

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

### 3. COMMENT ORIGINS AND COMMENTOR CHARACTERISTICS

This section provides demographic information on the comment letters received, including geographic origin, general affiliation with various government agencies or public interest groups, user type (neighbor, dog walker, etc.) and format (letter, form letter, email, etc.). A summary of the form letters and petitions received during the public comment period is also provided. This information allows the Trust to better understand its public audience. It is important to note that regardless of the form or source of public comment, the Trust considered it and gave it equal attention.

#### 3.1 GEOGRAPHIC ORIGIN OF COMMENTS

A total of 3,090 persons, organizations, and agencies provided comments in the form of oral comments at public hearings, letters, petitions, comment forms, and emails on the Draft PTIP and EIS.<sup>1</sup> Letters and emails on the Draft PTIP and EIS were received from all but one of the 50 states (North Dakota), the District of Columbia, and four foreign countries. A total of 1,311 letters and emails (42 percent) were received from California (Table 3-1). Of California letters and emails, 517 (39 percent) were from San Francisco. Responses from within the Presidio and nearby neighborhoods generated 196 letters and emails (15 percent of the California total) (Table 3-2).

**Table 3-1. Origin of Oral and Written Comments**

Country	State	Number of Responses
United States	Alaska	4
	Alabama	15
	Arkansas	4
	Arizona	39
	California	1,311
	Colorado	62
	Connecticut	25
	District Of Columbia	8
	Delaware	3
	Florida	134
	Georgia	41

**Table 3-1. Origin of Oral and Written Comments**

Country	State	Number of Responses
	Hawaii	12
	Idaho	7
	Illinois	72
	Indiana	29
	Iowa	12
	Kansas	20
	Kentucky	19
	Louisiana	8
	Maine	13
	Maryland	38
	Massachusetts	52
	Michigan	51
	Minnesota	21
	Missouri	29
	Mississippi	6
	Montana	6
	Nebraska	2
	New Jersey	62
	New Hampshire	9
	New Mexico	18
	New York	148
	Nevada	16
	North Carolina	29
	Ohio	56
	Oklahoma	13
	Oregon	62
	Pennsylvania	80
	Puerto Rico	2
	Rhode Island	7
	South Carolina	7
	South Dakota	4
	Tennessee	30
	Texas	97
	Utah	12
	Virginia	52
	Vermont	5
	Washington	70
	Wisconsin	32
	West Virginia	9
	Wyoming	3
Australia		2
Canada		4
Netherlands		1
United Kingdom		3
Unknown Geographic Location		214
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,090</b>

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this estimate, commentors submitting two or more letters were only counted once.

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

**Table 3-2. Regional Distribution of California Comments**

Region	Location	Zip Codes/ County	Number of Responses
City and County of San Francisco	Presidio	94129	22
	Neighborhoods Bordering Park <sup>1</sup>	94115, 94118, 94121, 94123	174
	Rest of San Francisco County		321
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>517</b>
Other Bay Area Counties	North Bay		86
	South Bay		83
	East Bay		149
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>319</b>
Other California	North Coast		16
	Shasta Cascade		7
	Gold Country		31
	High Sierra		11
	Central Valley		22
	Central Coast		67
	Los Angeles County		169
	Orange County		46
	Inland Empire		13
	Deserts		19
	San Diego County		74
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>475</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,311</b>

<sup>1</sup>Includes Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, and the Richmond District.

### 3.2 FORM LETTERS AND PETITIONS

A total of 2,657 out of 3,090 comment letters (85 percent) received during the public comment period for the Draft Plan and Draft EIS were form letters<sup>2</sup> reflecting the work of 11 organized response campaigns (Table 3-3). Two of these response campaigns each generated 1,473 and 882 letters, respectively, for a total of 2,355 letters, or 75 percent of all organized responses. In

addition, three petitions<sup>3</sup> with 46, 11 and 3 signatures, respectively, were received (Table 3-4). Almost all (60) of the signatures on these petitions were from the San Francisco Bay Area.

<sup>2</sup> Form letters were defined as those letters that were received separately but containing identical or very closely paraphrased text. If a letter did not contain all of the information presented in a given form, or if it included additional comments, it was coded as an individual letter.

<sup>3</sup> Petitions were defined as single letters signed by multiple members of the public.

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

**Table 3-3. Form Letters**

	<b>Subject of Form Letter</b>	<b>Number Received</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Reference in Directory of Responses (Chapter 6)</b>
1.	Presidio Should Serve Public Purpose	1,473	Requests that the Trust abandon the Draft Plan Alternative and adopt instead a plan under which the Presidio would serve public purposes, its historic and natural resources would be protected, and operating costs would be tightly controlled.	Form Letter 1
2.	Adopt the Original GMPA for the Presidio	882	Urges the Trust to abandon the Draft Plan Alternative and to adopt instead a plan based on the original GMPA.	Form Letter 2
3.	Implement the GMPA 2000 Alternative	18	Urges the Trust to implement the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000) because it is financially viable, it is what the public wanted in 1994 and what the public wants now, and tenant organizations in a national park should be programmatic park partners.	Form Letter 3
4.	Demolish Historic Buildings	12	Recommends demolishing 360 historic buildings to increase the amount of greenery and open spaces.	Form Letter 4
5.	Commit to Completing the Crissy Field Wetland	37	Requests that the Trust revise the PTIP so that it makes a definite commitment to completing the Crissy Field wetland rather than just undertaking a feasibility study as was proposed in the Draft PTIP.	Form Letter 5
6.	Preserve Fort Scott Softball / Baseball Fields	205	Requests that the Trust not remove or convert the Fort Scott softball/baseball fields because there are few remaining lighted fields to provide much needed open space and recreation in San Francisco.	Form Letter 6
7.	Address the Needs for Off-Leash Dog Walking	3	Reminds the Trust that the Presidio functions as a city park to support diverse uses and recreational activities, including off-leash dog walking.	Form Letter 7
8.	Consider Impacts upon Bicyclists' Safety and Comfort	11	Urges the Trust to work toward a more bicycle-friendly Presidio, acknowledges some of the improvements for cyclists that have already been made, and recommends additional changes to improve the bicycling environment both as a transportation and a recreational route.	Form Letter 8
9.	No Further Development of the Presidio	2	Favors no further development of the Presidio and asks that development be kept to a minimum level and the park be used for a national center of environmental leadership because its value as a park is priceless.	Form Letter 9
10.	Embrace "Less is More" as the Aesthetic of the Presidio	8	Prefers less development, less programming, and limited directional flexibility and urges the Trust to adopt the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).	Form Letter 10
11.	Develop More Running / Biking Trails	6	Requests that additional running and biking trails be developed within the Presidio.	Form Letter 11

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

**Table 3-4. Petitions**

	<b>Subject of Petition</b>	<b>Number of Signatures</b>	<b>Originator of Petition</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Reference in Directory of Responses (Chapter 6)</b>
1.	Commit to the Long-Term Welfare of Crissy Marsh	46	Presidio Native Plant Nursery and Restoration Volunteers	Encourages the Trust to work with the NPS to expand Crissy Marsh to create a more self-sufficient ecosystem and include in PTIP a number of principles that address preserving or enhancing marshlands.	Petition 1
2.	Preserve and Improve a Great Resource	3	Residents of San Francisco	Concerned that the Draft Plan would impose too much development, relies too heavily on the concept of a live/work community, and has a mission that is too ambitious.	Petition 2
3.	Provide for a Transit Hub and Operate a Shuttle Service Integrated into Adjoining Systems	11	Tamalpais Valley Gateway Coalition	Requests that the Presidio's transit hub and shuttle service be well integrated into a comprehensive system that would enable visitors to access park destinations north of the Golden Gate without use of the automobile.	Petition 3

### 3.3 ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION OF COMMENTS

Letters and emails from federal, state and local agencies and interested organizations accounted for 21 percent (98 comments) of the total received (not including form letters). Businesses (21 letters), natural resource conservation organizations (12 letters), neighborhood associations (11 letters),

and existing tenants (9 letters) represented the largest share of comments received from agencies and organizations (Table 3-5).

**Table 3-5. Organizational Affiliation of Comments**

<b>Type of Affiliation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Number per Affiliation Type</b>
Federal Government Agencies	National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area	4
	National Park Service, Pacific Great Basin Support Office	
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
State Government Agencies	Department of Transportation	3
	Golden Gate Bridge District	
	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission	
City and County Government Agencies	City of Sausalito	3
	Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco	
	San Francisco County Transportation Authority	
Federal Advisory Commissions and National Park Associations	Golden Gate National Parks Association	2
	Golden Gate National Recreation Area Citizens' Advisory Commission	

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

**Table 3-5. Organizational Affiliation of Comments**

Type of Affiliation	Name	Number per Affiliation Type
Natural Resource Conservation Organizations	Alliance for a Clean Waterfront	12
	California Alpine Club	
	California Native Plant Society	
	Golden Gate Audubon Society	
	National Parks Conservation Association	
	Native Plant Nursery, Presidio Volunteers (petition)	
	Natural Resources Defense Council	
	San Francisco League of Conservation Voters	
	Sierra Club	
	Urban Ecology	
	Urban Watershed Project	
	The Wilderness Society	
	Neighborhood Associations	
Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action		
Lake Street Residents Association		
Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association, Inc.		
Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning		
Pacific Heights Residents Association		
Planning Association for the Richmond		
Presidio Tenants Council		
Richmond District Democratic Club		
Sequoias Residential Association		
Presidio Tenants	Telegraph Hill Dwellers	9
	The Arion Press / The Grabhorn Institute	
	Food, Land & People	
	The John Stewart Company	
	Lexnet Consulting Group	
	Presidio Golf Course	
	San Francisco Conservation Corps	
	Swords to Plowshares	
	Tides Foundation	
	YMCA	
Historic Preservation Groups	California Heritage Council	6
	California Preservation Foundation	
	Council on America's Military Past	
	Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association	
	National Trust for Historic Preservation	
	San Francisco Architectural Heritage	

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

**Table 3-5. Organizational Affiliation of Comments**

Type of Affiliation	Name	Number per Affiliation Type
University or Academic Groups	Malcolm X Academy	7
	San Francisco State University, Biology Department	
	San Francisco State University, History Department	
	University of California San Francisco	
	University of San Francisco	
San Francisco Planning and Business Organizations	XCEL Academy	5
	Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	
	San Francisco Beautiful	
	San Francisco Chamber of Commerce	
	San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association	
Arts Organizations	San Francisco Tomorrow	3
	Arthouse	
	California Lawyers for the Arts	
Education and Recreation Organizations	Presidio Performing Arts	7
	Exploratorium	
	Jamestown Community Center	
	San Francisco Dog Owners Group	
	San Francisco Little League	
Transportation Advisory Groups	San Francisco Youth Commission, Culture and Urban Environment Committee	5
	Wally Byam Caravan Club International	
	Rails-to-Trails Conservancy	
	Rides for Bay Area Commuters, Inc.	
	San Francisco Bicycle Coalition	
Private Philanthropic Organizations	San Francisco Medical Air Access Project	1
	Tamalpais Valley Gateway Coalition (petition)	
	Evelyn & Walter Haas, Jr. Fund	

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

**Table 3-5. Organizational Affiliation of Comments**

Type of Affiliation	Name	Number per Affiliation Type
Businesses (speaking for or as the owner of a business)	Arbor House, LTD	21
	Engineers and Filmmakers Computer Users Group	
	Ernest A. Dernburg Medical Corporation	
	Karin Flood Eklund, KTB Management Group	
	GCA Strategies	
	Intrinsic Graphics	
	Law Office of Hubert D. Forsyth	
	Law Offices Wilson & Casey	
	Malcolm H. Gissen + Associates	
	Marilyn D. Mintz	
	MurphyReed Design Group	
	Ohashi Design Studio	
	Okamoto Saijo Architecture	
	Sapp Devco (on behalf of Costco)	
	Carl Scheidenhelm, AIA	
	Dr. David L. Schneider	
	Silicon Valley Community Ventures	
	Student Leadership Success Solutions	
	David J. Tirrell, AIA	
Jay Willner, WEH Corporation		
Kathleen M. Winslow, MFCC		
Presidio Advocacy Groups	Friends of the Presidio National Park	3
	Preserve the Presidio Campaign	
	Presidio Challenge	
Individuals	(no specific or identified affiliation)	2,989
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,090</b>

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

### 3.4 SELF-IDENTITY OF COMMENTORS

Approximately 225 (76 percent) of all commentors submitting individual letters did not identify themselves as a particular type of user. Of commentors that explicitly characterized themselves in some particular manner (e.g., I am

a native of San Francisco), the largest groups were long-term residents of San Francisco (5 percent) followed by neighbors (2 percent) (Table 3-6).

**Table 3-6. Self Identity of Commentors (User Types)**

User Type	Number of Responses
San Francisco Resident, Nonspecific	19
Neighbor	7
San Francisco Native	4
Native Plant Habitat Restoration Volunteer	4
Marina District Resident	3
Presidio Resident	3
Community Member, Presidio Restoration Advisory Board	2
Recreational Vehicle User	2
Runner	2
San Francisco Visitor	2
Taxpayer	2
AmeriCorps Worker	1
Bird Watcher	1
Board Member, Pacific Heights Residents Association	1
Certified Arborist	1
Citizens' Member, Doyle Drive Task Force	1
Cow Hollow District Resident	1
Daily User	1
Environmentalist	1
Former Chicagoan	1
Former Military Personnel Stationed at the Presidio	1
Golfer	1
Graduate Student	1
Marin County Resident	1
Member, Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning	1
Oregon Resident	1
Preschool Owner	1
Presidio Employee	1
Public School Teacher	1
Richmond District Resident	1
Sierra Club Member	1
Supporter of GGNRA	1
Urban Planner	1
YMCA Member	1
No Identified Type	225
<b>Total</b>	<b>298</b>

# RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

## 3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics

### 3.5 FORMAT OF COMMENTS

Most of the form letters (93 percent) were sent by email. Commentors choosing to submit their own comments generally sent their written comment letters by mail or fax (65 percent). Email was also used (35 percent). Only 34

commentors chose to provide their comments orally at one or more of the public hearings without also submitting their comments in writing (Table 3-7).

**Table 3-7. Format of Comments**

<b>Response Format</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Number of Signatures</b>
Form Letter Sent by Mail or Fax	174	174
Form Letter Sent by Email	2,483	2,483
Letter Sent by Mail or Fax	198	198
Letter Sent by Email	135	135
Petition	3	60
Unique Oral Comments	34	-
Unique Comment Cards	63	63

# **RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

## *3. Comment Origins and Commentor Characteristics*