

Public Comments January 16, 2014 to January 28, 2014

I am writing as a citizen of the bay area. I feel that I am entitled to my constitutional right to express my opinion to the board of trustees regarding the usage of national parks land, as I visit and I donate to the national parks frequently. I strongly urge the Trust to select the sustainability museum or the Presidio Exchange, which are in keeping with the charter to serve the public interest. Before you consider financial self-sustainability as a strength, please consider how capitalism works--- capital is used to gain revenues and profits. The more capital someone has, the more they can earn based on that capital. The trust should not be subsidizing the rich, but should be helping to provide resources for the public good, for the 99% that lack capital to create wealth, and which lack access to the true "riches" of a strong community and clean environment, and a commercial-free, marketing-free existence. The board should fulfill its charter to provide land for the public interest that enriches the soul of the public, and should not bow to serve financial interests of capitalists or powerful politicians who just want to raise money for their re-election. I realize a grave concern is job creation. Please consider the facts and conduct research into the working conditions and the turnover among your applicants who would be "job-creators." Consider the fiscal motivations for storing so-called "museum" items on public land which are indivisible form a marketing franchise, charging admission to admire them, and utilizing vacant offices in Marin which used to be filled with employees before they were sold to disney and down-sized. Children go to national parks to learn about nature. Sustainability and culture by the people for the people are natural themes; the children should not be marketed to with such outdated notions from "Hollywood films" on public lands. The future is unwritten, let's help kids write it using their own imagination, inspired by nature and people in their community, not recycled tropes or pet-projects.

Former Employee

my vote is for the Presidio Exchange

Lucas can build his museum elsewhere

David Key

Hi,

I was just brainstorming. Why not require the builder of the PX or whatever to build a building and road or bridge over an enlarged estuary? The existing estuary is too small to keep itself open to the Bay. This could be a win-win for people and the environment. We can and should do better than those 3 proposed ideas.

Thanks,
Denise Louie

These past few years Chrissy Field has been packed with people and dogs and some wildlife.

People in this city need more spacegreen space and grass. That is why there come to Crissy Field, the Ft. mason area and GGP. With the increased building of high rises in SF, this means more residents, and the need for more open space.

We do not need another educational center or museum or gift shop near open space opportunities. Place those concepts into existing buildings either in the Presidio or in under served areas of SF ...the south needs these centers, not the Presidio. Or, use the exploratorium.

Remove the building, or just make it space for picnics, walking, grassy, nice sustainable restroom area, showers,. Have it become part of the wetlands.

What ever happened to the risky field center.....? We are fine without it.

Thank for reviewing the public's opinion.

Kathryn Hyde

ugly, not what we want or need.

do not let this man hijack our bful space.

no!

Steven Clark

I fully support the new revised Lucas Museum for Cultural Arts proposal for the Mid-Crissy Field site. Either of the two proposed versions would be fine. It would be a tragic loss to the public for this proposal to not be approved in a timely manner. The public would be thrilled to have such a museum to built at the Mid-Crissy Field site. Other sites or buildings in the Presidio could be made available to the other two proposals.

Sincerely,

Bob Atwood

The newspapers are reporting that the final designs of the top three contenders for redevelopment of the Commissary site have been turned in to you all. The images in the newspaper are nice, and well-conceived -- except for their location. Please have the winner of the contest move his or her building to another location on the Presidio. Could replace the warehouses along Doyle Drive? Replace the Commissary with trees and grass and open spaces, even a few picnic tables. Maybe a small manmade hill with a bench on top so folks can catch the view. It is a park after all. Please don't allow it to be come a parking lot for art, technology, etc. With the plans for the over walk above Doyle Drive, trees and greenery and a path for pedestrians will fit right in. Fifty years from now, our kids and their kids will be astonished at how smart we were to keep the northern waterfront open and green and beautiful.

Thanks, Tom McCarthy

The Chronicle is carrying welcome news that Mr. Lucas is altering his plans for the Exchange Area where he would like to building a museum.

I would like to call your attention to the drawings several weeks or months back in The Chronicle showing what global warming and a rise in the sea level would mean for that low-lying area?

Has anyone addressed this potent possibility with some adequate plans to safeguard this lovely area?

Renee Renouf Hall

I don't enjoy sounding like a broken record in my endeavor to spare the Presidio from destruction by those who see it as prime real estate and not the treasured National Historic Landmark that it statutorily is, but perhaps the only way to be heard is to play the record again and again, in hopes that the message will get through.

What I do enjoy are the vistas and the open space that the U.S. Army had the sense to create by not over-building on this beautiful land. Please remember that first and foremost, besides being a National Historic Landmark, the Presidio is part of the National Park Service system, which is obligated to preserve and protect that with which it is entrusted.

What right do you have to obstruct this mission? What is the purpose of your creation in the first place? Is it to find an empty space and fill it (or to obscure it)? And why are you so determined to "populate" or "revitalize" the Presidio? The last thing this Presidio oasis needs is to become a city within the city.

For now, at least until the Doyle Drive Project is complete, it seems reasonable to hold off on any development of this commissary site. As much as I prefer the PX Exchange over the others presented, even that might be better to suspend for a while until more is known about what it will involve (i.e. the size, the programs, etc.).

The bottom line: What's the rush?

Thank you for listening.

Charlotte Hennessy

I have reviewed all three competing PX proposals, and in my personal opinion, the Lucas proposal is clearly superior. It has a very clear focus, while the other two seem to be a hodge-podge of good-sounding things but without any substantial unique content. Not to mention the funding the Lucas proposal brings with it. The Presidio and the Conservancy/National Park Service already have thousands of acres and numerous buildings to tell stories about history and the environment. San Francisco and the region deserve the first-class museum Lucas has proposed.

---Bob Reitherman

Don't do it- I saw that Rep. Pelosi was putting some pressure on you guys to get this done. Don't yield to that. George can stash his stuff elsewhere. I want a environmental site there- one that invites visitors to exhibits, provides meeting space for organizations and the like, The Lucas Museum has got NOTHING to do with the ideas that will guide this region into sustainable modes and better environmental stewardship of our bay and remaining wild areas for the next century. we don't need a museum full of randomstuff.

Elizabeth C. Creely

For crying out loud! Not since "Howard the Duck" has George Lucas had a vision that didn't bring billions of dollars to San Francisco and Northern California. How you dare to second guess him? The man is a visionary. Give him his original proposal.

Regards,
Scott Gross

I would not vote for the Lucas project, although the new proposal is much better, it still does not fit with the total picture. I think the plan to wait until the Doyle Drive construction is done is a very good one, as it will afford a much better picture of the whole area. I particularly like the Park Conservancy's Plan and would vote for that. We have to think of the future and how best to use the land we have.

Sincerely,

Jeanne P. Carney

OK, if you can't envision right now redeveloping the Commissary site with trees and grass and pedestrian pathways -- i.e., making it look like a park -- then at least put the Commissary site redevelopment on hold until the surrounding projects are completed. Once the Doyle Drive overwalk is done, and maybe even the redevelopment of the Palace of Fine Arts, and possibly incorporating the existing former Crissy Field visitors' center into the plans: art center, café, nature center? Whatever is decided for the area, please make it simple, use existing structures if you can, and make it look like a park. The plans submitted by the redevelopment contestants look really groovy; maybe they can be located elsewhere on the Presidio. But please keep the northern waterfront open and a park.

Thanks, Tom McCarthy

P.S. Pray for rain.

After reading numerous articles about this project and the three leading contenders, it seems clear this should not be a hasty decision. Perhaps it would have been better to sketch an entire plan for the Chrissy Field, new freeway, and Main Post areas, showing how they should flow and what tenants would

be best for the whole area, based on a vision that unites them in a graceful and meaningful way. The Palace of Fine Arts could also play a role in this unified vision.

I'm glad to see Mr. Lucas has been willing to scale back his plan, but his building still may not be the best choice.

I hope you will not feel pressured to select his option, but will wait to see what comes from further consideration of all options before this decision is made.

Diane Bolman

I urge you to vote against the Lucas proposal - it has nothing to do with the location or your overall mission of presidio history and it's environment. I hope to see an interactive, more locally relevant building and hopefully more educationally oriented.

Thank you.

Hilary Hyde

I appreciate the time and effort that you have spent in analyzing the proposals that have been put forth for a new museum on the Presidio grounds. George Lucas and his expansive body of work in film making and production are part of San Francisco's history without doubt. Star Wars captured my imagination during my formative childhood years, and I believe that it had the same effects on many people around the world. The Lucas Arts Museum would spark the minds of many young San Franciscans and Bay Areaans in the years to come. It is a rarity nowadays that a new museum would be solely financed privately without tapping into the general funds. In effect, the museum would be a gift to the people. I hope that you will share my views on Mr. Lucas' project and that you will consider allowing the construction of his museum in the Presidio. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
Kenny Mok, M.D.

Please do not allow the construction of this museum. It's not appropriate for public property to become the repository of a building that is basically a showcase for one man's ego.

New construction is not what the Presidio needs. It's wonderful to have a small park within San Francisco. It needs to be returned to the state it was in 200 years ago, not developed with restaurants and museums. That's not development, that's just greed.

Sincerely
Ernest Montague

PX I do NOT support this proposal. In general there has been far too much improvement, " development, ,"programming", and all around busy work to justify Presidio Trust jobs, I assume. The

place is becoming an over-managed Disneyland. The sculptures on Crissy Field are appallingly ugly. The owls are gone from the trees. The traffic jams are insane. There's more concrete with every new day.

Why can't you people know when enough is enough? Stop the madness.

H Balanza

I am for the PX project. Ideally I'd like to see Lucas (read his money) getting on board the PX project without thinking about commercial and branding opportunities. I live in Marin and feel that his projects are kept out of sight so as not to affect the public with there enormous proportions, tasteful or not. The LUCAS PROJECT is not out of sight it is right in the City's face and I don't like the scale of it one bit. Don't let the politicians who are enamored with BIG MONEY hold sway in this matter. Make the PX a citizen's project that reflects the values of the 99%. The PX project can be done in well thought out stages as money is available. YES ON PX.

Thank You,
Philip C. Hoffman

I love the idea of there being a digital museum in SF, and I love the idea of Lucas' art collection being displayed to the public....BUT, I think the building design is a boring and old fashioned and is too sedentary for the space it is to be placed in. I am actually in agreement of the Hargreaves Associates plan detailed in the SF Chronicle Insight section 1/24/2014. The sports basement building should be torn down and the wetlands expanded. Any museum built should be built up near the parade grounds or within the space of the Palace of Fine Arts. Of the 3 plans submitted, only the Lucas plan is sustainable. If they are determined to build something in the space of the sport's basement building, the building should be lighter and have more modern lines. It doesn't need to tie in w/ other Presidio buildings as it isn't in sight of any of them.

Anne de la Rosa

I previously wrote to urge you to reject the Lucas proposal for Crissy Field. His revised proposal has not changed my view that it is unconnected to the site and an inappropriate use of the spectacular natural environment. The museum could go practically anywhere. If Lucas really wanted to give the city a gift rather than inflate his ego, he would agree to house his collection at the old Exploratorium. And please do not be influenced by the continued public pressure and support from our local politicos.

After reviewing the three proposals, I urge you to reject them all. I agree with the original vision and design of Hargreaves Associates featured in the Insight of the Chronicle today, January 26. Keep the dynamic landscape of Crissy Field as an environmental park for all to enjoy.

Sandra Schloss

JOHN de FOREST

2534 Lake Street San Francisco, CA 94121

January 26, 2014

The Presidio Trust
Attn: Commissary Project
103 Montgomery Street
P.O. Box 29052
San Francisco, CA 94129

To whom it may concern:

I do not see it as desirable to add large buildings to the Presidio, which I feel ought to foster primarily an experience in natural beauty, not in cultural excitement, of which San Francisco has a great deal. But since you are determined to erect something at the especially lovely Crissy Field, I support the Haas Foundation's recommendation that you wait until the highway projects currently under construction are finished before you make a decision.

I won't deal here with the exhibits and programs proposed for each of the remaining three contestants. The contents of any new building you choose could be put anywhere if necessary, but the exterior will affect everyone's enjoyment of the park. Despite what John King has written, I do not find Lucas's building to be "unrelated to anything" there. It calls to mind the Palace of Fine Arts, which I doubt that he would say was out of place. I agree with him that the LCAM is not as fine a building, and I agree with many who think it is too big. But stylistically it is quite compatible.

The Presidio Exchange and the Bridge/Sustainability Institute, in contrast, with their cold, sharp, graceless severity, look actually contemptuous of their beautiful surroundings, and *appear* much more obtrusive than the LCAM. They remind me of sterile terminals at an airport. Moreover the wide walkways and all the other concrete poured over the landscape remind me of nothing so much as airport runways and soulless modern plazas. I don't want either airports or barren plazas in the Presidio, even to serve the worthy cause of sustainability.

Sincerely yours,

John de Forest

The location of the Sports Basement site across from Crissy field is best suited for an organization that will be geared toward the public as a whole, be open and inviting and not exclusive.

The Lucas proposal is geared to young people and a visual art museum is better placed elsewhere rather than across from the beach. Also, the building is ill suited for the location and is stall. Lastly, granting the project to Lucas creates the perception of catering to the elitist few.

Sustainability is really the story of this location of the Presidio and should be reflected in the use.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Best regards,
Maria Williams

Just wanting to voice my support for the Lucas Museum.

Thanks for your time,
Tamara

My family and I have had the privilege of seeing just a small portion of George Lucas' art treasures at Skywalker Ranch, which did not include any of his groundbreaking and innovative film contributions. Our hope is that by inviting him to bring the magnificent collection to the public, everyone would have a great opportunity to see some of the most innovative and creative art imaginable.

The building design does lend itself well to the lost art of Palatial construction that makes San Francisco a true "Grand Dame" of cities. It would be a shame to lose the collection and the stately design proposed by Mr. Lucas as well as the money to support such an endeavor in perpetuity.

Please vote to have the Lucas Museum built on the current Sports Authority site.

Thank you.
Terrie Miller

I urge you to seriously consider the comments of Mr. George Hargreaves and Ms. Mary Margaret Jones (SF Chronicle, Insight pg. E6, Jan. 26, 2014), concerning the extraordinary landscape that is Crissy Field.

They find it odd, and I agree, that the Trust is considering rebuilding on the Commissary site at the same time Doyle drive is being undergrounded to provide a beautiful unbroken vista uniting the Officers Club, the historic Main Post and the waterfront. This is a magnificent plan and a perfect treatment for this extraordinary National Historic Landmark District. A replacement structure at the Commissary site would be a blot on that vista.

Such a structure also is unnecessary, and none of the three final proposals for reuse of the site has a purpose requiring that unparalleled locale.

The Commissary location is quite unsuitable for a building site. It is a flood plain, and, as Hargreaves and Jones note, it's best use would be for expansion of the existing wetland marsh which could become truly sustainable over a larger area than currently allocated.

In a city that is rapidly becoming over built and over crowded, the Commissary site should remain convenient open space where people can seek peace.

That this has become a political issue is good reason not to rush to judgment on a site that is unique in the world in both geology and history. It is best to delay any consideration of new construction until the Doyle Drive project is complete. It is my hope that by then, the Trust will see the wisdom of not building anything there, that in this case it is unquestionably true that Less Is More.

The wetlands, landscape and open space opportunities that will exist when the undergrounding of Doyle Drive is complete will make an extraordinary site truly phenomenal. Please do not threaten this potential with unnecessary structures.

Respectfully,

Barbara W. Wanvig

Re: Delay Crissy Field Development Decision/
Lucas Museum proposal rejected as wholly inappropriate for and unrelated to prized national park land

Dear Chair:

In advance of tonight's Presidio Trust Board of Directors meeting, the Trust Board should delay its decision of selecting a development proposal for the Crissy Field Commissary site (current location of Sports Basement). The National Parks Conservation Association, People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning emphasized that delaying a decision until current Doyle Drive and future Tunnel Top parkland developments are complete is the most prudent action for the site.

Joining a distinguished list of local, national, and international leaders, the groups endorsed the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy's Presidio Exchange (PX), stating that it was the only proposal to respond to all the Trust's planning criteria. They rejected the revised Lucas Museum proposals as wholly inappropriate in mission, purpose, and design for Crissy Field, noting that they fail to meet the express program and design criteria required by the Trust Board.

Crissy Field is one of our nation's most iconic public spaces for enjoyment of our natural and cultural heritage, and decisions involving it must be made with broad community support, not in response to a heavy-handed political campaign. Because ongoing construction will dramatically alter the Crissy Field site in years to come, more time is needed to decide the future of this crown jewel. The Golden Gate has welcomed millions through the western entrance to the United States and is our Statue of Liberty of the west, not the place for a grandiose neo-classical monument to one person and his art.

The Board's decision on how to proceed will define its legacy. Delaying a decision would affirm the Board's commitment to the democratic purpose of these national parklands and building necessary public support. The PX is the only proposal loyal to the Trust's planning criteria, whereas the Lucas Museum proposal's program and mission are irrelevant to Crissy Field. A successful plan respects and enhances the long term vision of the park, and does not carry the stigma of being ushered in by political pressure.

Recently, the Presidio's philanthropic community wrote a series of letters, expressing deep concern for a decision by the Trust prior to the completion of the extensive Doyle Drive/Presidio Parkway

construction. The community emphasized that analysis of traffic, parking, and visitor use would be necessary, and premature development could jeopardize the millions of dollars that have been invested in park improvements and weaken the public support necessary for future philanthropy. The National Park Service also urged a delay in a recent letter, noting the “lack of public consensus” and “obvious controversy”, while concluding that “the [Lucas] museum’s offerings could be located anywhere; therefore, the museum does not merit one of the most important sites in the entire Presidio.”

Presidio neighbors care deeply that this national treasure retains strong public support and delaying a decision is the only way for the Board and public to make an informed decision about the site’s future. The PX is the only proposal that offers public programs and architecture specifically designed for the Crissy Field landscape. With world-renowned partners, such as National Geographic Society, the PX would bring to life our national park for visitors ranging from neighbors to inner-city youth to international travelers.

Thank you for the opportunity to bring these remarks to your attention.

Yours sincerely,
Robert E. Rutkowski

It would seem to me that if you can turn down this museum and gift of \$300 million, you do not need my yearly donation. I was looking forward to taking my grandchildren and other visitors to this magical place in this magical city. Diane Serber

It would be a mistake if San Francisco let Lucas goto Chicago. Imagine just the star wars fans alone visiting from all over the world. San Francisco is such a cultural hub already it would be a good meld.

Timothy Anadon

I’m writing a letter of support for the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum.

There has been a great deal of information available about the various options for our City, and I have carefully read the various proposals and also listened to many sides of the story.

As a business owner, homeowner, parent of a child attending public school in San Francisco, and as someone who actively promotes tourism to our incredible City – I see the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum as the best choice for San Francisco.

I know you will receive many longer letters, but I hope that you will consider mine as one that speaks both from a highly informed and highly committed perspective when you make your decisions moving forward.

Very best regards,

Lisa Spivey

I am writing to ask you to please delay any decision about the use and development of the mid-Crissy Field site, where the current Sports Basement is located, until the Presidio Parkway is completed and we can all make the best decision for the Park for the long run. I would also ask you to consider the possibility of converting that site into wetlands, as was illustrated in the San Francisco Chronicle this past weekend. Wetlands are an extremely valuable habitat, and this site would be a natural extension of the existing Crissy Field wetlands, which are really too small in themselves to be easily perpetuated as habitat. There is no need to rush into a decision to accept any particular proposal for the mid-Crissy Field site at this time.

I personally favor the Golden Gate Conservancy proposal over the proposal by George Lucas, as the Conservancy proposal is much more directly related to the Presidio and its history and to the national park than a museum of digital art would be. Restoration of the site as a natural wetlands environment, or even just green space, would be the best.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope to see your decision delayed until a more appropriate time when the Parkway is complete and the green space crossover connecting the shoreline to the main Post area is in place.

Sincerely,

Jill Sideman, Ph.D.

I'm writing to offer my support for the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum. What a great addition this museum will be, not only for the Presidio, but for San Francisco. There is no other museum like this that I know of, which will make it a special place here in the City. And its size will allow the City to host much larger exhibitions than it currently can.

San Francisco has always been a player in the cultural arts with strong ties to music and film. This museum will be a celebration of this. Please, vote to approve Lucas' vision and let him build his museum.

Thank you, Greg

FROM: THE PRESIDIO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
PO BOX 29163

Jan. 27, 2014

Presidio of San Francisco, CA 94129

TO: NANCY BECHTLE, Chair and
CRAIG MIDDLETON, Executive Director
PRESIDIO TRUST
Presidio of San Francisco, CA 94129

RE: Crissy Field/ Commissary Decision

Dear Ms. Bechtle and Mr. Middleton:

The Presidio Historical Association recommends that in the best interests of our children, grandchildren and future generations, and in the interest of the Trust satisfying its first duty, its statutory trust responsibility under the Presidio Trust Act to protect the historic and natural resources of the Presidio against development, we recommend that at this time, the Trust defer any decision selecting one of the three project proposals.

Your first and highest responsibility is to protect the Presidio's historic and natural resources for future generations of the public. No amount of projected income, nor any representations from present or former federal, state or city political figures, nor endorsements by those who know or who have business or political prospects with any of the applicants should have a higher priority in your Board decisions. While representations by those advocating the Lucas or other proposal would be relevant if you were managing private property or if you were managing an urban renewal project, that is not your task or your responsibility. Your first responsibility and duty is to the public and to Congress. You must follow the mandate of your Congressional Trust. You are to manage the most stringently protected type of nationally important historic property, (National Historic Landmark District or NHL), in a trust that legally and morally obligates you to preserve this rare, historically important site for the public now and in future generations. If a Trust member's inclination is to favor any other option for political, social or business reasons, then that Trust member, and that reasoning is out of place on this Board.

Despite the Trust's initial request for historically significant proposals, it nevertheless chose three proposals, one of which, (Lucas) did nothing to protect or educate the public on Presidio history, and two of which did very little to protect or promote the understanding of Presidio history. There is nothing that compels the choice of any of the three options for this rare and sensitive historic site entrusted to you. As pointed out by the letters from Frank Dean, Superintendent of the GGNRA, which letter we support, and by most newspaper columnists, editors and letters to editors in local newspapers in the last month, the best choice is to defer a decision, then take steps to select a more suitable project at some future time after Doyle Drive work is finished. A second reason is that by that time, the federal appeals court will probably have made a ruling relevant to the Trust's decision and/or to any construction at the site.

If, however, you choose not to defer your decision, then we recommend choosing the Conservancy's PX option. While it has little specific historical content, it nevertheless provides the opportunity for a building that can be used for many purposes, some of which can provide opportunities to the public to see and learn more about the Presidio and our nation's history.

The PHA would be happy to work with you in the future, supporting a Presidio team that is as effective as possible in preserving and educating the public about the historic and natural resources located in this priceless and protected National Historic Landmark District.

Sincerely,

Gary Widman, President

After reading the coverage in the San Francisco Chronicle concerning the Lucas Museum, my husband, a professional artist, turned to me and said, "Looks like the fix is in....they're going to reject the Lucas Museum." It certainly looks that way to us! What a tragedy to reject such a generous and appropriate gift to the people of San Francisco and those who visit us. Disney has an adjunct museum which is quite wonderful and well-attended....this new museum would be even more so! The art which would be displayed at the Lucas Museum fits in well with the Presidio's history and themes of American culture. I was opposed to the modern art museum because it didn't fit the site or the themes and is now going to be beautifully situated as an expanded part of the current MOMA. But the Lucas Museum is different. It would be built on the site of an existing structure of non-historical value. If it's just a matter of architecture, that seems like a minor issue. I believe the Presidio Trust should accept the gift in principle, by agreeing that the site is appropriate for such a museum and then work out the architectural details later.

Sincerely,
Boots Whitmer
Bob Steiner

My vote is to restore wetlands and create more ways for people to interact with nature and the natural processes and majestic beauty of the area. The gorgeous landscape and the habitat in an urban setting are the true value and benefit of the site. I think George Hargreaves in the SF Chronicle this past Sunday about summed up my feeling for how the site should be further "developed".

I am a regular user of Crissy Field. Though I live in the Mission District, I travel to Crissy Field once a week for my daughter's swim class at La Petite Baleen located on Old Mason Road. I cherish these days because it gets me out into the most spectacular natural landscape San Francisco has to offer. I relish the ability to be in such an urban city, but to escape it for just a few hours and connect with the bay, the fog, the birds, the weather, the Golden Gate Bridge, the beach, the wetlands. I want more!

Crissy Field doesn't need another building - especially a building and a program that has nothing to do with the landscape it is surrounded by or the cultural history of the place.

1 - A big NO for George Lucas' proposal. Have we learned nothing from the Metreon development downtown adjacent to a beautiful open space? Why build a museum that encourages people to be inside, sitting, watching, enveloped in fantasy and technology when we have one of the greatest natural treasures just outside of its doors/ What do movies have to do with Crissy Field? Just because a rich person offers you his hand-me-downs doesn't mean you have to take them. Absolutely NO.

2 - The Bridge Sustainability Institute - again, no. We don't need a building or a center to learn about sustainability when we have one of the greatest living laboratories right outside. Let's use the site to restore more wetlands and figure out how to make them function better, let's create more bird and fish habitat, let's create floating boardwalks over marshes so that our children can get down close and see the living organisms. The only time we need to go inside is to get a hot chocolate and warm up.

3 - Presidio Exchange. Again, I'm not sure this really fits. It's just not compelling. Another theater space is about all it sounds like. There are lots of places like this in the city. What we don't have much of in the city is nature.

Thanks for taking the time to read my comments. I say, leave it to the landscape architects.

Sincerely,
Amy Tanner

i visit the presidio and ride my bike though crissy field often. thank you for all you have done to establish current status.

please exercise caution and wait until the infrastructure and the tunnel top park is in place before making this decision. when the time is appropriate for a decision please do not allow the lucas museum to be built in the presidio. i feel it would be a pretentious eyesore detracting from the natural setting, and that it belongs in an area with greater public transportation access where it would not have adverse effect on a natural area.

please give priority to wetlands and do not allow something to be built that would require additional road capacity in order to avoid the traffic quagmire that would ensue. there are already traffic issues on the crissy field road on many days.

thank you
debra riat

When the planning and design for Crissy Field was under way there was long term plans to underground Doyle Drive and expand the tidal wetland.

(SF Gate <http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/article/Fog-sky-water-land-define-Crissy-Field-5172669.php>)

The tidal wetlands of Crissy Field are too small to be functional. The wetlands are closed off from the bay because there is not enough water flowing to keep them open. This decreases the function of the wetland and means that it is not supporting the plant and animal life it could.

The Commissary building is a non-historic building and should be removed and a wetland created in its place.

The Presidio Trust does not need to create another building since it is already financially self supporting. Instead it should focus on restoring the habitat.

The PX repeats what other buildings are doing nearby. The Fort Mason Center is a venue for shows. There are already Visitors and Interpretation buildings around the area. There are gift shops and places to get food. We do not need the PX. We also don't need a building with pictures and interpretation of wildlife instead of a place where people can actually see the wildlife. We need to restore and expand the wetland.

There are many places where the Lucas Museum it can go. There are very few places were we can restore the much needed wetlands.

People come to the Crissy Field area to view nature. They go somewhere else to shop. Lets enhance the unique characteristics of the Presidio by restoring the wetlands, not making it like everywhere else in San Francisco.

Thank you,
Price Sheppy

I attended the public hearing last night. Having recently moved back to San Francisco after 25 years away, the hearing provided a fresh perspective on this important matter. I live on the border of Pacific and Presidio Heights, Presidio Avenue.

I ask that you delay your decision and remove the Lucas proposal from consideration. While on the surface the Lucas proposal is quite generous, the underlying tone of: "George thinks this best" was egotistical and the presenting architect for the proposal had a difficult time keeping a straight face about the proposed building and Mr Lucas's hand in designing.

There seemed to be many synergies with the two other proposals and maybe with some time they could be integrated.... The potential for a landmark light on the land modern/contemporary building with appropriate programming and activities for this unique site is within our grasp, please let this opportunity play out under your direction.

Thank you.

I have attached two links, one a NYT Sunday Magazine story on the battles over architecture at The University of Virginia, home of Thomas Jefferson's academical village, some insights from this might add clarity. The second one is a story on Edutopia the Lucas education program, this might at least call into question some of the lofty claims and buss words related to education in the Lucas presentation.

Sincerely
C Bradley Miller

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/21/magazine/21uva.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
<http://educationnext.org/edutopian-vision/>

I'm a San Francisco native who goes to Crissy several times per week.

I would love to see the proposal from the Presidio Exchange chosen as it is in line with the requirements outlined by the Trust, and also invokes a sense of place.

While I have nothing against a wealthy investor's trying to build something in the Presidio, the Lucas museum neither has anything to do with the Presidio nor did it pay any real heed to the proposal requirements, particularly around height and architectural design.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carla A. Schlemminger

I attended part of the public meeting last night and was impressed by the large turnout. The audience seemed to be very supportive of the Conservancy's PX proposal. As the main author of the Living New Deal's for the Cultural Institution, a proposal for a National New Deal Museum, I also support the PX proposal. It is appropriate for the types of programs needed in the Presidio which would emphasize its historic, cultural and environmental resources. However, I do find the architectural rendering of the facility to be a bit jarring and would hope that some redesign would make the structure blend more with its natural setting. That said, we do need a "cultural institution" that truly fits with the park; the other main contender, the Lucas proposal, does not - either in architectural style or in the narrow focus of its proposed programming. But what is the rush at this point? Critics have suggested waiting until the broader site improvements have been completed. This would be the prudent course. As for the largesse of Mr. Lucas, why not offer it to his hometown of Modesto and pull up its profile. San Francisco doesn't necessarily need another art museum, but the Presidio does need a facility that is appropriate and is a good fit with the remarkable public space that has developed over the past few decades.

Harvey Smith

1 Presidio Trust Meeting 1/27/2014

Members of the Presidio Trust, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

I come before you, not just to urge you to choose what I think is the best proposal, but to be an advocate for the future of human innovation, and the future of our children's creative imagination. The American Experience is a fabric of millions of lives, woven together with the thread of our hopes, dreams and vision.

Our cultural history illustrates an advanced capacity for innovation in industry, agriculture, and the arts. Together, we have brought forth the miracles of our age.

No one present at the SF World's Fair of 1915 could have imagined the incredible advances we all take for granted today.

One thread of this fabric, is the life of George Lucas.

The history of Lucasfilm shows that George poured his fortunes into research and techniques which transformed the film medium and made it possible for artists to bring to their work anything their imagination could conjure.

We are all well aware of his notoriety, but his true legacy is more than the story of how he built the world's most successful independent film company, or transformed the entire medium of filmmaking. No, his true legacy is that all of his artistic instincts and industrial innovations were brought forth to serve one aim!, To ignite the fire of imagination in young people, and inspire them to believe the power of hard work, optimism, and integrity.

2

His films are modern fables,

At their root is his desire to inspire people and provide insight on the moral dilemmas of life.

They are guiding tales of right and wrong which inspire us to, beat the odds, challenge us to face the tough choices, and demonstrate how to render our goodness into the world.

As a Result of his efforts, there are thousands of people who took inspiration from these stories and turned their dreams into successful lives as artists, innovators and entrepreneurs.....breath

Many of the great industrialists of the last century realized that their money and personal comforts were minutia compared to our collective human legacy.

Thus, they endowed many of our great museums, and education institutions. To this day those institutions serve to inspire our children to greatness, to remind us all to believe... no to expect ourselves to achieve greatness!

Much like the industrialists of the past I believe George wants to endow a legacy that will outlive him.

He is poised to pour the fruits of his success and the power of his tremendous creative initiative into our lives and the lives of our children in the form of the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum.

No other proposal before you demonstrates, a similar legacy, none has more vision, more inspiration, or long term financial viability.

The choice is yours, What will your legacy be?

Marc Wendt

Last night I attended the public meeting of the Presidio Trust and stayed through about one third of the public comments. I was discouraged by the volume of comments from supporters of the "PX" proposal of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy who seem to be using a strategy of delaying a decision in hopes that Mr. Lucas will give up and go elsewhere with his proposed Cultural Arts Museum.

Every since I first moved to San Francisco in 1977 and saw "Star Wars" at the Coronet Theater on Geary Blvd, I have been inspired by the vision and generosity of Mr. Lucas. On my walk home from the meeting last night, I paused at the Letterman Digital Arts Centers beautiful landscaping to enjoy the view of the dome of the Palace of Fine Arts and thought of art for art's sake.

If the Trust decides to wait to make its decision, perhaps we should suggest the former Exploratorium's space at the Palace of Fine Arts as the temporary home of the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum while we await the final decision.

Best wishes from your neighbor,
Jon Anderson



NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS FOR PRESIDIO PLANNING

Box 29086, Presidio Station, San Francisco, California 94129

415-990-9059

January 16, 2014

Cow Hollow Association

Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association

Lake Street Residents Association

Laurel Heights Improvement Association

Marina Community Association

Pacific Heights Residents Association

Planning Association for the Richmond

Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors

Presidio Terrace Association

Sea Cliff Properties Association

Members of the Board of Directors and the Executive Director of the Presidio Trust
103 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94129

Re: Commissary Project – Request for Further Public Meeting

Dear Board Members and Mr. Middleton:

In order for the Board to receive meaningful comment from the public prior to making its decision on the Commissary Project, the Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning (NAPP) requests that a further public comment meeting be scheduled for late February or March, or alternatively, the written comment period be extended to March 15, 2014. This request is made for the following reasons:

The January 17, 2014 submissions may include complex changes to what previously has been submitted by the three finalists. As individuals, we cannot adequately analyze these new submissions and make informed comment by the January 27th meeting with only 4+ working days between the submissions and the Board’s meeting.

NAPP, its constituent organizations and most other organizations are greatly restricted in making any comment when there is no opportunity for their boards to meet and confer in the interim. In this case, between late Friday-1/17 and Monday-1/27, there is but the briefest window of time to analyze the submissions and take board action. The 10-day window includes 4 weekend days and a national holiday. Simply stated, none of the organizations will be able to meet and take informed action in that narrow window in order to authorize a representative to present meaningful comments at the public meeting.

Absent a second meeting, the public will be deprived of the opportunity to make thoughtful input by this unreasonably compressed timeframe. The Trust has a duty to make responsible decisions consistent with the Presidio Trust Act. The Board has demonstrated in the past that it takes its responsibilities seriously. However, to suddenly rush to judgment on the Commissary site project would be regrettable. NAPP submits that a further public board meeting should be scheduled for either late February or March. If the Trust is unwilling to do so, NAPP requests that the Board extend the written comment period until March 15, 2014, prior to the Board making its decision in this matter.

Sincerely,


William R. Shepard, Chair



National Trust for Historic Preservation

Save the past. Enrich the future.

January 27, 2014

Members of the Board of Directors
Presidio Trust
Building 103, Presidio of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94129

Via eDelivery: commissary@presidiotrust.gov

Re: Revised Proposals for Cultural Facility at Mid Crissy Field Site

Dear Members of the Presidio Trust Board:

On behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, we would like to offer comments regarding revised proposals for the development of a cultural facility at the former Commissary (Building 610) at Crissy Field. These comments supplement and reinforce concerns that we first raised in a letter dated October 23, 2013, in which we provided extensive comments regarding the critical role of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards)* and the *Mid-Crissy Area Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines)*. We encourage you to consult those comments as part of your current deliberations. This letter provides a summary of our key concerns, as well as an assessment of how the revised proposals respond to the Standards and Design Guidelines.

Our Interest

The National Trust is a private, non-profit corporation that helps people protect, enhance, and enjoy the places that matter to them. Chartered by Congress in 1949, the National Trust protects and defends America's historic resources, furthers the historic preservation policy of the United States, and facilitates public participation in the preservation of our nation's diverse heritage. See 16 U.S.C. § 468.

Background

Our advocacy efforts at the Presidio go back many years, predating the creation of the Presidio Trust. We are a concurring party to the Presidio Trust Programmatic Agreement (PTPA) for the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan, as well as to the Programmatic Agreement for the Main Post Update to the Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP). The National Trust was opposed to the CAMP proposal at the Main Post due to its inappropriate design and siting at the historic heart of the Presidio, a National Historic Landmark District.

The Current Proposals

We are aware that the revised proposals for the former Commissary were made at your request in a public statement dated November 21, 2013 in which you requested that revised proposals focus on three key areas: achieving program clarity; ensuring the building's compatibility with the Presidio; and understanding

San Francisco Field Office

The Hearst Building, 5 Third Street, Suite 707 San Francisco, CA 94103

E info@savingplaces.org P 415.947.0692 F 415.947.0699 www.PreservationNation.org

how economic viability will be assured. Our comments that follow focus exclusively on design compatibility concerns, and specifically how proposed new development at the Commissary site may impact the historic integrity of Crissy Field and the Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark District (NHLD).

Protecting the National Historic Landmark District

With specific regard to design issues, the November 21 public statement included the following observations:

- **Bridge/ Sustainability Institute:** While proposed building is “‘light on the land,’ it is also too large and we urge some consolidation of the building program.”
- **Lucas Cultural Arts Museum:** “We have significant issues with the proposed building—its massing and height, and its architectural style – and believe it should be redesigned to be more compatible with the Presidio.”
- **Presidio Exchange:** References the “design excellence” that the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy brings to each project it undertakes.

Broadly speaking, these observations mirror our own concerns. As we’ve previously noted, the Presidio Trust identified specific goals and criteria for evaluation for a cultural facility in its initial Request for Concept Proposals. Among those goals was that the proposed facility be compatible with the natural and cultural setting along the Crissy Marsh and San Francisco Bay, and that it conform to the Trust’s *Mid-Crissy Area Design Guidelines* and LEED requirements.

It bears underscoring that in developing the Design Guidelines, the Presidio Trust solicited public comment and consulted with the signatories and concurring parties to the Presidio Trust Programmatic Agreement (PTPA), the agreement that guides the Presidio Trust’s processes for complying with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA.) Failure to conform to the design guidelines subverts their purpose and undercuts the Presidio Trust’s compliance with NHPA.

As a general rule, while we remain concerned about the scale of the prospered new structures, it appears that the three proposals have been sufficiently revised so as to conform to the quantitative, purely objective guidance offered by the *Design Guidelines*. Unfortunately, we remain concerned that the equally important qualitative aspects of both the *Standards* and the *Design Guidelines* are being misinterpreted or disregarded.

Of particular importance in considering the current proposals are Standards 3 and 9. Standard 3 states that “changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.” Standard 9 refers specifically to new construction, stating that “new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”

Finding the right balance between differentiation and compatibility can be a design challenge in any setting, especially one as historically significant as the Presidio. The *Standards* seek to avoid extremes; either towards “compatibility,” where historic designs are literally replicated, or towards “differentiation,” in which new design is in intentional opposition to the historic context. Rather, modern preservation practice encourages design that sustains a sense of continuity in architectural language while avoiding literal resemblance or working in a historic style.¹

Looking at the three revised proposals for the Commissary site, it appears that the Lucas proposal skews towards architectural invention within a historical style, while the Bridge/Sustainability Institute and the Presidio Exchange proposals hew towards abstract reference to the historic setting.

Specifically, the Bridge/Sustainability Institute and the Presidio Exchange proposals find their design inspiration from the surrounding industrial vernacular found at Crissy Field, as called for by the *Design Guidelines*. While the designs arguably venture too far in the direction of differentiation, they both respond to the *Design Guidelines*’ call for new construction on Crissy Field to respond to a historic context that consists of “open, industrial architecture.” Furthermore, the *Design Guidelines* speak specifically to the design of a remodeled Commissary:

Any remodel of Building 610 should aim to create a contemporary structure that is compatible with the historic architecture that characterizes Crissy Field...The objective should be to reference the simple geometric volumes of other Crissy Field structures (p. 23).

In contrast, the Lucas proposal relies on a historical precedent that is not to be found at Crissy Field, nor indeed anywhere in the Presidio NHLD. Rather, it appears that the design inspiration is the architecture of the Panama–Pacific International Exposition. If the Lucas proposal had been conceived as infill to a Panama–Pacific International Exposition Historic District, one might argue that it represented a legitimate interpretation of the *Standards*. Within the context of Crissy Field and the Presidio, however, the design is inappropriate, and would undermine the historic integrity of the NHLD.

Application of the National Historic Preservation Act

Regardless of which proposal is ultimately selected, the Presidio Trust must comply with applicable federal environmental and historic preservation laws prior to final project approval. Agency compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act will require that the agency take specific steps to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to historic properties and engage in a review process with interested parties. The agency must be mindful of the unique requirements applicable to National Landmarks which require it to minimize harm to the “maximum extent possible.”

¹ See “‘Differentiated’ and ‘Compatible’: Four Strategies for Additions in Historic Settings” National Trust for Historic Preservation Forum Journal, Summer 2007

The most effective step the Board can take to assure that Section 106 process is meaningful is to select a design which it finds most compatible with the historic landscape at Crissy Field, and within the broader NHLD and would not adversely affect the Landmark as a whole. The widely accepted *Standards* and *Design Guidelines* are the benchmarks that staff will use to make that judgment. The successful applicant must be made aware that projects that do not conform to these Standards are more likely to result in project modifications, delays, and public scrutiny than those which conform to accepted standards.

Conclusion

Your November 21 public statement reaffirmed your “strong commitment to accomplishing an outcome in the Mid-Crissy area that will protect the park and bring long-term benefit to the Presidio and its visitors,” and stated “the Board also understands that it holds the option of not necessarily selecting any team at this point. Such is the importance of the site that we take seriously our duty to do right by it, even if that means waiting.”

The National Trust strongly encourages the Presidio Trust to avoid an adverse effect to the NHLD, which can be best achieved by assuring that any new development at Crissy Field clearly conforms to the *Design Guidelines*—one that reuses rather than replaces existing structure fabric; that complements rather than competes with the historic context, that is modest in scale; and that does not block views. In the absence of a design that meets these criteria, the Board should exercise its option of waiting.

Sincerely,



Anthony Veerkamp
Field Director



Brian Turner
Senior Field Officer & Attorney



5758 Geary Blvd., # 356 - San Francisco CA 94121-2112
Voice Mails & Faxes-(415) 541-5652 –Direct & Voice Mails (415) 668-8914
Email: president@sfparr.org Web Site: www.sfparr.org

January 25, 2014

Presidio Trust Board of Directors and Executive Director
Post Office Box 29052
Building 103, Presidio of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94129

RE: Comments With Respect to the “Revised Proposals for the Commissary”

Dear Trustees and Craig Middleton:

In a letter dated last October 7th, the Board of Directors of the Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR) urged the selection of the GGNP Conservancy’s September 2013 proposed Presidio Exchange (PX) for future uses of the former commissary in Mid-Crissy Field.

While PAR’s Board of Directors will not have an opportunity to discuss the three revised proposals submitted eight days ago and to reconsider that recommendation until its next meeting February 3rd, this letter provides you with my personal recommendations to PAR’s Board of Directors in the meantime.

In its January 2014 “Supplement” to its September 2013 proposal, the Conservancy:

- reaffirms its original proposal, provides additional information about the focus of the PX, its master narrative and how it will serve the Presidio;
- provides clearer descriptions of how its programs will complement those of other programs at the Presidio and how they will reach out to inner-city youths and families with the award-winning programs at the Crissy Field Center;
- provides a comprehensive description of how it has changed its emphases on basic visitor amenities to avoid overlaps with other key Presidio visitor destinations; and
- reduces the originally-proposed, first-phase of its construction from 97,000 to 55,000 square feet.

In my opinion, those supplements significantly strengthen the Conservancy’s proposal especially since it has become apparent one cannot be too confident that the landscape, topography and vegetation at that site will not continue changing until the Presidio Parkway and its tunnels are completed.

As a result, we are asking that you schedule more public hearings on future uses of that site so that PAR’s Board of Directors and others who commented on the original proposals have opportunities to reconsider them based on all of these very recent actual and potential changes.

Sincerely,

Raymond R. Holland
President

Public Comments from the Public Meeting on January 27, 2014

The site we are discussing was dedicated for a museum by the Trust. Years ago, members of the Trust asked Mr. Lucas for a museum and he agreed. Of the 3 proposals only the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum is an actual museum and it's more – it's an education institution too.

Some of its programming will link to the long history of film making in the Bay Area. Seen tonight, it is easy for amateur architects and others to take pot shots at the Lucas design and Mr. Lucas himself. The Lucas Museum is the most sympathetic to the site and the historic Presidio.

The other designs appear to be architectural statements searching for programming. As for appropriateness of an Arts museum, you currently house the Disney Family Museum and various families for business. I fail to see how the Lucas proposal falls outside that range. The NPS and others feel that the Lucas Museum could be sited anywhere. The same could be said for your other two proposals. If it isn't built at this museum site, it will go to Chicago which I recall already has a world class museum in a park fronting water.

Please don't lose this wonderful gift to our citizens.

Tim Irish

As a museum professional, I have to express full support for the Presidio Exchange.

- 1) Sensitivity to the site.
- 2) Programming and partnership.
- 3) Dynamism.
- 4) It is the right model for the future of arts/cultural space; it's feasible.

Lucas Museum.

- 1) Art educator / Museum Professional – I am in the field, keep up with new developments.
- 2) I am particularly wary of the utopian spin on education as a real way to improve on education systems here.

Park Conservancy already serves 60,000 students.

PX is right, to wait would open up similar...

Marc Mayer

Open space!

No Lucas mausoleum!

Lucas memorabilia should be left in Marin or Hollywood, NOT IN THE PRESIDIO!!

Jan Barroca

Before I give my enthusiastic endorsement of the Presidio Exchange, one thing I have to say as a museum professional and arts educator is that the Lucas Cultural Art Center's proposal use of education as a major argument is flawed. Its model is already outdated and serving youth from low income community to improve education is overly romantic and misguided.

The Presidio Exchange is a strong vision for the future. The Parks Conservancy has a proven track record in terms of programs, educations, and exhibition. The model is dynamic, cutting edge, flexible. It is a model of place making, creating new meanings and focuses. Its approach to partnerships shows shared ownership. It will create very important proposals.

While I understand the desire to delay this decision, I feel strongly that the PX is the right decision. I believe the PX should be selected with the potential of delaying full construction until after the construction.

As a museum and art education professional (working at the Museum of Modern Art, the New Museum, and the Asian Art Museum), the PX is REALLY the most potent model for the future of art, culture, environmental conservations and education.

Marc Mayer

Our whole family supports the Lucas project.

Laura Rhine

We support development projects!

Darlene Lam

I'm a parent from Presidio Dance Theatre. Supportive of Lucas project in supporting the arts.

Marcia Zorinlle

I support the Lucas Cultural Arts project / development at the Presidio.

Audrey Calvo

I fully support the suggestion that was made in the S.F. Chronicle, Sunday 1/26 by George Hargreaves and Mary Margaret Jones. What do we lack in San Francisco, in California, in the world-earth-planet? –

viable wetlands. Our grandchildren's grandchildren will enjoy the legacy of life and space for wild beings.

Please, no building. Enlarge the wetland; it would be a precious link between beach area and bridge, bay and Main Post.

Life. Nature. Preservation. Conservation.

Thank you,
Sarah Hummingbird

Delay the development of the Sports Basement site. Why hurry? We need thoughtful, respectful development of this natural jewel.

Kathy B.

I would like to advocate for the many shorebirds and wild life that would be attracted to the Presidio if the proposed site was added to the existing marsh!

I feel strongly that this area should be open space. All programs could be housed further away from the shore.

Please delay!

Adelaide Johnson

I support views of Amy Meyer and the majority of speakers who support the PX proposal only (or nothing – my view and voiced by a few others). Waiting for completion of the construction makes the most sense. Choosing the PX now might help with lining up funding.

Thank you,
Tom Kuhn
