400,000	290,000	400,000	270,000	0	410,000	400,000	400,000
<b>TOTAL ALL PLANNING DISTRICTS</b>								
Industrial/Warehouse/Infrastructure		580,000	250,000	180,000	80,000	130,000	190,000	520,000
Office		1,660,000	1,820,000	1,900,000	2,440,000	1,990,000	2,050,000	2,410,000
Retail		150,000	190,000	90,000	190,000	260,000	200,000	260,000
Lodging/Conference		540,000	260,000	190,000	320,000	290,000	450,000	30,000
Recreational		110,000	150,000	160,000	120,000	210,000	170,000	100,000
Cultural		370,000	530,000	310,000	470,000	500,000	500,000	110,000
Educational		210,000	390,000	350,000	220,000	350,000	460,000	30,000
Residential		1,320,000	1,960,000	1,480,000	1,310,000	1,910,000	1,890,000	2,430,000
Military		70,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	70,000
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	5,960,000	5,010,000	5,600,000	4,710,000	5,300,000	5,690,000	5,960,000	5,960,000

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

*The Community*

**Table 40: Summary of Maximum Demolition and New Construction Allowed**

Planning District	GMPA 2000 (No Action)		Final Plan		Final Plan Variant		Resource Consolidation		Sustainable Community		Cultural Destination		Minimum Management	
	Maximum Demolition	Maximum New Construction	Demolition	New Construction	Demolition	New Construction	Demolition	New Construction	Demolition	New Construction	Demolition	New Construction	Demolition	New Construction
Crissy Field	220,000	0	40,000	70,000	270,000	0	220,000	150,000	70,000	140,000	50,000	290,000	0	0
Main Post	50,000	100,000	20,000	110,000	20,000	0	100,000	330,000	40,000	270,000	50,000	240,000	0	0
Letterman	0	0	30,000	160,000	40,000	0	80,000	470,000	20,000	0	70,000	410,000	0	0
Fort Scott	0	50,000	70,000	170,000	10,000	0	80,000	150,000	30,000	0	80,000	200,000	0	0
East Housing	100,000	0	100,000	70,000	100,000	0	160,000	150,000	100,000	190,000	130,000	100,000	0	0
South Hills	620,000	0	680,000	0	680,000	0	870,000	0	620,000	0	860,000	0	0	0
Public Health Service Hospital	130,000	20,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	0	400,000	0	10,000	20,000	130,000	130,000	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,120,000</b>	<b>170,000</b>	<b>1,070,000</b>	<b>710,000</b>	<b>1,250,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,910,000</b>	<b>1,250,000</b>	<b>890,000</b>	<b>620,000</b>	<b>1,370,000</b>	<b>1,370,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

north would continue to accommodate a variety of uses, while the southern, less-developed areas would remain primarily as open space. The most dramatic change would be through the reduction in overall built square footage and the resulting net increase in open space. A total of 1.12 million square feet would be removed and up to 170,000 square feet of new construction would be allowed, resulting in a total of 5.01 million square feet. This would be a net reduction of approximately 16% in built space. Open space would increase by about 99 acres or 15%, from 695 acres to a total of 794 acres.

New visitor-oriented programs and services would be provided by tenants in leased building space, and additional open space would be created. This alternative proposes that the Presidio house a network of institutions devoted to stimulating understanding of and action on the world's most critical social, cultural, and environmental challenges. The incorporation of this land use program and associated visitor services and accommodations would enhance the park as a visitor destination.

Visitor and cultural/educational uses would expand under this alternative, and housing uses would be reduced. The breakdown of building space by use is shown in Table 39. The percentage breakdown of these uses would be approximately 33% of the built space would be office use; approximately 26% would be residential; approximately 29% would be for public uses; and the balance would be miscellaneous support and infrastructure uses.

The major change in land use would be with the removal of the Wherry Housing complex (approximately 620,000 sf) to restore open space in the South Hills district, and the removal of the Commissary and PX at Crissy Field to expand the marsh. The demolition would be somewhat offset by a relatively small amount of potential new construction (about 170,000 sf) at the Fort Scott, PHSB, and the Main Post planning districts as needed to augment proposed uses. The general density and character of land uses would not change at the Main Post, Fort Scott and Letterman. There would be a reduction in built space at the PHSB district, with the removal of the non-historic hospital wings.

Housing would continue to be dispersed throughout the south and eastern portions of the park and the number of housing units would be reduced by

more than half, from about 1650 to 770. Several residential clusters would be converted to lodging and conferencing functions.

At the Fort Scott and PHSB Planning Districts, existing dormitory, residential, and hospital facilities would be adapted for educational, conference, and training uses with park mission-related programs. While the East Housing district would primarily be residential in character, some housing would be removed and other units converted for educational programs. Expanded cultural programs, museums, and visitor-serving uses at the Main Post and Crissy Field (Area B) would result in the enhancement of these areas as the primary focus for park visitors. The Letterman Planning District would retain its primarily office land use orientation.

The amount of land dedicated to open space would significantly increase under this alternative with the removal of non-historic buildings in the South Hills, East Housing, and Crissy Field Planning districts. These areas would primarily be used to enhance native habitat and natural resources such as the coastal dunes at the Wherry housing site, the riparian corridors within Tennessee Hollow, and an expanded marsh at Crissy Field.

Land uses in the neighborhoods surrounding the Presidio are primarily residential. These areas are densely developed and proposed Presidio land uses would be generally compatible with surrounding uses. Proposed land uses immediately within the Presidio walls would primarily be open space/recreation, with some residential, office, and institutional uses. The removal of the Wherry Housing complex in the South Hills district would increase open space and remove a current residential use from the vicinity of the neighborhoods to the south. Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), the only other major change in historic land use adjacent to the neighborhoods would be the reoccupation of the PHSB Planning District as a long-term educational and training facility. This area has been relatively unused since base closure and although its reuse was previously analyzed in the 1994 GMPA EIS, it would represent a change in current activity levels in this area. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.) The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. Since 1994, several improvements have been made in these areas by the Trust, the NPS, and the Golden Gate National Parks Association (GGNPA), including rehabilitation of the golf course (and opening to the public), rehabilitation of the Presidio Gate and Arguello Gate to improve pedestrian access and safety, rehabilitation of Building 1750/Lobos Dunes restoration, Mountain Lake Enhancement (underway), and the Crissy Field Marsh project (within Area A).

In conclusion, the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would result in currently vacant building space being occupied and the current amount of residential space decreasing while visitor services would increase. Open space would be expanded. There would be no substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.

### ***Final Plan Alternative***

#### *Changes from Existing Conditions*

The general existing land use pattern at the Presidio would not change substantially under this alternative, although currently vacant building space would be occupied, and more visitor-serving uses would be introduced. Office and other mixed uses would continue to be concentrated in the northeast with housing clusters nearby activity areas.

Under this alternative, total building space would be reduced by about 360,000 sf or 6%, from 5.96 million sf to 5.6 million sf. Open space would increase by about 15% or 99 acres. The removal of the Wherry Housing complex and some of the non-historic housing along East and West Washington Boulevard would increase open space in the southern part of the park. Some planning districts in the northern part of the Presidio would have an increase in density and square footage as a result of replacement construction. Districts that would have an increase in square footage over existing conditions include the Main Post, Letterman, Crissy Field, and Fort Scott. The PSHH complex would remain at the same level of development, and there would be net reductions in the East Housing and South Hills planning districts. The number of housing units would remain the same,

though their locations would shift and the total amount of residential square footage would be reduced by about 470,000 sf.

Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), the only other major change in historic land use adjacent to surrounding residential neighborhoods would be the reoccupation of the PSHH Planning District for residential and educational uses. This area has been relatively unused since base closure, and although its reuse was previously analyzed in the 1994 GMPA EIS, it would represent a change in current activity levels in this area. An increase in square footage dedicated to cultural, educational and visitor amenities in the Crissy Field district would attract more visitors to the bayfront area of Area A. Mitigation requiring monitoring of Area B uses, and coordination with the NPS to ensure that proposed uses compliment Area A, would minimize this potential impact. The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.)

#### *Changes from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)*

With the Final Plan Alternative, the overall building square footage of Area B would be reduced, but not as much as under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). More replacement construction would be allowed, in conjunction with slightly less demolition. Similar to under the No Action Alternative, most of the demolition would affect non-historic housing. New construction would be limited to the replacement of existing structures of similar size in existing areas of development, and design and siting of new construction would protect the character of the National Historic Landmark District. These actions would increase the overall square footage of Area B over the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) by about 590,000 sf to 5.6 million square feet (360,000 less than exists today). The amount of land dedicated to open space would be roughly the same as the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), or about 100 acres more than exist today.

The distribution of uses amongst the building space would be similar to the GMPA in that approximately one-third of building space would be dedicated to public uses (visitor amenities, cultural and educational uses, lodging, etc.),

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

and one third to office use. Another third of the building space – or a greater percentage than in the No Action alternative – would be devoted to residential use. A lesser percentage would be devoted to industrial/warehouse space. The density of some planning districts would be greater than that in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), in order to account for the replacement and re-distribution of some square footage demolished in primarily the South Hills district.

Under this alternative, the mix of cultural and educational programs, community and visitor-serving uses in the Main Post and Crissy Field Planning Districts would result in the enhancement of these areas as the primary focus for park visitors. Similar to the GMPA, the Main Post would continue to primarily be a mixed use district with a preference for office uses and an inviting setting for visitor orientation and community facilities. The Final Plan Alternative allows for a net increase of 30,000 sf over what currently exists at Crissy Field, which is a net difference of 260,000 sf from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). However, the Final Plan Alternative commits to the long-term health of Crissy marsh and precludes any long-term leasing or development for the next two years (the estimated duration of the Crissy marsh study) within a designated area to avoid precluding expansion options. Lodging would be a permitted use, unlike under the No Action Alternative, office and industrial space would be reduced, and more cultural and educational uses would be accommodated at Crissy Field (Area B).

While allowing for some infill construction, the Letterman Planning District would retain its primarily office land use orientation with some residential and support services under the Final Plan Alternative. The Fort Scott planning district would host more educational and residential uses, and less conferencing, lodging, and support services than under the No Action Alternative. A net increase in built space of up to 100,000 sf, would be allowed to provide some replacement housing and to facilitate rehabilitation and reuse of the historic building clusters. In the PSHH area, the Final Plan Alternative would also include more residential and educational use than the No Action Alternative, and less lodging/conference uses. Both alternatives would consider removal of the non-historic hospital wings, however the Final Plan Alternative would permit replacement of the square footage elsewhere in the district.

The planned removal of the Wherry Housing complex would be consistent with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), however the Final Plan Alternative would also remove some of the non-historic housing along East and West Washington Boulevard to provide more open space in the South Hills planning district. Similar to the GMPA, some non-historic housing may be demolished in the East Housing Planning District for the restoration of Tennessee Hollow; but, unlike the GMPA, these units could be replaced by more compatible construction elsewhere in the planning district.

Land uses along the Presidio's urban edge would be very similar to those described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), except the PSHH complex would accommodate more residential and less conference uses. Land uses along Crissy Field (Area B) would be more focused on park visitors. (See comparison with existing conditions, above.)

In summary, the Final Plan Alternative would have similar impacts as the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), with the exceptions of more building space used for housing and less for industrial/support uses and increased open space in the South Hills district. There would be no substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.

## ***Final Plan Variant***

### *Changes from Existing Conditions*

Under the Final Plan Variant, the general pattern of land use would not change, although currently vacant buildings would be rehabilitated and reoccupied, the amount of residential space would decrease, and more lodging and visitor serving uses would be introduced. Intensively used areas concentrated in the north would continue to accommodate a variety of uses, while the southern, less-developed areas would remain primarily as open space.

The most dramatic change would be through the reduction in overall built square footage and the resulting net increase in open space. Under this alternative, there would be a reduction of about 1.3 million sf or 20% of total built space within Area B, from 5.96 million sf to 4.7 million sf. There would be no new construction, only demolition. The most significant change from

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

existing conditions would be the removal of the Wherry housing complex in the South Hills area, and building removals in the Crissy Field, East Housing, and PSHS districts. Remaining buildings would be converted to new uses, including an emphasis on conversion and sub-division of buildings for residential use. The removal of the Wherry Housing complex and some of the non-historic housing in East and West Washington Boulevard would allow for an increase in open space, which would increase by 124 acres from the current 695 acres. The number of housing units would be reduced from about 1,650 to 1,100 and the total amount of residential square footage reduced by about 950,000 sf.

Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), the only other major change in historic land use adjacent to surrounding residential neighborhoods would be the reoccupation of the PSHS Planning District for residential and educational uses. This area has been relatively unused since base closure, and although its reuse was previously analyzed in the 1994 GMPA EIS, it would represent a change in current activity levels in this area. An increase in square footage dedicated to cultural uses in the Crissy Field district would attract more visitors to the bayfront area of Area A. Mitigation requiring monitoring of Area B uses, and coordination with the NPS to ensure that proposed uses compliment Area A, would minimize this potential impact. The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.)

### *Changes from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)*

The Final Plan Variant would include no new construction and a net reduction in the total amount of built space, when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The overall building square footage of Area B would be reduced by about 20%, from 5.96 million sf to 4.7 million sf. The amount of land dedicated to open space would increase by about 18% (124 acres) to 819 acres or 25 acres over the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (794 acres). The Final Plan Variant would create more open space at Crissy

Field and in the East Housing districts than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

Within the 4.7 million sf of built space, more office use and more residential use would be accommodated than under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Approximately 40% of the building space would be for office use, which would occupy an estimated 1.9 million sf, for an increase of 240,000 sf over the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Residential uses would use about 31% of the building space, and public uses would use about 24% of the built space. The balance of space would be for miscellaneous park support functions. Residential uses would continue to be dispersed through the Presidio; however, the number of units would be greater than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) by 330. Replacement units for those removed would be gained through an aggressive approach to housing conversions and subdivisions.

Similar to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), community programs and visitor-serving uses in the Main Post and Crissy Field Planning Districts would result in the enhancement of these areas as the primary focus for park visitors. The Main Post would accommodate more office and less cultural and educational space than under the No Action Alternative, while the Crissy Field (Area B) would include the reverse (less office, more cultural uses). In the Crissy Field and East Housing districts, this alternative would create more open space through building demolitions than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), and would similarly expand Crissy marsh to a minimum 30 acres and restore the Tennessee Hollow watershed with a direct connection to Crissy Marsh. The Letterman district would accommodate more office space, despite some minor building demolition (40,000 sf), and less residential space than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Fort Scott would be a mixed-use complex with more emphasis on residential and educational uses, less emphasis on lodging/conference uses, and minor building demolition (10,000sf). The PSHS area would be primarily residential, and the non-historic wings of the hospital building would be removed and not replaced, as proposed in the No Action Alternative. Similar to the Final Plan Alternative, the South Hills planning district would contain more open space than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) due to the removal of some housing along East and West Washington Boulevard.

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

Land uses along the Presidio's urban edge would be very similar to those described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), except the PHS complex would accommodate more residential and less conference uses. Land uses along Crissy Field (Area B) would be more focused on park visitors. (See comparison with existing conditions, above.)

In conclusion, the Final Plan Variant would have similar effects as the No Action Alternative, with the exception of less built space, more office and residential use. Would create more open space at Crissy Field and the East Housing districts than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses would occur.

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

#### *Changes from Existing Conditions*

This alternative would change the existing land use pattern by removing all buildings from the southern half of the Presidio and concentrating active uses elsewhere. In the northern planning districts, currently vacant buildings would be returned to active use, and more lodging and visitor serving uses would be introduced. The amount of residential space and the number of residential units would decrease.

Under the Resource Consolidation Alternative, there would be a reduction of about 660,000 sf or 11% of total built space within Area B, from 5.96 million sf to 5.3 million sf. Open space would increase by 143 acres from the current 695 acres. In addition to removal of the Wherry Housing complex, this alternative would remove all East and West Washington Boulevard housing and the entire PHS complex. Planning districts in the northern part of the Presidio would have an increase in density and square footage to accommodate some replacement construction. The existing housing supply would be reduced by 740 units, from the current level of about 1650 units to about 910 units.

Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), changes in historic land uses adjacent to surrounding residential neighborhoods would include the removal of all uses from the PHS and South Hills planning districts. Increased square

footage dedicated to office and cultural uses in the Crissy Field district would attract more people to the bayfront area of Area A. Mitigation requiring monitoring of Area B uses, and coordination with the NPS to ensure that proposed uses compliment Area A, would minimize this potential impact. The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.)

#### *Changes from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)*

The Resource Consolidation Alternative would remove a total of 1.91 million sf of building space, or 790,000 sf more than under the No Action Alternative. More replacement construction would also be allowed, with up to 1.25 million sf dispersed between the Main Post, Letterman, Fort Scott, Crissy Field and East Housing planning districts. Overall, the existing 5.96 million sf in Area B would be reduced by 11% to a total of 5.3 million sf, or 290,000 sf more than under the No Action Alternative. The amount of land dedicated to open space would be 44 acres more than under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) for a total increase of 143 acres (or 20%) over existing conditions, to about 838 acres.

Within the 5.3 million sf of built space, more space would be devoted to office use than under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), with office uses occupying about 46% of the space or roughly 2.4 million square feet. Residential and public uses would each constitute about 25% of the built space, similar to the No Action Alternative. The balance of space would be for miscellaneous park support functions. Residential uses would continue to be dispersed through the Presidio; however, the number of units would be greater than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) by 140.

Similar to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the Main Post would be a mixed use district with a predominance of office use, but the total amount of allowable square footage in this district would be 180,000 sf more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Building removals in the Crissy Field district would be the same as the GMPA to allow for restoration of open space and wetlands expansion. However, up to 150,000 sf of replacement construction could occur in this district to allow for new visitor-serving uses

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

and would result in an increase of 150,000 sf more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). This alternative would provide for some infill housing, and related services in the Letterman Planning District with a net increase of 390,000 sf more than under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). In the South Hills district, removal of the Wherry housing complex would be the same as under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), but in addition, all of the East and West Washington Boulevard housing and the entire PSHH complex would be removed and the areas restored to native habitat and open space. More non-historic housing (160,000 sf) in the East Housing planning district would be removed under this alternative than in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) to restore Tennessee Hollow; however, replacement construction of up to 150,000 sf would be allowed.

Land uses along the Presidio's urban edge would be very similar to those described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), except the PSHH complex would be removed. Land uses along Crissy Field (Area B) would be more focused on park visitors. (See comparison with existing conditions, above.)

In conclusion, the Resource Consolidation Alternative would result in increased open space compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), with removal of the entire PSHH complex. There would be a greater number of residential units than in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). There would not be any substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses.

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

#### *Changes from Existing Conditions*

Overall, under the Sustainable Community Alternative, current land use patterns would remain the same, although currently vacant building space would be occupied, and more visitor-serving uses would be introduced. Office and other mixed uses would continue to be concentrated in the northeast with housing clusters nearby activity areas.

The most dramatic change would be the removal of the Wherry housing complex in the South Hills district and replacement construction in the Main Post, Crissy Field, and East Housing districts. Under this alternative, there

would be a reduction of about 270,000 sf or 5% of total built space within Area B, from 5.96 million sf to 5.69 million sf. Open space would increase by 77 acres from the current 695 acres. The PSHH complex would remain at about its current density but would be converted to residential uses. The residential pattern would remain dispersed around the park and the existing housing supply would be reduced by about 220 units, from the current level of about 1650 units to about 1430 units.

Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), the only other major change in historic land use adjacent to surrounding residential neighborhoods would be the reoccupation of the PSHH Planning District for residential and other accessory uses. This area has been relatively unused since base closure, and although its reuse was previously analyzed in the 1994 GMPA EIS, it would represent a change in current activity levels in this area. An increase in square footage dedicated to cultural, educational and visitor amenities in the Crissy Field district would attract more visitors to the bayfront area of Area A. Mitigation requiring monitoring of Area B uses, and coordination with the NPS to ensure that proposed uses compliment Area A, would minimize this potential impact. The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.)

#### *Changes from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)*

This alternative would remove a total of 890,000 sf of building space, or 230,000 sf less than under the No Action Alternative, and would permit up to 620,000 sf of replacement construction, or 450,000 sf more than the No Action Alternative. Overall, the existing 5.96 million sf in Area B would be reduced by only 5% to a total of 5.69 million sf (680,000 sf more than the No Action Alternative). The amount of land dedicated to open space would be less than the No Action Alternative by about 22 acres, representing a net increase of about 77 acres over existing conditions.

Within the 5.69 million sf of built space, about the same percentage of space would be devoted to office uses and public or visitor-serving uses as in the No

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Approximately one third of the space would be used for each. Another third of the space would be used for residential uses, representing an increase from the No Action Alternative. Residential uses would continue to be dispersed through the Presidio; however, the number of units would be greater than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) by 660.

Similar to the No Action Alternative, the Main Post would be a mixed use district with a predominance of office use, however, the total amount of allowable square footage in this district would be 180,000 sf more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Infill construction would be allowed to support this alternative's concept of a live-work environment. The Crissy Field planning district would have similar uses as the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), with more overall space, and an emphasis on cultural, educational, and office uses. There would be 150,000 sf less building removal in the Crissy Field district than in the GMPA and up to 140,000 sf of new construction allowed for new visitor-serving uses. This would result in an increase of 290,000 sf more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) for Crissy Field. The Letterman Planning District would primarily accommodate office uses, and there would be a 20,000 sf reduction in built space from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Fort Scott would be a mixture of residential, lodging, and conferencing uses as described in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), with the addition of educational uses; no new construction would be allowed. In the South Hills district, removal of the Wherry housing complex would be the same as under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). A total of 190,000 sf of replacement construction, for housing, would be allowed within the East Housing district. Allowable new construction would be the same as the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) for the PSHH complex, but only 10,000 sf would be removed (as opposed to 130,000 under the No Action Alternative).

Land uses along the Presidio's urban edge would be very similar to those described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), except the PSHH complex would accommodate more office and residential uses, and less conference uses. Land uses along Crissy Field (Area B) would be more focused on park visitors. (See comparison with existing conditions, above.)

In summary, the Sustainable Community Alternative would have effects similar to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), except that there would be less open space and more residential use. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses would occur.

## ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

### *Changes from Existing Conditions*

Overall, under the Cultural Destination Alternative, current land use patterns would remain the same, although currently vacant building space would be occupied, and more visitor-serving uses would be introduced. Office and other mixed uses would continue to be concentrated in the northeast with housing clusters nearby activity areas.

The most dramatic change would be the removal of the Wherry housing complex in the South Hills district and replacement construction in the Main Post, Letterman, Crissy Field, and Fort Scott planning districts. This alternative would retain Area B's current 5.96 million sf, with a maximum of 1.37 million sf of building demolition, and an equivalent amount of replacement construction. About 900,000 sf of non-historic housing would be removed from the South Hills planning district and replaced in the north. Open space would increase by 112 acres (16%) over existing conditions to provide for an increase in native plant habitat and recreational opportunities. The increase in open space would largely be accomplished through the removal of non-historic housing in the South Hills district. Most planning districts in the north would have an increase in square footage and density. There would be an increase in the number of existing housing units, from about 1650 to 1700.

Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), the only other major change in historic land use adjacent to surrounding residential neighborhoods would be the reoccupation of the PSHH Planning District for residential and educational uses. This area has been relatively unused since base closure, and although its reuse was previously analyzed in the 1994 GMPA EIS, it would represent a change in current activity levels in this area. An increase in square footage dedicated to cultural, educational and visitor amenities in the Crissy Field

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

district would attract more visitors to the bayfront area of Area A. Mitigation requiring monitoring of Area B uses, and coordination with the NPS to ensure that proposed uses compliment Area A, would minimize this potential impact. The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.)

### *Changes from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)*

The Cultural Destination Alternative would remove and replace a total of 1.37 million sf, more than under the No Action Alternative, and would ultimately maintain the existing 5.96 million square feet of building space in Area B. This would represent about 950,000 sf more than under the No Action Alternative. The amount of land dedicated to open space would increase by about 13 acres over the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), or by about 111 acres (16%) overall, to a total of 807 acres.

Within the 5.96 million sf of built space, approximately one-third of building space would be dedicated to public uses, one third to residential, and one third to office use. This represents a greater percentage of residential use than in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), and residential square footage would be substantially more (about 570,000 sf more), providing 1,700 dwelling units, or more than twice the number in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The increase in housing units would be accomplished through a combination of replacement construction and conversions of existing structures and would provide a more diverse housing stock for the Presidio community.

As in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the Main Post would continue its role as the "heart of the Presidio," and the predominant uses would be office, community and public amenities. Through additional demolition and new construction, the total square footage for the Main Post would be 140,000 sf more than under the No Action Alternative. Crissy Field would be the primary visitor activity core and compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), would have a significant increase in building space (460,000 sf more than No Action) providing a mix of cultural, educational, office, and lodging uses. Construction of infill housing and related services at the

Letterman Planning District would counterbalance the office use in this area, representing a net increase in built space of 340,000 sf over the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The Fort Scott planning district would host similar uses as proposed in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), but there would be a greater amount of space dedicated to residential, office and educational uses, less warehouse uses, and an increase in 70,000 sf of building space when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The East Hills Planning District would continue to serve as a primarily residential area; unlike the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), most non-historic housing would be removed and replaced. The PSHH would be adapted for education uses with supporting residential uses.

Land uses along the Presidio's urban edge would be very similar to those described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), except the PSHH complex would accommodate more residential and less conference uses. Land uses along Crissy Field (Area B) would be more focused on park visitors. (See comparison with existing conditions, above.)

In conclusion, the Cultural Destination Alternative would create more open space in the South Hills district than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). There would also be more residential, office use and public uses than would result under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). No substantial conflicts with adjacent land uses would occur.

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

#### *Changes from Existing Conditions*

This alternative proposes no significant changes to existing conditions. There would be no building demolition or new construction, and existing buildings (including those that have been vacant for a while) would be rehabilitated for reuse, including the long-term reuse of the Wherry Housing complex.

Aside from the Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) project (reviewed under previous environmental analysis), the only other major change in historic land use adjacent to surrounding residential neighborhoods would be the reoccupation of the PSHH Planning District for residential and educational uses. This area has been relatively unused since base closure, and although its

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

reuse was previously analyzed in the 1994 GMPA EIS, it would represent a change in current activity levels in this area. Uses in the Crissy Field district would attract more visitors to the bayfront area of Area A. Mitigation requiring monitoring of Area B uses, and coordination with the NPS to ensure that proposed uses compliment Area A, would minimize this potential impact. The remaining areas along the park's urban edge would continue to provide scenic, recreational, natural and open spaces. (For a discussion of the noise, visual, traffic and other related effects of the proposed reuse activities and corresponding mitigation measures, refer to relevant sections in this EIS.)

## *Changes to the No Action Alternative*

This alternative proposes only minimal management of the park to protect the visiting public and existing site resources. Therefore, in contrast to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), there would be no building demolition or new construction, and no land use changes. The total built square footage would remain at 5.96 million sf (as opposed to the No Action's total of 5.01 million sf) and the only change to open space would be a gain of 7 acres through the construction of the LDAC project at Letterman (in contrast the No Action's increase of 99 acres). The most substantive difference between this alternative and the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would be the retention and reuse of Wherry housing in the South Hills. (Under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), these units would be demolished and the area converted to open space/native plant communities).

Existing buildings would be rehabilitated for occupancy. In contrast to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), office and residential uses would be the predominant land uses, each at about 40% of the total square footage. The balance of space would be split between public type amenities and miscellaneous support uses. Office uses would continue to be concentrated in the northeast. Cultural and educational uses would be less than proposed under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). These uses would be concentrated in existing facilities primarily at the Main Post and Crissy Field planning districts. Residential uses would remain in existing locations, dispersed throughout the south and west. The total number of units, about 1650, would remain the same; this figure is greater than proposed under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) by about 880 units.

Land uses along the Presidio's urban edge would be generally compatible with existing adjacent uses, since there would be no significant change from current conditions except for re-activation of the PHS complex. However, there would be a substantial reduction in the open space benefits when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

In summary, the Minimum Management Alternative would not result in any change to existing conditions, beyond the leasing of existing structures. There would be no demolition and no new construction, and less open space than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). There would be more office and residential uses than would occur under the No Action, and, less public uses. No substantial conflicts with adjacent land use would result.

## **MITIGATION**

The following measure would apply to all alternatives.

CO-1 *Monitoring of Area B Uses.* Through the course of implementation, including leasing activities, the Trust would review proposed uses for specific areas buildings for their consistency with the PTMP Planning Principles to ensure protection of the Presidio's cultural, natural, scenic and recreational resources. The Trust would also consult with NPS for all activities that would have the potential to significantly affect Area A resources.

## **4.4.2 SOCIOECONOMIC ISSUES/HOUSING SUPPLY**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### ***Housing Supply***

This section describes the methodology for estimating the project impact under each alternative on housing demand in the Housing Impact Area (HIA). The project impact is defined both in terms of existing conditions and as the difference between the impact under each alternative and the impact under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), which represents the future baseline.

The specific methodology for the analysis involved the following steps:

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

*Step 1: Employment Generation* – The housing impact analysis begins with an estimation of the total number of jobs generated by each alternative. This process is displayed in Tables 1, 2, and 3 in Appendix E. For each alternative, the square footage of each land use is divided by its corresponding employee density (square feet per employee). This results in the total number of employees under each alternative, including existing employees at the Presidio. Employee densities from other studies completed for the Trust were used for this calculation.

The number of existing employees (2,020) is then subtracted to determine new employment. Finally, to allow comparison with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the number of new employees generated by the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) is subtracted from the new employment generated by each alternative. This results in the number of new employees generated by each alternative in excess of the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) employment. Employment under the No Action Alternative (6,460 jobs in 2020) was estimated by adjusting figures contained in the GMPA EIS. Adjustments included the addition of jobs associated with the LDAC project, office use of Building 1750, and the second phase of the Thoreau Center, in addition to the use of conservative employment density factors for all office and lodging uses.

*Step 2: Calculating Housing Supply* – To determine the net new supply of housing, the anticipated number of units in each alternative was compared to the existing number of units and to the number proposed in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). These calculations, shown in Table 4 and Table 6 in Appendix E, express the net new supply of housing in the Presidio.

*Step 3: Calculating Housing Demand* – In Step 3, housing demand is projected by translating total employment under each alternative and new project employment (calculated in Step 1) into households (see Table 41a). This is done by dividing each employment figure by the number of employed residents per household in the Bay Area in 2020 (ABAG 2000). As part of the jobs/housing balance impact analysis, total demand by Presidio-based employees for housing on-site at the Presidio is estimated based upon a survey of Presidio-based employees (Sedway Group 2001 and Presidio Trust 1999). This demand estimate indicates the number of employees that would want to

live at the Presidio, recognizing the importance of many factors such as renter/owner status, schools, and household type in residential locational decisions.

*Step 4: Comparing Housing Supply and Demand* – Table 41a contrasts housing supply with housing demand in the Presidio for all alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The net new supply (from Step 2) is subtracted from the new household demand (from Step 3). The difference represents the “net-new” household demand in the HIA for all alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). All alternatives can also be compared to the existing housing supply, and the total adjusted Presidio-based housing demand can be compared to the projected supply (presented in Table 41c). Any one of these three comparisons can be used to define the “jobs/housing balance.”

*Step 5: Regional Impact Analysis* – The final step gauges each alternative’s impact on the regional housing market. The last column in Table 41a presents each alternative’s additional household demand as a percentage of the additional households in the HIA as projected by ABAG between 2000 and 2020. For the purposes of this analysis, the year 2020 is used as the Presidio build-out year for each alternative.

*Single Room Occupancy/Dorm Room Analysis* – Single room occupancy/dorm rooms are treated separately in Table 41b. Only a supply-side analysis is completed, because the demand for single room occupancy/dorm rooms is assumed to equal the supply based on the presence of interns, volunteers, and other program partners under all alternatives. The number of proposed single room occupancy/dorm rooms under each alternative is compared to the number of units under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Table 41b).

### ***Jobs/Housing Balance***

The concept behind a “jobs/housing balance” is to strike a balance between the number of households and the number of jobs in an area. A jobs/housing balance theoretically promotes a healthy housing market, where supply equals demand. Other benefits can also result, such as shorter commutes for residents and a reduction in traffic congestion.

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## The Community

**Table 41a: Presidio Housing Impact Analysis: New Demand and Supply of Each Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)**

Alternative	New Employment (a)	New Household Demand (b)	Net New Supply (c)	Additional Household Demand in HIA (d)	% of Total New Households in HIA 2000 - 2020 (e)
No Action/GMPA 2000 (Future Baseline)	4,439	2,840	0	2,840	2.05
Final Plan	428	274	790	(516)	-0.37
Final Plan Variant	167	107	465	(358)	-0.26
Resource Consolidation	2,021	1,293	364	929	0.67
Sustainable Community	1,062	680	683	(3)	0.00
Cultural Destination	1,381	884	926	(42)	-0.03
Minimum Management	1,364	873	611	262	0.19

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Superdistrict and County Summaries of ABAG Projections, 2000; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) From Housing Appendix Table 3: Employment Generation Analysis.
- (b) New Household Demand equals New Project Employment divided by Employed Residents per Household for the Bay Area in 2020: 1.563.
- (c) Assumed supply of conventional dwelling units from Housing Appendix Table 4: Presidio Single-Family and Multifamily Housing Supply.
- (d) Additional Household Demand in HIA equals New Household Demand minus Net New Supply.  
HIA = Housing Impact Area, as defined by Table 16 in the Affected Environment Community Chapter: Definition of The Housing Impact Area.
- (e) Total New Households in HIA = 138,469. From Table 17 in the Affected Environment Community Chapter: Housing Impact Area Characteristics.

**Table 41b: Projected Presidio SRO and Dormitory Housing Supply**

Alternative	Projected Units (a)	No Action (GMPA 2000) Units (b)	Net New Supply (c)
No Action (GMPA 2000)	262	262	0
Final Plan	352	262	90
Final Plan Variant	138	262	(124)
Resource Consolidation	40	262	(222)
Sustainable Community	238	262	(24)
Cultural Destination	272	262	10
Minimum Management	538	262	276

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) Assumed supply of dormitory style units under each alternative. Currently, there are about 540 SRO/dorm units at the Presidio.
- (b) No Action (GMPA 2000) Units represents the number of dormitory style units assumed in 2020 under this alternative.
- (c) Net New Supply is the difference between Proposed Units and No Action (GMPA 2000) Units.

**Table 41c: Jobs/Housing Balance in the Presidio**

Alternative	Total Presidio Housing Supply (a)	Supply as a Percent of New Housing Demand		Supply as a Percent of Total Housing Demand		Supply as a Percent of Presidio-based Demand	
		New Household Demand (b)	Jobs/Housing Balance	Total Demand (c)	Jobs/Housing Balance	Presidio-based Demand (d)	Jobs/Housing Balance
No Action (GMPA 2000) (Baseline) (c)	505	2,840	18%	4,132	12%	1,398	36%
Final Plan	1,295	3,114	42%	4,406	29%	1,486	87%
Final Plan Variant	970	2,947	33%	4,239	23%	1,377	70%
Resource Consolidation	869	4,133	21%	5,425	16%	1,733	50%
Sustainable Community	1,188	3,520	34%	4,812	25%	1,549	77%
Cultural Destination	1,431	3,724	38%	5,016	29%	1,611	89%
Minimum Management	1,116	3,713	30%	5,005	22%	1,607	70%

Sources: The Presidio Trust; Sedway Group; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

- (a) Projected supply of conventional dwelling units. From Housing Appendix Table 6: Presidio Single-Family and Multifamily Housing Supply
- (b) From Housing Appendix Table 7: Presidio Housing Impact (does not include SRO/dorm units)
- (c) From Housing Appendix Table 9: Total Housing Demand Analysis
- (d) Total housing demand adjusted to reflect the desire of Presidio-based employees to live in the Presidio. Sedway Group, 2002.

As explained above (Step 4), Table 41c presents three separate comparisons that can be used to define the jobs/housing balance under each of the PTMP alternatives. The impact analysis provides comparisons of total housing demand to housing supply, comparisons of net new housing demand to housing supply, and comparisons of Presidio-based demand to supply.

Based on conversation with ABAG staff, this analysis assumes that the level of Presidio development projected by ABAG approximates the level of development under the GMPA, and any additional plans developed since the GMPA process (personal communication Fassinger). Therefore, any project impact resulting from each alternative represents an increase or decrease from ABAG's projected number of households in the HIA.

## POTENTIAL IMPACTS

### INCREASED DEMAND FOR HOUSING

#### *No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)*

As shown in Table 41a, new employment under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would generate demand for 2,840 new households, or approximately 2.05 percent of the new households projected in the HIA between 2000 and 2020.

#### *Final Plan Alternative*

New employment under the Final Plan Alternative would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), but would

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

also maintain the existing supply of housing, unlike the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (see Tables 41a and 41c). Overall, the Final Plan Alternative would reduce housing demand in the HIA by 516 households, or 0.37 percent of the additional households in the HIA between 2000 and 2020 when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

### ***Final Plan Variant***

New employment under the Final Plan Variant would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), and would maintain more of the existing supply of housing, but less than the Final Plan Alternative (see Tables 41a and 41c). Overall, the Final Plan Variant would reduce housing demand in the HIA by 358 households, or 0.26 percent of the additional households in the HIA between 2000 and 2020 when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

The Resource Consolidation Alternative would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), and would maintain more of the existing supply of housing, but less than the Final Plan Alternative (see Tables 41a and 41c). Overall, the Resource Consolidation Alternative would result in demand for 929 new households in the HIA, or 0.67 percent of the additional households in the HIA between 2000 and 2020 when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

The Sustainable Community Alternative would generate demand for more housing units than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), and would maintain more than half of the existing supply (see Tables 41a and 41c). Overall, the Sustainable Community Alternative would reduce housing demand in the HIA by 3 households, a negligible percent of the additional households in the HIA between 2000 and 2020 when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

### ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

The Cultural Destination Alternative would generate more demand for housing than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), and would provide the most housing among all the alternatives (see Tables 41a and 41c). Overall, the Cultural Destination Alternative would result in a decreased demand for 42 new households in the HIA, or 0.03 percent of the additional households in the HIA between 2000 and 2020 when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

As shown in Tables 41a and 41c, the Minimum Management Alternative would generate more housing demand than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) and would maintain the existing housing supply. Overall, the Minimum Management Alternative would increase housing demand in the HIA by 262 new households, or 0.19 percent of the additional households in the HIA between 2000 and 2020 when compared to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

## JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE

### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

Under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), 505 housing units would be provided. This housing supply would meet approximately 12 percent of the demand for housing based upon total household demand generated under the alternative, and 18 percent of net new housing demand. Approximately 36 percent of demand by Presidio-based employees would be met by this alternative (see Table 41c), without accounting for the demand and supply of dormitory style rooms (Table 41b). The No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would provide the least number of housing units among the alternatives due to the removal of existing housing, and as a consequence, contributes the least towards achieving a jobs/housing balance. As called for in the GMPA, progress towards the jobs/housing balance would be monitored over time. If additional housing for Presidio-based employees were needed, the conversion or adaptive rehabilitation of structures for residential use would be considered.

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

### ***Final Plan Alternative***

Under the Final Plan Alternative, 1,295 housing units would be provided (not including SRO/dorm rooms). This housing supply would meet approximately 29 percent of the demand for housing, based upon total household demand generated under the alternative, and 42 percent of net new housing demand (see Table 41c), without accounting for the demand and supply of dormitory style rooms (Table 41b). This alternative would provide housing in a quantity sufficient to meet 87 percent of Presidio-based employees housing demand, a significantly higher proportion than all other alternatives except the Cultural Destination Alternative. Among the alternatives, the Final Plan Alternative would contribute the most to achieving a jobs/housing balance as measured by two of the three job/housing calculations.

### ***Final Plan Variant***

Under the Final Plan Variant, 970 housing units would be provided (not including SRO/dorm rooms). This housing supply would meet approximately 23 percent of the demand for housing, based upon total household demand generated under the alternative, and 33 percent of net new housing demand (see Table 41c). This alternative would provide more housing to meet the Presidio-based employees housing demand (70 percent) than the No Action and Resource Consolidation Alternatives, the same amount as the Minimum Management Alternative, and somewhat less than the remaining alternatives, without accounting for the demand and supply of dormitory style rooms (Table 41b).

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

Under the Resource Consolidation Alternative, 869 housing units would be provided. This housing supply would meet approximately 16 percent of the total demand for housing, and 21 percent of net new housing demand. Approximately 50 percent of demand by Presidio-based employees would be met by this alternative (see Table 41c), without accounting for the demand and supply of dormitory style rooms (Table 41b). The Resource Consolidation Alternative would result in a reduction of the existing housing supply due to the removal of existing housing. As a consequence, this alternative would contribute less towards achieving a jobs/housing balance

than the Final Plan, Final Plan Variant, Sustainable Community, or Cultural Destination Alternatives, but more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

Under the Sustainable Community Alternative, 1,188 housing units would be provided. This housing supply would meet approximately 25 percent of the total demand for housing, and 34 percent of net new housing demand (see Table 41c). The Sustainable Community Alternative would provide housing supply in a quantity somewhat less than anticipated to be sufficient to meet Presidio-based employees housing demand (77 percent), without accounting for the demand and supply of dormitory style rooms (Table 41b). This alternative would contribute more towards achieving a jobs/housing balance than all other alternatives, except the Final Plan and Cultural Destination Alternatives.

### ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

Under the Cultural Destination Alternative, 1,431 housing units would be provided, the largest quantity of housing proposed among the alternatives. This housing supply would meet approximately 29 percent of the total demand for housing, and 38 percent of net new housing demand (see Table 41c). The Cultural Destination Alternative would provide sufficient housing supply to meet 89 percent of anticipated Presidio-based employees housing demand, without accounting for the demand and supply of dormitory style rooms (Table 41b).

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

Under the Minimum Management Alternative, the existing 1,116 unit supply of housing would be retained. This housing supply would meet approximately 22 percent of the total demand for housing, and 30 percent of net new housing demand (see Table 41c). Along with the Final Plan Variant, this alternative's housing supply would meet approximately 70 percent of housing demand by Presidio-based employees, contributing less toward a jobs/housing balance than the Final Plan, Sustainable Community, or Cultural Destination

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## The Community

Alternatives, but more than the No Action (GMPA 2000) and Resource Consolidation Alternatives.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Measures Adapted from the GMPA EIS

The following measure would apply to all alternatives.

CO-2 *Jobs/Housing Balance Monitoring.* Through the ongoing review of housing demand, occupancy and unit mix, progress towards the jobs/housing balance would be monitored. Housing opportunities would accommodate Presidio-based employees at a range of income levels.

### 4.4.3 SCHOOLS

#### METHODOLOGY

The effect of an alternative on schools is calculated by comparing the number of school children generated under each alternative to existing capacity at Presidio – serving public elementary, middle, and high schools.

Resident population estimates are shown in Table 42. The estimates for the number of school-aged children at the Presidio are based on the average number of children aged 5 through 10, 11 through 13, and 14 through 17 in the City and County of San Francisco from 1994 through 2000, as a percentage of the total population. From 1994 through 2000 an average of 5.6 percent of San Francisco’s population was aged 5 through 10, an average of 2.8 percent was aged 11 through 13, and an average of 3.8 percent was aged 14 through 17 (Schools Appendix Table 1 in Appendix F). These ratios are applied to the Presidio resident population estimates under the alternatives to estimate the percentage of Presidio residents aged 5 through 10, 11 through 13, and 14 through 17 under each alternative. This process is displayed in Table 43. Estimates for the Presidio resident population are derived from current residential leasing information. A household size of 2.5 persons per household has been applied to the number of residential units assumed under each alternative to calculate a resident population. Residents of single room

occupancy/dorm rooms have not been included in this analysis, because school age children will not occupy dormitory units at the Presidio.

**Table 42: PTMP Resident Population Estimates**

Alternative	Residential		Dormitory		Total Residential Population
	Units	Residents	Units	Residents	
No Action (GMPA 2000)	510	1,260	260	400	1,660
Final Plan	1,300	3,240	350	530	3,770
Final Plan Variant	970	2,430	140	210	2,630
Resource Consolidation	870	2,170	40	60	2,230
Sustainable Community	1,190	2,970	240	360	3,330
Cultural Destination	1,430	3,580	270	360	3,990
Minimum Management	1,120	2,790	540	810	3,600

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2000; The Presidio Trust, Bay Area Economics, 2002.

Notes:

Household size assumptions based on current residential leasing data from the Presidio Trust.

Assumptions:

Household size (a): 2.5 persons

Residents per Dormitory Unit: 1.5 persons

Estimates for the population in San Francisco aged 5 through 10, 11 through 13, and 14 through 17 in 2000 are supplied by Woods & Poole Economics Inc. of Washington, D. C., an economic forecasting service that uses a database containing more than 550 economic variables for every county in the United States for every year from 1970 through 2025. Data provided by Woods & Poole are used regularly by county and state governments throughout the U.S. for planning purposes. Woods & Poole also provides data to federal agencies including the Department of Interior, Department of Defense, Environmental Protection Agency, and Department of Veteran Affairs.

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

*The Community*

**Table 43: Public School Enrollment Estimates**

Alternative	Residential Population	Total Residents 5-10	Total Residents 11-13	Total Residents 14-17	Presidio Public Elementary School Enrollment		Presidio Public Middle School Enrollment		Presidio Public High School Enrollment		Total Enrollment
					Build-Out	Public School Capacity (d)	Build-Out	Public School Capacity (d)	Build-Out	Public School Capacity (d)	
No Action (GMPA 2000)	1,260	66	33	45	48	273	24	221	33	57 (at Galileo)	105
Final Plan	3,240	180	91	124	125	273	63	221	86	57 (at Galileo)	273
Final Plan Variant	2,430	135	68	93	93	273	47	221	64	57 (at Galileo)	205
Resource Consolidation	2,170	114	58	79	84	273	42	221	58	57 (at Galileo)	184
Sustainable Community	2,970	156	79	108	114	273	58	221	79	57 (at Galileo)	251
Cultural Destination	3,580	188	95	130	138	273	69	221	95	57 (at Galileo)	302
Minimum Management	2,790	147	74	101	107	273	54	221	74	57 (at Galileo)	235

Source: Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.; California Department of Education; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

**Notes:**

- (a) San Francisco County, California 2000 Data Pamphlet, Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.
- (b) California Department of Education, Education Demographics Unit.
- (c) Population for non-dormitory units.
- (d) Schools Appendix Table 2.

**Assumptions:**

- % of Residents 5-10 (a) 5.6%
- % of Residents 11-13 (a) 2.8%
- % of Residents 14-17 (a) 3.8%
- San Francisco Public School Enrollment Rate (b) 69.3%

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

The estimate of the percentage of Presidio school-aged children enrolled in San Francisco public schools is based on the total number of students in San Francisco public schools, as a percentage of the population in San Francisco aged 5 through 17. SFUSD enrollment data are provided on California Department of Education School District Web site, which shows that there were 62,041 children in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade in the 1999-2000 school year. Demographic estimates from Woods & Poole show that there are a total of 90,960 children in San Francisco in 2000 aged 5 through 17. Dividing this total by the 1999-2000 K-12 population in SFUSD generates a public school enrollment rate of 68.2 percent.

However, between 1993-1994 and 1999-2000 the public school enrollment rate of San Francisco children aged 5 through 17 averaged 69.3 percent per year.<sup>1</sup> Over the 7 school years from 1993-1994 through 1999-2000, the public school enrollment rate for SFUSD has ranged from a high of 72.7 percent in 1994 to a low of 67.7 percent in 1998.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, for this purpose of this analysis, a public school enrollment rate of 69.3 percent has been selected for Presidio residents in 2000 and 2020. The school enrollment data are presented in Schools Appendix Table 1 in Appendix F.

The SFUSD high schools serving the Presidio are currently over their combined capacity. Galileo High School itself, however, has excess space for an additional 57 students. Therefore, if development under an alternative generates 57 or fewer public high school students, it is assumed that these students would be accommodated by Galileo High School, and a significant impact would not occur.

Note that comparing the number of Presidio school children at build-out (2020) to SFUSD's existing capacity is problematic; school enrollment and facilities are likely to change significantly over the next 20 years. SFUSD

---

1 Years for which data is available from the State of California Department of Education, Education Demographic Unit.

2 Based on population estimates of San Francisco residents aged 5 through 17 provided by Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.

does not project enrollment and capacity needs beyond 1 year. Consequently, this analysis only provides a preliminary estimate of impacts, using the only available information.

## **POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

### INCREASED DEMAND FOR SCHOOL FACILITIES

#### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

As shown in Table 42, the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would generate 1,260 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding residents of single room occupancy/dorm rooms). This population would result in a total of 48 elementary school students, 24 middle school students, and 33 high school students in the SFUSD (Table 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio (Schools Appendix Table 2), there would be no impact, because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students generate by the Presidio. Although SFUSD high schools serving the Presidio already have more students than their combined existing capacity, the 33 public high school students that would be generated by the Presidio could be absorbed by Galileo High School, which has excess space for 57 students (Schools Appendix Table 2).

#### ***Final Plan Alternative***

As shown in Table 42, the Final Plan Alternative would generate 3,240 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding single room occupancy/dorm rooms residents). This population would result in a total of 125 elementary school students, 63 middle school students, and 86 high school students in the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). The Final Plan Alternative would generate 77 more elementary students, 39 more middle school students, and 53 more high school students than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Table 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio (Schools Appendix Table 2), there would be no impact, because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students that the Presidio would generate. However, the additional high school students would exceed the capacity of Presidio-serving high schools by 29 students, including Galileo High. Mitigation identified in this EIS, requiring

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

that the Trust collaborate with the School District to find space for these students, would reduce this impact.

### ***Final Plan Variant***

As shown in Table 42, the Final Plan Variant would generate 2,430 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding single room occupancy/dorm room residents). This population would result in a total of 93 elementary school students, 47 middle school students, and 64 high school students in the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). The Final Plan Variant would generate 45 more elementary students, 23 more middle school students, and 31 more high school students than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Table 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio (Schools Appendix Table 2), there would be no impact, because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students that the Presidio would generate. However, the additional high school students would exceed the capacity of Presidio-serving high schools by 7 students, including Galileo High. Mitigation identified in this EIS, requiring that the Trust collaborate with the School District to find space for these students, would reduce this impact.

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

As shown in Table 42, the Resource Consolidation Alternative would generate 2,170 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding single room occupancy/dormitory residents). This population would result in a total of 84 elementary, 42 middle and 58 high school students. This alternative would yield 36 more elementary students, 18 more middle school students, and 25 more high school students than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Table 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio, there would be no impact, because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students that the Presidio would generate. However, the additional high school students would exceed the capacity of Presidio - serving high schools by 1 student, including Galileo High (Schools Appendix Table 2). Mitigation identified in this EIS, requiring that the Trust collaborate with the School District to find space for these students, would reduce this impact.

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

As shown in Table 42, the Sustainable Community Alternative would generate 2,970 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding single room occupancy/dorm room residents). This population would result in 114 elementary, 58 middle, and 79 high school students, which would be 66 more elementary students, 34 more middle school students, and 46 more high school students than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Table 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio (Schools Appendix Table 2), there would be no impact, because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students that the Presidio would generate. However, the additional high school students would exceed the capacity of Presidio-serving high schools by 22 students, including Galileo High. Mitigation identified in this EIS, requiring that the Trust collaborate with the School District to find space for these students, would reduce this impact.

### ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

As shown in Table 42, this alternative would generate 3,580 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding single room occupancy/dorm room residents). This population would result in 138 elementary, 69 middle and 95 high school students, which is 90 more elementary students, 45 more middle school students, and 62 more high school students than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Table 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio (Schools Appendix Table 2), there would be no impact, because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students that the Presidio would generate. However, the additional high school students would exceed the capacity of Presidio-serving high schools by 38 students, including Galileo High. Mitigation identified in this EIS, requiring that the Trust collaborate with the School District to find space for these students, would reduce this impact.

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

As shown in Table 42, the Minimum Management Alternative would generate approximately 2,790 Presidio residents at build-out (excluding single room occupancy/dormitory residents). This population would result in 107

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

elementary, 54 middle and 74 high school students, which is 59 more elementary students, 30 more middle school students, and 41 more high school students than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) (Tables 43). For SFUSD elementary and middle schools serving the Presidio, there would be no impact because their capacity exceeds the number of public elementary and middle school students generated by the Presidio. However, the additional high school students would exceed the capacity of Presidio-serving high schools by 17 students, including Galileo High. Mitigation identified in this EIS, requiring that the Trust collaborate with the School District to find space for these students, would reduce this impact.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

### ***Measures Adapted from the GMPA EIS***

The GMPA EIS does not contain mitigation for schools.

### ***New Measures***

The following mitigation measure would apply to all alternatives except No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

CO-3 *Collaboration with SFUSD.* The Trust would make all reasonable efforts to collaborate with SFUSD to locate necessary space for students residing at the Presidio and continue to participate in the Federal Impact Aid program.

## **4.4.4 VISITOR EXPERIENCE**

Each alternative was analyzed for potential impacts on visitor experience, including visitor orientation, interpretation, public access, park tenants, and events and cultural programs.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The focus of the analysis in this section is on how the various alternatives will affect the experience of park visitors. The analysis focuses on visitor orientation, interpretation and educational opportunities, public access, park

tenants, and events and cultural programs. The changes in open space under each alternative are noted, as are the number of projected park visitors in the year 2020. Projected visitation considers both Areas A and B, and like the GMPA EIS analysis, is based on information stemming from the transportation model developed in support of this EIS (Wilbur Smith Associates, 2002). The City and County of San Francisco Planning Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, Interim Edition* (January 2000) was used to help identify visitor generation percentages for a variety of land uses that would generate recreational visitorship. These factors were then applied to projected trips associated with these land uses to predict future visitation. Different mixes of land uses in each alternative yielded a distinct estimate of visitation for each. For additional discussion of the methodology, please refer to responses to comments on the visitor experience in EIS Volume II, and Section 3.7 of the *PTMP Background Transportation Report* (Wilbur Smith Associates, 2002).

## **POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

### **IMPACTS ON VISITOR EXPERIENCE**

#### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

Under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) there would be a variety of programs and interpretive and educational opportunities within the Presidio. The William Penn Mott, Jr. NPS visitor center would continue to house a variety of interpretative services and media, and would provide enhanced visitor programs and services as funding permits. In accordance with the Trust Act, the NPS would carry out interpretation and education activities at the Presidio in cooperation with the Trust and park tenants. Other existing facilities and sites used for purposes of interpretation and delivering visitor information would continue in operation, and some additional visitor information and interpretation facilities would be provided in Area B. Interpretation would be provided at several batteries; the former Spanish/Mexican Presidio site and the Marine hospital cemetery would be commemorated. Open space would be expanded by about 99 acres, mostly in the southern part of the park. Thus, park visitorship would be dispersed throughout the park to open space areas such as the shoreline and golf course,

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

to the visitor center and other interpretive sites, and the other developed and natural areas.

Existing park-based programs would continue and would benefit the visitor experience. Interpretation and education programs would be provided by the NPS. Any additional visitor programs would be largely created and provided by park tenants. Tenants would provide educational opportunities and develop interpretive and stewardship programs. While this alternative would increase the number and range of programs provided for visitors, the level of programming would depend on the initiative of park tenants; only a base level of funding would be provided by the Trust.

Based on its building and land use characteristics, this alternative would attract approximately 5.2 million recreational visitors annually to Area B. Based upon visitation patterns in the Presidio, peak visitor use would occur primarily on weekend days and holidays with good weather.

### ***Final Plan Alternative***

This alternative would provide a greater number and variety of facilities for the visiting public than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Facilities would be concentrated in the Main Post and Crissy Field Planning Districts. The William Penn Mott, Jr. NPS Visitor Center would continue to house a variety of interpretative services and media. In addition, a variety of museum facilities or other cultural facilities could be developed at the Presidio to serve local, national, and international visitors. A major museum may be located at the Commissary of an alternate site in the Crissy Field (Area B) planning district to complement existing facilities and programs there. Other Crissy Field buildings may be used for visitor facilities, such as rehabilitated historic hangars. Small and large cultural facilities and visitor amenities could also be located at the Main Post. In addition, a new Center for Sustainability may be developed to demonstrate sustainable practices to park visitors.

Under the Trust Act, the NPS would be responsible for carrying out interpretation and education activities at the Presidio in cooperation with the Trust. The Trust would assist the NPS in developing and implementing collaborative interpretive and stewardship programs. The Trust would also facilitate educational opportunities for visitors, and support interpretive

programs, events, and outreach. Park rangers, volunteers, and tenants would organize and lead visitor activities. The Presidio's cultural, natural, and recreational resources, along with facilities renovated for such purposes by the Trust or by tenants, would provide the setting for a range of interpretive and educational programs. To ensure consistency and quality, the Trust would play a role in the coordination of programs; and would provide an increasing level of financial support over time. Program quality and quantity would also benefit from and philanthropic support.

The Trust, in cooperation with the NPS, would provide easily accessible orientation and information. Information/ orientation kiosks and outdoor recreational panels would be installed at key points in Area B. The wayside signage program would be completed. The jointly-developed Presidio interpretation strategy would also be completed. Future site planning would further refine and identify visitor activity and interpretation facility improvements.

Access to the Presidio and its facilities would be enhanced. To the maximum extent possible, solutions to barriers confronting visitors and Presidio employees with mobility and other impairments would be developed. Access improvements would conform to the requirements of the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards. The Trust would work collaboratively with the NPS to assure publications and programs would be designed to be accessible to individuals with special needs, including information for foreign visitors and visitors with sight, hearing, mental, and mobility impairments. Public access to portions of important historic buildings would be maintained and complemented by interpretive displays. Open space would be expanded by 99 acres, and park visitors would be dispersed throughout the park.

Based on its building and land use characteristics, this alternative would attract approximately 7.2 million recreational visitors annually to Area B. Based upon visitation patterns in the Presidio, peak visitor use would occur primarily on weekend days and holidays with good weather. On these days, visitors desiring solitude or a more contemplative experience would need to seek these experiences in less developed areas of the park. Mitigation measures identified in this EIS would ensure that visitation levels would not

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

exceed desired conditions, and that unacceptable impacts to park resources and visitor experiences would not occur.

### ***Final Plan Variant***

Under the Final Plan Variant, the improvements to interpretation and educational programs, cultural programs, visitor amenities, and access and visitor orientation would be similar to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The base level of funding for programs would also be the same. The Final Plan Variant would differ from the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) primarily in its proposed allocation of land uses which are more closely modeled after the Final Plan Alternative.

Visitor facilities and program-related uses would primarily be located at the Main Post, Crissy Field and Fort Scott. In contrast to the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), less space would be provided at the Main Post for cultural and educational uses, and more built space would be made available on Crissy Field (Area A). Open space would be expanded by 124 acres, or about 25 acres more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Park visitorship would be dispersed throughout the park.

The assumptions about the role of tenants in program delivery and the funding for programs would be the same as the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Interpretation and educational programs would be provided by the NPS. Any additional visitor programs would be largely created and provided by park tenants.

Based on building and land use characteristics, this variant would attract approximately 5.9 million recreational visitors annually to the Presidio. Mitigation Measures identified in this EIS would ensure that visitation levels would not exceed desired conditions, and that unacceptable impacts to park resources and visitor experiences would not occur.

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

This alternative would provide less variety of visitor facilities for the public than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Visitor facilities would be centered on the Main Post and Crissy Field Planning Districts, with more

emphasis on the restored areas of the South Hills Planning District. The William Penn Mott Jr. NPS Visitor Center would continue to provide visitor orientation and interpretation services and the NPS would continue to provide the lead in interpretation to the public. The main focus for visitor experience would be on environmental stewardship and preservation activities. Some museum spaces could be dedicated to visitors under this alternative; however, interpretation and visitor services would receive more focus in the restored open space areas of the South Hills Planning District than in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). A new Center for Sustainability would be established and be a key visitor facility under this alternative.

This alternative would provide programs focused more on resource protection and sustainability education than on arts, culture, or history. Funding levels would exceed those under the No Action (GMPA 2000) and Final Plan Alternatives. The NPS would continue to have the lead in providing interpretive programming. The Trust would provide expanded educational and other programmatic opportunities to visitors to supplement the efforts of the NPS. Mission-related tenants would provide a small number of programs.

Programs would focus on instilling great understanding and awareness of park resource values. More emphasis would be placed on stewardship projects and programs related to sustainable practices. New programs would be created in the restored South Hills Planning District, where open space would be expanded substantially. Overall, open space would increase by 143 acres, or 44 acres more than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Park visitorship would be dispersed throughout the park.

Based on its building and land use characteristics, this alternative would attract approximately 7.0 million recreational visitors annually to Area B. Mitigation measures identified in this EIS would ensure that visitation levels would not exceed desired conditions, and that unacceptable impacts to park resources and visitor experiences would not occur.

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

This alternative would provide less variety of visitor facilities for the public than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). The Main Post and Crissy Field Planning Districts would be centers for visitor activities. The NPS

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

would continue to have the lead in providing interpretation services, and the William Penn Mott, Jr. NPS Visitor Center would continue as the main contact point for visitor orientation and education. Visitor services would continue to serve national and international audiences; however, facilities and programs would have more emphasis on serving local visitors and residents of the Presidio. Some museum spaces dedicated to Presidio-related themes and stories would be provided, although less emphasis would be placed on providing museums to attract national and international visitors.

The number and range of programs provided for visitors would be greater under this alternative than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Funding levels would exceed those under the No Action and the Final Plan Alternative. The NPS would continue to have the lead in providing interpretive programming. The Trust would expand program offerings by developing educational and other cultural activities for visitors and for the community. Mission-related tenants would continue to provide a small number of programs for visitors and the Presidio community.

Under this alternative, the focus for these visitor programs would be to serve community-based residents and local visitors. Stewardship opportunities, some arts and entertainment programs, and additional active recreational facilities would enhance livability and visitor attraction. Open space would increase by 77 acres or less than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). Park visitors would be dispersed throughout the park.

Based on building and land use characteristics, this alternative would attract approximately 8.2 million recreational visitors annually to Area B. Mitigation measures identified in this EIS would ensure that visitation levels would not exceed desired conditions and that unacceptable impacts to park resources and visitor experiences would not occur.

### ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

This alternative would provide a greater variety of visitor facilities for the visiting public than the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) or any other. Visitor activity would be concentrated in the Main Post and Crissy Field Planning Districts. The William Penn Mott, Jr. NPS Visitor Center would continue to house a variety of interpretative services and media. In addition, a

variety of museum facilities could be developed at the Presidio to serve local, national, and international visitors. A major museum may be located on the northern end of Area B in the Crissy Field Planning District to complement existing facilities and programs there. Other Crissy Field buildings might be used for visitor facilities, such as rehabilitated historic hangars. Small and large museums could also be located at the Main Post, related to themes of cultural heritage, immigration and exploration, the West Coast's technological innovation, and the Presidio's dynamic natural environment. In addition, a Center for Sustainability would become a new visitor facility demonstrating sustainable practices to park visitors.

This alternative would have a greater number of programs for visitors than other alternatives, and the Trust would provide the highest level of funding under this alternative. Open space would increase by 112 acres, and park visitors would be dispersed throughout the park.

This alternative would attract approximately 7.2 million recreational visitors annually to Area B. Mitigation measures identified in this EIS would ensure that visitation levels would not exceed desired conditions and that unacceptable impacts to park resources and visitor experiences would not occur.

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

Under this alternative, minimal actions would be taken to expand visitor opportunities beyond existing facilities. The William Penn Mott, Jr. NPS visitor center would continue to offer a variety of interpretative services and media. Use of other existing visitor facilities for purposes of interpretation and delivering visitor information would continue. Only minimal additional interpretive or orientation signage would be installed. Leased buildings would not be required to install exhibits pertaining to the Presidio's interpretive themes.

Basic interpretation and education programs would continue, but on a reduced basis. Other programs, such as the pilot "At the Presidio" program, would most likely not occur. Tenant-based public programs would be minimal, as such programs would be encouraged, but not required. Special events may occur, but not to the extent of the other alternatives. Open Space would

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

increase by 7 acres, substantially less than with other alternatives. For these reasons, the Minimum Management alternative would provide few benefits to enhance visitor experience.

Based on its building and land use characteristics, this alternative would attract approximately 6.5 million recreational visitors annually to Area B. Mitigation measures identified in this EIS would ensure that visitation levels would not exceed desired conditions and that unacceptable impacts to park resources and visitor experiences would not occur.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### ***Measures Adapted from the GMPA EIS***

The GMPA EIS does not include mitigation for visitor experience impacts.

#### ***New Mitigation***

The following measures would apply to all alternatives except No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

*CO-4 Limitations of Visitor Opportunities.* The Trust would limit visitor opportunities to those that are suited and appropriate to the significant natural, historic, scenic, cultural, and recreational resources of the Presidio. Only those visitor activities that are consistent with the Trust Act and appropriate to the purpose for which the park was established would be allowed. The Trust would welcome tenants to provide activities consistent with these requirements.

*CO-5 Prohibitions on Visitor Uses.* The Trust would prohibit visitor uses that would impair park resources or values or would unreasonably interfere with NPS interpretive activities or other existing, appropriate park uses. As future plans are developed for Crissy Field (Area B), the Trust would cooperate with the NPS to the extent practicable to seek consistency with that agency's visitor management policies and procedures and improvements made to Area A. The Trust would also consider the effects on Crissy Field's visitors (Area A) when determining the appropriateness of future visitor activities.

*CO-6 Management Controls.* The Trust would impose management controls on visitor uses, if necessary, to ensure that the Presidio's resources are protected. If an ongoing or proposed activity would cause unacceptable impacts to park resources, adjustments would be made to the way the activity is conducted, including placing limitations on the activity, so as to eliminate the unacceptable impacts. Any restrictions would be based on professional judgment, law and policy, the best available scientific study or research, appropriate environmental review, and other available data. As visitor use changes over time, the Trust would decide if management actions are needed to keep use at acceptable and sustainable levels.

*CO-7 Special Events.* The Trust would require appropriate permit conditions are imposed for special events to ensure that park resources are protected.

*CO-8 Monitoring of Visitor Levels.* The Trust would monitor visitation levels to ensure that park uses would not unacceptably impact Presidio resources, including visitor experience. Visitor carrying capacities for managing visitor use would be identified if necessary.

## **4.4.5 RECREATION**

### ***METHODOLOGY***

Each alternative was analyzed for potential impacts on recreational activities and use. Activities range from passive to active and may or may not depend on unique features of the Presidio. Passive recreation includes walking on trails, bird watching, gardening, or picnicking. Active recreation includes ball sports, bicycling, use of indoor recreational facilities, or participating in large group festivities at special events. Activities that depend on the Presidio's unique natural and cultural resources include scenic viewing from overlooks, and participation in stewardship programs. Activities that do not depend on unique resources of the Presidio, and could be accommodated in other locations include court sports, picnic grounds, or playgrounds. Each alternative was then analyzed for its impact on the spectrum of recreational activities at the Presidio. Please refer to the Visitor Experience environmental consequences section for a discussion of impacts on the Presidio's interpretive and educational programs.

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

### **POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

#### IMPACT ON RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

##### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

Existing built recreational facilities, including the swimming pool, bowling center, ballfields, golf course, tennis courts, group camping area, picnic areas, and gymnasiums, would remain open to the public, except those facilities needed to be removed to meet other planning objectives, such as the removal of Morton Street ballfield to accommodate the restoration of Tennessee Hollow. The two ballfields at Fort Scott would be removed and the historic parade ground restored, providing space for large group assembly and improved visual access to the Golden Gate. The tennis court behind the PHSH would be relocated. Future use of Pop Hicks ballfield will be determined following completion of a Remediation Investigation/Feasibility Study. Under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the Rob Hill campground would also be rehabilitated and enhanced. Existing trails would be improved, some existing social trails removed or relocated, and other new trails constructed in accordance with the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan.

Under this alternative, recreational activities and opportunities would be provided for a wide range of visitors. Passive recreational experiences would be increased and diversified through the creation of new open space areas and through the continued restoration of both remnant natural areas and decadent forest stands. Larger open spaces would be improved for active outdoor activities and informal play. The removal of three ballfields would have an adverse effect on current users, though other facilities would still be available for these types of activities within the park. This alternative would provide a spectrum of recreation opportunities, expand the availability of recreation-related programs, and have an overall beneficial effect.

##### ***Final Plan Alternative***

Under this alternative, most existing recreation facilities would be retained and enhanced except where removal is needed to meet other planning objectives (such as completion of Doyle Drive, Tennessee Hollow, or

environmental remediation). The Trust would evaluate the potential for additional recreational facilities, and levels of use in balance with other park resource goals. Options for additional built facilities, indoors and outdoors, would be considered. No new forms of recreational activity are being proposed. Future planning efforts will further define compatible recreational activities and locations and will address the potential relocation of existing facilities or construction of new ones, including ballfields.

Consistent with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), two ballfields at Fort Scott would be removed to restore the historic parade ground, providing an area for large group assembly and enhancing the views of the Golden Gate. The Rob Hill group camping area, picnic areas and smaller fields would be enhanced. Existing trails would be improved, some existing social trails removed or relocated, and other new trails constructed in accordance with the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan.

The Trust will increase and diversify recreational opportunities through the creation of new open spaces. Under this alternative, recreation activities would be provided for a wide range of visitors. Open space and recreational amenities would be managed to provide settings for both intimate and large-group gatherings. Landscaped areas and small open spaces would be maintained for passive recreation. Larger open spaces would be improved for active outdoor activities and informal play. Passive recreation would be increased and diversified through the creation of new open space areas and through the continued restoration of both remnant natural areas and decadent forest stands.

##### ***Final Plan Variant***

The Final Plan Variant would have similar impacts on recreation as the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) except for the removal of one additional ballfield (Pop Hick's). This would not have an increased impact as the ballfield is currently not in use and its improvement under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would depend on the outcome of a separate Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study.

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

Under this alternative, additional emphasis would be placed on providing passive recreational opportunities for stewardship, nature appreciation, and solitude. Impacts on recreation would be similar to the Final Plan Alternative. However, closure of Washington Boulevard to vehicles resulting from the removal of East Washington and West Washington housing would further benefit bicyclists and pedestrians using that area.

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

This alternative would have similar impacts on recreation as the Final Plan Alternative.

### ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

This alternative would have similar impacts on recreation as the Final Plan Alternative.

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

All existing recreational facilities, including athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, hiking and bicycling trails, picnic areas, golf course, bowling alley, and gymnasiums would be retained for public use. No new trails and bikeways would be established. Trail repair and maintenance would only occur as needed to protect resources. Additionally, this alternative would not include any demolition or new construction. Therefore, no loss of buildings or facilities would occur. There would be no significant recreation impact due to the retention of all existing recreational facilities.

There would be little change in the spectrum of recreational activities at the Presidio. A decline in opportunities to participate in stewardship programs would occur, as few areas would be restored. No new recreational programs would be created.

## ***MITIGATION MEASURES***

### ***Measures Adapted from the GMPA EIS***

No measures for recreational activities were identified in the GMPA EIS.

### ***New Mitigation***

The following measures would apply to all of the alternatives.

CO-9 *Recreational Use Management Objectives.* The Trust would monitor changing patterns of use and trends in recreational activities, and assess and manage their potential effects on park resources. The Trust would develop and implement specific, measurable visitor management objectives to ensure that recreational uses and activities within Area B could be sustained without impairing park resources or values.

CO-10 *Relocation or Replacement of Recreational Facilities.* Should any recreational facilities need to be relocated in conjunction with other planning objectives, such as through the restoration of Tennessee Hollow or the reconfiguration of Doyle Drive, their relocation or replacement would be pursued during activity- or planning area-specific analyses.

CO-11 *Trail Maintenance and Enhancement.* Upon completion and approval of the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan, the Trust would implement priorities for trail repair, stabilization and enhancement, and initiate a Trails Stewardship Program to promote public support and interest in trail maintenance and enhancement activities.

## **4.4.6 PUBLIC SAFETY**

### ***METHODOLOGY***

#### ***Law Enforcement***

The Commander of the United States Park Police (USPP) San Francisco Field Office (SFFO), the Assistant Commander for Operations of the USPP San Francisco Field Office, the Assistant Commander for Administration of the

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

USPP San Francisco Field Office, and the Administrative Lieutenant of the USPP San Francisco Field Office were presented with data outlining the range of land use, resident, and employee assumptions under the alternatives under consideration in this analysis. In an interview, the USPP staff described the additional resources that would be required under each alternative in order to maintain current service levels.

### ***Fire Protection Emergency Response***

The Presidio Fire Department Fire Chief and Assistant Fire Chief were presented with data outlining the range of land use, resident, and employee assumptions under the alternatives being considered in this analysis. In an interview, the Presidio Fire Department Fire Chief and Assistant Fire Chief described the required long-term planning that would be required under each alternative in order to maintain current service levels.

## ***POTENTIAL IMPACTS***

### **INCREASED DEMAND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT**

#### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

As with many other public services, law enforcement services do not readily change in proportion to changes in population. As the resident and employee populations at the Presidio increase, and calls for police service increase, the USPP would scale up its operations as necessary in order to maintain current service levels. The envisioned level of operations could include a new police station at the Main Post, the establishment of full time desk service (a police station open 24 hours a day with a desk sergeant to manage police activities at the station), and the establishment of a total of four patrol beats in Area B. Increased services could include an additional police substation, station equipment, additional law enforcement vehicles, additional law enforcement personnel, additional dispatchers, additional administrative staff, and additional supplies and equipment for these personnel.

Established police standards call for 4.5 to 5.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) patrol officers per beat per shift (three shifts per day to maintain 24 hour coverage). The establishment of two new 24-hour patrol beats would

necessitate 27 to 33 new general patrol officer positions. Other staffing that would need to expand to serve additional calls include two investigators, one I.D. technician, five desk officers, two motorcycle patrol officers, and one to two horse-mounted patrol officers.

For the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the USPP estimates that the start-up costs for hiring additional personnel, purchasing new vehicles and other equipment, and setting up a police substation (in building space to be provided by the Presidio Trust) could total up to \$752,000. The annual costs for staffing, recruitment, equipment, and supplies are estimated to be as much as \$2.6 million. This cost estimate does not include any of the expenses related to the relocation of the USPP from its current location in Building 1217 to a more suitable location at the Main Post.

The increase in resident and employee population at the Presidio projected in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would potentially raise the number of calls for police service. Mitigation, which requires that law enforcement services be reviewed and expanded as necessary as development occurs, would ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

#### ***Final Plan Alternative***

As with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the increase in resident and employee populations at the Presidio projected under the Final Plan Alternative would potentially increase calls for police service. The operational level of service described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), above, would be needed to serve the increased demand. As with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), law enforcement services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

#### ***Final Plan Variant***

The increase in resident and employee population at the Presidio projected in the Final Variant and the resultant rise in calls for police service would require the operational level of service described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) above. As with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), law

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

## *The Community*

enforcement services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

### ***Resource Consolidation Alternative***

The increase in resident and employee population at the Presidio projected in the Resource Consolidation Alternative and the resultant rise in calls for police service would require the operational level of service described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) above. As with the No Action Alternative, law enforcement services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

### ***Sustainable Community Alternative***

The increase in resident and employee population at the Presidio projected in the Sustainable Community Alternative and the resultant rise in calls for police service would require the operational level of service described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) above. As with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), law enforcement services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

### ***Cultural Destination Alternative***

The increase in resident and employee population at the Presidio projected in the Cultural Destination Alternative, and the resultant rise in calls for police service would require the operational level of service described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) above. As with the No Action Alternative, law enforcement services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

### ***Minimum Management Alternative***

The current level of operational capacity for the USPP is not adequate to serve the Minimum Management Alternative. As with the No Action Alternative

(GMPA 2000), law enforcement services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that law enforcement services remain at adequate levels.

## INCREASED DEMAND FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

### ***No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000)***

As with many other public services, fire protection, and emergency response services do not readily change in proportion to changes in population. Build-out of the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would result in significant increases in resident and employee populations but no significant increase in the square footage of buildings that would need fire protection. Because the increase in population is an important life-safety factor, the Fire Department would have to review and adjust its operations in order to maintain current service levels in order to meet National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1500 standards. The Fire Department does not have a long-range plan in place to determine the long-term needs for fire protection and emergency response, thus additional analysis will be required. This analysis would set forth requirements for adjusting Fire Department operations, and identify any required new facilities and personnel.

The increase over current levels in resident and employee population at the Presidio projected in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) would increase the number of calls for fire protection and emergency response. Fire protection and emergency response services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that fire protection services remain at adequate levels.

### ***All Remaining Alternatives***

As with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), the increase in resident and employee populations at the Presidio projected under each of the remaining alternatives would increase calls for fire protection and emergency response. The operational level of service described under the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000), above, could be needed to serve an increase in demand. As with the No Action Alternative, fire protection and emergency response

# ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

*The Community*

services would need to be reviewed and expanded as necessary as PTMP is implemented to ensure that fire protection services are provided at adequate levels.

## ***MITIGATION MEASURES***

### ***Measures Adapted from the GMPA EIS***

The GMPA EIS does not contain mitigation for law enforcement, fire protection, or emergency services.

### ***New Mitigation***

The following mitigation measure would apply to all alternatives.

CO-12 *Expansion of Public Safety Services.* As PTMP is implemented, the Trust would work with USPP and NPS public safety service providers to review public safety service standards set forth in the Presidio Public Safety Analysis (NPS 1994) and identify any appropriate increases in staff, equipment, and facilities in order to maintain adequate services. The Trust would work jointly with NPS to study and identify appropriate locations for USPP and NPS public safety facilities.