

APPENDIX A
Revised Environmental Screening Form

1. Background

- *Project Title* – Presidio Trust Management Plan
- *Agency* – The Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129-0052
- *Project* – A comprehensive planning effort to update the July 1994 Final General Management Plan Amendment for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco (Presidio Trust Management Plan or PTMP).
- *Contact Person* – John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Manager
- *Phone Number* – (415) 561-5300

2. Project Description

The Presidio Trust is proposing to update portions of the 1994 Presidio General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) completed by the National Park Service (NPS) in 1994. The proposed update is for the areas of the Presidio of San Francisco that were transferred to the Trust’s jurisdiction (Area B) by Congress under the 1996 Presidio Trust Act (Trust Act). This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is accompanied by a Final Plan document entitled Presidio Trust Management Plan; Land Use Policies for Area B of the Presidio of San Francisco (PTMP). Together these documents supplement the 1994 GMPA and GMPA EIS. The Plan update and supplemental EIS are necessary to reflect the 1998 change in administrative jurisdiction of Area B and other substantive changes occurring since 1994, as is explained in the EIS.

3. Purpose of Environmental Screening Form and Supplemental EIS

The ESF is based on the results of a preliminary environmental analysis and early public scoping for the project. This Environmental Screening Form (ESF) is being used to de-emphasize insignificant issues, and narrow the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Plan accordingly. The PTMP EIS will supplement the GMPA Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (National Park Service 1994a)¹. The GMPA EIS is a program document that analyzed the environmental consequences of four alternatives for management and use of the Presidio, and identified mitigation measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects. The PTMP EIS will concentrate on new information relevant to environmental concerns that bear on the PTMP alternatives or their impacts. These issues include substantial changes that have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the GMPA was prepared. NEPA Regulations encourage this approach to “focus on the issues which are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ripe” (Section 1508.28). After PTMP is complete and adopted by the Trust, additional site-specific plans and environmental analyses, as appropriate, will be prepared to fully implement the programmatic goals of the Plan.

¹ The Presidio GMPA EIS can be viewed at: the Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, San Francisco, California; Park Headquarters, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, California; or at the San Francisco Main Library, Government Information Center, Larkin and Grove Streets, San Francisco, California.



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

4. Environmental Screening Checklist

ARE ANY MEASURABLE EFFECTS POSSIBLE ON THE FOLLOWING IMPACT TOPICS THAT WERE DISCUSSED IN THE GMPA EIS DUE TO CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES OR NEW OPPORTUNITIES SINCE PREPARATION OF THE GMPA? Yes/No

1. Regional Economy and Employment?	Yes
2. City Services?	Yes
3. Solid Waste?	No
4. Health Care?	Yes
5. Housing?	Yes
6. Traffic and Transportation Systems?	Yes
7. Land Use, the Presidio Community, and Surrounding Neighborhoods?	Yes
8. National Historic Landmark District?	Yes
9. Archaeology?	Yes
10. Water Supply?	Yes
11. Water Quality?	Yes
12. Wetlands and Stream Drainages?	Yes
13. Native Plant Communities?	Yes
14. Wildlife?	Yes
15. Threatened, Endangered, Rare, and Sensitive Plant and Animal Species?	Yes
16. Park Management and Operations?	Yes
17. Geology and Soils?	No
18. Floodplains?	No
19. Climate?	No
20. Air Quality?	Yes
21. Noise?	Yes
22. Visitor Experience?	Yes
23. Recreation and Public Access?	Yes
24. Scenic Viewing?	Yes
25. Human Health, Safety, and the Environment?	No
26. Energy Consumption?	Yes



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

ARE ANY MEASURABLE EFFECTS POSSIBLE ON THE FOLLOWING IMPACT TOPICS THAT WERE DISCUSSED IN THE GMPA EIS DUE TO CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES OR NEW OPPORTUNITIES SINCE PREPARATION OF THE GMPA? Yes/No

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 27. Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations? | Yes |
| 28. Other Significant Environmental Resources? | Yes |

5. Preliminary Evaluation of Impacts

1. *Regional Economy and Employment?* YES. Land uses that differ from those specified in the GMPA, as well as increases in the numbers of visitors to the park, could have effects on the city and region. Construction and renovation activities would also contribute to the local and regional economy. The EIS will discuss the potential impact of the proposed action on the economy and employment in the Bay Area and the City of San Francisco.
2. *City Services?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact due to additional requirements that the proposed action may place on city services, including utility systems, transportation services, the public school system, and public safety services.
3. *Solid Waste?* YES. The EIS will discuss the increased generation of solid waste, and effects on its landfills.
4. *Health Care?* NO. The effects of alternative uses of the Letterman Army Medical Center and Letterman Army Institute of Research were adequately addressed in the final Letterman Complex EIS. The increase, if any, in number of medical aid incidents requiring hospitalization due to the proposed alternatives would be distributed among area hospitals and would not impact area hospital services. Therefore, additional study under the EIS is not warranted.
5. *Housing?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on regional demand for housing units due to changes in Presidio employee housing demand, housing removals or conversions, and potential new construction.
6. *Traffic and Transportation Systems?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact of alternative modes of travel, increased traffic, parking changes, demand for transit, and roadway improvements on Presidio (Areas A and B) traffic, roadways, and parking and on the local and regional transportation network due to the proposed action. New information, to the extent known, on the effect of proposed Doyle Drive reconstruction on Presidio traffic will also be provided.
7. *Land Use, the Presidio Community, and Surrounding Neighborhoods?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on recreation/open space, institutional, commercial/office and residential use and acreage, total building square footage, residents and daily guests, and surrounding neighborhoods. Possible conflicts among the alternatives and the objectives of existing and proposed land use plans, policies, and controls will also be discussed.



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

8. *National Historic Landmark District?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential for an adverse effect on historic properties and cultural landscape due to site changes to accommodate proposed uses, including landscape and circulation improvements and building rehabilitation, demolition and new construction.
9. *Archaeology?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential for an adverse impact on known and potential prehistoric and historic resources due to ground-disturbing work resulting from the Plan. The EIS will also include an efficient program to ensure that predicted and discovered archeological resources can be documented, conserved, and given consideration while keeping significant features and sites from adverse effect.
10. *Water Supply?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on water supply of Lobos Creek and historic demand for city water due to Presidio water consumption.
11. *Water Quality?* YES. The EIS will discuss potential degradation of water quality due to construction activities and increased urban runoff.
12. *Wetlands and Stream Drainage?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on wetlands and riparian habitat in Areas A and B of the Presidio due to changes in land use, building rehabilitation and construction, and any potential conflicts with the Vegetation Management Plan (NPS 1999).
13. *Native Plant Communities?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on the viability of native plant communities in the Presidio (Areas A and B) due to changes in land use, building rehabilitation and construction, and any potential conflicts with the Vegetation Management Plan (NPS 1999).
14. *Wildlife?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on native terrestrial and migratory bird species due to increased visitor use, noise and disturbance associated with construction activities, changes in land use, building rehabilitation and construction, and any potential conflicts with the Vegetation Management Plan (NPS 1999).
15. *Threatened, Endangered, Rare, and Sensitive Plant and Animal Species?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on special status species due to site development (including building rehabilitation), changes in land use, recreational activities, and any potential conflicts with the Vegetation Management Plan (NPS 1999).
16. *Park Management and Operations?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on park management and operations due to Federal appropriations declining to zero by fiscal year 2013, leasing of residential and non-residential properties, building replacement, rehabilitation and removal, annual operating costs, infrastructure repair and revenues, transportation services, landscaping, and natural resources management.
17. *Geology and Soils?* NO. Information on topographic conditions, geologic hazards, and soils within the Presidio is provided on pages 102 and 103 in the GMPA EIS and is incorporated by reference and summarized in this document. The Presidio consists of a blanket of unconsolidated sediments (dune and beach sand, landslide debris, alluvium, artificial fill) overlying bedrock (mostly Franciscan mélangé) which is exposed on cliffs and hills. Ground surface elevations range from sea level to about +1300 feet above mean sea level. The two major active faults near the Presidio are the San Andreas (about 9 kilometers



west) and the Hayward (about 16 kilometers east) Strong earthquake shaking is highly likely to result from earthquakes on the San Andreas or Hayward faults, or other more distant faults in the San Francisco Bay Area.² Landslides are a major topographic hazard in the Presidio because of steep, hilly terrain and unstable sediments or weak bedrock formations. Prolonged rainfall, earthquakes, or continuous disturbance of the original terrain can trigger landslides. Soils in the Presidio are mostly excessively drained sands, artificial fill, and other Urban Land (asphalt, concrete, etc.), all of which are subject to seismic ground shaking hazards to some degree. Portions of the Main Post, Letterman Complex, and Crissy Field are located in a zone potentially subject to liquefaction during strong earthquake shaking. Future earthquake shaking may be exacerbated and damage intensified within these areas because the soft liquefiable sands may lose strength rapidly.

Site-specific development projects implementing the Plan will require supplemental review to evaluate geologic and seismic hazards and to comply with the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act. The Trust will refer to the State of California's Seismic Hazard Zones map of the county (California Division of Mines and Geology 2000) and utilize Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (California Division of Mines and Geology 1997) in developing mitigation design. Mitigation evaluations and preparation of mitigation designs will be performed by a California Certified Engineering Geologist and/or a Registered Geotechnical Engineer (to evaluate geologic subgrade, earthquake ground motion, and liquefaction), and/or Registered Structural Engineer (to evaluate structural safety), as appropriate. Because site-specific recommendations for the mitigation of geologic hazards will be incorporated into subsequent NEPA documents, more study at this program level of environmental review is not warranted.

18. *Floodplains*. NO. This impact topic was dismissed from further consideration in the GMPA EIS. Crissy Field is the only area within the Presidio that was historically subjected to minor recurrent flooding due to an inadequate local drainage system. Since preparation of the GMPA EIS, the Trust has installed \$1.2 million of new storm drain improvements and a new stormwater outfall. These improvements have reduced the risk of flooding in the Crissy Field area. However, Crissy Field may be at risk from future tsunamis (seismic sea waves, also known as tidal waves) created by earthquakes or other disturbances in the Pacific Ocean.³ Should it be determined that a specific development project within Crissy Field/Area B would result in an unacceptable risk of flood loss and human safety based on the best information available during subsequent environmental review, the Presidio Trust would consider practicable alternatives or not construct the new structures and facilities within this area. In such cases, design will be governed by consideration of probabilistic estimates of the risk of damage resulting from tsunamis or other natural hazards. Design and siting evaluations would consider the extent of this flood hazard and include appropriate flood protection measures to minimize risks to human life and property and preserve its beneficial and natural values. The Presidio Trust will comply with requirements for development in floodplains contained in Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management. Because none of the proposed alternatives would support or allow incompatible development within a regulated floodplain, more study at this program level of environmental review is not warranted.

² The California Division of Mines and Geology has calculated the ground motion using probabilistic seismic hazard methods as outlined in the joint Division and U.S. Geological Survey report, Division Open-File Report 96-08. For the Design Basis Earthquake (i.e., 10 percent chance of exceedance in 50 years), ground motion is calculated to be Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) = 0.67g. A value over 0.65g is considered "violent shaking," with the potential for "heavy" damage to structures.

³ According to the GMPA EIS, 19 tsunamis were reported at the Golden Gate between 1868 and 1968. The maximum tsunami was reported to be 7.4 feet. A tsunami of 7.9 feet occurs about once every 100 years.



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

19. *Climate.* NO. This impact topic was dismissed from further consideration in the GMPA EIS. None of the proposed alternatives would impact temperature, wind, precipitation, or other weather conditions or patterns. Therefore, more study under the EIS is not warranted.
20. *Air Quality?* YES. The EIS will identify areas in the Presidio that currently do not meet air quality standards due to existing conditions. The potential impact on air quality and sensitive receptors due to construction activities and Plan implementation (numbers of vehicle trips and associated air pollutant emissions) and changes in procedures for assessing impacts since the GMPA EIS was completed as recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District will be evaluated. The evaluation will discuss whether any alternatives would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
21. *Noise?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on noise levels in noise-sensitive areas related to construction and traffic increases on internal and adjacent roadways using the San Francisco noise ordinance as a measure of impact.
22. *Visitor Experience?* YES. The EIS will discuss impacts of new uses and activity levels on the visitor experience in Areas A and B of the Presidio, and compatibility with the Presidio Interpretive Plan (under preparation).
23. *Recreation and Public Access?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on recreational opportunities and amenities to support recreational uses for park visitors, and effect on current users and public access throughout the Presidio. Any conflicts with the Presidio Bicycle and Trails Master Plan (in preparation) will also be discussed.
24. *Scenic Viewing?* YES. The EIS will discuss the potential impact on scenic viewing opportunities and visual qualities of the Presidio due to changes in Presidio-wide views from principal viewpoints within and outside the park. Effects from additional sources of lighting or sources of glare on day or nighttime views will also be discussed.
25. *Human Health, Safety, and the Environment?* NO. Several areas of contamination caused by hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants have been delineated at the Presidio (see the attached Environmental Remediation figure). Various sites contain volatile and semi-volatile hydrocarbons derived from petroleum products, pesticides, heavy metals, polychlorinated biphenyls, and polyaromatic hydrocarbons. Exposure to these materials, which may have carcinogenic or toxic properties, can result in adverse human health and ecological effects. Soils and water at the site have been investigated, evaluations of the potential risk posed by contaminants under different scenarios have been prepared, and efforts to clean up the contamination have begun (National Park Service, 1993).

The Trust's cleanup of non-petroleum substances, pollutants, and contaminants on the Presidio is addressed through compliance with pollution cleanup laws that include environmental data collection, analyses, remedial design and implementation, and reporting and documentation requirements, separate from the PTMP and its associated NEPA process. The data collection, analyses, and cleanup efforts are being managed in accordance with federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and through regulations set forth in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Cleanup of petroleum contamination is governed by Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR),



California Health and Safety Code Chapters 6.5 and 6.8, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (Title 40 CFR, Part 300). The overall cleanup of the Presidio is regulated by the State of California and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Within the State, the California EPA (Cal-EPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has oversight authority and jurisdiction over the non-petroleum CERCLA sites and locations subject to Health and Safety Code requirements. DTSC consults with EPA as necessary. The Cal-EPA Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is the lead on the cleanup of petroleum-contaminated sites (“Petroleum Program”).

Formal mechanisms for implementing the cleanup consist of regulatory orders and memoranda of agreement (MOA). DTSC governs the cleanup of non-petroleum sites based on a Consent Agreement signed by the Trust and DTSC in August 1999 (“CERCLA Program”). The RWQCB issued Order No. 96-070, which covers petroleum cleanup activities. There are also two MOAs – Army, Trust, and NPS (MOA), and the Trust and NPS (Area A MOA). These MOA were finalized in May 1999 and identify the results of negotiations with the Army to complete the Main Installation investigation and to assume the lead for the cleanup. Both MOAs direct expedited cleanup and reuse of the Presidio while ensuring protection of human health and the environment.

Following passage of the Base Realignment and Conversion (BRAC) legislation in 1994, responsibility for cleanup of hazardous waste sites shifted from the U.S. Army to the Presidio. Along with the transfer of lead agency status to the Presidio Trust, the Army agreed to provide \$100 million to be dispersed over four years to pay for the cleanup efforts. Under this agreement (by the Presidio Trust, NPS and the U.S. Army), the Trust will continue the Army’s cleanup program and accelerate the schedule from a 30-year to a 10-year schedule.

Although the Presidio is not on the National Priorities List (Superfund), the cleanup is following the CERCLA cleanup process, which consists of:

- A Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, which summarizes the nature and extent of contamination, as determined by investigation overseen by DTSC. The RI incorporates risk assessment information based on existing and proposed land uses;
- A Feasibility Study (FS), which identifies remedial objectives, evaluates the feasibility of various remedial technologies, and develops remedial alternatives to address the remedial objectives identified for the site. A Draft and Final FS is prepared. The Draft is made available for public review and comment, in addition to soliciting input from regulatory agencies;
- A Remedial Action Plan (RAP), which describes in detail the remedial actions that will be undertaken to remedy contamination at the site. As with the Draft FS, a Draft RAP is made available for public and agency review and comment;
- A Remedial Design (RD) Document, which provides detailed technical plans and engineering designs for implementation of the remedial alternative selected in the RAP; and
- Implementation of remedial actions and long-term monitoring.



The cleanup of contaminated sites is still in progress. The Army completed the RI/FS for the Presidio Main Installation, Crissy Field and Directorate of Engineering and Housing (DEH) operable units (OU) in 1997-98. For the Main Installation OU, the Army's Final FS was largely rejected by a large number of commentors, who generally felt that the overall strategy for the Army's proposed cleanups was not sufficient for a national park. When the Trust took over the management of approximately 80 percent of the land at the Presidio in 1998, they began negotiations with the Army to complete the FS ("Revised Final FS") and to assume the lead for the cleanup. These negotiations were finalized by the two MOAs noted above. The Revised Final FS is currently being prepared but has not been released as a public review draft due to negotiations between the Trust, NPS, regulatory agencies and the Presidio RAB on what the preferred remedies will be in the FS document. It is anticipated the draft Revised Final FS Report of the Main Installation sites will be released for public comment in July 2001 at the earliest.

The 1997-98 RI/FS for the Main Installation sites was developed to follow the land use designations set forth in the Final GMPA (July 1994). Cleanup levels for known areas of contamination have either been pre-determined from past Army documents, or they are being revised and/or negotiated currently. Cleanup levels for petroleum contaminants are designated by their cleanup levels listed in the Order No. 96-070 Site Cleanup Requirements (SCRs) established by the U.S. Army and the California RWQCB in 1996. Crissy Field RAP and DEH RAP both have cleanup levels established for their respective remedial actions (these are in the library as well). The Main Installation sites, Public Health Service Hospital (PHSH) sites and any other sites on the Presidio not in the Petroleum Program, Crissy Field, DEH, or other MOUs, with the exception of the Firing Ranges, will have cleanup levels established in a separate stand-alone document to be released later this year. This document will build upon the risk assessment conducted by the Army during its RI/FS of the Main Installation sites.

Numerical cleanup standards will be established for land use types (e.g., residential, recreational, commercial, etc., as well as ecological). These standards will apply to each location proposed for development in the Plan. If there are changes to the land use designations resulting from Plan implementation, the remediation goals could change if a cleanup standard that applies to the new land use designation is less or more stringent. New information regarding the Trust's cleanup program is being evaluated as it becomes available.

Although the PTMP is on roughly the same schedule with Main Installation Revised Final FS, the PTMP and Main Installation cleanup are separate projects that are not specifically tied together in terms of their release date. However, the Revised Final FS must take into account scenarios and preferred alternatives put forth in the EIS, as this may change the land use designations where some of the Main Installation sites exist.

A Presidio-wide Contingency Plan (under development) covers unknown contamination that may be discovered at other areas of the Presidio during construction, demolition, or other development activities. This plan documents presumptive remedies for contamination that may be discovered and includes procedures for handling hazardous materials, stained soil, etc., and contact procedures for notifying the agencies and the public.



Public comment on the remediation goals and activities is addressed through the cleanup process itself rather than through this NEPA process. Under CERCLA, public comments received on the Draft FS and Draft RAP documents must be considered in the preparation of the Final RI/FS and Final RAP. The Trust has also prepared a Community Relations Plan in accordance with DTSC guidance and CERCLA requirements. It was released in January 2001 as a draft and, following receipt and incorporation of comments, will become final. Reports of the site investigation and remediation studies performed at the Presidio can be reviewed at the information repositories maintained at the Trust's library, 34 Graham Street, or at the library on the second floor of 1750 Lincoln Boulevard. Review copies of the Draft FS and Draft RAP will also be available at 34 Graham Street and 1750 Lincoln Boulevard. Individuals who wish to be notified of the release of these documents should contact Jane Packer, the Trust's Community Relations Specialist (415/561-4255).

Another opportunity for public comment on the cleanup is provided through the site Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). As part of the BRAC process, the RAB was established in 1994 and routinely consults with the Presidio Trust, state agencies and the National Park Service (NPS) regarding cleanup of the Presidio. The RAB meets twice per month; every 2nd Tuesday is the official RAB meeting that is open to the public, agencies, the Trust and NPS, and other entities.

Therefore, potential impacts to human health, safety, and the environment following cleanup and implementation of the PTMP are not anticipated to be significant, and more study under the EIS is not warranted.

26. *Energy Consumption?* YES. The GMPA EIS determined that energy-reducing measures at the Presidio would have a minor but positive effect on energy conservation in the region. The Presidio Trust implements cost effective and aggressive energy efficiency practices and sustainable design principles in Trust and tenant facilities to significantly reduce energy consumption in accordance with Executive Order 13123 – Greening The Government Through Efficient Energy Management and its Green Building Guidelines (Presidio Trust 2000e). Energy consumption (per gross square foot) at the Presidio will be reduced through life cycle cost effective measures by at least 35 percent by 2010 relative to 1985. In addition, energy conservation standards required by the State of California's Title 24 building standards for energy using systems at Presidio buildings (that do not impact building historical architectural features) will be met or exceeded by 10 percent in 2002 and 25 percent in 2005. However, while the Trust will make best efforts to comply with efficient energy management goals, because energy requirements and conservation potential of the proposed alternatives may be greater than that covered under the GMPA EIS, additional analysis under the EIS is required.

27. *Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations?* YES. Executive Order 12898 – Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations directs federal agencies to assess whether their actions have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations. The EIS will evaluate the potential effect on local minority or low-income populations, based on the most current available data.

28. *Other Significant Environmental Resources?* YES. The EIS will discuss the incremental impact of the proposed action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions (cumulative



impacts), the relationship between short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved should any of the proposed alternatives be implemented.

7. References

California Division of Mines and Geology

- 1997 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California*. Special Publication 117, 74 pages.
- 2000 *Seismic Hazards Zones Maps of the City and County of San Francisco*. Open File Report 2000-009. Released November 17, 2000.

Erler & Kalinowski, Inc.

- 2000 *Presidio-Wide Contingency Plan (Draft)*. Dated: October 2000.

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

- 1993. *Draft General Management Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement*. Dated 1993.
- 1994a *Final General Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement, Presidio of San Francisco, Golden Gate National Recreation Area*.
- 1994b *Presidio of San Francisco Storm Water Management Plan*. Prepared by Dames & Moore. Dated: May 1994.
- 1997 *Presidio of San Francisco Natural Resource Inventory and Vegetation Management Options*. Prepared by Jones & Stokes Associates. Dated: November 1997.
- 1999 *Presidio of San Francisco Vegetation Management Plan and Environmental Assessment*.
- 2000a *Scoping, Presidio Trust Jurisdiction, Presidio Trust Implementation Plan, Presidio (PR 00-098)*. Memorandum from GGNRA Environmental Protection Specialist to NPS Project Review Committee Members. Dated: August 7, 2000.
- 2000b *Preliminary Comments on the PTIP Screening Form*. Memo dated August 17, 2000, 4 pages.

Presidio Trust

- 2000a *Presidio Trust Implementation Plan: An Updated Plan for Area B of the Presidio – Conceptual Alternatives Workbook*. Dated November, 2000.
- 2000b *PTIP: An Update for Area B – Summary of Public Scoping Workshop Presentation, July 12, 2000*. 23 pages.
- 2000c *PTIP Public Scoping Workshop – July 12, 2000: Summary of Public Scoping Comments*. 13 pages.
- 2000d *Financial Concepts Workshop, September 13, 2000*. 4 pages.
- 2000e *Green Building Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Historic and Non-Historic Buildings*. Draft Report. Dated October 5, 2000.
- 2001 *Draft Presidio Trust Implementation Plan*.



NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

Reference: 36 CFR Part 1010.

Dated: April 25, 2002.



