

RECORD OF DECISION

ATTACHMENT 3

ERRATA

ATTACHMENT 3 ERRATA

The following text corrections are incorporated by reference into the Presidio Trust Management Plan Final EIS and Final Plan as specified below. Changes include the correction of typographical, mathematical or other errors which were discovered following release of the Final EIS and Final Plan documents and/or are clarifications provided in response to public comment as summarized in Attachment 2 (Report Accompanying the ROD). These changes do not substantively alter the conclusions of the EIS or otherwise influence the basis upon which the Presidio Trust has made its decision regarding this project.

Changes are generally presented using verbatim quotes from the relevant document and underline/strikeout, unless otherwise noted. Page and section numbers are provided as a guide for the reader.

FINAL EIS VOLUME I

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation:

Page S-9: Section 4.2.2 Archaeological Resources, Final Plan Variant column:

- Text should be corrected to include the word “no” as follows: “Similar impacts to the No Action Alternative except there would be **no** potential effects due to new construction.”

Page S-14, Section 4.3.5 Noise (General Construction/Demolition Noise), Final Plan Variant column:

- The following text should be added at the end of the sentence: “Demolition activities would have similar potential to intermittently disrupt tenants, recreational users and residences **as described under the Final Plan Alternative.**”

Page S-19, Section 4.5 Transportation and Circulation (Increased Congestion on Local Roadways), Minimum Management Alternative column

- The following text should be added at the end of the sentence: “Unacceptable service levels at the same intersections as the No Action, plus 8 in the a.m. and 5 **in the p.m.**”

Page S-20, Section 4.6.1 Water Supply and Demand, Cultural Destination Alternative column:

- Text should be corrected as follows: “Projected daily water demand would be the highest under this alternative at ~~08.4~~ **0.84** to 2.08 mgd, and...”

Page 11, 1st paragraph: The redundant reference to the GGNRA Act is removed as follows:

- “The Trust Act sets forth two overall requirements of the Trust. First, the Trust must manage the leasing, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair and improvement of property within Area B of the Presidio in accordance with the purposes set forth in the GGNRA Act (Public Law 92-589, 86 Stat. 1299; 16 U.S.C. § 460bb). Second, the Trust must manage the leasing, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair and improvement of property within Area B in accordance with ~~the purposes of the GGNRA Act and~~ the “general objectives” of the GMPA.”

RECORD OF DECISION

Attachment 3 – Errata

Page 28, Section 2.5.2 and Page 271, Table 39: add a footnote as follows:

- “The Final Plan Alternative states as a preference residential use of the PHSB building, which is approximately 314,000 square feet including both historic and non-historic portions. (Non-historic portions may be removed and replaced elsewhere on the site). Residential use of the building is the Trust’s preference, despite the assumption in the Final EIS analysis that only 200,000 square feet would be in residential use, with the bulk of remaining square footage in educational use. Because educational use represents a more intense use, in terms of the number of persons on site, the number of peak period automobile trips, and other considerations, the assumptions inherent in the Final EIS analysis are considered more conservative (i.e. they would generate more impacts and less revenue) than the preference stated in the Plan, and thus did not warrant modification between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Nothing in the Final EIS analysis should be construed as negating the Trust’s preference for residential use of the PHSB building, and the potential educational use of auxiliary structures in the PHSB complex.”

Pages 292 through 296, Section 4.4.4 Visitor Experience:

- Projected visitation is provided for each alternative in this section. This text should be corrected to state that these estimates account for recreational visitors to both Areas A & B, not just Area B as presented in the Final EIS. (Table 1, beginning on page 19, correctly notes this fact.)

Pages 309 & 310 (Tables 47 and 48):

- The following footnote should be added to both tables: **“For two-way STOP-controlled intersections, the LOS is presented for the worst approach.”**

Page 377, Section 5.1 (History of Public Involvement): The word “Trust” should be added to the first sentence as follows:

- “The Presidio **Trust** considers public involvement....”

FINAL EIS VOLUME II (RESPONSES TO COMMENTS)

Page 4-256, top of right column:

- A new column entitled “Average Auto Occupancy” should be added to the table summarizing auto reduction goals and standards as follows:

| | <u>Internal Trips</u> | <u>External Trips</u> | <u>Average Auto Occupancy</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Minimum Standards: | 50% by auto | 70% by auto | 1.4 persons/auto |
| Long-Term Goal: | 35% by auto | 50% by auto | 1.4 persons/auto |

Beginning on Page 6-1 (Directory of Responses to Comments):

- Add the following commentors:

Ausman, James: (HO-1) 4-173

Dodge, Shannon: (HO-1) 4-173

RECORD OF DECISION

Attachment 3 – Errata

Edwards, Jenie: (PR-16) 4-214; (PR-17) 4-215
Ellingham, Lewis: (BR-3) 4-143; (NC-1) 4-163
Friman, Mary: (AL-3) 4-68
Gallagher, John: (PI-6) 4-49; PR-14 (4-213)
Kwan, Wai Ching: (HO-1) 4-173
Moussa, Susan: see TS general
Palsic, Cheryl: (NC-1) 4-163
Raford, Noah: (HO-1) 4-173
Schulte, Faye: (NC-1) 4-163
Trost, Cecilia: (PI-6) 4-49
Williams, Keira: (NC-7) 4-167

PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page viii, Figure I, and page 108, Figure 3.8, add a footnote as follows:

- “For the correct delineation of VMP zones (historic forest, native plant communities, and designed landscaped areas) in the southwestern quadrant of the Presidio, see Figure 1.2, page 8.”

Page 46, last paragraph in right column to be edited as follows:

- “At a minimum, the TDM program is designed to reduce vehicle trips so that trips involving automobiles will represent a maximum of 70 percent of external person trips and 50 percent of internal person trips, **assuming an auto occupancy rate of 1.4 persons per vehicle**. Above and beyond this minimum standard, the Trust plans to pursue an aggressive long-term goal for automobile trip reductions as transit services are expanded, and as the resident and employee populations of the Presidio approach historic levels. The long-term goal is to reduce vehicle trips and increase auto occupancy such that only 50 percent of all external trips and 35 percent of all internal trips are by auto, **assuming an auto occupancy rate of 1.4 persons per vehicle**.”

Page 101, 2nd to last sentence in left column to be edited as follows:

- “Compatible recreational activities will be allowed, although ~~Paul Goode Field~~ **Morton Street Field** may be removed or relocated to allow for restoration of Tennessee Hollow.”

Appendix D, Page D-1, First and Second Paragraphs to be edited as follows:

- “The Presidio Trust (Trust) has an aggressive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program in place to reduce overall reliance on the automobile by encouraging alternatives such as walking, biking, carpool/vanpools, and transit. With implementation of the PTMP, the program will be expanded to achieve minimum standards for reduced auto use. No more than 70 percent of external trips that start or end at the Presidio will be by private auto, and no more than 50 percent of internal trips within the Presidio will be by private auto, **assuming an auto occupancy rate of 1.4 persons per vehicle. If the average auto occupancy is less than 1.4, the auto mode share would need to be lower in order to meet the minimum standards.**”

RECORD OF DECISION

Attachment 3 – Errata

In the long-term, when transit services to the Presidio are expanded and the population and employment figures reach historic levels, these minimum standards will be exceeded. The long-term goal is to reduce vehicle trips so that only 50 percent of external trips and 35 percent of internal trips are made by automobiles, **assuming an auto occupancy rate of 1.4 persons per vehicle.**”