

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## *2. Methodology and Organization*

## 2. METHODOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION

This section describes the way in which oral and written comments received regarding the Draft Plan and EIS during the public comment period have been summarized and responses provided. Subsequent sections provide an analysis of comments – their number, form, origins, and commentor characteristics (Section 3), comment summaries and detailed responses (Section 4), copies of all comment letters received from federal, state and local agencies (Section 5), and a list of all commentors and index to responses (Section 6).

### 2.1 RECEIPT OF COMMENTS

By the close of the public comment period, the Trust received a total of 264 written comment letters and faxes, 135 emails, and 2,657 form letters on the Draft PTIP and EIS. The Trust and GGNRA Citizens' Advisory Commission also heard 95 oral testimonies by 88 individuals, 61 of whom also submitted written comment letters. In addition, 25 comment letters were submitted after the expiration of the public comment period and have been considered and responded to as part of the record.

### 2.2 TOPICS

The volume of comments received, and the fact that many comments addressed the same or similar issues provided both the opportunity and the necessity for grouping and summarizing like comments or comments on a similar topic in order to allow for meaningful responses. Comments were grouped by topic and summarized. A total of 34 general topic headings were used; these are listed below.

- Purpose and Need (PN)
- EIS Process (EP)
- Public Involvement (PI)
- Vision (VI)
- Alternatives (AL)
- General Planning (GP)
- Planning District Concepts and Guidelines (PG)
- Type of Plan (TP)
- Historic Resources (HR)
- Archaeology (AR)
- Programmatic Agreement (PA)
- Open Space (OS)
- Biological and Water Resources (BR and WR)
- Land Use (LU)
- Visual Resources (VR)
- Air Quality and Noise (AQ)
- New Construction (NC)
- Housing and Employment (HO)
- Lodging (LO)
- Programs (PR)
- Visitor Experience (VE)
- Transportation and Circulation (TR)
- Transit Services (TN)
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PB)
- Parking (PK)
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
- Doyle Drive (DD)
- Water Supply and Utilities (UT)
- Schools (SC)
- Presidio Trust Operations / Financial Analysis (FI)
- Cumulative Impacts (CI)
- Tenant Selection (TS)
- Implementation Strategy (IM)
- Consultation and Coordination (CC)

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 2. Methodology and Organization

### 2.3 SUBJECT AREAS

Within each topic area, comments were further aggregated into subject matter summaries. For example, within the topic area of Housing, subject matter summaries were developed to group comments related to new construction, removal of Wherry Housing, housing demand, and other housing-related subjects raised by the commentors. To assist reviewers, each comment topic is preceded by a short outline summarizing the subject matter within that topic.

### 2.4 SUMMARIES

Depending upon the level of public interest within a topic and its subject matter, comment summaries may encompass comments submitted by substantial numbers of commentors, or very few. Direct quotations from particular commentors are included in the comment summaries where they are helpful in communicating the essence of a group of comments. In the same instances, individual or representative commentors are often identified by name.<sup>1</sup> In most cases, commentors are not identified by name in the comment summaries, and those seeking responses to comments of a particular individual or organization should consult the index of responses (Section 6) to determine their location.

### 2.5 RESPONSES

Responses immediately follow each subject matter summary, and have been prepared by Trust staff and consultants following review of the comment summary and the full text of the original comments. All comments have been considered and responded to equally. Their importance is not weighted by the source of the comment or any commentor characteristic. Every comment or suggestion has value, whether expressed by one or a hundred commentors, and comments have been addressed for their substance, not for their frequency.

Responses provide explanations and clarifications related to the content of the Trust's Final Plan and the Final EIS. Where changes to either document have been made in response to comments, these are identified. Where questions are posed by the commentors, these are answered or acknowledged as outstanding issues. References to the Final Plan, EIS, technical analyses, and other source materials are included as appropriate. Cross referencing between responses is kept to a minimum, resulting in some repetition where the subject matter of comment summaries are similar.

### 2.6 ORIGINAL COMMENTS

While the comment summaries are intended to accurately reflect commentors' view and suggestions, they do not replace the comments in their original form. The original comments are available for review at the Presidio Trust Library, 34 Graham Street, in the Presidio, and constitute part of the formal public record. All comments have been made available to the Presidio Trust Board of Directors, and comments together with the entire record will be considered by the Board in making the final decision following publication of the Final Plan and Final EIS.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Natural Resources Defense Council, National Parks Conservation Association, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, and The Wilderness Society submitted a joint comment letter. This comment letter is referred to in these Responses to Comments as "NRDC" or "NRDC letter."