

Public Meeting of the Board, Presidio Trust

April 27, 2000

Toby Rosenblatt: Welcome. We are gathered, as you know--oh, excuse me. Before we start, could I ask is there anybody here who knows of other individuals or who would like to indicate that we need signing?

We'll continue with the signing for the early part of the meeting in case somebody does come who needs it. And if you're aware of somebody coming in who needs it, please let us know.

This is a public meeting of the board, of the Presidio Trust, for the purpose of the board receiving information from the public and from our staff about housing, and the housing program, and the planning for housing program, housing at the Presidio.

We appreciate your taking the time to come. These are helpful conversations for us. Just to give you a sense of the pattern today, it is our intention--we have a short presentation to make in honor of a very outstanding individual in our staff. And then we will proceed

with the staff presentation and discussion of our housing planning and its current status. And then we would like to hear from any of you who would like to address the board with respect to the issues about housing in the Presidio.

The pattern for the public commentary will follow the usual routine that I'm sure you're all aware of. We would ask you to sign up in advance. We would ask you out of courtesy to the others that you keep your remarks within a three-minute period, briefer if convenient and possible.

Everything that is said today will be, is being recorded. And that information will be included in all of the considerations that we will be doing going forward as we do our housing planning. So with that introduction, I would like to turn the program over to our executive director, Jim Meadows, for a special presentation.

[cellular phone rings]

That does remind me, out of courtesy of everybody else who came for the purpose of the meeting, if you have a cell phone or a pager, would you please be good enough to turn it off, or turn it on vibrate mode, or go outside with it? Thank you.

Jim Meadows: Thank you, Toby. I'd like to, at this point, welcome Brian O'Neil, who's a superintendent of the Golden Gate National Recreation Association, to join me in what we consider a very special presentation.

The Presidio Trust and the National Park Service share many duties at the Presidio and responsibilities. One thing we're especially proud of is the smooth transition that we were able to effect of employment between employees that were formerly employed with the National Park Service that are currently employed by the Presidio Trust.

Each year, the Secretary of the Interior honors a select few of its 180,000 employees with a valor award, which is for their commendable performance beyond the call of duty. And we're here today to present it to one of the Presidio Trust staff, formerly

National Park Service employee, Brad Robert Benson, for his efforts several years ago.

Brad has worked for the park system for several years. First for the National Park Service, and today, for the Presidio Trust, caring for the Presidio's trails and grounds. In 1996, Brad, in a similar capacity for GGNRA, basically was working and found himself in a situation that was a bit unusual.

On July 18, in 1996, Brad was at work in Aquatic Park when he was informed by a visitor that a man was drowning off the Muni Pier. It appeared the man was unable to swim and might be attempting suicide.

Brad rushed to the scene. Saw the man floating face down in the Bay. Without regard for his own personal safety, jumped into the Bay in the near-freezing water, and stabilized the person, and kept the man afloat for 20 minutes until additional help could arrive.

This type of effort and this type of service is something that we hope to become a standard, or the highest standard the Presidio Trust, and it certainly is part of the high standards of the National Park Service.

And so in spite of very grave dangers to himself, he did effort that brought credit to himself, to the National Park Service, and also to the standards of the Trust and the Park Service. I'd like to invite Brian O'Neil to make a few remarks on the Park Service's behalf.

Brian O'Neil: No, I just would like to echo what Jim has said, is that we have a lot of remarkable people who put their lives at stake on a day to day basis. And the actions that Brad did, and the best sort of expectation one could have in an employee of any agency, did the necessary. Put his life at risk, and as a result, was responsible for saving someone. So I think both Jim and I, and all the employees that we represent, just want to express our most heartfelt thanks for someone who exemplifies what we want to see in public service. And it's with great honor on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, that we jointly present this valor award to Brad for his extraordinary efforts in this incident.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Okay, thank you, Brad, thank you, Brian, thank you for joining us for that special--thank you, Jim.

As many of you know, this April is really concentration month on the housing in the Presidio. This is now the third of the public meetings that have been conducted by the Presidio Trust with respect to the housing subject. We did a workshop, and then we did a Presidio forum, and now this public board meeting.

During the next few minutes, Jim Meadows and the staff will be making presentations about more information about the housing. Some of that will be familiar to a number of you who were at earlier meetings. Some of it will be new information which is evolving as a result of the prior discussions and the ongoing research being done by the staff, the consultants, and with the input from you all.

So again, thank you for coming to be part of this. And let me turn it over to Jim and his people for the presentation. Let me ask one more time, is there anyone here who is in need of our signing facilitator? Or are you aware of anybody else who may be? Okay, if not, I think we can say thank you and...why don't the board, we can go down there and we can see better.

Jim Meadows: For those of you that attended our public workshop, or the Presidio forum, this is a very similar presentation to what was made in those two venues. As Toby mentioned, this is the third in the series of preliminary workshops having to do with housing. The housing workshops are part of, and a preparation for the planning process that the Presidio Trust has announced that the ongoing planning process that will start scoping in July of this year that will bring forward modifications and planning changes that are necessary or being looked at to the general management plan amendment as what we're calling the Presidio Trust implementation plan, and an associated environmental impact statement that will, an environmental analysis that will go along with that planning, that implementation planning.

There will be a formal scoping session on housing. There will be a formal scoping session on the overall requirements of the environmental impact statement. But we wanted to kick off this housing program in advance of, but in addition to any formal scoping process that will go on for housing.

We're going to give a two-part PowerPoint. Ann Ostrander is going to come up and give you some background on housing. We're going to discuss the jobs/housing balance criteria that were established in the GMPA. And moving forward with the Trust implementation plans. And then from there, we'll be opening it up for questions and answers. Ann?

Ann Ostrander: Thought we'd start with this very brief summary, the history of housing in the Presidio. During the more than 100 years that the Army was here in the Presidio, it built housing in many neighborhoods, and it built basically three different types of accommodations: Barracks for enlisted soldiers, family housing, and bachelors' officers quarters.

During its tenure it built approximately 1,200 units. Fifty-eight were demolished recently to make room for the Dune Restoration Project over on Lincoln Boulevard. And nine units were converted to office space over on O'Reilly Avenue as part of the Thoreau Center development. That leaves us 1,116 units today.

The Army also built through the barracks and the dorms in the bachelors' officers quarters accommodations for 500 individuals. Today, of the 1,116 units, approximately 70 percent were built after World War II. That's our non-historic housing stock.

The historic housing stock is mostly represented through single family or duplex units. And the non-historic stock ranges from duplexes all the way to 12-plex units. We also have 200 accommodations for single people. Those are the dorms and the barracks. And the difference between the 200 that we have today and the 500 that were built is mostly accounted for through conversions of the residential space to non-residential. If you think

about the Montgomery Street barracks, for example, all of those barracks are now used as office space.

The Army was clearly in its apartments and homes building to accommodate families. You can see that we have an incredible shortage of smaller units. Only ten one-bedroom units. And 77 percent of all of our units have three or more bedrooms.

By the time the Army left in 1994, there was a residential population of approximately 4,700 people. And there was an employment force of about 5,500. 2,000 military people, and about 3,500 civilians.

When the Trust assumed management in 1998 of Area B of the Presidio, it was clearly being guided by the General Management Plan Amendment which was prepared for the Presidio. And one key element in that document refers to a jobs/housing balance. And while we need to do more analysis, the idea behind that concept is that people who live near their places of employment are more likely to walk or bicycle to work, and thereby reducing traffic, improving

environmental quality, and helping to create a vibrant residential community.

Again, going back to that summary of 1998 when the Trust first started working here in the Presidio, and working hand in hand with the John Stewart Company, its management agent, the Trust developed key interim housing preference groups. Again, going back first and foremost to this jobs/housing balance concept. First preference for housing here in the Presidio is given to full-time, Presidio-based employees. Second is the federal employee base, third are the specialty tenants. Those are people who, for example, the university housing program, participants or volunteers here in the park. And last is the general public.

Ultimately, the long-term goal for the housing is to have all of the units be leased by Presidio-based employees. To ensure that a broad spectrum of employees is accommodated here in the Presidio, we also have developed key programs. The first is the preferred rental program. And that accommodates people making up to 100 percent of the median income for the Bay Area. And right now, for

example, that income range is just under \$75,000 for a family of four.

There are 150 units set aside for this program in five neighborhoods- -McArthur, Sanchez, Corey, Baker Beach, and South Baker Beach. People who are in this program pay 40 percent of their income for rent, and that includes utilities.

To ensure that there's a broad public safety presence here in the Presidio, we also have developed two programs for people in the life safety professions here. People who are full-time firefighters or full-time employees of the U.S. Park Police. 40 units are in that program in the same neighborhoods as the preferred rental program, with the addition of West Washington. And officers in those programs pay either 25 or 30 percent of their income for rent, also including utilities.

Going back again, one of our key goals is to accommodate a very broad spectrum of employees. And as you may remember, we have ten one-bedroom units. There's an incredible dearth of

accommodations for smaller households. So just this month, we began leasing at Building 1028 over by the Letterman complex.

These units will accommodate single or two-person households of modest means. People who make up to 50 percent of median income get first preference for this housing. And rents range between \$475 and \$525 per month.

Also to serve that population, we'll be bringing more units online in the near future. 18 more units at Letterman Apartments later this year, 19 studio or one-bedroom units at Building 42--that's Pershing Hall up in the main post. And in 2002, 12 studio or one-bedrooms over at Barnard Hall--that's in the Coby neighborhood--and 17 studio units over at Scott Hall--that's the sort of big white classical building over by the Golden Gate Bridge. And that will also be in 2002.

When the Trust took over, there were approximately 300 Department of Defense households living here in the Presidio, and about 145 other leaseholders, people who were either employees of

the National Park Service, or park partners--that is, employees of the organizations headquartered here in the Presidio.

From there we have leased, we're up to over 800 leases including DOD households. We expect to lease about another 200 by the end of this fiscal year. And we expect to lease another 200 this year and we expect to have all of our units leased. We expect to have all of our units leased by the end of the next fiscal year, which is October 2001.

We wanted to highlight how important the residential leasing revenue is to our overall financial health. I think you all know about the financial necessity of achieving self-sufficiency in the year 2013. To achieve that goal, over \$36 million is required. And of that total, the housing revenue is expected to generate \$20.6 million. So that represents 56 percent of the overall pie, so to speak. It's a very, very important piece and that's one of the reasons we're working so hard to renovate and lease units as fast as we can.

We also have other housing efforts underway, working with staff of the National Park Service and tenants, and other Trust staff. There's been a really successful project underway to reintroduce native plants at the Baker Beach apartment complex. Playground installations--this one is over in the East Washington neighborhood. Lots of housing upgrades. And a very related effort not totally physical in its nature. But residential rules, what does it mean to live in a national park?

Living here is sometimes different from living in rental housing available in the private rental market. And issues of gardening, landscaping, pets, sustainability, those associating with composting and recycling, and just the fine grain issues of outdoor furniture and equipment. The tension sometimes between what tenants can and cannot do in the context of also trying to provide a very positive visitor experience.

So that just gives you a snapshot hopefully, and at this point I'm going to turn it over to our executive director and he's going to talk about goals for anticipating future housing units.

Jim Meadows: Thanks, Ann. The original GMPA housing assumptions called for jobs/housing balance at the Presidio. It didn't spell out what that was defined as, or what the numbers would be, but it certainly supported the idea that it was a strong sustainability issue to have people live and work at the Presidio, rather than a cross-commute being set up.

The housing was also meant to support park activities, and alternate uses assigned to certain housing areas could be entertained. The need for additional on-site housing would be analyzed based upon actual employment patterns and related housing demands, which is what we're undertaking currently.

As Ann had summarized, we have currently 1,116 housing units total at the Presidio. That includes three interim programs that basically, if we're going to go to a jobs/housing balance, whereby all people living at the Presidio will be working at the Presidio, we will have to phase out those interim programs.

One of those programs, we've reached agreement with the Department of Defense where they've already downsized their 306 approximate units at the Presidio to about 149 units presently, and by the end of next year, they'll reduce that down to 22 units, and then over a period of four years, they will reduce that down to zero. That will basically terminate the DOD presence in housing at the Presidio.

But of our current housing stock, 521 of those units are scheduled per the GMPA for demolition or deconstruction over a period of time. That leaves us with only 595 units available over the long-term to try to satisfy a jobs/housing balance.

When the Trust Act was created, it basically allows us and dictates that we look at a reevaluation of our development tools and the plans that we have in effect. Those tools include renovation of existing housing stock, new construction, or conversion of existing non-residential buildings, or large residential buildings into smaller residential buildings to improve the mix.

The Trust Act also clearly stated a financial self-sufficiency mandate by the year 2013, and things, circumstances changed. Basically, the 6th Army, which had been previously planned to remain for the indefinite future at the Presidio, did not remain, and the UCSF proposed campus at Letterman did not come into effect.

The other change since 1994 was a very strong housing market in San Francisco, and therefore in the Presidio. The Trust remains committed and believes that the jobs/housing balance is probably the most, or at least one of the most important things we can do to create an environmentally sustainable community and to have the less impact on the environment than a traditional park or a traditional place where you would have housing and jobs but no relationship between the two. We are committed to that jobs/housing balance.

The actual number of future employees is yet to be determined, and part of this Presidio-wide implementation plan will be to do a current study on what we believe, what we estimate to be the future employment force.

However, we can't sit back and just say, "We can't do any planning or any implementation until we complete that plan." So we've started with some hypothetical numbers and said, per the GMPA which basically called out for probably about 4,800 employees, if there were 5,000 employees at the Presidio, and if we're committed to a jobs/housing balance of as many of half of those at the Presidio, that we would have to basically find housing for as many as 2,500 employees.

We know that we have 800 units currently available. That's just under 600 units of housing and 200 beds of conversions of single-room occupancy type barracks. That would leave, under that scenario, a shortfall of approximately 1,700 units or place for 1,700 employees to live.

Therefore, we're conducting a Presidio housing study to be part of our implementation planning. It will be brought to the public for response and comment. And this will become one of the key elements for our future implementation.

The formal scoping for this planning will occur in July. And I would ask, I believe everyone by this point in time, certainly if you're a resident at the Presidio, you should be receiving the Presidio Post. If you are not receiving the Post, or if you are not a resident and not receiving the Post, please sign up outside. Because in the Post next month we will be publishing the workshop format for the next 12 months so that you can line out those areas that you have special interest in, or line out those areas that you would especially like to attend.

The housing study that we're going to put together starting now is looking at who's going to work here. The numbers of employees that we estimate at this point that will be working here. Their household income, their household size, their demand for housing and other issues such as the transportation impacts, the schools impacts, and retail uses such as where do you shop? Where do you have your places to eat? Where do you go to buy a cup of coffee?

These are all issues that we have to study as part of our overall planning. After bringing the first phase of this report out for public

input, we will then initiate a second phase of this report in the fall of the year 2000 which will look for alternatives to meet the anticipated demand.

Those alternatives include, again, the tools we have in place, renovation of existing housing stock which we have underway. New construction--where should that new construction be? What should be the density for the locations? And then finally, conversion of both non-residential and large residential units into other areas of housing.

Now one of the other key elements, perhaps the most key element in the Presidio Trust charge is preservation of the Presidio as a national park. Something that's been implied in that notion of preservation we want to make sure is more explicit is that those areas that are natural areas today will remain natural areas into the future.

What you see in this slide, up right now, are what we call the building or activity areas of the Presidio. And that in yellow is the building activity zone, or non-residential space primarily. In the

light aqua are the housing areas within the Presidio where there is existing housing today. The darker green shade is open space and recreation, and that will remain open space and recreation.

The ideas for, behind this map and for the housing study and for our future public workshops, is where does the housing go? What type should it be? How do we reach out to our total employee force?

And how do we make sure that we have a jobs/housing balance for as many as half of the employees that live at the Presidio?

This concludes the formal presentation that we've given at all three workshops, preliminary workshops to date. Basically, we'll turn up the lights now. We have some people who signed up for questions. And after remarks by the chairman, we'll welcome those questions and answers.

Toby Rosenblatt: Let me mention again the pattern we would appreciate your following, if you wish to address us. Please be sure that you sign up on one of these cards, which are back there, and that you try to

please, we're going to ask you to retain your remarks within a three month--[audience laughs] no, we're not going to stay three months.

We'll be back and back again, but not three months--three-minute time so that other people can have the opportunity to speak as well.

We'll begin with Michael Radke to be followed by Brian Hughes, and then Ken Field. Please come forward to the mike here. That would be helpful, and your words will be recorded.

Michael Radke: Hi, my name's Mike Radke. I live in Presidio and I'm a National Park Service employee, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I moved into Presidio in May of '96, moving from a rent controlled situation, under an agreement between the union and the Department of the Interior.

There were originally 70 of us that were allotted housing here under a lottery system. And presently, depending on who went over to Public Safety, there's between 30 and 40 of us.

In October of '98, the Park Service transferred our leases to the Presidio when they took over. And I've been paying rent to the Stewart Company at the NPS rate since that time.

I received a letter in February of 2000 from the Stewart Company stating that the rent would be raised to market rate in February 2001, and that my present rental rate would continue until then. And that I should sign a lease with the Stewart Company.

That rental agreement that they're proposing is essentially my net salary right now. The MNS Presidio residents were advised that they may have some rights under the existing leases with the Park Service. And so we were advised by the union lawyer not to sign the lease, the new lease with the Trust until it was clarified.

And we had sent a letter in April asking the board to clarify the validity of our original NPS lease. We received the latter from the Presidio Trust board from Jim Meadows, that our leases were no longer valid. And we were offered a number of programs for rent in

the Presidio, none of which address the NPS economic, our economic situation.

We also received a rather threatening letter from the Stewart Company stating that unless we signed leases with the Trust by May 15th, we were in danger of trespassing, and would be evicted. Myself, and the NPS residents, welcome an opportunity to meet with the Trust and the Stewart Company to work out our differences. But more in a spirit of cooperation, and not intimidation. Thank you.

[applause]

Brian Hughes: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the board, Mr. Meadows. My name is Brian Hughes, and I direct the National Parks and Conservation Association-Pacific Region. On behalf of NPCA, I wish to thank the board for this opportunity to provide comment on the development of a housing study for the Presidio.

At the outset, we wish to thank the board for committing to engage in a comprehensive planning effort for the park. As described in the

final Letterman EIS, the implementation plan, this housing study, the park management study, and the traffic demand management program provide the best opportunity to fully assess the change in circumstance since the GMPA was prepared.

Moreover, upon completion, these plans will hopefully establish a publicly supported vision for the Presidio. It is with this in mind, that NPCA offers these comments. NPCA recognizes the importance of the Presidio's housing stock, both in their utility and in achieving the financial mandate of the trust, and in their importance in creating community here at the Presidio.

Any housing program must strive to reflect both these important attributes while insuring the program is compatible with the protection of the park's unique, natural and historic resources.

We were therefore troubled by the April 17th Presidio forum wherein the Trust stated that prior to public scoping or any analysis of alternatives, it had committed to a jobs/housing balance of 50 percent.

I'd like to point out that I noticed in this presentation today that that's no longer a stated goal, but a hypothetical analysis. That's important to note here.

Further, we were told that this goal would necessitate the construction of up to 1,200 new housing units. We would like to say while a 50 percent jobs/housing balance appears to be a laudable goal, it raises a few serious issues. First, it's 50 percent jobs/housing balance, and the construction of new housing both represent significant departures from the GMPA.

The GMPA, for example, projected fewer employees, and a jobs/housing balance of between 35 and 38 percent. Second, this goal is not found in any analysis nor supported by a completed housing study or associated environmental impact study.

Third, the establishment of this goal prior to such evaluation of a housing demand, the available housing stock, and the environmental

considerations places decision making ahead of appropriate planning.

We therefore ask the board to undertake a meaningful housing study that incorporates the following elements. A housing demand analysis similar to that used in the development of the GMPA. An assessment of the available housing stock at the park that includes the possibility of conversion of existing housing into smaller units. And if there are unmet needs in analysis of the environmental impacts of meeting those needs as well as the benefits.

Any plan for housing employees at the Presidio must reflect the goals of meeting the financial mandate of the Trust, while limiting to the greatest extent possible additional development. As is in keeping with preserving national parks for future generations.

Thank you very much.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Ken Field, and then Michelle Rios.

Ken Field: I'm Ken Field, and I'm an interim tenant at the Presidio. I'm part of the student housing program. And one thing that I've heard again and again at several of these meetings is the idea of sustainability and the building of community. The building a community isn't actually mandated by the GMPA, but sustainability is. And I would like to point out--

Toby Rosenblatt: Mr. Field, we need a little bit more volume.

Ken Field: I'd like to point out a discrepancy between what is currently the practice of the Presidio and the long-term goal of sustainability, and that is that the current practice of using market rate within San Francisco to establish both program housing rates, such as the preferred rental program, as well as market rate rents does not coincide with the fact that we're trying to strive for a sustainable community here within the Presidio.

San Francisco has one of the least sustainable housing markets in the world. In that, I think that that has to be considered when these rates

are established. And I'm glad to see that the Presidio Trust has finally put in writing a ten percent cap on rental increases per year. And I think that's the kind of certainty that helps families within the Presidio plan for future years and may help preserve a sustainable community where the families can raise children without fear that they will be evicted in future years by the amount of increases in their rent.

I'd just like to lastly close by saying that although both sustainability and forming a community are important goals, the community that I see at Baker Beach Apartments is one in crisis. And one that this crisis has been caused by not knowing what your rent will be next year when you sign your lease. And by changes in policy from year to year. And I think the planning that you're doing now is very important, but these plans must be communicated to the tenants, whom they affect the most.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Michelle Rios, and then Craig Glassner.

Michelle Rios: My name is Michelle Rios. I am a National Park Service employee, and I've been a Presidio resident for several years now. First, I just wanted to express some general concerns for the whole Presidio community here, which I think you're beginning to understand is in a state of flux. It's in a state of concern and crisis.

The market rents that you're charging are basically not contributing to community. I think it's getting to the point where you're pricing the people who do work here out of this market. You're creating an elite community, economically elite community. And what you're ending up with is a regular turnover. You're losing diversity. You're losing the stability and the integrity of the community. And I'm concerned, although you've now put a ten percent cap in writing, that's still an extraordinary rental increase on an annual basis.

Very few of us in the world get a ten percent annual increase in our salary. Which means if we can afford it this year, and perhaps next year, the odds that we will really be able to afford it in a long-term sustainable way are minimal at best.

Stepping back from the general concerns, speaking specifically to the NPS residents, I've been very disappointed in the response that we've gotten to our concerns. I think we have some valid concerns about tremendous, extraordinary increases in the space of one year going up three and four times what people are paying now. In this market, that's barely enough time to determine if we're going to be able to stay at the Presidio, stay in San Francisco, stay in our jobs.

And I'd really like to ask the Trust's consideration that you suspend the April 17th letter, with its rather short and threatening deadline, and take the opportunity to have discussions with us to maybe phase in this program. And we want very much to contribute to this community. We want to reach a fair agreement on how to do that over time. We want to help the Trust meet its financial goals, but we'd like some respect and some consideration for our situation as well. Thank you.

[applause]

Craig Glassner: Good morning, my name is Craig Glassner. I'm a park ranger with the National Park Service, supervisor park ranger, and a resident here in the Presidio for about a year and a half now.

The original 70 or so of us that moved into the Presidio, we were the original stewards of the Presidio. We were here with a purpose, to help protect the resources. I could go on and on and talk about the incidents, phone calls of park dispatch about empty units being broken into, resource concerns that on our own time we've helped deal with and report. There was a reason we moved here. We knew our situation was not a permanent situation. We knew that when we moved out of rent controlled housing into the Presidio.

Yet many of us who have attended hours and hours of public meetings, planning sessions, scoping sessions, really believed in the Presidio and its future.

We knew it would not last forever though, but we didn't expect to be evicted. My rent is going up to 150 percent of my take home pay as

of February 1st. That's one and a half times what I take home from my pay. Obviously, I can't pay that level of rent.

The time I have between now and February 1st to find a new job, to move out of the Bay Area--because for political reasons, and environmental reasons, I can't in good conscience commute two hours from affordable housing back here into the Bay Area, I have to find a new job and move out. Find a new school for my children. And the short time frame, let me put it this way, I feel like an animal cornered protecting my young. We don't want this to develop into a confrontational situation, we truly want to work with the Trust to make this happen.

Your letter of April 17th states that you're interested in finding ways to accommodate NPS employees to continue to live in the Presidio. In the spirit of that, we propose that a meeting be held between the appropriate representatives of the Trust and residents of the Park Service living here in the Presidio to try to come to a resolution to some disagreements we have. And also to the housing situation.

We truly want to see the Presidio succeed, but we feel that the current situation is just untenable to us. We believe there are alternatives that will help meet the financial goal, yet give us a reasonable period of time to get our lives in order, to move on, to move elsewhere, to find new jobs, whatever it takes for us as families to survive.

The preferred rental program doesn't work. We've yet to meet anyone that will be able to stay in the Presidio for any length of time under any of the alternative programs that have been offered at this point. I've had residents, neighbors of mine who worked for the Presidio Trust, come to me and say, "What are we going to do? We can't afford to stay here." I've had market tenant rate residents living in my neighborhood come to me and say, "I can't afford the kind of rent increases that are being talked about." I've had members of non-profits who are in my neighborhood, neighbors and friends of mine who have come to me and said, "What are you guys doing about this situation? We can't stay here."

We feel that we need to reevaluate that situation, and would like the opportunity to meet. I would like a response from you in terms of establishing a meeting by Friday, May 5th. And we would also like to request formally that in the interim, in good faith, that the somewhat threatening letter of April 17th that we're in receipt of be deferred until such time as we have a chance to talk about the situation. Thank you.

[applause]

Supervisor Tom Ammiano: Good morning.

Toby Rosenblatt: Supervisor Ammiano, welcome.

Supervisor Tom Ammiano: Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: We appreciate your coming over here to talk to us and are looking forward to your remarks.

Supervisor Tom Ammiano: Thank you, and I appreciate being here this morning. I represent a broad coalition of groups, civil rights, environmental and community, all concerned about the Trust leasing practices at the Presidio.

I stand today to submit to you a letter signed by these organizations that details these concerns. Members of this coalition support the vision of GMPA and are concerned that the Trust residential, as well as non-residential leasing practices depart from that vision as set forth in the letter.

The announcement in the San Francisco Business Times regarding the new Hambrecht lease underscores how well-founded are the concerns we express about non-residential housing and leasing.

The letter has also defined the problems we see regarding residential housing in the Presidio, and its relation to the broader pattern that we see happening here and in San Francisco as evidenced by renters in this city are being driven out by high rents. Businesses in this

city, particularly non-profits, are being driven out by high rents.

Now it appears the same things may be happening here.

San Francisco is in grave jeopardy of losing the philosophical and intellectual capital inherent in the myriad of diverse organizations and small businesses that have made our city great. It appears that the Presidio, once considered a possible solution to this problem, not only reflects that process, but may also serve to accelerate it.

As was stated at the housing forum the other night, and at the tenants' meeting, tenants are being driven out of the Presidio because of high rents. Notwithstanding your preferred housing program, which clearly is not good enough. Non-profits can't afford to come here. Hambrecht is paying \$40 to \$50 per square foot. Mission enhancing tenants such as Americorps and Exploratorium who are here now are being forced out.

High end tenants who come here will have lots of employees who won't need housing. They'll own homes they'll want to keep. And

many of their employees who do need housing will be lower wage employees who won't be able to afford your rents.

The Trust announced intention to build upward of 1,200 new housing units will not elevate this problem. And all this will do will provide high-end housing for the newest employees of dot-coms. The preferred housing program does not serve those who are already under it and the examples of Lucas and Hambrecht indicate that your business tenants will not further your announced 50 percent jobs/housing balance.

We understand that you need to meet your financial mandate, and that housing rents need to contribute to that goal. I, and the people I represent do not want the Presidio to be sold. I ask on the behalf on the 60 plus groups and individuals which signed this letter that you remember the Presidio does not need to be sold to be lost.

And in addition, as you commence your housing study, I would suggest you might set aside some funds for Section 8 housing and [Helpa] housing. These are federally subsidized programs for

people of low income, and people with AIDS. And we have worked with HUD to increase the subsidy so that it's almost at market rate, and it wouldn't be necessary then for the Trust to underwrite these programs.

So thank you very much. I appreciate you listening. And I do have the letter here, which I could present to the Trust.

Toby Rosenblatt: Could you please?

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Next speaker is Becky Hogue, to be followed by [Atiati]. Sorry, I should know that.

Becky Hogue: Good morning. As vice president of the Richmond District Democratic Club, we are very concerned about housing on the Presidio. We have members that live here, and we know how important the Presidio is to them. This evening, our club will again be taking action in the form of a resolution on housing. We've been

involved in the Presidio Management Plan, and hearings and that.

And housing has always been one of our major concerns.

Our members want to see the Trust succeed. But not at the expense of families. The General Management Plan calls for people that work on the Presidio live there. But when the rents are, in some cases, 80 percent of the family's income, we don't see how that can happen.

This concerns us because it will bring more traffic to our neighborhood. So we ask that you work with the residents to keep the community on the Presidio alive. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Mary Joe? And then Johanna Wald.

[Mary Joe]: Can you hear me? I'm a resident. I'm a resident who works at the Exploratorium. And I moved in in February of 1998 when the Park Service was managing the rental arrangement.

My rent at that time for a two-bedroom place was \$1,600 a month. My rent now beginning this year is \$1,870, which is an 18 percent increase. And with a ten percent increase each year, that means next year, if I was to renew my rent, I would have an almost 30 percent increase in rent in three years. I can't possibly do that. And so I wonder about the housing, the work/live situation. The goal here for this organization.

I don't see how it's possible for people who work in non-profit organizations, who don't get big increases every year, to live and work here. And also, if you live in the city there's a rent control situation. So we may have to move in and pay high rent the first year, but I think the maximum cap is only two percent each year. So at least you can sort of create a stable housing situation in the city because you're not expecting huge increases every year.

As someone said previously, most people don't get ten percent increases each year in our salaries. And so if your housing goes up ten percent every year, you can't possibly stay in the same situation

unless you get a new job. And if you're living here on the Presidio, and working here at the Presidio, then getting a new job means that you're moving away from that whole idea.

So as a renter, I feel a great deal of pressure that a ten percent increase is considered a good increase every year. I won't be able to stay here next year. I can't afford these kinds of increases every year.

And I work at a non-profit organization that I think is important to have here in the Presidio. You need a mix of organizations working here. And there are lots of non-profit organizations working here now. And I think they were the original renters in the Presidio. The original tenants, or many of the original tenants.

So I just think there needs to be more consideration. I agree that it seems to be becoming an elitist kind of community. Because ten percent increases are very large increases, and you have to make a very large salary to be able to absorb that.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Following Johanna would be Colin [Farish].

Johanna Wald: Good morning. My name is Johanna Wald. I'm the director of the [Land] Program for the Natural Resources Defense Council, NRDC.

On behalf of NRDC I thank the board for holding this public meeting. I want to take this opportunity to thank you in person for your recent commitment to engage in comprehensive planning at the Presidio. The housing study that's the subject of this hearing, the parking management study, and the traffic demand program, together with the comprehensive planning effort will allow you to not only address, change circumstances as Jim indicated at the beginning of this hearing, but also I hope to develop, with public participation, your own vision for the Presidio.

Like others who will speak to you this morning, NRDC understands that the housing stock at the Presidio has a very important role to

play in meeting the congressional mandate for self-sufficiency as well as creating community.

We also believe that this program must be conducted in a way that is compatible with the overarching mandate to protect the Presidio's historic, cultural and natural resources.

The concerns we have at this time stem largely from the April 17th housing forum. At that forum, the Trust stated publicly that they were fully committed to a 50 percent jobs/housing balance. They also stated that to meet this balance, it would be necessary to construct up to 1,200 new housing units. Both this jobs/housing balance and the new construction represent major departures from the GMPA. And accordingly, hearing these commitments in advance of the beginning of the housing study or any environmental review raised major concerns in our minds.

I was therefore very pleased to hear this morning the very different tone that was used in describing both the balance and new construction.

We ask that the board ensure that the housing study that is about to begin incorporates the following elements. First, a housing demand analysis that is similar to the one that was used in developing the GMPA. Second, an assessment of the available housing stock in the park that includes an analysis of the degree to which existing larger units can be converted to smaller units, and if there are in fact unmet needs, an analysis of meeting those needs as well the benefits.

With such a study in hand, the Trust will be able to demonstrate to concerned members of the public how much housing is actually needed, as well as that it is going to meet that need with the least amount of development possible. This is how it should be in a national park. Thank you.

[applause]

Colin [Farish]: Hello. My name's Colin [Farish], and first I wanted to thank the Trust for providing this opportunity and commend them for a job that is both difficult and challenging. And I think that the study

could prove to answer some significant questions, and I really appreciate a lot of the participation here today.

My issue is mainly programmatic. We had one of the first 20 non-profits here in the park. And I think that in the study that's going to be conducted, I would like the Trust to take into consideration the programmatic contributions of the non-profits in the realization of the GMPA. Because I think that that is one of the areas that the current Presidio residents program as well as the price...I just think that that's an area that needs to be considered.

One of my concerns is that the park has had a history when it was a military base of being very open and accommodating to a lot of the military personnel here. My aunt was living here during World War II when my uncle was overseas, and she was telling me about the marvelous open community field that everybody had. They worked in the garden, and it was of course challenging times. And being here early during the transition between the military base to the Presidio Trust, I really appreciated the open feeling and the camaraderie that many of us had.

And I'm afraid that I do have to agree with many of the speakers today that I'm feeling that that is increasingly being lost as we see a more isolated population concentrating in certain neighborhoods. There is a sense of elitism, and I just am hoping that the Trust can address some of these issues and perhaps create a program that rewards the contributions of some of the non-profits and some of the other people that are involved in programmatic activities. Thanks.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Ron Hearon and Steve Procop.

Ron Hearon: My name's Ron Hearon. I'm a National Park ranger. A required occupant also, and a law enforcement ranger here in the Presidio.

Toby Rosenblatt: Can you get a little closer to the mike?

Ron Hearon: And we moved here in December of '94, onto Washington Boulevard. And there are now, there are a lot of people that are

there. There were very few people living there when we moved here. I'm required to respond to after-hour emergencies in the park-- GGNRA.

But now myself and my family of five can no longer afford to live here. My rent's going to go up to...well, with the letters that have been mentioned recently, rent will go up to 82 percent of my gross salary. So that's quite a bit. So I am actively looking to work in other parks. I've been with the National Park Service since about 1982.

So it's a unique situation, and I think you're finding that out, for a number of us Park Service residents. Just to put a personal touch on it, that's all I wanted to interject. Thank you for your time.

[applause]

Steve Procop: Steve Procop. I'm also a ranger with the National Park Service here on the Presidio. The dialogue and the communication between the Trust and the National Park Service employees living on the Presidio

has been very unsettling for me. I've been an employee of the Park Service for 23 years, and the treatment regarding the housing issue has been very disturbing. My rent is going to go up to 140 percent of my salary eight months from now. The impact to family members and to the Park Service families has been substantial.

We, the National Park Service employees, we have a tradition of living here on the Presidio prior to even a Trust being thought of by Congress. And for the Trust to come in and to raise rents at these astronomical levels--in my case, from \$1,100 to \$4,200 over the course of eight months--an eviction notice would have been much more to the point and much more accurate. I really encourage a meeting to be set up, as has been suggested by others. We have not been able to meet with the board to discuss some of these issues.

Sustainability is a very key part of my life, as it is of all the employees that I work with. We're a Park Service family. My neighborhood--I have nothing against dot-com firms, but there's absolutely no one that I've seen moving in that has the commitment to the environment that a lot of my colleagues do. I'm sure there are

a lot of people in the dot-com, et cetera world that are committed to the environment, but I hate to see those that are truly committed being edged out.

And also the preferred rental program, it doesn't address many of our needs, unfortunately. So please request a meeting. Thank you very much.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Maria Brown and then Robert McKenna.

Maria Brown: Thank you very much for listening to us today. You've embarked on a very exciting and noble endeavor. And as you've heard today, we support the Presidio. We want to see it be a success. And I support your goal for housing, that housing is occupied by people who work in the Presidio.

I have two concerns where I've seen inconsistencies in the policies and the goal. One is I run a non-profit that is a park partner in the

Presidio. And when my employees have applied for housing, they've been told it'll be a two- to six-month wait. Then when, what just happened recently, one of my employees' roommates applied as not a park partner. She got a unit available the next day. So there's some inconsistency there. And it's not only this one instance--I've heard of other people where this has occurred. I've actually heard that it's better to apply as an outsider, as someone who doesn't work in the park. You're more likely to get a unit.

My second area of concern is the people who work for the park have received notices. And what I've heard is they have received notices that their rent will go up approximately 400 percent in one year to reach market value. Whereas other people in the park who are park partners, and their rent is going up 10 percent a year over four or five years to reach market rate. So I see an inconsistency there. Why are park employees receiving such a drastic rental increase, where other people in the park are having it amortized over a longer period of time? And I don't understand that difference, why that's happening. Thank you.

[applause]

Robert McKenna: Good morning everyone. My name is Robert McKenna. I'm a clinical psychologist and I work with people who are dealing with a psychological adjustment to rehabilitation with physical change. Usually injuries or dealing with diseases.

And I'm also a board member of Access Sport America, which is an organization that brings accessible sports to people and families with people with disabilities. And we'd like to bring that type of quality program to the Presidio.

Recently I went over to the Stewart group to look into housing at the Presidio and ask them about accessibility. And they said they--at least the woman that I spoke with said that she wasn't familiar with any accessible units in the Presidio. And I'd just like the Trust to look into that type of thing.

The beauty of park systems and the philosophy of park systems is really to bring community together. And I bring this up as a

psychologist because what you're doing here as the Trust is to develop community. And community doesn't happen naturally. It's something that we all have to work at. We have to think about what components of society do we want to bring together, what availability do we want to have to all of us--rich, poor, able-bodied, disabled. And we have to create that, think about it, construct it. It won't happen naturally, and we have to look into all of our resources, whether they're financial resources or creative resources.

We have an immense power here in this park. It's so stunningly beautiful. I'm from the East Coast. We don't have anything like the Presidio on the East Coast. This is just so tremendous. It's just an Eden. And I hope that we can be progressive and highly conscious of what we want to create here.

As a relatively recently disabled person, I know what it's like to be able-bodied and I know what it's like to be disabled. And it's wonderful to have accessible housing, but it's also wonderful to be able to go over and visit your friends and have an impromptu meal or a drink or play with your friends' kids. So accessibility isn't just

about having a housing unit or a few, but to look into accessibility to maintain community for all of us. Thank you very much.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is Vivica from the Urban Habitat Program, and then Nancy Horner, to be followed by Chris Tweedy.

Vivica: Good morning, I'm Vivica. I'm from the Urban Habitat Program, and we've been involved with Presidio planning for a long time. Our executive director was on the Presidio Council back when the GMPA was being envisioned and finally completed.

So I sort of come from the perspective of the long haul, which a lot of you have been on the long haul, too. And people in this room.

But I guess the slide that said how we're going to do the housing management plan--and the first bullet was who will work here--sort of had an ominous quality to me. I mean it's a thoughtful question, I'm sure, as far as planning goes. But I think programmatically...this

is where the housing program and the non-residential leasing program really coincide. Because the question of who will work here has to do with the non-residential leases.

Then I was thinking there can be a tendency to just see what the market will bear. And we all know what the market's like--it's quite an extraordinary time. But I think we forget how policy and public policy affect--it's not just the market. Public policy really affects land use. And so the Trust has an opportunity to put in place policies that are going to affect who works here. So it's not just what the market for who will work here, but what policies we put in place for who will work here.

I guess I'm troubled to see that a lot of...the leases that have been generated it seems are proportionally more towards income generation. Which I think is necessary. So I think it would be less--as long as the income generation helps to be able to support the site or the programming of folks that are here--non-profits that have been mentioned--can happen, that's great. So we need money to make the place work. And as long as having businesses like Lucas

or investment banks come in, can support having programmatic tenants here, that's great.

So I see goals that the Trust has to meet, as well as ones that have been put up today that are challenging. It's social equity, which is definitely a huge part of the general management plan, which we were really happy about because our organization works on environmental justice.

And so one thing I'd like to say specifically is the goal of the jobs/housing balance, that there be an equity cut to it. So it's not just an overall percentage of people working here having housing, but I think it should be an equitable percentage across income levels. So there could be policy goals set that way. So I think that would address some of the diversity concerns.

And then that would set a minimum standard for something like what is the preferred rental program. But I think the preferred rental program should be something that works to get the lowest income segment in at an equitable percentage of overall leases.

And then the last thing I would like to say, as my time is up, is that it's been mentioned about the non-profit rental market overall. And it is a challenge, I think, for non-profits in the Bay Area. But it's a challenge I feel like the Trust has a mandate to try to help solve. Because there's a mandate to get sustainable programming in.

So it's not easy, but if we were going to meet the programmatic goals then we've got to figure out some way of solving this problem creatively. And I think there's lots of folks that are interested in helping to do that. And there have been opening gestures at talking about how to do that with the Trust. But I'd like to see as much attention put on that as getting in the Lucases and the investment banks. Thank you.

[applause]

Nancy Horner: Good morning. My name is Nancy Horner. I'm the chief of planning at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. And I am the current supervisor of someone who lives in Presidio housing, and a

former supervisor of someone as well. And I'd like to give a couple of examples of how the housing policies impact park employees, as well as some issues about the housing program.

I hired a GS-12 architect who came to look for housing in the Presidio and at the lowest rent available when she came to the Presidio. And when she provided the information about her income at the GS-12 level, she was told that she didn't make enough money to be able to afford that. So she had to re-describe her income, and we had to do a little arm twisting, I think, to convince the residential housing program that at that salary level she could afford to pay the rent on the Presidio.

So she's in there now and she can afford it. It's a big chunk of her salary. But if the rental rates go up 10 percent a year she won't be able to afford to live there, and I might be losing a good employee. And this is an example of a personal situation where the housing program is not really meeting the needs of a Presidio employee.

I was a former supervisor of a secretary that did qualify for one of the special programs. And I think it bears some looking into whether the current rate that's applied at the special program is really one that's going to meet the needs of Presidio employees. It's calculated at 40 percent of gross salary. For this person it was 55 percent of her take home pay. And included in the formula to calculate that was her child support payment--she was a single mom. And she no longer works for the Park Service. She took another job elsewhere that paid more.

And I think that's another example of how the housing program, in spite of the best efforts to create policies that really reach out and provide a diversity of housing for Presidio and park employees, that in reality it may not really be doing the job.

A couple of years ago I spoke with the executive director of one of the Marin park partners who was being forced to move from housing outside the park. And she was encouraged to look in the Presidio for a possible residence. She looked at the available

housing in the Presidio, and at the rates that were being offered could not afford it and found a rental situation in Sausalito.

So I think it's really important. These are true stories. They are examples of people that have a range of incomes, but at the even higher level, if the executive directors of our park partners and at the GS-12 level cannot afford to live in the Presidio, there should be a concern that the housing policy is not really meeting the goals of housing Presidio employees, as well as maintaining the integrity of the community. Because if people come and work in the park and live in the Presidio, but then in a year or two have to move on because they cannot meet the 10 percent annual increase, it does raise some real concerns about whether the housing program is meeting the goals. Thanks.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Chris Tweedy, and then Marcia Smith White.

Chris Tweedy: Hi, I'm Chris Tweedy. I hadn't intended to speak, but nobody else from the Department of Defense residence had stood up. And I just wanted to let everybody know that the military tenants are also experiencing considerable distress. And we're thinking about getting out earlier than we might otherwise need to.

We have been frustrated in talking to the John Stewart housing office that they won't tell us terms of the lease that we will be facing signing in September. And we're not sure that this is a wise place for us to be financially. My husband works in San Francisco. He's active duty military. He cannot get out of his assignment. We have to stay in the city two more years, at least. My daughter is attending Lowell High School and doesn't want to give that up. So we're looking at just getting out on the open market in San Francisco and fighting with everybody else on the military [unintelligible] that we have. And we're very sad that as an Air Force family it's not been made possible for us to complete my husband's military assignment in the military housing that we have now. Only the Army families are going to be permitted to stay and finish their assignments.

Thank you.

[applause]

Marcia Smith White: My name is Marcia Smith White, and now you've heard from one DOD family. Now you get to hear from two!

First of all, I was delighted that we were able to extend our lease, because the military families were to be expired as of this fall. So that we were extended a year was a good thing. One of the things that also happened with the military families is that we kind of felt that we extended that economic diversity program. Because we did bring up the bottom half of the curve because we couldn't pay the high rents.

The program that's been set up is going to cover the Army families so that they can stay. The rest of us are still working at plans on how to deal and figure things out.

But today I'm wearing two hats. Not only from a DOD family, but as someone who lives in the park and who works with the residents.

In the mayor's program we hear a lot of concerns about what's going on. And I do need you all to know that from the community point of view we love having the National Park rangers living beside us. We love having the police living close to us. And we've also liked having the military, because it gave us a sense of security, it gave us a sense of balance, and it gave us a sense that there is a sense of order that can be followed through and all things will fall into place.

I should also mention too that I work with a lot of community activities. And it's from these families, and these families that get involved with things, that we do create our sense of community. And as Craig Milton in time and time again meetings, bring us your solutions, bring us your ideas, and bring us your creativity. This is exactly what I'm counting on from meetings like this. And even if it means maybe the new corporations that are making all this money to help keep our park going, maybe they should donate one percent of their for-profit things. Do subsidize all of those that don't have enough money to stay here, but do provide a tremendous sense of what's going on and how to make this park have a face, and how to

allow this park to be all that we can be, because we are a very diverse group and we are people of great creativity. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is Bill Howe. And then the last speaker is Becky Evans.

Bill Howe: I just have sort of a logical problem with the presentation. As I understand it, if you go ahead with the Lucas project, that's 2,500 employees. If half of them live here, that's your housing. I just don't get it, where the planning is coming from. Because it seems like if you choose Lucas, there's no more housing left for other people. I don't get the overall effort here, because it seems like the piecemeal approach that you've chosen is taking precedence over an integrated housing balance program. Do you understand?

[applause]

Becky Evans: I didn't think I'd have to [back clean up]. My name is Becky Evans. I'm co-chair of the Sierra Club's Presidio Committee. We have 35,000 members in the Bay Area and 10,000 in the city of San Francisco. I wanted to thank the Trust for having this process, this hearing. And also for agreeing to have a further planning process for the whole park.

The Club is still working on its housing policy, and we will be participating very fully in these planning sessions and the scoping meetings that you have. And we'll deal with [non-residential, rented and other thing].

But listening to the concerns expressed by the residents here, I think you guys have a real problem. I think it's very important for this park to be sustainable, to be diverse. The park partners, the National Park Service people need to live here as well as the people who work for the dot-coms or for Lucas. And I think it's really sad when the people who have spent so much time and have invested so much of their lives in protecting the nation's parks, and this park in particular, are being forced out.

I've been involved with this planning process in the national park for almost longer than anybody else in this room except Amy Meyer and one or two other people. And the Sierra Club, of course, supported the GGNRA legislation, we supported the Trust legislation. But I think that we really need to solve this problem, because this park needs to be sustainable. It needs to be a park and not an office park. Not a place where only the wealthy can live.

And if you're talking about market rents, San Francisco has the highest housing market in the country. That is no goal for a national park. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Shelly Hamilton is the last speaker.

Shelly Hamilton: Hello, my name is Shelly Hamilton, and I've been associated with the Presidio since about 1994, quite a long time. And I do some independent consulting with various organizations for the Presidio.

And I was just looking at a couple of numbers and I had a question. I was a little confused. I've been involved and come to the financial management program workshops and stuff. And based on the financial management plan, there were some certain assumptions that must have gone in to set the lease rates to come up with the 20.6 million. And then going to market rate, I was just wondering what the increase in the rents were subsidizing, or where the extra money was going and what the plan for that was.

And just looking at some very basic numbers, if I look at about six different non-residential buildings: Lucas; Hambrecht Building 35; the Film Institute 39; the dot-coms in 2020; Concord Group in 37; and Amazon, Lexia Internet at 85, 86, 87. At \$45 a square foot, that comes out to about \$14.6 million. Added to the 20.6 million for the residential housing, you come up with 34.76 million, which is about 2 million short of your 36.6 total. And that's only looking at six non-residential buildings plus the housing. It's not including anything for Scott or anywhere else on the Presidio.

So I'm just a little unclear as to how the financials work out when you look at it from that perspective.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: We keep getting more yellow cards. Carolyn Quesada. And I assume this is the last speaker. Okay.

Carolyn Quesada: Thank you for giving me a minute. My name is Carolyn Quesada. I work at the San Francisco Conservation Corps. I'm a social worker there.

We have about a hundred corps members, half of whom are based at our Presidio. We qualify for the preferred rental program, our staff and our corps members. And over the past few months I've brought 23 of our corps members to the Baker Beach Apartments. They've been wonderful and very helpful. Although the last week, we were told that our corps members don't make enough money to get the apartments that they actually, by the size of their families, qualify for. It's a concern that we have. They do provide numerous

community services on the Presidio itself. They help maintain the grounds, and they're building up their families.

Our understanding of the preferred rental program was that the qualifications were that they needed to be a park partner. They couldn't earn more than \$45,000. I'll have you know that most of our corps members are earning \$6.50 an hour 32 hours a week. So I just bring this to you because it is a matter of concern. We do enjoy being on the Presidio. Our corps members do feel a sense of loyalty here and very much want to be a part of the community. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Okay, that completes the public conversation. There are a number of items that you have raised that are part of the issues and the ideas that were raised at the last two sessions that we've had on the housing, and they will be issues that are incorporated into the ongoing look at what the housing program and policies and development will be.

There are a few issues that were raised today that we will ask...that as part of this process become part of the things that we will ask our staff to look at. As examples only, this last item about the conservation corps, the earlier item about some confusion about the preferences or the availability of units for one of the park partners organizations, the issue about accessibility.

One of the other examples--I think we have to remember that the housing that is occupied and been involved with the Department of Defense entities, and the housing that has been occupied and is involved with the National Park Service have unique characteristics.

It is not only the issues of the Presidio Trust which impact the policies that apply to that housing. Very, very strong issues...very clearly is a better way to say it. Very clearly there are service-wide issues that impact what the Department of Defense policies are with respect to housing for members of the various branches of the military. And there are NPS-wide policies that impact the provision of housing for people who work for the National Park Service.

That complicates the issue, and is very much a part of the ongoing conversation--or review is a better way to say it--that is going on between our executive director and the appropriate counterparts in the National Park Service and in the Department of Defense.

The other piece that I would just...for those people who are perhaps early on or new to these conversations, one of the pieces that one, I would say, needs to bear in mind. When you hear conversations about the rates of increase, one needs to also look at the base from which that increase is occurring, and how that fits into the totality of all of the variables that are required to be considered when you look at the different pieces of legislation which govern how the Presidio is to be managed.

All of that represents a series of issues you are aware of, and they will become more explicitly part of the planning that goes into this housing plan.

The last thing that I wanted to mention is there were a number of elements or pieces that several speakers talked about that they are

hopeful will be incorporated into the methodology of the ongoing implementation planning for the housing as it relates to the planning process itself and as it relates to the environmental review process. That's very much a part of the thinking that the planning staff, our staff, has in mind, and that we've had conversations about.

With that, I would like to ask if there are any other remarks by other board members or any remarks from our staff.

Amy Meyer: I'm going to take a stab at this one, and it's a sensitive issue and I've taken a little--I'm sorry.

I'll take a stab at this one and see if I can maybe evoke a little more conversation on it.

One of the things I understand of people who have occupied some of the housing here, and I think this would be primarily Park Service employees. With that point I'm not distinguishing among what types, what kind of license, what kind of lease, because it's not something I'm technically able to respond to.

But one of the things that seems to have happened is that some people have been able to live in some very wonderful housing when they came onto the Presidio originally, and they were pioneers at the Presidio. In the sense that the transportation, the signage, the condition of buildings, everything was in a working, a formative stage.

And one of the things that people are being asked to do is to look at the fact that they are living under circumstances that ultimately do have to go, and would go, in this city for a higher rent. Going back to various stories I've heard about rentals, I can only point to my own daughter who's living in the Richmond District, who lives for \$800 plus in what I would call a large basement studio. That's the best I could call it. And the fact that she can keep her cat there means a good deal. But it just doesn't compare to some of the rentals here, and she's grateful for what she has. But that's part of the outside world.

So what I see people struggling with is the idea that they've been living in nice housing and may have to live in housing that is not quite as nice but could still be on the Presidio and still have its conveniences. I think this is something that's very hard for people to accept.

Also, one of the things that's become very clear to me...I guess it was...there's been a few instances where I hear that people really need smaller units than they have, and we don't have them. We have ten one-bedroom units, and a one-bedroom can do very well for one or two people. And we don't have enough of those and we're working on it. But it does affect what people are able to get when they come here, and what they would have to pay.

Mary Murphy: I'll just add to what Amy had to say, which is that I think that all the comments we've heard today are, the intention of the implementation plan is to take a step back and to look at these things in their totality. And that all of these things, I think--I can't remember who made the point, but it's an obvious and well-taken point, that the non-residential leasing program, the programmatic goals incorporated

into that have in effect, there's a synergistic relationship as to the housing program and the non-residential leasing program.

And it raises, it brings to the front all the deep, philosophical questions of what it means to run this place as a national park. How and what the cultural landscape means. What does the built environment mean in a national park? How do we build community, which means things like good urban planning, to the extent that this does have an urban component to it? What do you need in terms of density to actually form community?

Those are the issues that we want to address in the implementation planning. And I was very grateful for your remarks about accessibility, because I think that's a very critical component. I think it's extremely important that this park be an accessible park. And I very much appreciate your point of view on that, and that is certainly something we'll be looking into very seriously.

All of these things come together. So that is the goal of this. And I think that we need to actually try to build consensus. Because as you

can hear from the different points of views that are expressed today, some people think there should be more housing, and some people think any addition to the built environment is a bad thing.

Somewhere along the line we have to find a way to build consensus around issues that at this point are polarized, and to achieve the ends that we want to achieve as a national park.

As to existing tenants, I think one of the themes you're hearing here is that to the extent that there are existing tenants who are employees of other federal agencies, part of what you're talking about are transfer payments from one agency to another. And they have to be resolved at an agency level.

And it's not to say that people are unsympathetic to the plight or the difficulties. We can't solve the untenable circumstances of market housing in San Francisco. I think everyone understand how unaffordable generally for people of all ranges of income this city is.

It's just an intractable problem of living in this otherwise beautiful place. But with respect to other federal employees, part of what you're talking about is a discussion that needs to occur at a federal

level because, as Toby said earlier, there are DOD and Park Service-wide policies.

And that in part, this isn't just a question of what the Trust is prepared to do, it's a question of what other federal agencies are prepared to do for their own employees. And it's something that we need to discuss at that level. I don't want anyone to think that we're not sympathetic to the points of view of people who are here, or that we are somehow immune to the desire to build a community of people where it's really a vibrant community where people feel they really can count on one another and that's a real place in itself.

Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Again, let me thank you all for coming and participating. And again, to remind you to look for the references that Jim Meadows talked about earlier for the announcements in the forthcoming...

[laughter]

...Post.

Female voice: I swatted him.

Toby Rosenblatt: I've just gotten a very appropriate reminder. Excuse me. In the forthcoming Post about the future dates for all of the planning. And having said that, I'm sorry, please.

Jennifer Hernandez: I'm the newest member, at least on the panel before you today, and I just wanted to take this opportunity to first off say hi, and second to thank you for very, very thoughtful remarks.

This is a very interesting and exciting time, I think--at least for me. Because it's an opportunity to update this planning process. And housing is just one of the elements that I'd like to focus on with you. But during the lunch hour I hope that those of you who are around are able will take the time to chat with me.

You need to know I'm also very focused on the visitor experience to this national park. And the combination of residential, non-residential occupancy, plus visitor experiences is where I'd like to

stay focused on at least my own personal interest in this planning process. And I'm very interested in those of you who are privileged and pioneers in living here, I have to say about visitor experiences.

So I look forward to meeting you over lunch.

Toby Rosenblatt: Actually, there isn't a lunch.

[laughter]

Jennifer Hernandez: Never mind!

Toby Rosenblatt: Just to be clear about it--

Jennifer Hernandez: Lunch!

Toby Rosenblatt: We would like to give you all lunch, but we just...we hadn't planned on that in the budget. Let me just suggest that Jennifer.

Female voice: If we were to have a lunch!

Jennifer Hernandez: Find me anyway.

Toby Rosenblatt: Jennifer was planning...so she'll be here for a while...

Jennifer Hernandez: I will.

Toby Rosenblatt: ...if you'd like to talk with her. Again, thank you and that completes our discussion today.

[End of meeting]