

PRESIDIO TRUST PUBLIC BOARD MEETING - SEPTEMBER 17, 2001

NOTE: the following is the best transcript available of the public board meeting of the Presidio Trust Board of Directors held on September 17, 2001. It is based upon an audio recording of the meeting.

Toby Rosenblatt: Ladies and gentlemen, before we begin the formal board meeting, I'd like to indicate that we do have signing available somewhere. Do we have an interpreter who will do signing? If that person isn't here yet, they will be here shortly.

Sorry, is that coming across? It takes a few minutes to get everything tuned.

My name is Toby Rosenblatt, and I am Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Presidio Trust. Other Board members here: Mary Murphy, Mike Heyman, Amy Meyer, and at this end, Jennifer Hernandez and Bill Reilly. And our Executive Director, Jim Meadows.

Before we begin the Trust Board meeting, the day, as you know, in San Francisco, is another day of remembrance this week for the tragedies that occurred in New York and Washington. There are lots of services that have happened this week, and many of us, I'm sure, have participated in our own homes, or our own places of worship, with family and friends. But I think we should take another moment,

because this day of remembrance here in San Francisco, in remembering the heroism of those we have seen this week, and the sadness for the families who lost people, and for those who themselves died in this awful tragedy. And say a prayer, wherever one chooses to say his or her own prayer, that peace and enlightenment can come to this world.

And with that, I would like to ask us to take a moment of silence.

[Moment of silence]

Okay. Thank you. I think we just got a little reminder that if you have a cell phone, this might be a good time to turn it off, cell phones, pagers and other electronics. There will be breaks during the day, obviously, when you can step outside to use those if you need to.

Voice: Microphone.

Toby Rosenblatt: Is this one not working? Okay, thank you, I just need to remember to speak into it directly. And I will try to do that, thank you.

We welcome you today. I apologize to those of us up here and to you for the very bright lights. Unfortunately, we need those because we are doing a videotape of this meeting for the record, and we will begin with an introduction from our Executive Director. Jim will talk a bit about again reminding us of our purpose in the meeting today. And then we will have any additional comments, first from our Deputy Director for Planning, Hillary Gittleman, and then any comments in addition from the Board members. And then we will begin the regular testimony from members of the public who would like to address the PTIP subject today.

So with that, Jim, please.

Jim Meadows: Thank you, Toby. Welcome, again, to the Presidio, as part of the Presidio Trust implementation planning process. I'm not sure everyone knows that September 17 is the 225th anniversary of the official commemoration of The Presidio of San Francisco, which was commemorated first by having the first mass celebrated on site on September 17, 1776. So we certainly have basically something to remember, and something to move forward from.

I would point out that this meeting, for another purpose of remembrance and looking forward, will end promptly at 4:00 o'clock.

Because we are coming up on Rosh Hashanah, and basically we decided to move forward with the meeting on this date, with a specific understanding that it would end at that time.

This is a formal public hearing on the draft PTIP plan, and the associated draft EIS. The earlier public meeting scheduled for September 11 was canceled for obvious reasons, and has been rescheduled for this location on Tuesday, October 16, starting at 6:00 p.m. There are flyers about that meeting outside, and basically, we hope that you will tell other people. And we will be putting it on our web site, and publicizing that fact. Other upcoming meetings and new exhibits also have flyers associated with them out at the front table, and we hope you'll take advantage of those.

The purpose of the PTIP public hearing is to receive public comments on the draft comments. All comments we receive, either orally at one of the public hearings, or in writing, by the close of the comment period on October 25th will be logged into the formal administrative record, and will inform the preparation of a final plan EIS. Individual

substantive comments will be responded to in writing, and many will result in changes to the draft plan and the draft EIS. I would point out that where we are today as far as the draft plan is the result also of public comment and changes that have been brought forward because of those public comments.

We have planned a brief introduction by staff today, which Hillary Gittleman will prepare, and ask that if you wish to speak, and you have not already done so, that you use one of the sign-up cards, and that following your introduction, the Chair will call the speakers in order that they've been signed up, and each speaker will have three minutes for their remarks. Please begin your remarks by stating your name, because we are recording this entire meeting for the administrative record.

I think by this time everybody understands this planning process began in July of 2000, when the Trust decided to undergo an update of the GMPA for the area under the Trust's operation, Area B of the Presidio. This decision was based on a variety of factors, including changes in circumstances that had occurred since the GMP was published in 1994. Following that six-month scoping period, and a

vetting of a preliminary range of alternatives, the Trust and staff and consultants developed the draft plan and the draft EIS which was presented to the public on July 25. The draft plan and alternatives already reflected a great deal of public input, and will continue to reflect that input until published next spring.

Basically at this time, I'd like to welcome your comments, welcome you to the meeting and ask if Hillary Gittleman will give you an idea of the key components of the plan that has been put forward, and some synopsis of some of the most common comments we received to date. So thank you again for coming.

Hillary.

Hillary Gittleman: Thank you, Jim, and thank you all for coming.

On July 25th the staff made a presentation to the public on the date that we issued the draft plan and the draft EIS, and I don't want to go into the kind of detail we went into that night. But I wanted to take just a minute to summarize some of the key components of the draft

plan, which really constitutes at this point our proposed vision for the future of the Presidio.

It's derived very much from the GMPA, or the General Management Plan Amendment, that was adopted in 1994. In fact, Chapter 2 of the draft plan that is currently being circulated for comments lifts huge portions of the GMPA. It's almost directly derived from that document. And I think the plan as a whole articulates a set of values that everyone would agree with, things like preservation of historic resources, including the National Landmark Historic District; compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act; protection and enhancement of natural areas in compliance with the section of the Trust Act that requires that any new construction only occur within already disturbed areas. So if there's an area in the park that's natural or green today, you can be assured that it will be that way in the future.

But the four principal components of the draft plan, as we presented it on July 25th, are that it calls for an increase in open space in the Presidio over the life of the plan of about 100 acres. So there will be 100 acres of additional open space in the Presidio, if you were to visit

it 20 or 30 years from today. In addition, the plan calls for a reduction in the amount of building space here. So again, if you were to visit the Presidio in 20 or 30 years, you would find almost half a million square feet less buildings than currently exist today. Finally, we want to achieve both of those goals, the increase in open space and the decrease in building space, without losing housing units. So the policy of no net loss of housing is an important one. And that is a departure from the 1994 GMPA. Another departure is the commitment of the draft plan to an expanded program of cultural and educational activities in the Presidio for park visitors.

The result is a plan that is very general. It's very much like a city's general plan in articulating a policy framework that is intended to guide future decisions. And inherent in that preparation, and the circulation of a general plan is an understanding that we're going to be coming back to you many times in the future as the planning gets more and more specific, and more and more fine-grained over time. Chapter five of the draft plan actually articulates a commitment to further planning, environmental analysis and substantial public input prior to any projects involving new construction or demolition. And that's based on the reality or the understanding that this is a very general policy level document.

We've already heard some very insightful comments regarding these components of the draft plan and other issues that have been raised in the process. These include comments we received at the August 28th meeting of the GGNRA Advisory Commission. In addition, the staff has been attending some informal meetings, talking with neighborhood organizations, tenants, neighbors and other interested parties over the last month and a half. From all of these comments and discussions, it's clear how important the Presidio is to everybody, and how heartfelt the sense of commitment to the values that the plan articulates just is.

This is not to suggest that there's agreement on every topic. Like every land-use issue in San Francisco, I think every real blueprint for change, every document that will call for change. There's a healthy debate, and there have been some very incisive questions so far.

I wanted to take a minute just to talk about a couple of those. One of the refrains we're hearing a lot is, "Why can't you simply implement the 1994 GMPA?" And I have an answer to that question, although it's not a simple one. In its most literal reading, the 1994 GMPA doesn't meet the requirements of the Trust Act, and just couldn't be

implemented because of the changes in circumstances that have occurred. And that was clear to the Trust and was clearly articulated by the Trust during the scoping process that Jim referred to.

What we've done in the EIS, the draft EIS that's being circulated now for comment, is develop an alternative that's as close as we could possibly get to the GMPA, the original GMPA. And it reflects all those changes necessary to bring it into conformance with the changes in circumstances and the things that have transpired. And this was done in a direct response to the comments we received in the scoping process. As described in the draft EIS, that alternative, which is the no-action alternative, would result in the greatest reduction in square footage and the least activity of any of the alternatives in the draft. But it would also result in a substantial loss of dwelling units, and it would have no--it would not have the increase in programs, the cultural and educational program component envisioned by the plan. It would also not result in sufficient revenue to complete the capital program in the same timeframe as some of the other alternatives.

So it's that kind of comment we're looking for. The question about why not the GMPA, but also then some suggestions about how that

alternative and the other alternatives can be modified as we go forward and complete the planning process.

Before we call the first speakers, I did want to clarify that all the comments we get today, as well as those we get on October 16th orally, and the comments we get in writing, will be treated the same. So if you don't feel like speaking today, you have ample opportunity between now and the close of the comment period, on October 25th.

Then the hard work starts for us, for our staff. Once we received all the comments on the 25th, we're going to take the comments or questions, organize them, understand fully the scope of the issues they raise, and prepare written responses. Once we have written responses, we'll be preparing a draft of the final documents for consideration and adoption by the Board of Directors. Probably the soonest we can get to that threshold will be February and March of next year. So I'll look forward to getting your comments this evening and in the future.

Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you, Hillary. Did you, by the way, want to mention anything about the displays over there that people could look at?

Hillary Gittleman: I'd be happy to. We took the opportunity to bring with us some of the graphics we've been using to describe key components of the plan. I think the things you see through the open doors are illustrations of each of the planning areas that articulate some of the details about historic buildings, nonhistoric buildings, developed areas, and natural areas, in each of those districts. And there are Trust staff members stationed over near there if you should have questions after the hearing, we'd be happy to stick around and answer them.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Are there any comments at this point from members of the Board?

Mary Murphy: Thank you, Hillary. I think it's worth clarifying, not to anticipate too much some of the comments that we expect to hear today. I think it's important also to just follow up on what Hillary was saying, to just be completely clear about two things.

One is, that this is a general plan, and that more site-specific planning will follow on this. And under all circumstances, they will be subject to the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, the

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the provisions of the Presidio Trust Act. And I think it's important for everyone to understand the legal framework within which the Trust is putting forward this very general plan about the future uses of the Presidio, and the attendant possible environmental effects.

As Hillary stated, the Trust Act provides that where there can never be more built environment in the Presidio than there is today, so it will never be more than six million square feet of space, although our preferred alternative does reduce that below six million, by about half a million square feet of space.

New construction can only occur in areas that are previously disturbed. If there were to be any new construction, it would be subject not only to further environmental review, under the National Environmental Policy Act, but it would be subject to review under the National Historic Preservation Act, because the entire Presidio is a National Historical Landmark District.

And finally, it's important to note that the plan departs in certain ways from the GMPA. I think most specifically, as Hillary has noted, by

committing to no net loss of housing in this plan, our preferred alternative, I think it's worth discussing a little bit, that we have indicated there's a preference from the Trust, amongst the alternatives.

And there are some reasons for that preference.

I think it's important to note that there is a policy commitment to not have a net loss of housing here at the Presidio, and also, to achieve a meaningful jobs-housing balance, which is something that was not anticipated under the GMPA.

There's also a commitment to not defer maintenance of the park. And even when you look at the budgetary implications of the different alternatives, one of the reasons why we have had to adopt a different preferred alternative than the GMPA is that there's a preference for making sure that we do not defer the maintenance of the park. We are talking about roads, infrastructure, sewer, police and fire, replanting the forest, all of the things that will affect the daily experience of this park; that we do have a preference for trying to bring our capital projects online without long deferment of maintenance of the buildings, the facilities, the roads, the infrastructure, the forest.

Finally, we see that another departure is that there is a higher degree of commitment to cultural programming in our preferred alternative. The original GMPA projected that programming and outreach to the public would occur pretty much exclusively through nonprofit tenants who would be tenants here at the Presidio. And we have taken, under the Presidio Trust, in our leasing activities, we have required affirmatively, as leasehold covenants of tenants, that they provide certain programmatic content, which is a departure in some respects from the pre-Trust leases that were signed, although the pre-Trust leases, the tenants under those leases, certainly have honored the notion, and have done a lot of really great programming here at the Presidio.

What we anticipate is that there will be a mix of programming. Some will be provided by tenants, as originally anticipated by the GMPA. Some will be provided by institutions, educational and cultural, that will have a permanent presence here at the Presidio, to provide more cultural outreach, and to provide more scientific and educational outreach to the local community and to the nation as a whole.

And I think those are differences that we see from the GMPA, and they do represent a policy, a thoughtful policy consideration, on the part of the Board. And we welcome people's reactions to those today.

Amy Meyer:

I would like to say something in particular about the open space element of this plan. We are trying to get a Presidio with a very high quality of open space, and possibilities of habitat increase and good experience of a broad range of different types of open space.

And one of the figures we have used is that we have about 97 additional acres of open space planning for in our preferred alternative. But actually, this starts with 224 acres of open space, some of which right now, though categorized as open space, about 124 acres, is not of a quality nature. It's got concrete on it, or ice plant, or ivy, and it's not doing anything for any habitat or experience of people who want to walk through.

What we're proposing to add, therefore, within these 224 acres, is 132 acres of native plants, 53 acres of forest, and 37 acres of cultivated landscape. And so that we are speaking of an improvement to some 222 acres of open space, though we speak of a net gain of 97, it's

actually improvement to 222 acres. And I just wanted to bring that forward.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. I have a number of cards here already, again, if you wish to speak, please sign up on the cards. The cards are available over by the door. There is a microphone in the center of the room. I'd like to ask you to please address the audience and us only by using the mike. If you do otherwise, it will not get into the record.

I'm going to call names at least two or three at a time, so that the second and third speakers can be standing up, ready to speak right away. We're going to have to run on a very tight time period for everybody. As you can see, there are already a large number of cards here, and we have as we indicated earlier a limited amount of time that we can do this today. So I would ask the speakers to come up to the mike. Over on your right, at the front of the building, there is a time—you'll find assistance from a time-keeper who will let you know as you are approaching your one minute left of the three minutes that we would ask you to use.

Question: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a brief question?

Toby Rosenblatt: Sure.

Question: Based on what was said over here, you said you'd treat the comments made here and the ones in writing [unintelligible], but I assume that does not mean that if we stand up and say we represent an organization that we can't also make written comments later?

Toby Rosenblatt: Absolutely . . . sure. Okay, beginning with Milan White, and then Marsha Smith White, and then Charles Minster.

Milan White: Members of the Presidio Trust, I'm Milan White, representing as a member of the Wally Byam Caravan Club International, and also, speaking on behalf of the Family Motorcoach Association, and the Good Sam Club, combined membership, a million people. I'd like to address two items, the planning principle 10, and the Crissy Field Area B district.

The Wally Byam Caravan Club International, and Airstream Owners Association, has submitted a detailed plan for a recreation vehicle park in The Presidio of San Francisco. It is projected that this facility, as

proposed, would generate a net of a million dollars a year in revenue for the Presidio. There are 8-1/2 million RVers who are potential appreciative guests of this historical place. WVCCI requests the Presidio Trust to make provisions for RVers.

Crissy Field, Area B, district land use preferences, recreation and lodging. The area between the commissary and, you have a copy of this, it's building 640, which was the former military language school. The area between those two buildings is one of the possible locations that could be converted for limited recreation vehicle use for recreation and housing. On the occasion of Presidio special events, visitor parking could be made available by not taking reservations in the RV park. Some of your conference attendees may opt to use RV space if it's available for temporary housing. Public transportation and Presidio shuttle will be encouraged.

We feel that the Trust needs to modify your anti-vehicle attitude, because it's discriminatory against people who are driving in from out of the City. I've listed 14 communication items, starting January 7th, from John Garamendi, Deputy Secretary of the Interior, to this current meeting.

If an 18-hole golf course and a film studio are consistent with the Presidio development plans, why not an RV park for that segment of the public? My father was stationed in the Presidio in the 1890's just prior to the Philippine war, the Spanish-American war, and he didn't mention a thing about a golf course. Thank you for your time.

Toby Rosenblatt: Marsha Smith White and then Charles Minster.

Marsha Smith White: My name is Marsha Smith White. I am fortunate enough to live here. I also have the opportunity to work with the residential neighborhoods with a mayors program. I run a community desk which works with a lot of volunteers. And we also put out a local newsletter for our residents.

One of the important components for the PTIP is sustainability. And of course when we talk about sustainability, we're also talking about the human resource of sustainability, and ergo, you're talking about the community. Our human community was affected dramatically last Tuesday. Ironically, it was the United Nations international peace day. The Presidio community today has set up a memorial of music

and slide show, a dove of peace card, yellow ribbons as well as a fund for our firemens' families in New York. It is over at the chapel, just two doors down. If you have time and inclination, it is available to you after the PTIP process.

Everyone here is involved in community. And I am truly thrilled that you are here. Because ultimately we all have the vision of the park, and a wonderful park, at our fingertips. So my caution is to let our voices be strong, our vision secure, and our dialogs long. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Charles Minster, and then Hubert Sidow.

Charles Minster: Good afternoon, Board members, and the public, ladies and gentlemen.

I spoke to the Board last meeting. My name is Charles Minster. I am an employee here at the Trust, have been working at the Presidio since 1986 in the grounds maintenance section. But I speak today as a member of the National Parks and Public Employees Union Laborers, Local #1141. I am an elected member of the negotiating committee, and also the delegate to the central labor council. I'm going to read

here a resolution that was recently passed by the City supervisors unanimously, signed by Mayor Brown on August the 27th.

Whereas the national parks of this country were established to preserve and protect these jewels of nature, and whereas the workers of this country struggled for decades to gain the respect and recognition from the owners of capital; and whereas the long effort by workers to gain union representation and collective bargaining rights were gained by many courageous men and women; and whereas the legislation creating a government corporation, the Presidio Trust, to run and administer the bulk of the former Presidio military installation as a national park is callously denying the rights of workers, and exploiting the natural wealth of the Presidio for monetary gain; and whereas the issue of collective bargaining for U.S. government workers has been established by law for decades, and recognized as productive and essential for the smooth operation of the people's business; now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors in the City and County of San Francisco acknowledge the rights of workers to union representation, and the right to bargain over wages and job conditions with their employers, in the private and governmental sector. And be it further resolved that the Board of

Supervisors urges the Board of Presidio Trust sit down and bargain with employees' acknowledged representative, and hammer out a contract that speaks to the needs of workers and government alike.

I might mention that Mr. Meadows, who is sitting up here at the table, has a contract with the Presidio Trust Board. And the Presidio Trust Board, at the last meeting, was so disingenuous as to say that they were only abiding by the law that is trying to deny us collective bargaining rights. Well, we might labor for our living, but we're not stupid. And we recognize that people like you are the people that dictate the laws as to how they should be written in this country.

And many of the people that sit up on this Board, including Donald Fisher, is a known sweatshop employer around this world, and certainly is not a friend of unions. And on this Board, there's not a single working person. So I don't think you're really concerned about our interests at all. And when you have the right to hire and fire at will, as you're allowing this Board to have, you're terrorizing the workforce that is here. You hold over their heads that hammer that says, you either do what I say, or you're fired.

Now, that's something that people died for in this country to gain, to fight against that kind of abuse. But you people seem to want it at your will.

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is Walter Johnson then Ruth Gravanis and then William Selinger.

Walter Johnson: Good afternoon. Thank you very much for this opportunity of being here. Even found my way here. Glad they had signs out saying public hearing, or I'd probably be over at Oakland by now.

But I'm here to support the laborers' union in their effort for real, basic, collective bargaining. That's what the world is about. That's what the United States is, that the labor movement has that basic right.

And from my understanding, that is not taking place at the present time.

We at the San Francisco Labor Council strongly support the laborers' union. We represent 80,000 members in the City and County of San Francisco. And patience has its boundaries.

And we're hearing reports that the bargaining is not going on, that they're not really having substantive bargaining. So we are going to pursue this in every way we can to make sure that the people here are treated like other people in the City and County of San Francisco that have unions. And that is the responsibility of the Board here, the Presidio, the political world, to make sure that they have this right.

Now, since there seems to be a confusion somewhere along the line, and as you get older, sometimes I even get a little confused. But I looked this up in a book called a dictionary. I looked up the word, "negotiate." Says, to confer with another in order to come to terms or reach an agreement. To arrange or settle by conferring or discussing. Example, negotiate a union contract. To transfer title to ownership and so forth. But the important thing is, what does it mean to sit down and to say, to arrange and settle by conferring or negotiate, and to negotiate a union contract. That is what the world is about. That is what the responsibility of the Presidio is.

And we're going to make sure that that responsibility is fulfilled. We can't have nice talk about the Presidio, what a wonderful organization, what a place it is, and all that, unless we carry forth the basic rights of

the United States of America, and that is, the right to bargaining, the right to be recognized as real human beings, and not just items on a profit-and-loss statement.

So I strongly urge you to get down to business, sit down and negotiate, and bring this to a conclusion. And I'm now getting a sign that I've got 30 seconds left. And it's very hard when you're a labor person to sit down after you've been to a microphone. But I'll behave myself and adhere to the rules and sit down. And I probably even have 10 seconds left. Let's get it down, and make sure that workers are having fair treatment, and recognized as real human beings. Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: As several of you or many of you will recognize, the subject of the last two speakers is not the subject of PTIP or of this meeting. But I do want to indicate that in fact the negotiations are underway; that the union has been invited to come back to the bargaining table; and that the remaining issues that are involved are at that stage, and other issues are currently under review by the Federal Labor Relations Authority. So there is a process underway that is dealing with this.

Ruth Gravanis, and then William Selinger. Ruth, please.

Ruth Gravanis: Good afternoon. I'm Ruth Gravanis. I think you'll hear from a number of speakers about how the general plan amendment is vastly superior to the preferred plan alternative, and I'd like to refresh everyone's memory about one item in the 1994 GMPA.

The GMPA called for reestablishing an ecologically viable self-sustaining tidal marsh, requiring a minimum of human intervention, and providing for the connection of the future restored riparian corridor to the marsh, and allowing for future expansion of the marsh south of Mason Street.

Now we've been told that the PTIP is based on the GMPA, and only deviates where necessary. But I suggest to you that the PTIP deviates in many very, very major ways. And I have to ask how we justify this particular change. Not only deleting any commitment to the expansion of the marsh, but also planning other activities and other developments that would preclude the future development of the expanded marsh.

I'd like to know what "change in circumstances" made it necessary to drop what many, many members of the public feel a commitment has already been made to. Yes, it will be expensive, but we've seen a huge outpouring of support, huge outpouring of resources, monetary, volunteer resources, to phase one. And I ask you, how can we afford not to protect that investment by expanding the marsh? If we do not expand it, hydrologists have told us, we will end up with nothing but an artificially maintained lagoon. It will not achieve the status as an actual self-sustaining tidal marsh without the expansion.

I know that there's been some commitment made to a study. I'm very, very happy to hear that. But I can't imagine what good it is to do a study if we preclude the opportunity to implement this expansion by planning an area with other uses. So I ask you to commit to the tidal marsh expansion, so that all of those people who felt we were promised a self-sustaining tidal marsh don't feel cheated. Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: William Selinger and Joel Ventresca. I would ask all of you to bear in mind, we are in a very tight timetable to get all the speakers in. Please try to hold your applause.

William Selinger: Okay. I'm Bill Selinger. I represent the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, which is a neighborhood association in the Telegraph Hill-North Beach area. We have over 800 members, and among other things, it's been around a long time, and if it hadn't been for the Telegraph Hill Dwellers and some other like-minded people, some of the people who came to this meeting today would have probably driven here on an elevated interstate highway that led all the way from the Embarcadero to the Golden Gate Bridge. We're very proud of that, and we want to have an influence on this group likewise.

We have a little concern about emphasis on educational and cultural programs. I don't see screaming out of the Act a mandate to do that, unless of course it is directly related to the park itself. And I hope that the Board will keep that focus in mind, that the mandate is for a national park, and not for other things.

And one particular comment I'd like to make is that you've had quite a few critics, as you well know. But one Board member responded to a critic by saying, we have a national constituency, which of course is true. It's a national park. But it's also true that the park is in San

Francisco; it's not in Atlanta, and it's not in Akron, Ohio. And as a practical matter, the people who live there can't really come here and give their input to you in any regular way.

So we feel as citizens of San Francisco that we do represent a national constituency in a certain way, and we hope you will listen to us with that in mind. We plan to make a thorough comment to you with the approval of our Board of Directors before the end of your comment period, and hope you will consider it very carefully.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Joel Ventresca, and then Margo Park, and then Mike Van Dyke.

Joel Ventresca: Joel Ventresca. I'm chair of Preserve the Presidio Campaign, which has monitored the Presidio planning process for seven years.

The pro-development draft plan will lead to the first conversion of a national park into a business park. This privatization draft plan is a blueprint for new, inappropriate commercial development, which is unprecedented in the national park system. A free enterprise, profit-

making venture approach won't protect the park. It will harm the park.

The Trust recommended draft plan will allow 2.2 million square feet of new construction, which is equivalent to more than four Transamerica buildings; 1.9 million square feet of demolition in the Trust-controlled area; 6.189 million square feet of building space, and buildout in 2020 in Area B alone, which is an increase of 229,000 square feet over existing square footage today; 1,650 housing units, which will include hundreds of new, larger, denser, apartment-sized residential units; 3,720 permanent residents; 3,190 employees. These figures are based on Table 1 in the EIS on page 2020--page 20 and 21, with the Lucas development included. Three times more new construction will be permitted than the 1994 GMPA. This plan will allow one million square feet of more built space than under the 1994 GMPA at buildout.

Market forces seeking profits, natural resources and public subsidies are exploiting and plundering an irreplaceable, priceless, scenic and historic park area. Muir and Thoreau helped establish the national park system to protect places from the ravages of development. To

take lands off the market forever, and to ensure public control. The Presidio Trust is moving in the opposite direction in all three areas.

Toby Rosenblatt: Margo Perk.

Margo Perk: I am Margo Perk, and I am a member of NAP, and I sit on the Board of Directors of Pacific Heights Residents Association. But I'm speaking for myself today.

I think that PTIP is one of the most confusing public documents I've had to read. The plan is not a plan at all. It's a general policy statement, because it says there will be future planning efforts. Then where is it written in the document what the process would be, or what would be the subjects of future planning and public participation?

As an example, lodging. PTIP defines lodging as overnight accommodations for visitors ranging from facilities close to major visitor destinations, to bed-and-breakfast hostels, and accommodations for conference attendees. First, the Trust must demonstrate these various needs, and their specific size and locations. Secondly, the addition from the GMPA from lodging in the Crissy Field area for

example is brand new to me. That's a big change. And really smells bad.

For example, I have three communications of conversations between the Trust and a developer obtained from the public file of letters done during the PTIP process in the Trust office. As early as September 16th, 1999, that's even before the PTIP process began, there is a communication from Western Pacific Properties to Mr. Meadows regarding the prospect of developing a world class lodge at Crissy Field comparable to the Inn at Spanish Bay, he said.

I'm going to skip some. In a final letter dated June of 2000, and again, it's before the PTIP, or simultaneous with the beginning of PTIP, that really stinks. And the developer writes, and I quote: "We understand from you that the Trust wishes to engage in a pre-approved EIS, studying the use, concepts and utilization of the balance of Crissy Field. If I understand you correctly, this is the best approach given your recent experience with Letterman Digital Arts." In other words, a lot of debate, and trying to close the process of really open comment.

Besides my own thinking that since the Presidio is in the middle of San Francisco, and a tourist hotel is inappropriate anywhere in the Presidio, I will go back to my original concern regarding the process for approval of specific uses in this document. How will we know, the citizens, when a proposal such as this arrives on your desk? Since it pretty clearly implies that it will be pre-approved. I'll stop. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: I will plead with you one more time: please hold your applause. You're just adding to the timetable.

Female Voice: You're adding the time. Because the next speaker is coming up, and we have time to applaud in between.

Toby Rosenblatt: Your attitude speaks for itself. All right, to the last speaker, the one piece I'd comment on in process is that because there are letters of communication sent to the Trust, those should not be interpreted as views of the Trust's Executive Director or the Board. Those are matters of public record, but they don't represent the PTIP plan or the intention of PTIP, the plan, or the Trust.

Mike Van Dyke, Brett Altshuler and Bill Hough.

Mike Van Dyke: Hi, I'm Mike Van Dyke, and I'm a member. I actually live out here. And I really want to thank you first for putting all the time and effort with this out here. And what needs to be done, it's very hard to sit up on a board and hear those things. But you guys have really done a great job, and so has the Trust. And I'm glad we have a chance here to talk about the plan and what the future is. And this diversity is extremely important, to hear what the opinions are.

And living out here is one of the best places I've lived in my life, and I've really enjoyed that. And I want to see that diversity be part of the future. And I really thank you for keeping the housing the same, and letting people keep living out here, and keep the numbers the same.

I also want to encourage you in the future to keep the economic diversity there. So we can have people who can afford to live out here on all socioeconomic planes, not just the upper economic planes. It's expensive to live in San Francisco, and I think this place, when you have community involvement like I am involved with the community. I'm the mayor of my road, and also, part of the community activities

team, and involved with that. It really adds a lot of value. And there's people who live out here and don't work out here either, and those people who are involved with the community that are out here should be encouraged to stay involved, instead of being moved off as more employees come out here who might not be involved.

I just want to let you know about the future, and how I see it coming. And I want those people to be able to be part of San Francisco, and part of this community, and be able to be with it, without being forced out in the future, and treating them in a way that's equitable to people who work out here too. I know it's something you have in your scheme right now to do that. And I also really thank you for putting the time and effort in. It's been a lot of time and a lot of effort, and a long process I've been watching you go through. And thanks a lot for doing that.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Fred Altshuler: Good afternoon. I'm Fred Altshuler. I'm a board member of the Planning Association for the Richmond, and speaking on behalf of the board. PAR, as I'm sure most people here know, is the representative

of the Richmond district south of the Presidio. We have 1,800 households as dues-paying members, and we're the largest neighborhood group in the City.

I want to primarily address issues concerning the Public Health Service Hospital. But first, I'd like to comment on a couple of things that Ms. Murphy and Ms. Gittleman said at the outset.

First, we share somewhat the frustrations that another speaker has mentioned about the generality of the PTIP. It's not an implementation plan; it's something else. And particularly, I was pleased to hear Ms. Murphy reiterate that there will be public input at later phases of this process. We think that's very important, but we would like you to specify what kind of public input there will be at the various phases, so we know how to deal with these future issues as they come up. I was also pleased to hear Ms. Murphy say that you are open to discussion of issues such as no net loss of housing, and the jobs-housing balance. I think those things should be vetted, and I think we will be addressing those assumptions, and I hope you're open to consideration of them.

Turning to the Public Health Service Hospital, again, the description in the PTIP reflects this generality. It says, “educational, institutional or conference facilities and/or housing.” And that kind of description has been difficult to deal with. But I’d like to address a couple of specifics.

First, I think there is a specific reference to the possibility of a private school. And PAR is opposed to that alternative. A private school, we feel, as another speaker who addressed education indicated, is not conducive to the mission of the park. There would be increased vehicular use affecting the neighborhoods. It’s unlikely to produce as much revenue. And, we think, is not suited to the site or the mission of the Trust and the Presidio.

And second, the alternative of conference facilities. There are to be conference facilities in Fort Scott. I think this will be duplicative as we understand it. And like the possibility of a private school, it would have the intense kind of uses that would be, we think, incompatible with the neighborhood. Something like housing, we think, would be much more suitable, and would be, would fulfill a need that the park

may legitimately have. I see my time is just about up, so thank you very much.

Board Member: I'd like to say one thing. I'm rather impressed by the urging on us that we be quite specific, or more specific than we have been, with respect to the processes that will attend the future decisions under what is more general than a specific plan. And I know that that's shared by a number of people on this Board. And I think we're going to have to work hard on this issue.

Toby Rosenblatt: Next speaker, Bill Hough. Julie Cheever after him, and then Totton Heffelfinger.

Bill Hough: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Hough. I brought these photographs with me to remind us why we are all here today.

This is a photo of former Congressman Phil Burton, who stands in the Fort Mason meadow. He sponsored the legislation that created the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. He ensured that the Presidio would become part of the park when it became excess to the needs of the Army. He ensured that the development of the Presidio would be

kept at a minimum until it became a park. Congressman Burton wanted to provide parks for people. In his view, the wealthy had their own parks.

The second photo shows William Penn Mott, Jr., who served as the Director of the National Parks System under President Ronald Reagan, shaking hands with the president at the White House. As you know, the Presidio Trust acknowledges Mr. Mott's role in directing the GMPA by mandating that a Visitors' Center be named in his honor.

On August 15th, I attended the presentation on PTIP at the San Francisco Urban Planning and Research Association. One of the presenters represented Sasaki Associates, a major consultant for PTIP. He said that in preparing the new plan, he had visited several urban parks to learn how better to tell the Presidio story. After the presentation I asked him how many of the parks that he had visited had national cemeteries. He said he didn't know. What is unique about the Presidio, I believe, is not the historic buildings or the spectacular setting, but that it was a military post, guarding the Golden Gate, now transformed into a national park. Isn't this story of the Presidio, of those men and women, just buried a few hundred yards to the west of

us, who gave their life for our country, for our democracy, for our freedom. The story of the Presidio is not General McDowell's tombstone, or Pershing, or Stillwell Hull. It's Bull Run. It's [Bella] Woods. It's the Burma Road. Didn't the Park Service get it right in 1994 when it proclaimed after four years of public hearing that the Presidio's new role symbolizes the swords into plowshares concept, that on a site of incomparable beauty, we can link our military past with a future full of promise and possibility?

One of the most influential persons in crafting that vision was Mr. Mott. He said the Presidio's location and facilities are such that we have to look at it from a bigger point of view than just a national park. It can be, and should be, a global resource, because there is no place quite like it. Mr. Mott is featured in the GMPA. He, and his vision, are missing in your preferred draft alternative. In your plan, the world, global, does not even appear. Don't shrink-wrap the vision of William Penn Mott, Jr., in a Visitors' Center. Don't shrink-wrap the historic role of the Presidio as the guardian of the Golden Gate in museums and entertainment. We have plenty of entertainment. We need solutions. Implement the GMPA, and let the Presidio live. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Julie Cheever, and then Totton Heffelfinger, and then Diane Herman.

Julie Cheever: My name is Julie Cheever. I am a member of the Planning Association for the Richmond, and a member of the Park committee that's drafting the organization's written comment.

We want to thank the Board members for being here to listen in person to these comments from the public. I would like to add a couple of specific points to those from PAR that were already mentioned. These are positions that PAR has taken, and they will be discussed in more detail in PAR's forthcoming written comment.

On the subject of tenant selection, we think that priority should be given to tenants with a mission or a business purpose related to Presidio themes, as opposed to tenants whose only contribution would be financial. We advocate that the proposed plan should state that once tenant candidates are found to meet minimum financial standards for a given building or site, priority should then be given to candidates with a mission or business purpose related to Park themes.

On the related issue of programming, we think the Trust should rely more on tenants to deliver public programming, rather than taking over the delivery of most programs, or taking over organizing the delivery of most programs. This would flow from the Trust giving priorities to tenants that support a park theme. We think the public should be strongly involved in deciding what museums, environmental, other projects, and other major programs would be provided through the Trust. Museums should be appropriately sized and Presidio related, such as a museum of moderate size related to Presidio or Western history.

On the subject of housing, PAR believes that the construction of new housing structures is inappropriate for a national park. We advocate that the plan should be revised to state that instead of building new housing structures, the Trust should concentrate on renovating and subdividing existing buildings for housing. We do not support a numerical goal or quota of 1,650 units for housing. We note that the job side of the jobs-housing equation is brought into question by some other positions that we and other groups are taking. And we also note that some of the existing housing units are in fact group quarters that might more appropriately be categorized as lodging.

Finally on the subject of lodging, we advocate that there should be no general tourist lodging, such as large hotels, at the Presidio. We believe that tourist hotels would increase traffic and intrude on the environment and mission of the Presidio. And we also think that tourists staying in beautiful hotels in the Presidio would not necessarily spend most of their time at the Presidio as opposed to elsewhere in San Francisco and the Bay Area. We support a reasonable amount of configuration of existing buildings for youth and elder hostels and bed and breakfasts. And we think accommodations should be Presidio-related, such as facilities for people attending conferences at Fort Scott. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Mr. Heffelfinger, and then Diane Herman, and then Bill Hinslen.

Totton Heffelfinger: Mr. Chairman and members of this Board, thank you for the opportunity of addressing some concerns to you. My name is Totton Heffelfinger. As a resident of San Francisco, I'm a frequent visitor by foot and by bicycle to the Crissy Field area.

As a wetland protection volunteer for the Sierra Club, I have worked for over 15 years to protect and restore the diminishing wetlands around the Bay. It was truly exciting to me when the decision was made to restore tidal marsh at Crissy Field, something that was touted far and wide, way beyond San Francisco's boundaries, as a great experiment in tidal marsh restoration, much needed since San Francisco has very little.

But the decision to initially restore under 18 acres, as opposed to the minimum 30 acres recommended by the hydrologists has resulted in threats to the marsh restoration that profoundly concerned me. All of us who are frequent visitors to the area planned for tidal marsh have witnessed the accumulation of sand choking the lagoon entrance, and the consequent threat to the success and the sustainability of marsh restoration. I believe that there is no disagreement about the need to either expand the aquatic area, or to engage in a regular and expensive effort to remove sand from the entrance to the lagoon, what is now the lagoon and what we hope will become the marsh if it's treated properly.

In the meantime, the areas in which expansion may occur that should be kept free of other development, especially urban type development, lodges, cafes, this sort of thing. To allow the development of urban facilities along Mason Street would be inconsistent with the promise of the General Management Plan to provide a self-sustaining tidal marsh, a minimum of human intervention, the future expansion of the marsh south of Mason Street, and a connection to a restore riparian area.

So we hope that your priorities will clearly express the need for the studies, and to get them done, and to maintain the areas in which the marsh can be restored to make it a sustaining jewel of the park, which it can be. Thank you.

Diane Herman: Good afternoon. I'm Diane Herman. I'm president of the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association, and I'm speaking on its behalf this afternoon.

Last month I stated at the GGNRA Advisory Commission that we feel the Presidio Trust should be commended for making the preservation and presentation of the Presidio's rich history cornerstones of the

Presidio Trust planning policy. And the Presidio Trust should also be commended for including historical material, including text and wonderful illustrations, in the draft PTIP, which will do nothing but raise the consciousness of the public about the Presidio's history. In light of recent events, I think those comments bear repeating here, and perhaps some expansion. The enemies of our country may take lives, they may destroy property, but they can't destroy our heritage or take away our tradition.

But just as we have the power to defend our heritage, so do we have the responsibility to preserve it. So we encourage the Presidio Trust to exercise the will to preserve and present the history of the Presidio in the face of economic and political pressures that don't share these values.

We're also encouraged by the remarks today by Director Heyman and Director Murphy regarding the future planning processes. We had commented at the GGNRA Advisory Commission that we were very concerned about the inadequacy of public involvement and the lack of consultation with interested preservation groups in the future planning processes.

Because of the generalities of the land use plan that the PTIP actually is, it's critical that there be active participation of the public and consultations with these groups. We've been told by staff that the EIS process will be the process for public involvement, but we believe that the Section 106 process should be included in that public involvement, so that there is this greater participation and better notice to the public as to what the Trust intends for future development.

And, finally, we are concerned about several of the guidelines for the development, particularly in the main post area, and other sensitive historic areas, and we will be presenting our written comments later in your comment period. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Bill Henslin, Don Green, Johanna Wald.

Bill Henslin: Good afternoon. I'm Bill Henslin, a resident of the upper Fillmore Neighborhood, and a co-founder of Friends of the Presidio National Park dot org.

The California Institute of Technology's motto is: the truth shall make you free. In that spirit, I'd like to address four points of truth regarding Presidio finances. I'll have detailed handouts available after the meeting.

First, throughout this scoping process, you've claimed that the 1994 General Management Plan, the GMPA, couldn't make ends meet by 2013. Now the draft PTIP EIS, on page 374, tells us that the main reason for this was your own decision to tear down the Baker Beach apartments nine years earlier under GMPA than under the other PTIP alternatives. This eliminated nine years' worth of a \$12 million annual revenue stream, putting the GMPA \$108 million behind the other alternatives by 2013. You've now presented a financially viable GMPA 2000 alternative in the draft EIS, but you haven't yet made that your preferred alternative.

Second, several local reporters still seem to believe that making ends meet by 2013 will be a daunting task for the Trust. But the spreadsheets in appendix J of the EIS tell a far more encouraging story. Under the GMPA 2000 plan, you say that you will need \$49.3 million in annual revenue by 2013. But the spreadsheets project that

you'll make more than that as soon as 2003, ten years ahead of schedule. In 2002, you'll make \$56 million. In 2004, \$61 million. And you'll make more than \$50 million every year from 2003 on, not including more than \$200 million you'll receive from Congress in appropriations between now and 2013.

Third point, the EIS says, on page 30, that the GMPA 2000 is viable with 73 percent of your nonresidential space rented at an average of \$9 per square foot per year, which is well below what you consider market rate. The GMPA 2000 assumes \$5 million in rent from Lucas. That's ground rent. But if Lucas did not proceed, you could more than make up for the \$5 million by charging just 11-1/4 instead of 9 for your other space. You'd still be well below market, so your tenants would get a break, and you'd have ample flexibility.

Fourth, extrapolation from the GMPA 2000 shows that you can finish all 485 million in capital improvements by 2040 or even 2030 if you would phase the demolition of Baker Beach appropriately, and you'd accomplish all this while setting asides tens or even hundreds of millions in reserves.

Given all this, what could possibly be wrong with staying on track with the GMPA, and creating a national park in which we all might find renewal, perspective, and even some lasting solutions to our very real environmental, social and cultural problems.

Toby Rosenblatt: Don Green.

Donald Green: Good afternoon. I'm Donald Green with the Sierra Club, as well as a resident in the neighborhood. An add-on to what Bill Henslin just said. In your plans, your proposed plan runs at \$75 million a year revenue and expense in the year 2020. The GMPA runs at \$50 million a year for revenues and expense. That's a 50 percent increase over the GMPA. If the GMPA is feasible at \$50 million, there's no reason to go to \$75 million either in expenses or receipts.

With regard to the planning process, which concerns me very much, about 2-1/2 to 3 million square feet is reserved for what you call cultural, educational, office, lodging and conference center. As I understand what you said up to now, both in documents and in person, none of that, none of that will be reviewed by the public. What you have said is, any new construction will be reviewed by the public.

That's 700,000 square feet. I'm concerned about the up to 3 million square feet that you're going to go ahead and rehabilitate and lease out for whatever use you see fit, between lodging, conference, museums, et cetera. I think that's wrong.

One of the things we presented earlier, which I will say again, it does not make sense to come to the public with an EIS and a plan for Crissy Field without telling us with respect to lodging, housing, conference, et cetera, what other options there are in the Presidio. We did that with Letterman, and we got Lucas, before we knew what else you were going to do. So I would ask you please to complete your housing plan for the park. I think what you have now is grossly deficient. The GMPA can easily get us 11 or 1,200 units, compared to your 1,600 units, after tearing down the 500-600 units that are supposed to come down. We don't need new construction.

So you should have these park-wide plans on housing, lodging, conference center, museums, et cetera, available before you start leasing out space for any one of those and present them to the public. You should also have them available before you start asking the public what to do in specific areas, or else we're back where we were before.

With respect to Letterman, the finances are clear. You don't need that \$5 million a year clearly. You could easily now in the next PTIP, in the next EIS, including the no-build option, which you rejected out of hand in your original EIS, and which we said at the time was improper. We've had a significant official correspondence on this. Since we don't need the Letterman project, we could have open space. So I would urge you to commit to a no-build option, even if it costs the Trust a few dollars to buy out that contract, which it might, you're going to have plenty of money. Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: Johanna Wald, Jennifer Gridley, and Redmond Kernan.

Johanna Wald: Good afternoon. My name is Johanna Wald. I'm with the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), here in San Francisco.

I want to begin by thanking you all for extending the comment period on the PTIP documents, and also, for reducing the amount of development that is included in your proposed plan. Thank you, in other words, for hearing the public. I along with others am gratified

by your express commitment today to continue hearing us. And as you heard, you will continue hearing from us.

The issue that I want to address this afternoon includes the nature of the plan that you have proposed, and specifically, its very general nature. The people that I have been working with in connection with Presidio issues have tried to be sensitive to what we are told is your need for flexibility. The draft PTIP plan, however, goes beyond flexibility. It imposes no real limits on what you or your successors can do. Its planning principles, its concepts, its guidelines, are extremely general, as you have heard this afternoon, and as you yourselves have conceded.

In essence the preferred plan gives a blank check to whoever happens to be on your Board at any given time. I would urge you to rethink this approach. I and I believe the public want the Presidio Trust to provide us with a roadmap for the Presidio's future, not just how you're going to make future decisions, but with a plan that will allow us to hold you and your successors accountable for your actions, with a plan that imposes some real limits on what you can and cannot do.

This is not because we do or do not trust you. Trust has nothing to do with it. This is because we are talking about a national park. Because it's a park, its owners, the public, are entitled to know what you, its trustees, expect it to look like in 2013. If you don't tell us in objective, measurable terms what you're trying to do, how will we evaluate your stewardship in 2013? How will we determine whether or not you're making progress toward your goals?

In other words, your plan has many pages, but it provides no answers. It might be appropriate for the City of San Francisco, but I submit to you it is not appropriate for any unit of the national park system including the Presidio. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Jennifer Gridley, Redmond Kernan.

Jennifer Gridley: Good afternoon. I am Jennifer Gridley, and I am here today for the Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning. Can you hear me?

A lot of what I have to say will underscore what others have said, so I'll try to be brief. I wanted to just thank you for the extension on the comment period. It meant a lot to us, who care very deeply about this

park and the future of the park to have a little bit more time to assemble our thoughts.

What I'm going to say is basically a summary of what will be written in further detail in our written submittal to you later. I'm going to talk about process, new construction, programs and tenant selection.

We would request that the Trust have a proposed plan that is more specific, particularly in planning districts as they relate to the Presidio as a whole; and that there be a process identified by which the public can participate in the future actions regarding the development of these districts.

We would also request that there be no new replacement construction for housing. That housing be reconfigured and retained for as long as necessary to ensure financial self-sufficiency. And the establishment of an appropriate financial reserve. Once its usefulness has been exhausted, or for no longer than 30 years, where it should be removed and not replaced elsewhere in the park.

The Trust, this is about programs, the Trust has proposed what has been described as a robust budget for programs, implemented by the Trust itself, not through the tenants. And we requested a public planning process be established to evaluate those proposed programs, to ensure that they are related to Presidio issues.

And finally, regarding tenant selection, we support a tenant selection criteria which, while recognizing the need for financial sound tenants, does not place a premium on financial considerations above their contributions to the park programs. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Red Kernan. Herb Elliott.

Herb Elliott: Hi, my name is Herb Elliott. I'm a director of the Planning Association of the Richmond, and I'd like to share with you the preliminary thought that the Board has about the Wherry housing situation.

In designating the Presidio as a national park, the Congress stated that one of the principal objectives was to preserve and restore the areas of natural landscape and the scenic beauty within the Presidio. The

Presidio's western hillside and coastal prairie region with its natural terrain and distinctive features, and its unique habitat, is among the largest and most diverse of the natural scenic areas.

The nonhistoric and deteriorating Wherry housing at Baker Beach housing complex is unsightly and poorly planned intrusion into the key areas of the native habitat and open space that was intended for this park. For this reason, the GMPA recognized that returning the grassland area in the western hillside portion of the Presidio now occupied by the Wherry housing to open space within a 10-year period was a high priority.

PAR believes that the Wherry housing complex should be removed at the earliest possible moment, to facilitate a program of orderly restoration of native habitat on the Wherry site, and to avoid the continuing temptation to sacrifice pragmatic goals to financial considerations. PAR believes that the Wherry housing structure should be removed in increments, corresponding to the creation of any additional housing in the Presidio, which we have indicated would be preferably through the reconfiguration of existing buildings, and not new construction. The removal should occur in reasonable

increments, such as one-third, one-third, one-third, corresponding to the number of reconfigured housing units as they become available for leasing. Their demolition should not be delayed to some unspecified future time. And if for some reason this approach does not result in a timely removal of the Wherry units, we believe that the absolute maximum time limit should be established and set as one third by 2013, one third in the following two decades, with the outside maximum decade in 2033.

And I will tell you, as a director, I voted against that last provision. I personally believe that these should come down in no less than 10 years. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Go ahead, please.

Arthur Feinstein: Board members, I'm Arthur Feinstein. I'm the Executive Director of the Golden Gate Audubon Society, and as such, I imagine you can imagine why I'm here. We are talking about a national park after all. And what distinguishes our national parks but their natural resources? Even our national recreation areas such as GGNRA are known for their natural resources. The Presidio also.

No plan is perfect. The GMPA was not perfect in terms of dealing with the natural resources, and we also fear that PTIP is not perfect in dealing with our natural resources. Pity the poor wetlands. I've been working along with Totton Heffelfinger and Ruth Gravanis on wetlands for 15 or 20 years. And they're always the things that the property owners and the wise-use movement, and you all know who they are, attack first. And that's why we've lost over 50 percent of our nation's wetlands, over 80 percent in the Bay Area.

How surprising then to find that the Presidio Trust is not moving strongly forward in the other direction, and reassuring us that we are going to restore our Crissy Field wetland. We worked so hard, when the GMPA was being created, brought out hundreds and hundreds of people to support--and I'm sure you remember that--to support the creation of a Crissy Field wetland, one that requires 30 acres of size.

We didn't get it, and we're losing our wetland. You have the choice, and you have the chance, to make sure we have a sustaining and fruitful wetland. Imagine all those bed and breakfasts and hotels we're going to bring down to Crissy Field, and they're going to look at a

little puddle. In a little while you'll suddenly find that you don't have people coming. Because what's the joy of having a disaster rather than a completed and a fruitful wetland.

So one of the things I really urge you to do is to change that element of the PTIP and bring back Crissy Field wetland restoration, and make sure that comports with the Tennessee Hollow restoration also.

On the plus side, I want to thank you very much for your work on restoring California quail. As you might know the City of San Francisco has endorsed our proposal to bring California quail back to San Francisco. In 1930, we had maybe 1,400 quail in Golden Gate Park alone, probably thousands in the Presidio. Now there are maybe 30 in the Presidio, 12 in Golden Gate Park. They're just about gone from San Francisco. They're our State bird. Now they're our City bird. We're going to try to bring them back. We've been working with your staff to do so. We've been doing some restoration projects in the Presidio. Your staff helped fund a restoration plan that we had professional biological consultants prepare. We'll be submitting that to you this week or the week after.

We hope that you will take that and incorporate it into the PTIP to bring back the quail to San Francisco, and make the Presidio just that much more enjoyable for everybody. We have a real chance to do that, and as I said, your staff has been very helpful. So we'd like to thank you for that. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Next speaker is Michael Alexander, then Doug Kern, then Beverly McAllister.

Michael Alexander: Good afternoon, Directors. I'm confining my comments today only on Presidio's open space, and details will follow.

American architecture just after World War II was awful. Our misuse of land was much worse. The army was not immune. Its base at the Golden Gate of three compact living and working areas separated and surrounded by continuous bands of open space was transformed. The Presidio became an inefficient suburban sprawl of scattered housing areas dependent on private autos and cheap fuel.

The GMPA partially corrected this by recommending the removal of the nonhistoric Wherry housing and by restoring Tennessee Hollow.

The draft plan incorporates those good decade-old ideas, and they added 97 acres of open space. But the draft plan fails to incorporate what we've learned since. According to studies by San Francisco State University biologist and the BMP consultant, Mike Vasey, nonhistoric suburban sprawl has so fragmented the Presidio's biologically valuable open space that over time its species will continue to go extinct. That threat will trigger further actions under the Endangered Species Act.

We can do better. Now is the time, as we create our 20-year plan. The final plan should create continuous bands of biologically valuable open space, beginning with a fully functioning expanded Crissy Field tidal marsh, extending up the restored Tennessee Hollow, across the unfragmented southern hills, and along the coastal bluffs.

This natural vision has elements of the draft plan and the resource consolidation alternative. It will create sustainable open space, and benefit a dozen declining or threatened bird species, including the California quail, many plant and insect species, and the gray fox and other mammals. This natural vision can be achieved over time, while

maintaining a full housing stock and respecting the National Historic Landmark District.

The draft plan does very well in demonstrating cultural sustainability. It can do better with natural sustainability. We can build on our strengths of environmental volunteers, the Golden Gate National Parks Association, the Gordon Moore Foundation, and other philanthropies. With the Presidio's favorite location, we can prepare the next generation to better understand and protect the earth. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Doug Kern? I'm sorry, Bill?

Bill Reilly: Let me ask one question. I think that vision is very enticing in many respects. It obviously has implications for remaining development. What would you do about that? Would you concentrate development in other areas that are suitable for add-on housing and development?

Michael Alexander: Yes. In areas that are already built, and to concentrate on the three already-built areas of the Presidio, so that you have a land use that is, that respects the historic land use of the Presidio, with three villages if you like, spaced along the northern bluffs. They can be connected

with a single transportation line in a very efficient manner, and providing a vast swath of open space to the south, and with corridors separating those concentrated living and working areas, so that they don't just blend together into a sprawl.

Bill Reilly: Thank you. Very thoughtful planning concept. Thank you, Toby.

Doug Kern: Hello. My name is Doug Kern. I'm Executive Director of the Urban Watershed Project, a nonprofit group working with the Trust on Tennessee Hollow. I'm also a community member of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board.

Let me say, I want to commend the Trust on a lot of the good words that are in the document with respect to Tennessee Hollow. I'd like to see you take it a little bit further. There are elements where the language says, we may do this and we may do that. I'd like to encourage you to actually commit to what you're willing to do, particularly with respect to the area around Doyle Drive.

You've heard other commenters remark on the wetlands expansion. This is an area right around Doyle Drive where you have an

opportunity to really be in the driver's seat with respect to Doyle Drive planning and the Crissy Field marsh expansion. So I want to encourage you to put additional resources where you can in the biological and natural resource planning staff, and get in the driver's seat on Doyle Drive as well.

With respect to the remediation, it's my perception that there are areas within the plan that their land-use changes. We in the Restoration Advisory Board have been working very closely with Trust staff for now a couple of years, and it appears that we need to have further conversations with Trust staff, with respect to land use. We've been advocating for certain cleanups at certain sites, and now there appear to be changes, and perhaps we could get some clarification with staff at the appropriate time. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. The next speaker is Beverly McAllister, and then we will take a very short break.

Beverly McAllister: My name is Beverly J. McAllister. I'm a board member of the Pacific Heights Residents Association.

The Presidio Trust Board has the power to decide the Presidio's future.

The PTIP draft alternative often states that the source of this power comes from the Presidio Trust Act of 1996. The companies of several of the current board members supported the Presidio Trust Act, the power of which they now command. But what this Board has obtained in power it falls short of in glory. For it is not glorious to state in your draft plan that it was developed in close consultation with the public.

What kind of close consultation are you referring to, when the overwhelming majority of the public, during the November scoping process, expressed its preference to keep the General Management Plan, and rejected the Board's early formulation of what is now known as the draft alternative.

Nor is it glorious to state, in your draft document, that the National Park Service, has and will continue to cooperate with the Presidio Trust. How could the Presidio Trust have been cooperating with the National Park Service when in order to preserve this resource, the National Park Service had to write 30 pages of objections after having been presented with an earlier version of what is now known as the draft alternative? How in the future do you expect the National Park

Service will be able to cooperate with your draft plan, when this draft says that it may have an adverse impact on the Presidio's Natural Historic Landmark District, which the National Park Service is bound to protect? In addition, how can the National Park Service be expected to cooperate with the draft plan if it weakens the National Park Service's responsibility to be the primary provider of public interpretative services, visitor orientations and educational programs on all lands throughout the park?

Members of this Board will soon face possible replacement. The Presidio deserves a clearly defined process, describing how the broader public can influence, not merely be informed of, the kinds of programs, tenants, and limited development this place deserves.

The vision and mission of the General Management Plan, to be a global center, dedicated to addressing the world's most political, environmental, social and cultural problems, is not evident in PTIP. Many of us were aware of the loss of this vision, and since the events of last Tuesday, we are most painfully aware. The General Management Plan offers us a mission, and a clear plan, which was substantially influenced by the public over a four-year period from

thousands of people throughout the Bay Area. We request you keep this vision, this mission and this plan. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: We will take a very short break, and when we return, the next speaker will be Randy Zebell, followed by David Luth followed by Judith-- there is no last name on that card.

[Brief recess]

Randy Zebell: Good afternoon. My name is Randy Zebell. I'm President of the local chapter of the California Native Plant Society. I'm here this afternoon to give you our perspective and our position on the PTIP process. First of all, we support the expansion, as other people have mentioned today, of the Presidio marsh system to the extent needed to establish full Golden Gate tidal range, and perennial tidal flows. We'd like to see stronger language in PTIP committing the Trust to expansion of these wetlands.

We also support the restoration of the creeks and riparian habitat of the Tennessee Hollow area, including the removal of structures, a ballfield and landfill, as needed. We'd also like to see stronger language in

PTIP as well that would assure the restoration of an ecologically functional Tennessee Hollow, and connection to the Presidio marsh system. We also urge you to reject any of the designs for the reconfiguration of Doyle Drive that would interfere with this possible Tennessee Hollow restoration, and that may interfere with its connection to those expanded wetlands.

We would also encourage the phased removal of the Wherry housing on a timetable that is consistent with the Fish and Wildlife Service's endangered species recovery plan for a rare plant in that area, *lessinga germanorum*. We want to assure its recovery.

We also support the removal of non-historic structures, east and west Washington and Quarry Road, as necessary to allow the protection and restoration of the serpentine grassland communities in that area. We'd like to see connectivity and expansion of the serpentine habitats so that there is a chance of survival for this especially rich endangered species habitat.

And lastly, I'd just like to mention briefly the Public Health Service Hospital. In the Vegetation Management Plan it shows a significant

sensitive habitat in this area, and we want to assure that this habitat isn't converted to landscaping. And we urge that native habitat be given priority over ornamental landscaping whenever possible. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. David Luth.

David Luth: Hello, my name is David Luth, and I'm a resident of the Richmond district.

The PTIP has strived to balance definitions and constraints, a roadmap as it were, with the flexibility to build and support the Presidio going forward in the future. However, I believe that they failed much too far to the side of flexibility, and created significant fear in the community with their lack of definition. I think a couple of key areas that I'd like to address today related to that are in areas one and two, the main post and Crissy Field, the total lack of definition of retail and lodging.

I don't think anybody in the City would like to see another city-like neighborhood with large hotels and large retail in the Presidio, yet that's not specifically excluded. So I think there is significant fear,

and a lack of support, as opposed to support, created by that lack of definition.

Also, the totally wishy-washy lack of commitment to the tidal marsh expansion as has been addressed before is another area where that lack of definition has created more fear and much less support.

The other area that I think I would like to address is the public health and services area, area five. From my perspective there is no plan in the plan for that area. There really is no definition. If there are real and viable proposals for that area, they should have been made public by now. There have been plenty of years gone by with that unoccupied and available. Without a viable alternative that meets the significant constraints of the Lobos Creek impact, and the environmental impacts out in that area, which is the prime area for habitat restoration, I think that the plan should accommodate or prefer removal and restoration to a total natural habitat in that area, because it is next to the key restoration area for the Presidio.

I think those are the two key areas that I find the lack of definition to really destroy the plan. Not, the whole plan isn't necessarily that bad.

The Fort Scott area is a decent example of a clear concept, a reasonable definition, of how you propose to improve and support the Presidio in the future. But there definitely are areas that are lacking. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Next speaker is Judith--can we have your last name, please?

Judith Hunt: Yes, my name is Judith S. Hunt. Please use the "S" because there used to be four of us in the phone book.

Toby Rosenblatt: Could you one more time, the last name is?

Judith Hunt: Hunt, H-u-n-t.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Judith Hunt: I want to say that I have found these meetings very helpful. Because some times I get ideas from other people, and I hope you all listen, because you might pick up some ideas from various and sundry here. And I'm going to send in written comment, and I would urge everyone here to do the same, because I think one of my comments that I sent

when I was leaving the country, and I mailed it from the airport, took hold. I am the only one I heard to suggest that the Wherry housing be used for U.S. medical students, and for those who go to San Francisco State. In the 1950's I belonged to an organization that sought housing at San Francisco State around there for Oriental students, and we couldn't find it. And I'm sure that there's probably still a housing problem.

I would like to adhere to the Telegraph Hill Tenants' Association that we are not just addressing a local problem, but it's a national thing. National parks belong to the entire country, and there's a great hot middle western part of the country that would probably love to come and spend some time in foggy San Francisco's in July and August, and in the winter get away from the snows.

And I think you should address it not as a business location but as a park. And I would suggest, I suggested this when I went to all the national park hearings, that they have camp parking. They told me that they would only have group parking, and I said why not family tent parking? I think my daughter got her moral training by going camping with us, where she learned to respect other people's terrain.

And the park people said, it's too cold. I don't know if they've ever been up to Lake Tinea.

Also I would like to adhere to the gentleman who suggested that golf be removed. Turn the golf course back to the natural habitat. It would be a lot easier than removing all the cement from Wherry housing. And Wherry housing, I'm sure, will be needed for a long time.

Speaking for the nation, I think it's a disgrace that San Francisco has so many homeless people on the streets who probably come from other places. I crossed the country by train ten years ago, and men were riding the rods to get West, even then housing was a problem in the cold climates. And the homeless have come out here just for the climate, and we have how many empty buildings in the Presidio while there are homeless on the streets. They opened some of those buildings when we had the Loma Prieta quake, and the people from the Marina came and lived there for a time. But they wouldn't let homeless people in. This is, I think, a national disgrace.

We're coming into bad times now. I want to tell you something about my life. I meant to hold it back, until I heard people say the Wherry

housing is deteriorating et cetera. I lived in Spanish American war housing in 1937. My father was then a physician at the Presidio Station Hospital, and that was our housing, and we could hear the rats underneath. Wherry housing should not be demolished. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is Michael Vasey, and then Tom Escher.

Michael Vasey: Michael Vasey, I'm with San Francisco State University. And I'm the person that Michael Alexander referred to earlier. I did a survey of the vegetation in the Presidio some years ago, so I feel I have some insights into its status, and would echo really the vision that was articulated by Michael. I think that I would like to say that I'm pleased that this process is underway, and that the planning for the Presidio is reopened. I think this is a golden opportunity for us to really right a major oversight in the past plan. And that oversight essentially is the opportunity to connect up the grasslands, the remnant serpentine grasslands, and the Inspiration Point area, with the grasslands that are still present near the coast, surrounded for example, by the War Memorial area.

If you look at all the plans and all the figures in the past plans, there is no provision for connectivity between those two sights. And yet, based on my analysis, and others, I think, it's pretty obvious I think that the serpentine grassland, the scrub, and that general mosaic of communities, which at one time was extraordinarily rich in the Presidio, and one of the dominant systems, has now been fragmented to the extent that its future is very, very doubtful.

It's really going to be essential that we create some kind of connectivity and expansion of that network of serpentine sites. To the prospect, the possibility, of removing the East Washington housing, set aside the issues around the housing, just from purely the perspective of being able to reestablish that connectivity is extremely exciting. And I think the idea of being able to build this kind of continuous area from the top of the ridge along the bluffs to Crissy Field and then up to Tennessee Hollow is extremely exciting.

One of the things I would urge the Trust to do is to adopt something along those lines, the resource consolidation alternative looks pretty good to me, although I would definitely make some adjustments to the

landscaping and forest side of the equation so that we could establish that connectivity we're just talking about.

I would urge the Trust to work with the staff which has been doing a marvelous job, with the restoration of the dune community in particular. There's great progress there. They need to start spending as much time on the serpentine grasslands. It's going to be a trickier job to restore that system, but it definitely can be done. And with the idea of being able to open up that East Washington housing area as a sort of a centerpiece connecting the two ends, that is exciting.

I urge you to reshape your vision, to follow this insight. I really thank you for looking at this openly, and I encourage you to take that path.

Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Tom Escher, and then Patricia Voy, and then Mary Ann Miller.

Tom Escher: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Escher, and I'm a native San Franciscan. I've lived in different neighborhoods all my life. Most

recently I'm living now in Cow Hollow, and I consider myself an active member of the Cow Hollow Association.

As I was reading the plan, a lot of my major concerns were addressed.

Will you be increasing building area? The plan says no; you're going to be reducing it.

Will new construction ruin the look of the Presidio? No. You said construction will be limited to existing areas of development, and will be compatible with existing.

Are you going to decrease open space? The plan says no.

Are you going to conserve resources? Yes.

What about potential traffic problems? You're going to promote walking. You're going to get away from a lot of cars. You're going to promote public transit.

We San Franciscans are very selfish when it comes to anything in our City. The Presidio has been our special area for many, many years.

We're fortunate that the GGNRA and the Presidio Trust were created to manage the Presidio for the benefit of San Francisco and all other Americans.

You've created a solid, well-thought-out plan. I support the Presidio Trust draft implementation plan, dated July 2001. Please implement the plan, so that locals and all other visitors can enjoy the Presidio for years to come. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Patricia Voy: Can you hear me? Patricia Voy. First of all, I'm running on big emotions today, because last Tuesday was closer to home than I really wanted to happen. So I'm just going to talk philosophically about what I'm seeing on the outside.

I'm worried about this Trust Board not getting the correct information from the paid employees. Tennessee Hollow, all of us are for Tennessee Hollow. But the transportation department is planning to put, pushing for an underground Doyle Drive, and that would eliminate Tennessee Hollow.

If you take a look at two of the plans over here, you want open space, but the northeast end is only going to be walkways and pathways, a whole section of it. Is that a park? My question is, are we looking at this plan like we did the Fillmore in the 50's and the 60's, and look what we got? Are we looking at this from a redevelopment perspective instead of from a park perspective?

I really want us to seriously concern what we're doing. PTIP, the transportation element, the conflicting numbers, is just unbelievable. According to NEPA, you're supposed to have a programmatic plan, but it's supposed to be identified. What you're headed to is piecemealing, so when all of you go to the Lord above, the next person can build a high rise. It's not specified. It simply is too nebulous.

Transportationwise, there is no mention of tour buses. No mention of how you're going to handle events. No mention of what the long-range plan is, other than, we have a programmatic plan. Are we headed into something that we don't want to head into?

But I am more worried about the one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, one's missing, of you not getting the correct information from what we're hearing on the outside of what's happening in the Presidio. We're going to have a series of meetings, and we'd like to invite two of you or three of you or three of you to come and hear what we've heard. Not your paid employees. I really think you should start listening to what we have to say, and we're not not-in-our-backyard people.

Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action had tanks for years. We've had military, which is far more egregious than a park. But we love the military. But I'm seeing a plan of putting a tunnel through our national cemetery. And I just really question what our long-range plan is with PTIP, and I question the validity of it.

There are two drawings over here that are wall-to-wall buildings, with the exception of pathways, on the Crissy Field. What is the long range plan? Are we doing the right thing? Do we have to build all these new buildings? I'm not sure that we do. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Mary Ann Miller, and then David Coggeshall.

Mary Ann Miller: Mary Ann Miller for San Francisco Tomorrow. I'm a planner, and I guess I like to see the evidence of good comprehensive planning in any document I read. I was looking very hard for it in the PTIP document and in the EIS.

On page 81, Table 4.1, I have what look like some good hard figures. So if I ask myself, how much is being removed from area one? How much is going to be added to area six? Or vice versa. I have some numbers. But I wonder: where did those numbers come from? If the over 500-person staff of the department right now, the Presidio Trust staff, can only come up with one table on which I have some hard information, I'm at a loss.

First of all, this hard information is only with regard to square footage of buildings, and it transfers from some area to another area a certain amount of square footage. It doesn't tell me how many roads could be removed if such-and-such square footage, if you take out 110,000 square feet from one area, how much paving can you take out? How many parking spaces can you take out? How many acres of open

space are you adding back? How much restoration will happen in those acreages?

The guru of planning in my time as I went through school was Ian McCard, and he died a few short months ago and he is much lamented, his passing. Because that man, just pre-computer, was just saying, take sheets of tracing paper, and overlay them on each other. If you want to restore areas, and you want to have unbroken wildlife passage, and you don't want roads in certain areas, lay it out that way. And overlay that on where you have the housing that you want to retain, or where you want to remove roads and where you want to remove parking.

And then put figures on that. Okay, we removed so much parking, now we've removed 50 parking spaces. We've removed X lineal square feet of roadway. But that's where this plan, I don't see it ever going in that direction, because the criteria aren't set in the plan for the future area plans, area plans one through seven. I don't see that even coming up in the future. I want to see for each square foot of this, how much of that? What are we getting?

The other thing is with regard to housing, San Francisco Tomorrow always wanted to retain all possible housing. But you know we want to be flexible on that, to use that overused word. Because if housing, if it's found that housing isn't well served by commercial nearby, by transit nearby. If people are always using their cars from housing that's too far away from everything, then it shouldn't be retained, not in those areas.

So use some criteria for your planning. Give us some numbers. Interweave the numbers with numbers from other charts. Don't just give us the blandness of square footage that will be removed, but where and why and how, and how will it affect the overall plan. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: David Coggeshall, and then Michael Warner.

David Coggeshall: Hello. My name is David Coggeshall, with San Francisco Communications. Over the last three years I've worked on Presidio projects with the Presidio Trust, the National Park Service and the Presidio Alliance. I hope to work on more projects in the future.

My comment and question goes to the financial structure of the Presidio experience, which in large degree is that of the Presidio Trust. Personally, I'm afraid that the Trust legislation may be flawed, but I want to understand the basic business assumptions that are implicit in PTIP. It seems that Congress decided that the Presidio should be financially self-supporting, and that this should be done through rental of the buildings, both residential and nonresidential.

The problem that I see in the Presidio business model is that there are at least three or four different lines of business. There is one, the preservation and protection of the historic structures and the open space. Two, the rental and maintenance of the buildings and associated infrastructure. Three, the development of programmatic content relative to the Presidio mission of sustainability. And four, tourist destination concessions, such as cultural exhibits, et cetera.

It occurs to me that each of these businesses needs to be individually analyzed with appropriate assumptions and targets. For instance, the historic preservation responsibility should still rightly stay with tax-supported government management. The real estate business line should be bracketed with financial assumptions that provide no more

than a moderate rate of return on the direct costs of that business. The programmatic content of sustainability should come primarily from tenants and members of the broader public Presidio community. If these and other lines of business are mixed together in the same financial model, then we have the danger of one line of business cross-subsidizing the others.

The bottom line is this: it does not make sense, to me, that we should be looking to real estate profits to fund the visionary work of solving major world problems. This is not meant as a criticism of the Trust, who I feel is doing quite a good job. Rather, I am questioning the intent of the legislation that created the Trust, and whether it actually makes business sense. If it is flawed, maybe it could be improved.

Thank you.

Michael Warner: Hi, my name is Michael Warner, and I am here--I live in the Presidio, and I'm pretty familiar with it, and I wanted to draw your attention to a very particular site and a particular very beautiful place, which on all these charts, there is no sort of plans for it except vegetation, it's sort of a green spot. And what I have here is a proposal you'll get, we're trying to keep it condensed into just one page, for a use of that space

which would preserve its historical integrity, its natural ambience.

And as far as I understand, I guess, the only plan for it now is for storage.

The site is called Battery Dynamite. It's part of the 140 Battery system, and it's adjacent to the power plant. The power plant was built in 1900, and it's very evocative in position and architecture of an acropolis. And in going through a lot of these plans, and the conceptualization of what the Presidio can be, there is a lot of call for both globalization, making the park available to people in the area, and for people in the world.

I'm representing a group of people who, and basically it's defined by the people who I've introduced to the concept. It's got the potential for wildfire in the sense. It's very positive. Sorry, I'm kind of excited, I've been waiting to talk to you guys about this. It's basically a huge wall. It's about 130 feet long and 30 feet high, cut into the side of this hill which has got forests, and you can see pictures of it here. And what we're proposing is a creative arts and new media center. And the idea is basically, the dot comedy, the divine dot comedy has sort of

blown by now. And there are some really fascinating new techniques and methods of bringing people together in interactive spaces.

There's a very strong and sort of long tradition of this community in the Bay Area. A lot of potential to do some really amazing things. And I just wanted to sort of introduce the idea that this could be a kind of playground for the imagination up there. And it really is not -- the site, the structure of the site has some underground structures, open-air atriums. There's really no other good use for it.

And it's also adjacent to Fort Scott, and it could augment whatever activities you decide should go there. But basically a 24-hour art center where people can create and express themselves. Oh, I'm going to leave this over there by the technology stuff, if I can use that table.

Toby Rosenblatt: What's on there?

Michael Warner: We whipped up, we did a sort of two-thirds view of the facilities. It's hard to imagine, so it shows the square footage, and it shows--a lot of this is inaccessible, it's locked up here. But baseline here, your maps, you can deduce that there is some underground structure. Some of it is

open now. And it shows some pictures, and it talks about if you put projective cameras in various places, you can basically make it a portal into a replication of the Presidio today, and in the past, topological map. But this represents basically the actual physical space.

Toby Rosenblatt: Is the concept this happens inside a [unintelligible] battery, or on top, or adjacent to? All of that?

Michael Warner: Exactly, all of those. In the sense that the walls are great for people visiting the physical site, but represented here is what's called a retinal scanning display. It's very cheap, and the price point is coming down, and in the next five years it'll be commercially available. But it basically projects information in your environment. It's called augmented reality. In other words, you could have a National Park Service person walking around, guiding your tour of people from all over the country, showing them native plants. And basically that could make it truly a national park, in fact, a global park, so you could do your conferences and have people tapping in. This is doable now, in fact. I just want to introduce you to the concept, since it's rather novel.

Toby Rosenblatt: Could you leave it up here?

Michael Warner: Up there? Well, it's very draft. What might interest--I don't know if you're familiar with D. Hawk and the idea of chaotic organization. We want to try to make it a community defined vision, and we want it--so we tried to stay away from details. Kristin, actually, coming up next, is going to talk a little bit about it.

So what we're presenting is the capacities to do this. And we're curious on how we do it. We have a very specific idea here, and it fits well with the sort of general, and so we want to try to explore bridging that. I mean it's going to be very expensive to renovate this site. I think my sense is that the funding would be there, that you probably wouldn't have to pay for it. Of course we'd appreciate your support. And we'd just love to explore it with you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Are you the next speaker, Kristin?

Kristin Tesla: Yes.

Toby Rosenblatt: But definitely leave that. Don't take it home with you. Or give us a set.

Kristin Tesla: Okay, part two. I'm Kristin Tesla, and I live in Haight Ashbury, a resident there. And I'm part of this group that sort of [unintelligible] right now, but interested artists looking to create this space.

And what we're asking for you is, one, also, your open-mindedness in helping us construct this, but also, an opportunity to work with you and your staff in thinking through how we can work within the concept of the plan to make this happen.

Very specifically we want to make sure that the plan not only doesn't preclude us from using this space, given that it doesn't have any use for it, but also it offers the opportunity for it to be considered the preferred use of that space, designate it very exclusively to be used in such a manner in the plan.

That's sort of on the facilities side of things, but also, to see if we could be considered part of your concept of program partners. This is something that would be a project that we would hope would be a

long-term partner in the--in the plan and in the Presidio development, something that could not only be on site, as far as availability of these technologies and artistic opportunities, but also something that can serve in the bigger Presidio community as ways of educating individuals about the environment, about the space, and the wildlife in the area through the technologies which I couldn't explain to you nearly as well as he could. And we'd be willing to talk to you further about it, and would like to be able to talk to you and your staff about some of these ideas.

Toby Rosenblatt: Okay, thank you.

Michael Warner: Could I add one more thing?

Toby Rosenblatt: Yeah.

Michael Warner: In the spirit of promoting community, if you're interested in learning more, please write your email or telephone number on it and we'll contact you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Okay. Leanne Hoadley, and then Mark Zier.

Leanne Hoadley: My name is Leanne. I'm a resident and a tenant in the park, and I speak for myself. But I think the dynamic and artistic resources at a grassroots level, like that what Michael presented, kind of shows us that there are so many different uses for the buildings here in the Presidio, I hope you'll look at that.

I just, I have a question that many of the Board members attempted to answer before it had the opportunity to be asked again, and again and again. And that is, the GMPA and the GMPA 2000, is indeed the preferred alternative as stated in the Presidio Trust scoping documents, then why wasn't the GMPA 2000 presented to the public on July 25th as the Presidio Trust preferred alternative? It seems like it might have saved money, marketingwise, PR-wise.

The answers given to us don't really satisfy that question. At least they don't satisfy those of us who know the documents very well. And if after this next round of comments are collected, and again, it's determined that the public prefers the alternative GMPT 2000, then what will the Trust Board do?

Speaking as a director of a nonprofit, I'm deeply saddened by the approach the Trust has taken in regards to programming in their draft alternative, demanding up to an extra \$20 million annually in the Trust budget for the Trust to do most of the programming in the park. This completely undermines the vision of the GMPA, and I think now more than ever we must have values greater than the mighty dollar. I hope the Trust re-reads the vision of the GMPA, and at some point, understands what's truly at stake. I know sometimes on my way home on Lincoln, at the end of my day, I see a fox gingerly trying to cross the street. And I'm filled with anxiety that I hope it makes it, and excitement that I've living in a place where foxes run around. And I just hope, in the plans for entertainment, the cost of those handful of foxes here is added in. Thank you.

Mark Zier: Hi, my name is Mark Zier. I'm part of the group that's with the Friends of the Presidio National Park. We are a group that is trying to get information out, and we have various handouts, the editorial that Don Green and Johanna Wald produced in the Chronicle last week we have available. Also other charts and figures. We've gotten a lot of input from a lot of people on those charts and figures, and I believe they, one in particular that I have, a comparison of GMPA and PTIP,

is accurate. But I have not had any input from the Trust on this one, and I would appreciate that and welcome it.

We had a meeting last week on Wednesday evening. We brought a number of people together to discuss the implications of the draft alternative. And Hilary Gittleman was there, and encouraged us to use our imaginations as we read the documents, and not look too hard for details. But I got to tell you, when I use my imagination, it's kind of scary. I see the Inn at San Francisco Bay. I see condos with a killer view. I see a conference think-tank center for the World Trade Organization and other multinationals who are interested in privatizing the world's air and water and land resources. And I don't know that that's--I can't imagine that that's what you intend. But that's where my imagination goes.

And so I have a number of questions that I would like to answer very specifically. And I would appreciate answers to these questions before the end of the comment period so that all of us can answer, or respond, to your plan with greater detail and greater assurance that we're both talking about the same thing.

Question #1: The Trust has defined the general objectives of the GMPA in a way that we feel limits the distinctive mission of the Park as a global center dedicated to addressing the world's most critical environmental, social and cultural challenges. Why has the Trust apparently decided, especially through its tenant selection process, to limit the diversity of programming that could otherwise be provided by outside organizations in open competition?

Question #2: How can the operating expenses for the GMP alternative, analyzed in the draft EIS, be the same as those in the Trust's preferred plan, when the assumptions regarding number of visitors, employees, housing and new construction are so different? And if you go and look at that, you'll see that.

Question #3: What is the financial justification for removing housing units and replacing them with new more expensive units? How will this benefit lower income employees at the Presidio? And will all housing at the Presidio be exclusively rental housing? Will any ground lease condominiums be allowed?

Finally, what are the results of the extensive consultations with the Smithsonian? How many new major museums is the Trust contemplating? Why are the Trust's projected operating costs so high compared to other museums such as the de Young?

Please, save me from my imagination. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Next speaker is Carlin Hunter, and then Judy Bretschneider.

Carlin Hunter: Hello, my name is Carlin Hunter, I live and as you will hear, hope to be working, in the Presidio. Three years ago I applied and was accepted in the initial public offering of workspaces, the only fine art use person accepted.

As yet no building has been designated for use by fine artists. This is a use stipulated in the initial plan. Today, I am unsure whether your acceptance of my proposal will ever be honored.

Artists must be represented in the Presidio. I stand here as a representative of that body of people wanting to know if and when you will honor your stated commitment to give me space to carry out my

proposed art form, and when you will give other artists opportunity to work within the national park as stipulated in your original plan.

Please let me know if there is any proposed funding to support fine artists in the Presidio, some of whom might be unable to afford the high rents being asked for space. You set out with good intentions, but now it seems that many businesses who do not conform to that original idea of befitting a national park are being housed prior to some as myself who were accepted, and did comply with the demands stipulated in the original plan. Please explain why you held a competition to allocate space. And if you are not going to give space to those accepted already under the new plan. Thank you.

Judy Bretschneider: I'm Judy Bretschneider from the Presidio Performing Arts. I'm the founder and co-president, and we would like to say that we believe it is essential for the Presidio Trust to develop and coordinate and oversee the finest level of cultural programming with partners inside and outside the Park. We believe that only if the Presidio Trust maintains a cultural programming division for the public benefit will the Presidio become a consistently interesting and exciting venue for people of all ages. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. That completes all of the speaker cards that we have. And I want to thank everybody who took the time to come and address the Board. Are there any comments that the Board members wish to make? Bill.

Bill Reilly: Thank you, Toby. I would just like to say something about what we've heard, and respond to it to some degree. From the point of view of what it is we're trying to do, I am very conscious, in my service on this Board, of the fact that we are writing a new chapter in the history of the national parks. They began with the establishment of the crown jewels, Yosemite and Yellowstone, and moving on to recognize the important ecological areas like the Everglades.

The Civil War battlefields were included. Later, the gateways, and more recently, the urban parks, Chattahoochee and Cuyahoga and the rest. And almost each of these times, there was a great debate about the appropriateness of new resources and the values that were proposed to be acknowledged.

I recall that when The Cape Cod National Seashore was proposed, many local residents opposed it, fearing that it would restrict the use of their land or perhaps attract too much traffic. If you look at the Cape Cod today from the air, where The Cape Cod National Seashore begins, at the [elbow] of the Cape, it's green and it's beautiful, and that's largely a consequence of the creation of that national seashore.

I began the day, I, I came to this meeting and was involved in trying to figure out whether The World Wildlife Fund, whose board I chair, would meet next week. And a couple of people, hearing I was coming to this meeting asked, two people, unrelated, asked the question, "Will, will you have to give the Presidio back to the army now?" And it struck me that we are probably a short phase in this long history, we're writing this chapter, a new chapter, really.

We've been given a charter, a statute which says we are supposed to promote the self-financed preservation of the national park. We're writing it very slowly. We have never done this before. We, up here, on this, at this table, nor has the country. And we very much need ideas. Now, I was listening today to several of you when you talked

about your concept of the national park, and what it is that's appropriate to it, and what, in your view, is not.

And I'm very sympathetic to a lot of the feelings about avoiding commercialization and development here. But you know, we've had that debate. We've gotta have some, we've gotta have, finance this place. Neither the State nor the City was prepared to do that a few years ago, and Congress was only under tightly constrained circumstances that we now live with.

Many of the comments today occurred to me as, as anti-urban. I don't find the suburban character of the Presidio that attractive, frankly. I think it is suburban in a surrounding city which is remarkably urbane, beautifully urbane. Its character, whether you like the suburban character or not, exacerbates very seriously the transportation problem. I tried to attract The Nature Conservancy's western regional office to the Presidio, and after canvassing their employees, there was no way they wanted to come here. They simply, they didn't all [have come by] cars. And they didn't have easy access, particularly from the East Bay. That's a very serious problem we have to overcome.

To the degree that we find some means of concentrating some development here, it will make the solution to that problem easier. So, those of you who are concerned about transportation might think through the implications of the development configuration here.

It's, I think, incumbent on any national park to offer services, to offer cultural activities, to offer a program. There's no question that it must do that. It offers very little today. We have to provide some reason for being, we have to satisfy the congressional directive that we serve the national interest, people from other parts of the country, and we have to do it in a way that has enough services within the park that we don't create the problems we've seen so many national parks, go to Gatlinburg in Tennessee. Because of a resistance to providing accommodations and services within the park, the surroundings are a mess.

I would say that we want very much to realize the original vision of encouraging environmental innovations, energy efficiency, technologies, water purification and desalination, inventions, approaches. But I would say to you that those things will not come just from the non-profit sector. I mean, we'll be lucky in this market

to get for-profit tenants to do some of those things. But we're looking for them, we're having conversations with them, and we very much continue to have a commitment to see that they're an important part of the tenant next year.

I would just say in conclusion, bear with us. We're trying to do something very important, I think. And we are trying to do so very much in dialogue with you. We have listened to the comments we've received. I was quite taken by many of the contributions today. I'm sure my colleagues were, as well. And as we continue to sort through this process, bearing in mind that to some degree it is a reactive process. One reason we're not as specific as some of you might like is we, too, are dealing with what is proposed, what we can do in the present market, what is offered to us, what is available.

We'll continue to do that, I think, with the values that, to a large degree, we all share, and, I think that we'll do so in a spirit of dialogue and the same kinds of concerns that caused us to add to open space will, I think, continue to move us toward a direction many of you, not all will appreciate. But I, for one, have appreciated very much the comments that have been made both before and at this hearing, and

we'll all look forward to continue to work to realize the enormous possibility of this very beautiful place.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Other comments at this point? Amy?

Amy Meyer: I, first of all want to thank everybody for giving us such a wide ranging group of comments. We really covered a lot of different ideas, and nobody really very much duplicated anybody else, or maybe one or two people duplicated each other, but it's not. . . There was a lot here today--

I've been working with the national park system and the City parks for 30 years. I came into this as a person working the activist group, People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and I still am the co-chair of that group. We also, I have, I was a City Park Commissioner for 12 years and I've been the vice chair of the GGNRA Advisory Commission since it began in 1974. And one of the things I've seen is that this part, this part of the GGNRA, our underlying ground is the GGNRA. And this part of the GGNRA, with its 470 historic structures is different from any other part of the park as a whole.

But also it's the highest concentration of historic structures in the country. And with this, we have this charge of, "You've gotta be self-sufficient by 2013," and we don't have the luxury of waiting until just exactly what we want comes in some kind of stipulated order. We can't leave buildings vacant for huge periods of time. Buildings go dead if they're vacant for long periods of time. But also, we are very much dependent upon what people offer to us. We've had a range of offers, and some of them get started and seem to work, and some of them don't.

Now, where we began, we were in a very hot real estate market, where people wanted to locate in buildings. Right now, we're in a situation that none of us can predict at the moment. But you know, a couple of months ago, it was looking much more difficult.

So, we are dependent upon what people bring to us in ideas, and how they can work out the means to finance them. And we don't, we have only a certain amount of support to offer. What we do offer to groups who do locate themselves here is the background, the ability to use

areas in common, whether indoors or outdoors, and the support that these groups can receive in the Presidio.

The other thing I want to reassure people of with regard to those 470 historic structures is that we care very much about the National Historic Landmark here, and that what we do is as . . . I know Mary said this earlier, and I would just reiterate it, that the National Historic Preservation Act in particular and all the constraints around having a national historic landmark, this is part of why the Presidio was set aside within this park. The underlying legislation is the legislation to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and it set this land aside, along with the whole rest of the park for its natural historic, scenic and recreational values, and its educational and recreational opportunities.

And that's fundamentally underneath what we adhere to, along with the superimposition of the Trust Act. And we're all committed to it, and we thank you. I mean, I personally thanking you for coming here today and letting us know the thoughts you have that will help us to carry this out as best we can. Thanks.

Toby Rosenblatt: Okay. All right, again, thank you, and we are adjourned.

[End of Transcript]