

**PRESIDIO TRUST PUBLIC BOARD MEETING – DECEMBER 10, 2003**

**NOTE: the following is the best transcript available of the public board meeting of the Presidio Trust Board of Directors held on December 10, 2003. It is based upon an audio recording of the meeting.**

Toby Rosenblatt: Ladies and gentlemen, could I ask you to take your seats, please? We'll get the meeting started.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for joining us tonight for this hearing and discussion and presentation with respect to the Public Health Service Hospital site. We have a few items of business from the Board prior to getting into that. I do need to make note that we are starting at 6:35, and to indicate that those attending include myself, Toby Rosenblatt, Chair of the Board; Joseph Yew; Mary Murphy; Bill Wilson; and Lydia Beebe; and our director, Craig Middleton.

We will start with a few brief remarks from Craig on other business.

Craig Middleton: Well, thank you for coming tonight. I know it's holiday party time. I don't know what it says about all of us that we're here instead of at a holiday party, but I'm glad we're all here.

I just wanted to cover a couple of announcements before we get into our main topic and really the purpose of this meeting, which is to talk about the Public Health Service Hospital project.

First, I'd like to acknowledge the people who have provided correspondence. We've gotten a lot of e-mails and calls and letters primarily from Cow Hollow residents about their concerns about the location of the capacitor to provide electric power to the LDA project - the Lucasfilm project. I just wanted to tell you that I have spoken with the folks at Lucasfilm, and that they are working with PG&E to try to find a satisfactory resolution to that issue of the location of the capacitor; and that we will continue to work with them to ensure the satisfactory outcome. That's not a subject for tonight's meeting but I wanted to just raise that because we have gotten quite a few calls and letters.

Secondly, I'd like to announce two public meetings - workshops, actually. These are at the inception of the design process for the Main Parade Ground and will be held in January. We would like to get public input right at the beginning of that process. This is for the transformation of that large parking lot area just north of here in the Main Parade Ground into a grand public plaza. We are fortunate to have the Olin

partnership, the design team, out here in January. We'll have two public workshops in January - one on January 13th. That will be at the Golden Gate Club at 7:00. And the second is on January 29th, also at 7:00, here in the Officers' Club.

With that, I'd like to turn it back to you, Mr. Chairman, for commencement of the meeting.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. We have one business item for the Board to deal with, which is approval of minutes of two prior board meetings, September 25th and October 29th. Those were both sets of minutes sent to the Board members for approval, and they are posted on the Web site, I believe. Any modifications? Do I have a motion for approval? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Toby Rosenblatt: Opposed? Okay, those are approved.

Now, we will begin our conversations tonight about the Public Health Service Hospital site with a short presentation by our Executive Director

and our Director of Planning. And then we will welcome your comments. We would ask you, as we have done in the past, two very common pieces of practice. One, that you please sign up. There are sign-up sheets, I'm sure you noticed, out in the hall as you came in. And there is one of our staff right at the door who has some additional blank ones. And then, that you please, out of courtesy to the number of people who are here at this hour, keep your remarks within the three-minute time limit. We have a timekeeper somewhere who will be here to help you remember that.

There is a microphone, as we always do, in the middle of the room there, and I would ask you to be sure to speak clearly into the microphone because that's the only way that your remarks get recorded fully in total for the public record, which, among other requirements, this meeting is part of the environmental review legal process and we want to capture those as well as making sure that we can in fact [unintelligible] everybody else [unintelligible]. So with that, Craig, would you . . .

Craig Middleton: Thank you. As Toby said, we are here to receive comment on the Public Health Service Hospital. Looking at the number of people who have come out tonight, I would ask that we do restrict our comments to the

subject at hand. There are plenty of other ways to reach us if you have other subjects that you'd like to talk about. But tonight's meeting really was called for that purpose, and that is the Public Health Service Hospital project.

I would also say that although tonight ends the scoping period for the project, it is only really the beginning of the project and there will be other opportunities to comment as we move throughout the project. We are conducting a detailed analysis of a range of project alternatives, and we will ask for your comments on that environmental analysis before we make a final decision about that. We've already received many letters, e-mails, faxes, comments at our other public meeting. All of these will be used to inform our analysis as we move forward.

About the end of January we plan to circulate a draft environmental assessment for you to review. And we have already scheduled a public meeting for comment on that environmental assessment document for March 3rd. So, there will be plenty of opportunity. If you want to be notified in writing of these public meetings as they go forward, please sign up in the hallway. There's a mailing list, and if you're not already on the mailing list I'd like to make sure you're on it.

One of the issues that we will be analyzing and considering in this environmental analysis is whether there should be direct automobile access between Park Presidio Boulevard and the Public Health Service Hospital site. Trust Board members have asked staff to examine the feasibility of providing access through an additional intersection at Park Presidio Boulevard north of Lake Street. Hillary Gitelman will be talking a little bit more about that as we go forward tonight. We've initiated discussions with both the potential developers about this idea. But I need you to understand that for this idea to move forward we need support from Caltrans. We may be asking you to assist us in that should the analysis prove to be feasible.

There's another subject, and it relates to a comment that we have heard several times, both in faxes and e-mails and phone calls and in comment, and in our meetings with folks. And that is that the issue of, by asking for a minimum of a million dollars in base rent from potential development partners, that the Presidio Trust has somehow rejected or precluded any alternative smaller than the maximum 400,000 square feet, which is the current square footage. We will, of course, be addressing this in the environmental analysis. But I wanted to ask you tonight to

think about and examine some of the assumptions inherent in this concern. And I just wanted to raise them. I know that this is a concern that's out there, so I wanted to address it.

First, I think the proponents of this view are assuming that a smaller alternative cannot generate a million dollars. This is something that has not been demonstrated to my satisfaction.

And second, I'd like you to consider some financial realities about the Presidio as you think about whether or not the Presidio can afford to redevelop the Public Health Service Hospital site without generating that kind of rent, at least as a minimum.

Consider for a moment that federal appropriations make about a third of our revenue, and that these funds are not guaranteed, and that they are being provided at lower levels by Washington, and it was anticipated originally in our Financial Management Program. In fact, last year we received \$1.8 million less than our Financial Management Program had suggested we should receive.

I think most people know that there's a declining federal appropriation until 2013, when the Trust has to become financially self-sufficient. But I think a lot of people think that that's some sort of a guaranteed amount. And I'm just telling you - and I think people here who are representing congressional offices can affirm this - that that is not the case. This is just a suggested amount. It's a ceiling and it's not guaranteed.

Consider also that revenues fluctuate with the economy, and that operating costs, particularly the costs of police and fire services, tend to rise steadily. They have risen steadily and we would expect that they probably will continue to rise steadily. Consider that nearly half of the Presidio's housing is scheduled for eventual demolition. This is the Baker Beach housing, which now provides over \$10 million in annual revenue. Add to that the requirement to repay Treasury loans, the cost of restoring the forest, and the remaining historic buildings and infrastructure at the park.

My point is this - the law requires the Trust to be financially self-sufficient. It is our responsibility as a Board and staff and as a community to provide for the ongoing care of the Presidio, to use the

park's built assets to generate revenue to protect and maintain this park.

This requires that we make economically strong deals.

The idea of a financially self-sufficient national park is a relatively new one. But the idea of environment development partners to rehabilitate and reuse historic properties has been with us for years. Doing so within a national park to generate the revenues needed for rehabilitation and for operations, and for the enhancement of the park, is being done elsewhere, even in San Francisco.

Let me refer you quickly to the Argonaut Hotel that opened within the San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park just this fall. This is a good example of what I'm trying to talk about. The rehabilitation and reuse of that historic building, which cost over \$40 million - about half of what we think will be needed at the Public Health Service Hospital - will generate about \$1 million in base rent for the park each year, plus a percentage of gross sales during the course of the 57-year lease - all of this to preserve the park's ships and the operation of the maritime park. That's a good deal for the public. It preserves an historic building. It creates revenue. It's a good deal for park visitors. And I think it's a good deal for the surrounding community. With your help, I think we can

achieve similar benefits for the Presidio at the Public Health Service Hospital.

With that, I'd like to introduce Hillary Gitelman, our Director of Planning, who will take us quickly through the site and what we're going to talk about tonight. And then we'll get right to public comment. Thank you.

Hillary Gitelman: Well, thank you all. I promise there are just a few images here, and this will be brief. In fact, there are so few images that I've provided some hard copies to the Board members, so you don't have to get up and schlep around to the front of the room.

What I'd like to do briefly is introduce the site and the Trust's objectives. We don't have any presentations from the developer's plan this evening. We do have some exhibits in the back of the room, however, which we invite you to take a look at. And we are always available to you to answer questions after the meeting.

As most of you are of course aware, the Public Health Service Hospital district is located at the southwest corner of the Presidio. It's one of

seven districts that we identified and planned for in the Presidio Trust Management Plan which was adopted in August of 2002. This district contains 42 acres and about 400,000 square feet of buildings today. It's one of the first areas that we're turning our attention to since adoption of the Presidio Trust Management Plan, for one simple reason. And that is that the buildings in this area are in a sad state of disrepair.

They are really a safety and security issue that we think it's incumbent on us to address with all due haste. Our priority objective for this project is the rehabilitation and reuse of the historic buildings in this district. And I think an important corollary to that is increasing the safety and security of our property and also the surrounding neighbors that abut this district.

Other project goals include introducing compatible uses to the district, and other issues that are listed on this slide. Our idea is that all of these objectives have to be balanced in a final, successful project. In fact, we think the successful project at the end of the day will achieve all of these things - not one above the other, but all of them, to the best of our ability.

We also have to make sure in the course of this project that we accomplish all of the other objectives and commitments we've set for

ourselves in the Public Health Service Hospital district and surrounding districts. For example, just this year we adopted a trail and bikeway master plan for the Presidio with our partners at the National Park Service. And we've made a commitment to introduce trails to this district to connect it to other areas of the Presidio. We've also made a commitment in that plan to introduce a trailhead and a scenic overlook west of the main hospital building. These are things that we want to do no matter what happens with reuse and rehabilitation, and things that have to be compatible with any reuse strategy.

Similarly, we want to assist in the recovery of the San Francisco lessingia, an endangered plant species that's found within the district and within adjacent planning districts of the Presidio. We want to enhance quail habitat and have made commitments in that regard. We also want to continue the enhancement efforts at Mountain Lake, which lies just to the east of the Public Health Service Hospital district.

Of course, we can't forget that the Presidio is a park like no other. Craig mentioned some of the financial challenges we have. It's expensive to operate this park, and the park has demands on our capital in terms of needed investments. And it's too easy to think of this project and its

potential financial benefits just as the rent it can produce, because the rent is a factor of so many other variables - the size of the project, unit size, unit count, market assumptions, financing cost, Trust participation, lease terms, and many, many more. I think we really won't know financial benefits of the project until the end of the process, but we can't lose sight of the fact that the financial success of the project is one of our many objectives.

I wanted to talk about some of the other things that are happening in the district briefly. This is a map that shows really the areas that are off limits to the developer groups vying for our attention and our partnership. This map shows the natural areas within the district. And these areas, we've committed, over time, to restore as natural areas, native plant habitat, to increase the natural values in these parts of the district.

Similarly, there are commitments that we have made and will make regarding remediation sites in the district. This graphic shows two remediation sites within the Public Health Service Hospital district. And the future of these sites is being planned through a separate planning process. The remedies or the strategies for these sites have not been determined, but we have made a commitment in the site Landfill 8 on the

top of the slide to commemorate the marine cemetery which lies buried under the fill materials. We've also made a commitment, as I mentioned, at Landfill 10 to introduce a trailhead, scenic overlook and trail improvements in our trails master plan. And we hope there's an opportunity there for shared parking between the recreational users and the ultimate users of the hospital building.

Here's another image that I wanted to share with you tonight, and Craig mentioned this briefly. We have been seriously looking at the possibility of providing a direct vehicular access to this site from Park Presidio Boulevard. And in partnership with some wonderful traffic engineers and consultants on our staff and consultants, I think we've found a strategy is physically feasible. We are still looking at the operational issues, and we will of course need to get Caltrans' approval to do anything like this. I think it's something that we could all work on together, and that your support and the City's support - some of which has already been expressed to us - will be extremely helpful going forward.

The concept that's illustrated in this drawing is just a simple intersection. There are no ramps. This is not an interchange. This is just a signalized

intersection north of the intersection of Park Presidio and Lake. And what it would allow is all of the traffic exiting the Public Health Service Hospital site could exit onto Park Presidio Boulevard and not have to go through 14th and 15th Avenues. Traffic inbound to the site could also come through this intersection, but some traffic would still enter the site from 14th and 15th Avenue. Unfortunately, there's no way to configure the intersection without widening the roadway to make it possible to close those access points entirely. Anyway, we're happy to talk about that in some more detail with you following the meeting.

So where are we in the process? Craig mentioned we've initiated preparation of an environmental assessment. We're looking at four alternatives. The first alternative is one that we analyzed in the management plan EIS two years ago. The second is an alternative that loosely resembles two of the proposals we've received - one of the Forest City proposals and a John Stewart proposal. The third alternative is the "smaller alternative" that would remove the wings of the main hospital building and not replace them. And the fourth alternative loosely resembles one of the Forest City proposals that would build up on the Battery Caulfield site.

We are undertaking technical studies of all of these - traffic, parking, hydrology, biology. We had someone go out there and do a bat survey for us. And we would appreciate this evening any comments you have on the scope of these alternatives, but also the necessary analyses that we should be undertaking as we study them in detail.

Our schedule from here on out, we're concluding, as Craig mentioned, the scoping period, which began in July or August, tonight. And then hopefully at the end of January we'll be issuing an environmental document for your review and comment. We've already scheduled a public meeting on that document for March 3rd, and we hope you will join us again then to provide further input on all of this.

That concludes my introductory remarks. I want to thank you all for coming. We're really looking forward to hearing your comments and moving forward with the project.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you, Hillary.

A logistics question. Would it work if we could move that microphone  
the public is going to use closer to where we are? Can that work?  
Because it's a long way away.

Male voice: It'd be nice to see people.

Toby Rosenblatt: That's good. Thank you.

Also, since nobody's here videoing us, can we shut down these big lights  
on either side? I don't think we need those. You can see us. You can  
see without the hot lights.

Okay. The first speaker, I want to welcome back Amy Meyer, who is, as  
all of you know, probably the most renowned friend of the park, the  
Presidio, and GGNRA, and has been for years a wonderful colleague for  
all of us here on the Board. So, Amy? Welcome back.

Amy Meyer: Thanks, Toby.

This is the first big project for the new Board. And as an old Board  
member, I know and the old Board members know that the Presidio Trust

went through a period of public distrust before the approval of the 2002 Presidio Trust Management Plan - the PTMP. The Trust has had a good relationship with the general public since that time. I hope that renewal of the Public Health Service Hospital site, and also the process of planning the rehabilitation, will continue the broad public support that now exists.

What the Board experienced before was very difficult. You may be aware that there was a fight to get this 42-acre area into the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It was to be sold off by the Army. But the Park Service and Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund lawyers proved it was part of the public domain and thus the park. Because the site was mostly unused for over ten years, neighbors became accustomed to few people and little traffic - and they will have to get used to some increased activity.

There is a good background description in the PTMP of the site, but some specifics changed in the request for qualifications. For example, the upper plateau is a limit of contemplated development of the PTMP, as described and diagrammed on pages 96 to 97, and on page 133 of the plan's environmental impact statement - the EIS. Construction on the

Battery Caulfield site at the top of the property was not shown. Such development could create a significant change in land use, habitat, wildlife corridors and traffic patterns. Construction would require further environmental study, an environmental assessment, and a finding of no significant impact would not suffice.

I believe that the upper part of the Public Health Service Hospital site should be kept open for habitat and wildlife, as well as for the interpretation of the Nike site. This would be the best way for this portion of the land to contribute to the successful reuse of the hospital site, which will be measured by how well the renewal contributes to the Presidio's national park quality. Overall, renewal has to include protection of historic architecture, habitat, wildlife, the green surround, views and scenery, and of recreational opportunities such as trail connections. That's what's essentially the mandate of the legislation that established the GGNRA. Restoring open space around the two buildings at the top of the site would help accomplish some of these goals.

Once again, it is not only the result but the process itself in determining the future of the hospital site that must stand up to public scrutiny. I look forward to the completion of this worthwhile and necessary project to

replace a sadly blighted area. The project can also increase public confidence in the efforts of the Presidio Trust to care for the Presidio.

Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

[applause]

Our next speaker, we would like to also welcome Supervisor McGoldrick.

Jake McGoldrick: Thank you very much, commissioners. And if I may personally say hello to Commissioner Toby Rosenblatt, I have not actually testified before you for about 12 years, maybe 15 years . . .

Toby Rosenblatt: [laughs]

Jake McGoldrick: . . . when you were the president of the Planning Commission. So this is like a little trip down memory lane.

Toby Rosenblatt: When Amy says “old commissioners” and “old directors . . .” [laughs]

Jake McGoldrick: [laughs] Directors. I'm sorry.

I am here tonight in my capacity as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. And my office has, in consultation with the neighbors and the constituents in the area, taken a position which I would like to enter into the record for you tonight, and I will hand you a letter from my office. Essentially, it is directed to all of you and to Mr. Middleton and Mr. Pelka. And it states as follows:

I am writing to express my concern with certain elements of the proposed development of the Public Health district site in the Presidio. Specifically, the size and scope of the project raises significant neighborhood and public safety concerns that may impact nearby residents and constituents in both districts 1 and 2. The neighborhood traffic impacts of the proposed development are somewhat alarming. By your own estimates, traffic flow will increase threefold onto Lake Street and the avenues surrounding the Public Health district. This will create significant parking, traffic and pedestrian safety issues on our city streets.

Increasing pedestrian safety both in district 1 and citywide has been a very significant concern of my office since my election to the Board of Supervisors. In order to mitigate this impact, I do strongly support creating a new intersection directly onto the Presidio from Highway 1 - Park Presidio - as has already been discussed tonight.

In addition, the current proposals submitted by the prospective developers appear to try to maximize the number of units developed in the Public Health district without fully taking into regard whether this scale is consistent enough and sensitive to the character of the surrounding neighborhood. I urge the Presidio Trust to carefully consider scaling back the size of the development and demolishing the non-historic wings of the old Merchant Marine hospital. This option would both reduce density inside the Presidio and lessen traffic safety concerns outside the gate on City streets.

The pedestrian safety advisory committee, which the San Francisco Board of Supervisors established to advise the City on policies affecting pedestrians, is currently in the process of developing a really groundbreaking pedestrian master plan for the City of San Francisco. I say groundbreaking because in fact it will be a national model.

In order for such efforts to be successful it is crucial for projects in the Presidio that may impact pedestrians in surrounding neighborhoods to participate in our local planning efforts and understand our policies and objectives. I hope the Presidio Trust will consider doing this as you move forward with development projects, and show sensitivity, as I believe you have, to our nearby residents.

Consulting fully and openly with the public on this major development will benefit both Richmond district residents and the Presidio Trust. We are, after all, neighbors and members of the same community.

My staff recently has met with nearby neighbors and organizations, and especially, for example, the Richmond Presidio Neighbors, who are a newly formed organization most immediately affected from the Richmond district, and whose homes border right along the Presidio there. I believe that the Richmond Presidio Neighbors and other neighborhood groups and organizations and individuals you will hear from tonight are able to be supportive of a project which will be appropriate to scale and sensitive to the area. My office is ready and willing to work collaboratively with the Presidio Trust and any other

interested individuals to make this the best project you can possibly put forward. Thank you very much. I appreciate your hard work.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you, Supervisor. Mollie, could you pick up the letter from him, or one of our staff, so that we have that?

Okay. The next speaker is Ron Miguel, to be followed by Claudia Lewis, and then Irene Solomon.

Ron Miguel: Thank you very much for having this meeting this evening. I know it's unusual for you to have two public meetings of your Board in a row. And the fact that you have done so is greatly appreciated. I also appreciate both Craig and Hillary's remarks because they show you have already read a great deal of the material that has come up to you regarding this from the time of the last meeting and the time that the two development plans were announced.

PAR has submitted extensive notes, and I will very briefly go over some of them with a few changes or additions. We felt that the environmental

review process for this project was flawed because it seemed that the financial review revenue requirement was arbitrarily imposed upon the project. And we understand the necessity for being self-sufficient in 2013, but the calculations behind the requirement have not been sufficiently explained to the public. And it seems that the financial goals are overriding all other goals of the Presidio.

Secondly, the planning process was also flawed because public comment was not really sought until after the options were narrowed basically to two maximum developments that have been submitted. This is contrary to the assurances given in the PTMP process that there would be full public participation in the development of plans for individual planning districts. That may be an interpretation that differs from yours.

Lesser development options - and I'm glad you mentioned them, Mr. Middleton - must be given full and unimpeded considerations if the environmental assessment process is not to be compromised. The concept of taking down the non-historic wings and not replacing them has to be fully considered. We are opposed to any development, as Amy Meyer mentioned earlier, at Battery Caulfield. Regardless of whether development is done there or not - and we propose not - there should be a

full environmental assessment as to what is going to be done with that particular area location.

The neighborhood obviously, as all neighborhoods in San Francisco, comes down to two main or one main point, density and traffic, which go together. PAR has pushed, to my knowledge, for over eight years the concept of having an intersection -

[bell]

Oh, that's my time? Sorry. Anyway. Having that intersection, I was very glad to see it detailed up there. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Claudia Lewis and then Irene Solomon and then Eric Solomon.

It might be helpful to move this along if the subsequent speaker would come up and be ready to move right in after each speaker. Please go ahead.

Claudia Lewis: Good evening, members of the Trust. I'm the president of Richmond Presidio Neighbors. Richmond Presidio Neighbors was formed following the October 29th Trust hearing, when families residing closest to the Public Health Service Hospital became alarmed by the development plans for close to 400 apartment units just within the 15th Avenue gate.

We, the members of Richmond Presidio Neighbors - the folks with the stickers - are homeowners and residents who favor development of the site, but only responsible development. Development that is in keeping with the character of our neighborhood, that preserves the integrity of the surrounding national park land, and that does not pose traffic and safety hazards to the hundreds of people who walk, bike and run on Lake Street on a daily basis.

This is a beautiful, quiet, family-friendly neighborhood, and Richmond Presidio Neighbors will be relentless in preserving its unique character. To this end, in the past five weeks we have reached out to Lake Street and Avenue residents on both sides of Park Presidio, and papered their doorsteps with over 1,500 flyers. Our efforts have been met with a

groundswell of support, as evidenced by the hundreds of e-mails and letters flooding the Trust.

We have also reached out to our city, state and federal officials, meeting with Congresswoman Pelosi's office, state Senator Jackie Speier's office, Assemblyman Leland Yee's, Mayor-Elect Gavin Newsom's office, Supervisor Jake McGoldrick, the Department of Parking and Traffic, and the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services.

Every official we have met with pledged to assist us in having our concerns addressed. And those concerns are twofold. First, the scale and density of the development. There is no other residential apartment complex of this size anywhere north of Market Street. To now place one within a national park one hundred yards from a primarily single-family home community is unprecedented and contrary to the Trust's own stated goal of selecting a plan that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Members of the Trust, we intend to hold you accountable to your word, and we urge you to downsize the development.

Our second concern is with the traffic that such an enormous development will generate. The current plan to have all traffic enter and

exit through 14th and 15th Avenues, and now, as we've heard, consideration of the Park Presidio Boulevard, is a good solution. We submit that direct access from Park Presidio Boulevard is a must and should be a project mandate. Every official we have met with has agreed that direct access will be beneficial, and the Trust has received letters from them confirming this. Coordinating with the Department of Parking and Traffic and Caltrans to make dedicated access for the development a reality must be a priority now, and not an afterthought when six to eight hundred new residents begin flooding the streets.

We are pleased that the Presidio Trust agreed to meet with us yesterday, and we look forward to a continued dialogue with you. Please slow down the process and listen to our concerns.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: I would just urge you - we get it.

[laughter]

It's going to be a much longer night if we have applause between every speaker. So, having gotten this far and having clearly heard that message, from now on I would urge if you could please forego the applause, we'll all move through the speakers more quickly. Please go ahead.

Irene Solomon: Yes. As a member of the Cow Hollow Society, I would like to pass on a few reminders and cautions to the Richmond Presidio group. First of all, I have not heard any mention of what source of power would be available to the planned Public Health Service Hospital development. Those of us in Cow Hollow have learned from our experience with the Lucasfilm project that the environmental report concerned did not concern itself with the impact on our neighborhood of the power that was needed to supply the Lucasfilm project.

Furthermore, there has been no attention to the issue of a capacitor, which has been refused, so we understand by the Presidio Trust, and therefore must be located in our neighborhood, which like the Richmond is a neighborhood of residential buildings with families with children. We urge that, for this new project, a proper environmental review be conducted so that you do not find yourself in the position that we are in,

trying to block the development of enormous feeder lines through residential areas in order to supply a project for the Presidio Trust.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Eric Solomon. And then the next speaker would be Woody Scall.

Eric Solomon: I just wanted to -

Toby Rosenblatt: You are . . . ? I'm sorry.

Eric Solomon: Eric Solomon. Am I the one you want?

Toby Rosenblatt: Yes. Oh, please. I wanted to get your name on the record.

Eric Solomon: Okay. And you can hold your applause.

[laughter]

I just want to spend a little bit because - this is just one sentence, a question on what was just said. Since you don't mention where your

power source will be for these hundreds of units you're building, I assume that the hospital already has a power station, comma. So why can't you use that station or expand it to power the Lucasville, as we call it, Digital Arts Center, rather than forcing this 24 megawatt feeder line through high density, children-infested residential City streets, such as Filbert and Lyon?

I spent a good deal of time in the last weeks talking to the PG&E people, who are supplying the power. Are they going to supply the power to your new residential developments? Are you using less power than the Lucas people will be using? Do you have the capacity to create power on this vast holding called the Presidio that you have a Presidio Trust of?

I think it's really important because the word on the street - we were on the street this morning. We're a little aged to lie down in front of earth movers, but we do pretty well now – we'll be better tomorrow morning. I would assume, though, that you are dead set against supplying the power by building anything on the Presidio ground. We were told by PG&E that you - and you were mentioned by name, the Presidio Trust - had absolutely refused to have this monstrous capacitor or whatever it's called - which is supposed to be 17 feet high. There's a picture of it,

maybe. So if you don't want to supply the power, why do you want to buy it from PG&E? I think it would be a pretty good question. And who's paying for it?

Toby Rosenblatt: Let me just repeat what was said earlier in the meeting. Two things. One is to remind everybody that this meeting is about Public Health Service Hospital.

Eric Solomon: Oh, absolutely.

Toby Rosenblatt: [laughs]

Eric Solomon: You got it in there, I heard.

Toby Rosenblatt: But the other piece is that, as our Executive Director indicated at the beginning, there is a review, again, by the Presidio Trust staff about options and alternatives for the Lucas power sources. And so -

Eric Solomon: They started digging this morning.

Toby Rosenblatt: Just let me finish, okay?

Eric Solomon: Okay.

Toby Rosenblatt: You shouldn't assume that what PG&E says the Trust said is necessarily what the Trust is going to do or may even have said.

Eric Solomon: Ah, but PG&E answers my phone calls.

[laughter]

Toby Rosenblatt: Well, you can . . . Okay, let's go back and talk about the Public Health Hospital site.

Ed Alazraqui: Hi. Ed Alazraqui. I'm a member of the Richmond Presidio Neighbors. I just want to bolster what our president so eloquently said earlier. I've been a homeowner and resident of the 14th Avenue/North of Lake area for ten years, and expecting our second child any minute now. In fact, I have my cell phone on vibrate just in case.

There are a lot of kids in the neighborhood, and a lot of them go up and down Lake Street and of course use Mountain Lake Park. So we're

certainly pleased to hear that you are seriously considering the alternative access through a north of Lake intersection, which will have actually the added benefit of slowing down traffic from a highway directly transitioning into City streets, which is really a problem. And a six-lane intersection that a lot of kids use to go over to Mountain Lake Park, we certainly appreciate the fact that you are seriously considering that.

I've been coming to these meetings for a number of years now, and that's the first time I've actually heard the proposal publicly presented. And again, we really appreciate that. What Claudia mentioned and what I want to really rearticulate is the fact that we are not against the development. In fact, again, I've been living in the area for ten years and have seen it slowly deteriorate to its present condition. And I actually look forward and am actually pleased by what I've seen from some of the proposals.

So we're not anti-development. We really want to work with the Trust. We want you to seriously consider alternatives that might be able to downsize the project to minimize the effect on the surrounding community. And again, we are very encouraged that you are going to seriously look at the alternative access. And I thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is Woody Scale.

Woody Scal: Scal, thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Scal. And then Bill Gorman.

Woody Scal: Good evening. Again, I'm Woody Scal. I live on Lake Street with my family. I'm a member of the Richmond Presidio Neighbors as well, so I'm for responsible development of the site. I strongly support some of the points that have been made about the likely effects of this development on our neighborhood. One basic fact about real estate development that you all know is that it's around for a long, long time. And in San Francisco, as you know, the badly conceived developments are literally cursed by residents for years and years. I'd say how many of us have looked at those ugly high-rise buildings towering over Aquatic Park or Fisherman's Wharf and wondered, who built those things and why didn't somebody do something about it? I submit that that's the kind of project this is, less for its aesthetic effects and more for its effects on the neighborhood. I hate to say it, but this project will probably outlive most of us.

So, to the members of the Presidio Trust and to the staff, I would say, as hundreds of residents sit in congested traffic every morning because of this development; as parents frantically usher their kids across busier streets, worried about their safety; as residents grind their teeth looking for that last parking spot at night; and as a neighborhood bemoans the loss of its friendly, quiet and safe ambience, I'd really ask you folks, do you really want to be remembered as the ones who created these problems?

My point is that I think you're handing your neighbors and your City a large set of problems. And unfortunately, this is the aspect of the Presidio that thousands of people will face every day. That's what they'll remember. Despite all your hard work and admirable work to build a great place here, and a financially self-sufficient installation, this project, in many people's eyes, is what your legacy will be - for literally decades to come.

So I would ask for what purpose? Craig Middleton made some good points about the need for financial self-sufficiency. But this project, at a million dollars by our estimation, would only be two and a half percent of

your total budget. Maybe we're wrong, but we'd like to talk to you about that. And I certainly hope that you can get that million dollars for a smaller development. If you can't, it's our estimate that the difference between a large development and the more moderate options on the table is literally less than one percent of your operating needs.

So I'd say why create these serious problems by pushing forward with a project that doesn't get you that much closer to your goal? There is a better way more in keeping with San Francisco, and I think you folks know it. Please downsize this development, and before you greenlight it solve the traffic nightmare by delivering on this option of direct access off of Park Presidio. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Bill Gorman.

Bill Gorman: Good evening, I'm Bill Gorman. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I understand all the concerns of the Richmond Presidio area neighbors concerning traffic and safety. I just wanted, again, to reemphasize what some earlier folks had said. Something else to think about, for example,

is the electromagnetic field generated by any power that we supplied to the site. For example, in front of my house it's proposed that PG&E down Filbert Street, in supplying the Lucasfilm project, again, put up a 24 megawatt electric line. And the electromagnetic field generated by that really has unknown and possibly very damaging effects to the people living in the neighborhood. That has not really been explored in any kind of public forum or any kind of environmental study done to point out those effects. Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is - I think it's Alicia. I'm sorry, I can't quite read it. Weinstock? And then Mark Weinstock. Help me with your name, would you?

Alana Weinstock: Alana.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Alana Weinstock: My name's Alana and I'm nine years old. When I was little, I was taught that a national park was lots of open green space with hiking and sometimes camping - not 400 apartments. And something I have always been looking forward to is just to walk to the bus stop on 16th by myself.

But now I can't because with 400 houses up there, it would not be safe.

And sometimes in my house, it shakes when buses go by. And there are little kids on our block and we can't play on the sidewalk, and I don't like that. The end.

[applause]

Mark Weinstock: I didn't put her up to that. She wrote that all on her own. I'm Mark Weinstock, and we live on 15th Avenue. We sort of live right at ground zero. We live at the house closest to the Public Health Hospital, so we're going to be pretty affected by whatever happens up there.

I sort of want to follow up on some of the things Alana was saying. The Public Health Hospital site has never had the type of traffic that might happen if an alternate access doesn't happen. This was a Marine hospital where all the patients were from other places. They didn't get a lot of visitors; there weren't a lot of cars. We have older neighbors who've lived there for a long time. They say in those days there might've been a hundred cars a day, when it was used as a hospital, when the wings were used.

Until those beautiful wings were built in the 1950s, 15th Avenue was a cul de sac. When the wings were built, they extended it up into the Presidio. Even for the 25 years or so that the entire hospital was functioning with the wings and all, traffic was minimal. Since the JCC has gone in and rented the nurses' quarters, there's more traffic now than there ever was when it was a hospital, according to the people who lived there back then, and I take their word for it. The beautiful wings of the main hospital building have been empty for just about as long as they were ever used. And they're actually not that beautiful.

[laughter]

They are an eyesore for miles around, and I only live maybe 500 feet from them. I sort of agree with what was said earlier. I find it hard to believe that the Trust would want these architectural gems left up as their legacy to this project. Before this redevelopment project was even considered, our street, before we formed a sort of neighborhood association, had many meetings with both the Presidio Trust and the Department of Parking and Traffic from San Francisco about some serious safety concerns. 15th Avenue coming out of the Presidio is pretty steep downhill. I don't think you can see from that picture, but if you

take it a little further, it's going straight uphill. As Alana said, cars come flying down the steep 15th Avenue street. They don't stop. There is a stop sign at the bottom; nobody pays attention. It's also one of the main bicycle routes to the Golden Gate Bridge. On a nice day, 300 or more bicycles will use 15th Avenue. In the last couple of years there have been a lot of accidents on 15th Avenue. When I called the Richmond police to find out how many, they just said, "A lot. We're not sure how many, but we seem to be there a lot." Two weeks ago I saw a bike versus car accident. The biker was carried off in an ambulance. It's a narrow street with a big downhill. The bikers are still going to be coming down.

As was said before, I think if there's any significant development there needs to be a different entrance and exit. I think it's a great idea. Park Presidio access makes sense for everybody. It's a win-win. It's a win for the park, it's a win for the residents, it's a win for the developers. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. The next speaker is Sally Palmer, and then Brooke Sampson.

Sally Palmer: [Unintelligible].

Toby Rosenblatt: Your testimony won't make it on the record if you're not about this close to the mike. Or maybe it's out of order.

Sally Palmer: How's that? Can you hear me?

Toby Rosenblatt: There you go. Yeah.

Sally Palmer: Shall I start over?

Toby Rosenblatt: Sure.

Sally Palmer: My name's Sally Palmer and I live at Lake Street at 15th. As I was saying, I am neither as sophisticated about development planning, nor as eloquent as the people who've spoken before me. But as a resident and as a mother, and as I look around and see other people in the Richmond Presidio Neighborhood Association, I think all of us have something in common, which is we moved there with a recognition of a neighborhood that was not only single-family homes but family-oriented. And to contemplate some of the changes here have been very troubling for many of us, as you probably recognize by now.

When I consider the prospect for this, the one thing that strikes me is remembering back many years ago when the house fell into the 250-foot-deep hole on West Clay Park and it was all over the national news, and traffic was diverted for months and months and months. And the nightmare that that created lingers with me still because, as I consider this development and think of the traffic, the honking, the noise, the lines - we couldn't even pull out of our driveways - cars. And these are just residents that were diverted. This was not with any new residents that would be part of this project.

That was a nightmare. And I appreciate the fact that you've mentioned tonight that there would be an entrance on the Park Presidio. But even with that, I still can't imagine that the impact at the corner of 15th and Lake wouldn't be extraordinary and untenable for the neighbors in that area. Everything else I had planned to say has already been said better than I can say it. Thank you for your time.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

[applause]

Brooke Sampson, and then Charles Holden.

Brooke Sampson: My name is Brooke Sampson. As you can see by the large developments such as the Public Health Service Hospital adjacent to a residential neighborhood, there are a lot of issues to tackle. I too live in a neighborhood adjacent to a large development - Lucasfilm Letterman Digital Arts Center.

As you've heard this evening, there are some issues that are of concern. I'm very encouraged tonight to hear that the capacitor is starting to be discussed between the Presidio Trust, Lucasfilm and PG&E. I would also encourage the Presidio Trust to begin the discussion about the route that has been selected by PG&E, and any alternatives - possibly a natural gas generator on site. This ties back in, of course, to the Public Health Service Hospital. What power is going to be used for that large development - could the same power generator be used for that power source so that the residents of that neighborhood do not have to endure the impact of a trench going through their neighborhood.

In addition, if the Presidio Trust could encourage an open public forum between the parties involved - not only on our power situation but also

this power situation - since PG&E tends to not want to open up their discussions, possibly the Trust could help them. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Charles Holden.

Charles Holden: The pace of the Public Hospital project needs to be scaled back until the off-site issues are taken up by Caltrans and the City. Circulation issues must be resolved, Caltrans must approve, and then the rent structure can properly be visited. Questions involving the 15th Avenue gate traffic flows cannot be properly estimated until Highway 1 is reconfigured and the Caltrans entitlement is had and obtained. There must be cooperation between the Trust and the planners on these off-site issues.

The rent must be scaled back so that the size of the project is compatible with the entitlements that actually are given by Caltrans, for example. One awkward possibility would be if the City and County of San Francisco decided to declare abandon 15th Avenue. You would have to look for another place for access. It looks like that street is being completely overburdened, and the City might consider that unless there's appropriate planning in the future.

Electrical service is not planned. There needs to be no repetition of the power line issue that's a point of friction between Cow Hollow and the Trust presently. Perhaps the power line should be relocated to serve all of the Presidio in a safe and wise manner, with the line running under or above populated or non-populated areas - I propose under the Marina Green. I think all of the energy issues should be decided at one time. The off-sites will be considered, and we won't have a constant repetition of these off-site issues. Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: Nicholas Zaldastam, and then Richard Chow.

Nicholas Zaldastam: Thank you. I'm new to this neighborhood and new to this whole process. I am glad to have the opportunity to speak. As a Republican, I'm also delighted that our president has brought some new members to this group so that we can truly have a nice interaction between the neighbors adjacent to the Presidio and the activities here.

I too am understanding what has to be done here in terms of gaining some revenues here to keep the park alive, and I'm in full support of that. But I am incredibly bothered by the fact that we have a clear problem here in terms of communication. It is very sad that there have been quite

a few people from Cow Hollow that have had to stand up at this forum and express their concerns. That means there's no communication going on. I heard one gentleman say that he doesn't get return phone calls. And what I'm concerned about with this project is the Richmond folks will feel and experience the same thing.

Perhaps there are new things that are happening, and that's what I'm here to support so that we don't have that problem. But it is really, I think, extremely important that the Trust not only listens to us, but really takes action to support us as residents, and in support of developing the Presidio itself. And clearly, there are hidden issues, or issues that are not being addressed until very late in the process. And providing a means to open up those issues earlier on would make a much better relationship between ourselves as residents adjacent to the Presidio and themselves.

I'm in full support of basically stopping all energy projects and revisiting that so that we can in fact come up with a master plan. The energy needs of this Presidio are going to be ubiquitous to every project we have. And there doesn't seem to be any mass plan to those energy needs. As a result, there's a real problem in the Cow Hollow area, which will also be a problem to the Richmond area. Twenty-four megawatts of energy

lights up 24,000 houses. Twenty-four megawatts of energy creates enough EMF to basically cause cancer in adults and leukemia in kids. It's a big problem. We're talking about a very big development here, and I too am not hearing anything about the energy needs and energy requirements and the energy plans here. So, this has to be, I think, addressed as a mass plan. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Richard Chow, and then Ann Weinstock.

Richard Chow: Hi, my name is Richard Chow. My family and I live on Lake Street between 16th and 17th Avenue. And recently I've been working with the Richmond Presidio Neighbors. I wanted to expand on the issue of the unique and wonderful character that is the Richmond Presidio district.

We moved to this area precisely because it had a quality of life unmatched in most neighborhoods in most cities in the United States. As you know, the character of any community is defined by many factors. In the case of the Richmond Presidio neighborhood, those factors include, of course, proximity to absolutely wonderful parks - of course including the Presidio.

We also have access to tremendous cultural diversity as found in the Geary and in the Clement Street corridors. And finally, and perhaps most importantly, those families that have lived there, those families and individuals who have lived in the neighborhood for many years, as well as those who have moved recently to the area, constitute a wonderful and thriving community. We appreciate what we have, profoundly, and we certainly don't take it for granted.

The current plans, as we understand them, we believe will jeopardize the quality of life that we've come to appreciate. We believe that these plans need to be accordingly scaled back in ways that have been expressed by many of the people here today. I'd like to echo some of the comments already, from my colleagues from the Richmond Presidio neighborhoods that we would welcome a dialogue. We certainly would welcome a low-impact development effort at the hospital site. Thank you very much.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Ann Weinstock, and then Mark Higbie.

Ann Weinstock: Hello, my name's Ann Weinstock and I am a member of PAR and NAPP and the recently formulated RPN, Richmond Presidio Neighbors, and I am a very [proximal] neighbor as well. I'm going to make it short and sweet. I was very happy to hear about the consideration of the access off Park Presidio because, to me, this is the most important aspect of the project.

Our streets, as you've heard, can't handle the traffic. And there are plenty of reasons to consider this access not only as the neighborhood considerations, but also for the construction phase, which I'm comparing to Letterman and what they've done there. And for the protection of the intersection of Park Presidio and Lake Street, which already - the Department of Parking and Traffic and other people from the City have discussed how dangerous that intersection is for pedestrians. They would welcome any opportunity for traffic calming of the cars coming through the tunnel before they get to Lake and Park Presidio. So short but sweet, strongly consider the access off Park Presidio to the point where I think the project should be halted until it's resolved.

Toby Rosenblatt: Mark Higbie, and then Gretchen Knoell.

Mark Higbie: My name is Mark Higbie and I live on 16th Avenue and Lake Street. I too am a member of the Richmond Presidio Neighbors. I've recently been compelled to pay attention to the dialogue taking place between yourselves in the Trust, and the folks who live around the perimeter of your charge, the Presidio. And this dialogue hasn't sounded much like a conversation. Everyone's wound up - your staff, the folks who live around me - and what I'm hearing is always framed as "You versus them." But wait, let's stop for a moment and talk about us.

Joe, Hillary, Jeff, Mary, Ed, Tia, Woody, Lydia, Mark, Claudia, Von, and Craig, Alana, Toby, Robin, Paul, Colleen, Dick, Gretchen, Bill, and everyone here tonight who I haven't met. We are all neighbors who live in a community, our community. How do we know this? Well, Daniel Webster defines a neighbor as a person living or located near another vested by principles of friendship and cooperation. Daniel goes on to define community as a unified body of individuals living at a particular area holding a common interest within a larger context in society. Does this sound like us? I think it does. We are all Richmond Presidio neighbors and we want to get this development right. Our government has told us if we want to keep the Presidio, we have to make it pay for itself. But we have to be able to afford it.

Can we afford to compromise the fragile nature of our quiet streets and the safety of our kids with increased traffic? With the increased traffic that will certainly come with the wrong plan, neighbors, I submit to you that this is not just about cash, it is about our community and we are all in it much deeper than a dollar might dictate.

Right now, we have some thoughtful and elegant proposals on the table from John and Craig. We appreciate their desire to extend our neighborhood and build more community. But as we know, the devil is in the details. And we've been hearing about these details in e-mails, phone calls, faxes, family-friendly collateral, and some impassioned words here tonight. This is good. We are vested as neighbors to communicate with one another. But let me say that from where I stand right now, we should be committed to communicate in ways that will allow us to hear each other.

Tonight my message is simple. Let us commit to realign our thinking of why we're here, and what we're trying to create in the context of our community. Thank you, neighbors. I'm looking forward to the conversation.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Gretchen Knoell, and then Joanne Zlatunich.

Gretchen Knoell: My name is Gretchen Knoell and I live on 16th Avenue north of Lake Street. Now, as the mother of two children, I can only echo many of the concerns we've heard here tonight. And I'd like to offer two more additional thoughts about the density and traffic concerns. And I truly appreciate the need to have a financially viable project - of course you do - and the Presidio does need to pay for itself. So it seems if you can consider dedicating some of the space in the project to inhabitants who will create less traffic, such as senior citizens and assisted living, if you could make that a mandate, that could potentially cut down on the density level here, and also achieve the financial goals.

And secondly, there's an excellent secondary benefit to the new access onto Park Presidio that you are considering, which I'm glad to hear. And that is the fear that's created, in my boys and in me, going over to Mountain Lake Park. As a matter of fact, sometimes I don't even bother going because crossing Park Presidio is a frightening, can be very

frightening with the cars that come zooming and screeching to a stop. So I appreciate that you're seriously considering that and hope that you will adopt that plan, and take into consideration the added benefit of making our street safer through putting in additional access. Thank you very much.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Joanne Zlatunich: Good evening. My name is Joanne Zlatunich. I've been a resident of the Richmond district for over 12 years and have enjoyed the Presidio with the educational volunteer and recreational opportunities it has. I've gone past this site for more than those years. I appreciate the redevelopment of this, but there are definitely a couple of things I really want to mention.

These wings that are on there, and the proposals that I've seen by the two groups that have proposed the redevelopment - to truly, historically renovate this building, the wings have really got to go. They do not historically renovate this building if they are still there. This seems to go

along with the sentiment tonight, that this whole project seems to be looking at a downsize.

In accordance to that, any building in the Battery Caulfield area is also illogical. That area is a very sensitive habitat, not just for the flora and fauna that are there, but for the people. Anybody who is going to be residing in this, anybody who is a neighbor, anybody who's going to use this place, it's a national park. It's not just for us. It's not just for the people who are going to be living in this newly renovated hospital - well, building. Aesthetically, we need open space. It's a national park. We need to remember that historical significance at the Nike missile site, and have some kind of placard there, and leave that area open. Yet, we also need to take these wings off and leave them off. Thank you for your time.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Okay, the next speaker is Matthew Zlatunich. And then Ellen Hornstein.

Matthew Zlatunich: My name is Max Zlatunich, and I've been a life long resident of San Francisco and resided in the Richmond district for about 10 years. I'm

also up here to reiterate the point that I believe that the project needs to be downscaled. Most of the people here have commented on the traffic concerns. But my comments will be directed more toward the foot traffic concerns. I think that bringing so many people into this area is going to really impact the natural areas.

I've been involved as a volunteer doing habitat restoration and wildlife monitoring throughout the area, so I know it very well. I spend a lot of time over there, up on the upper plateaus. These areas, these habitats and ecosystems, are among the best ecosystems throughout the whole park. They are vital towards the plants and animals that live there. They provide vital habitat that needs to be preserved and restored, and I think the influx of hundreds of people into the area will have just as much of an effect on these habitats as the traffic will on the surrounding residential areas. So I encourage you to really consider downscaling the project something like along the lines of alternative three, and that's - I hope that all the neighbors here today, and all of our comments are going to be really, seriously considered. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Ellen Hornstein.

[applause]

And then go ahead, Ellen.

Ellen Hornstein: I live in Cow Hollow. The Public Health Service has issues facing it today that currently are being faced in other areas - obviously, the Cow Hollow area. One of these major issues is power, and I won't go in and repeat everything that the others have said about this. But the way the Presidio Trust is dealing today with the power requirements for the Lucas project I feel have a direct bearing on how the Presidio Trust will deal with the Public Health Service Hospital in the future.

My memory isn't really that great at my age, but a few years ago we were Cow Hollow residents faced with primarily the Lucas project and the Shorenstein project, and I think that a lot of the Cow Hollow area really supported the Lucas project - I know I certainly did. I don't recall - correct me if I'm wrong - but I do not recall it being pointed out that power lines carrying power to service a small city would be running down residential streets filled with families and children, thereby making us face serious potential health hazards.

Now, PG&E, and I believe Presidio Trust, are telling us that the potential health hazards are inconclusive. Well, what that says to me is that you cannot conclusively assure me that we're not going to be getting cancers, leukemias, et cetera, as has been pointed out. This is an enormous health risk to all of us. My children, as Toby knows full well, are grown. And I'm not faced with this, but we have a wonderful family neighborhood much like the Richmond neighborhood and this is very frightening. I don't know - maybe I missed it – I'm not hearing what the power source is going to be for this. I think that this issue has to be raised. I would like to know from the Trust what was the former power source that was used for Letterman and for other power needs in the Presidio. And I also would like to ask, have you considered a natural gas generator for the power sources? Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

[applause]

Next speaker is Margaret Zegart, and then Judy Hulkka.

Margaret Zegart: Margaret Kettunen Zegart. I'm the kind of person the Richmond neighborhood doesn't like because I go down 15th Avenue and through the Presidio to my home in Marin any time I'm in San Francisco, which usually is three or four times a week. And I would like to speak to different issues.

One of them is the scale and density. I think the wings should be down, but I think that the density could be modestly changed by instead of developing just the back "T" as proposed by the Forest Development into senior housing, to make that into a cross. And that will not damage the appearance, and will increase a real need in the community for senior housing and reduce the traffic and circulation needs. In terms of families, I hope that you have two- and three-bedroom units as well in the other section, rather than just one-bedroom units, because that, again, will reduce density, and yet you will still maintain a good revenue source and you will fulfill another need.

The circulation - I think the trail from Mountain Lake across from behind should be developed. The DeAnza trail should be a significant aspect of this development, and that will afford the community, the Richmond community, a way to walk safely going over the tunnel area.

I hate to tell you that I think that working with Caltrans is just a real bug. And I believe you should have an alternative to that. To my mind there are two things you can do. You can ride to the Presidio side of 14th Avenue. There is enough space to build an entrance. And you can make it one-way traffic - a circle. But more desirable, I think, would be to work – there's a social road. Instead of a social trail, there's a social road that goes up from Pershing Drive. So you can use Lincoln to Pershing Drive and then access in that way. And you can do it within the Presidio domain and not be delayed as you certainly will be because of the Caltrans projects. The funding for those, and then even the conceptual planning for those take from ten to 20 years. It's dismal. And I think there are two alternatives there that should be considered.

Another thing that I think would be important for you to consider is in terms of the financial aspect, I believe it is inherently wrong to have a developer doing long-term leasing. This is not the kind of thing that is, I believe, appropriate for the national park. Making a choice of your developer, I think that that should be a very strong consideration. One of the things that people wanted this national park so badly for at its conception so that it wouldn't be taken over by developers who were

making big profits and subleasing and leasing - that kind of thing. And I think it's best to keep this whole aspect of property and occupation within the genesis of your own Presidio.

I believe when you're talking about power, I think that you should think in terms of your goal, which is sustainability. There are other alternative means for power. And I believe that probably the power source was in the Albion Press, which is now occupied and has been considered to be continued - the Albion Press, which is a wonderful building. And the way they are utilizing it is a tremendous asset, so I hope that you retain both that and the school for young children, as decided. The -

Toby Rosenblatt: Margaret, I have to ask you to wind up, please. Your time is -

Margaret Zegart: I'm over?

Toby Rosenblatt: Way past over.

Margaret Zegart: I'm sorry. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Judy Hulka, and then Totten Heffelfinger.

Judy Hulka: My name is Judy Hulka, and I'm speaking for NAPP - the Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning, 11 organizations that have been united on the Presidio since 1989. We don't believe that the upcoming environmental review process will assure the goals of this project, particularly if it's based on the minimum requirement of NEPA. We think that a supplemental environmental impact statement is needed.

NAPP also wants the environmental assessment itself to give equal treatment to different size developments from the largest to the smallest, which you say you will do. We hope that the full economic benefit language that was introduced into the previous documents on this project will not put the smallest alternative at a disadvantage. To preclude that and make all of us feel secure, we urge you to restate the financial goal in the EA to say something like, "This project should provide the Trust with appropriate income related to its proposed size and use." We also want the EA to look at the impact of different densities of housing and

residential use, and evaluate the effect of different types of tenants on open space and our surrounding neighborhoods.

Regarding the effects of building at Battery Caulfield, we believe that significantly more study is needed than your schedule allows. So, to simplify the entire environmental review process, we would like to see you eliminate Battery Caulfield from the project.

We also want the EA to evaluate the traffic impact of all four alternatives, which everyone has spoken to so far. NAPP believes that the size of this project should not be determined until that analysis is complete. Good timing can create goodwill, and that's what we all want to do. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Totten Heffelfinger: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Totten Heffelfinger and I'm a resident of the Richmond district, although not so close to 14th and 15th Avenues that I'm quite as much impacted. But I do fully

sympathize with the needs of those people to downsize this project and solve some of the intense traffic problems that will occur.

But my main comment tonight is that no development should be permitted at the Battery Caulfield site. The development should be restricted to the existing hospital area. The Battery Caulfield site should be preserved from development, and as soon as practicable restored as habitat and integrated into adjacent quail and native plant communities.

The development of residential structures and parking space at Battery Caulfield as proposed by Forest City Development would not be compatible with the adjacent communities and would eliminate a unique opportunity to add the three-acre site to a habitat mixture that is rare even in the Presidio.

Furthermore, the intense development proposed would be likely to result in at least the following adverse environmental impacts, which could not adequately be mitigated and must be carefully considered in the environmental assessment. Adjacent quail habitat could be disturbed by noise, artificial light and pets. Uncollected garbage could attract an increased number of predators. Wetlands and associated habitat in the

Nike Swale would be adversely impacted by runoff from the developed site, and could suffer from intentional or inadvertent introduction of [more and basic] species. Prominent structures and their artificial light would be overwhelmingly visible from the south, from quite far away, replacing the natural views.

The development of the site would frustrate efforts to control vehicular traffic and result in an increase in automobile traffic on Caulfield Road. This would be detrimental to the natural areas above and below the site, and impair the enjoyment of the area by many people, especially those who are hikers and bicyclers.

So I urge the Presidio Trust to choose an alternative that will avoid these impacts, and select an alternative that will preserve the potential Battery Caulfield site and at the same time downsize the project, as has been so eloquently advocated by other speakers. Thank you very much.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker is Lynn Terry, and then Mike Van Dyke.

Lynn Terry: My name's Lynn Terry. My wife and I own a home at 218 15th Avenue, about a block and a half from that entrance. We've lived there since 1976. Back when we bought the house, the Public Health Hospital was still there. In fact, as a little aside, I was an IBM rep for the hospital and my wife was a market and support rep.

To just reinforce what I think Mark Weinstock mentioned earlier, the impact on the neighborhood was nil and less than nil. That place was very, very quiet. It's been that way for many, many years. The language school that came up from Monterey was the same thing. There was no impact on the neighborhood whatsoever. So obviously we've been nervous as we've heard more about the potential size of the development inside of the Presidio. I'm one of the people who would've been perfectly happy if the U.S. Army had retained it as a base. Everyone had access to the park and it was great. But obviously that's not the case. And we understand that it has to be self-sustaining and that money's going to have to be somehow made in some of these different projects.

But the thing that makes me most nervous, as it has for most other people, the size and the potential impact on traffic in the neighborhood. And so I would say yes, that it's essential that you find an alternative

entrance. And if it can be worked out with Caltrans, I think that could possibly work. But again, it'll be dependent on the size and the number of vehicles. There were not ever a lot of people in that hospital there. And the numbers of people that I've heard on some of these projects are probably twice the number of people that worked at the hospital when I was the IBM rep there.

Finally, the thing that has not been mentioned at all - and it was in a meeting about a year and a half ago, I think, when first we were talking about this particular project - that just would be a nightmare for me would be a bus coming down 15th Avenue. And I'm hoping that the projects you're looking at, number one, will be downscaled. But number two, that there will be some reassurance that I can leave here with tonight that there's no question that no development will generate any demand for a bus down 15th Avenue. Thanks.

Toby Rosenblatt: I think most of the people who attend these probably know this. But the issues that are raised in meetings like this, where this is an environmental review under way, those issues get analyzed and answered - every one of them - in the report that will come out.

Okay, the next speaker?

Mike Van Dyke: Thank you very much, Toby. My name is Mike Van Dyke. I want to first thank you guys for having this meeting. It shows a commitment that you're willing to put forward to building this community the right way by having another meeting so closely after the other one to hear people's comments.

As you know, I live out here on the Presidio and I'm representing the Presidio community tonight, which is about a thousand homes that are out here that we rent from the Presidio Trust. Everyone at our last meeting, at our town hall meetings we hear about how the police have to constantly go out to this building and keep people out of it, get scavengers out of it, and people are trying to live in it. So all the progress that you're putting towards this is good. We see this as a good building block for the community. All the ideas are coming forward to making this some sort of central block where people can live out here and enjoy the park. There's a positive force for it.

I know there's concerns. We've heard from other people, and I think you will listen to those as we've already seen by some of the alternative

methods of getting into the park. And I wanted to make sure you knew that people like it who live out here, and people who live out here want to see the community grow. And we've seen you support that - especially you, Craig. We've seen events happen out here just in the last week - the tree lighting, the day of thanks. And we like that feeling, that hometown atmosphere, just right here on this park. And we want more people to become involved with it.

The plans here really help that grow. And on a personal note, I like to see the plan that has a long-term leasing option because it reminds me of the rental car analogy. I don't wash a rental car before I take it back. I think you've always heard the quote, "It's a rental" when you get one. I might have even said that. And people who rent things for short periods of time often don't take care of them as much as they do when they get ownership and they can feel like they belong to a community. When you allow something like that to happen, whichever supposedly you want to go with, is really a way to build a foundation for this community to grow.

We have literally thousands of people living out here now that can be the number one resource. The people who can make others feel welcome when they come in the park and have it open-armed, instead of being

something that's a transient neighborhood where we don't have people who feel responsible to the Richmond and the Presidio neighborhoods that are outside of the Presidio area itself. And I think a good way to start is to look at ways where people who feel more of a bond to this park that we have, because I like living out here and I'd like to see that as a future for other people, too. Thank you very much for listening to the comments. I'm keeping an open mind about what's going on and responding back to this.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. John Brooke, and then Cecile Dauydiak, I think it is.

John Brooke: Good evening. My name's John Brooke. I want to ask the Board and the Presidio Trust to ensure that the environmental impact reviews for the development of the Public Health Hospital include the following four points. Number one, a true and real assessment of the electrical power requirements for the projects. Number two, an assessment of how the power will be sourced. And number three, strong consideration for how the power will be routed to the facility. Finally, number four, that any change to the above require a complete reevaluation of the electrical power portion of the environmental impact study.

Learning from the Letterman Digital experience, the EIS did not address these four points. As a result, PG&E is now routing 24 megawatts of power through Cow Hollow. At the best, the perception is that the Letterman Digital complex has backdoored the electrical power impacts of the project without appropriate environmental impact evaluation. At worst, the perception is that the federally required environmental impact process has been corrupted. Thank you very much.

Toby Rosenblatt: The next speaker, please.

Cecile Dauydiak: The last name is Dauydiak.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

Cecile Dauydiak: I live on 15th at California. I've been there since 1955. And if you want to tell what business is on a street, when the hospital was in full function it was over 300 patients plus over 300 employees plus visitors. At a time when there weren't that many cars, there were cars going up and down, up and down, all the time.

We were so happy when they closed the hospital because it slowed down the traffic. We have more cars. And the amount of building that you want to do will bring more cars into the district, and more going down 15th, 16th, 17th and Lake Street. I doubt that any of you live in the Richmond district. But if you did live in the Richmond district you would understand what we're trying to tell you. We're trying to tell you to cut down on your size. That hospital needs to be replaced - we all know that. That you put up something that's less in number to cut down on the traffic that will be going on to the community. And I represent myself in talking here. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you.

[applause]

The next speaker is Rommie Lucia, and then Josiah Clark. Rommie Lucia - is she here? Josiah Clark - is he here? Richard Keenan.

Richard Keenan: Good evening. My name is Richard Keenan, and my wife, Katherine McNamara, and I live on 15th Avenue between California and Lake

Streets. And like many people here, we're also members of the Richmond Presidio Neighborhood.

Toby Rosenblatt: [Unintelligible].

Richard Keenan: Oh. Thanks. How's that? We've lived on our block for 20 years in the neighborhood. You've heard from others, I think, say, well, the nature of the neighborhood. I want to make a couple of comments in the minutes I have. First, I want to thank the people from Cow Hollow who have commented tonight. They're raising concerns that are new to us. They've taken a night to be here, and we appreciate hearing about them. We want to understand these issues better.

Mark Weinstock, who lives at what we call ground zero, commented about the wings. I don't know who selected that picture, but it's probably Exhibit A of why the wings ought to go.

[laughter]

But there's something that people haven't spoken about much. Imagine that building, with those wings, with every window ablaze at night, and

what kind of a visual impact that's going to have on the western San Francisco skyline at night. You don't just see it from Mark's house, you see it from Golden Gate Park, you see it from many parts of San Francisco. I'd like to have some consideration made as to the visual pollution, one might argue, that lighting up a building that size, with the density that may have the favorite proposal would result in.

When we were considering how to best relate our concerns, I think we were concerned that we might be dismissed as sort of NIMBYs, not in my backyards. But I think you've heard from many groups now, local politicians, and people who are not at ground zero, who are saying this concerns them. It concerns them as far as the impact, the density that's being considered. It concerns as far as the traffic. Can I just have a show of hands of people who are still here who are not at ground zero who are concerned about this project? I think it's not just a very local problem or concern to the neighbors.

I've heard now that you are going to give serious consideration to a Park Presidio entrance, and we applaud that. But I and others would like to ask to make that a mandate - that you make that a mandate before you select a winner. If it's not a mandate, it will not be done. It won't be

budgeted, it won't be planned for, it won't be addressed. But the vigor of solving it is if you make it a mandate. If you say you'll consider it, I'm sure you will. But it will not guarantee a success by having you making a mandate to have a Park Presidio entrance and exit.

The NAPP speaker spoke of NEPA, and everyone's aware of the possibilities of litigation. No one wants that. But I think it's worth considering you're making a decision on a project that's going to impact the entire Richmond neighborhood long past the lives of anyone in this room. This is a long-term decision you're making. Please don't rush to judgment. We have one chance to get it right. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Next speaker is Diane Osollo.

Diane Osollo: Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity. I'm a student at San Francisco State University, and I've just observed the meeting as it goes on. But I wanted to make a comment that I hope you will include in your ongoing cost benefit analysis and environmental impact reports, issues of traffic calming, preserving the ecosystem. And I'm also wondering how

you will place some security personnel to ensure that if development does go up, however downsized it is, it is a safe, calm and pleasant experience for occupants. And I would also like to add that I do hope that you utilize green power resources such as water radiation recycling, solar energy resources, so as to keep the building. Thank you.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: Eloise Jonas.

Eloise Jonas: Hi, I'm a Richmond neighbor, and I live on Lake between 15th and 16th. That's my view. I think that's the back of the hospital, though. Everybody said everything that I think. I don't have too much more to add, except that I used to attend the meetings back a few years ago and I believe what a man said earlier, that it wasn't going to be anything but maybe educational or senior housing. And I was quite happy with that. But this isn't something I'm particularly happy with because of obvious reasons.

So I'm asking you to maybe try and please go back to the original plans of senior housing. I think that would generate less traffic. That's really

ugly, and I hate to be a negative person, but I don't really like the looks of that either; it's huge. It looks sort of jail-like. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. That completes all of the speaker cards that we have. Mollie? Is that right? All right, one gentleman who hasn't been heard. Yeah, go ahead.

Mark Talini: I'm a Richmond Presidio neighbor. My name is Mark Talini. I live on Lake Street between 15th and 16th. And I would like to amplify some of the comments that were made about traffic on Lake Street in the intersections of Park Presidio, 15th Avenue, 14th Avenue.

First I'd like to describe what it's like at 8:30 in the morning, between the hours of 8:30 and 9:00, as we try to pull out of the driveway onto Lake Street, and confront a line of cars that on an average morning can number higher than 20, stretching from Park Presidio intersection all the way past our house. The approximately five minutes it can take to cross Lake Street at that point - excuse me - the five minutes it can take to pull out of our driveway at that point of the morning. And this is under existing

traffic conditions, without the addition of 5,500 additional cars to the mix.

Second issue is the safety aspects of traffic - our intersection at 15th and Lake, and the 14th Avenue and Lake Street intersection, at the Park Presidio Lake Street intersection. I'd like to describe a maneuver that hasn't been mentioned before, but that happens approximately 20 times an hour, which is first we see cars pulling off of Park Presidio heading south. They pull off Park Presidio onto Lake because Park Presidio does not allow left turns eastbound. What cars then do is they try to pull a U-turn on 14th Avenue and invariably cause further disruption, further danger to pedestrians, to bikers. A similar maneuver is where cars will drive down Park Presidio, make a right onto California, and will then make another right onto 14th Avenue and come back up. And at that intersection, will then try to reenter Lake Street. And we've seen several near accidents there.

I think it's worth confirming with the City the accident count. I recognize that the Richmond police division couldn't provide more exact statistics, but I think it is worth visiting with the City to understand exactly what the incidence of accidents is there. By our estimate, it's

something on the order of once a month. And that's at the intersection of 15th and Lake. And I imagine it's far more frequent at the intersection of Park Presidio and Lake. And I think what makes this all the more painful for us is having seen a biker struck head-on by a car two weeks ago and carried away in an ambulance. It sort of really accentuates this issue for us. Thank you.

Toby Rosenblatt: Thank you. Next speaker, please.

Steven Myers: Good evening to you all. My name is Steven Myers and I wanted to offer the testimony of a native son, because I think in some ways, although I have no prepared remarks, and I'd like to apologize to ya'll that I'm unacquainted with you. I did attend the last meeting, and become very interested in this.

I became a resident of north Berkeley in 1997 when I began graduate school. I grew up on 14th between Lake and California. I reckon in the decade in the 1970s I hit ten million tennis balls against my garage door at 159 14th Avenue. And I spent more time at Mountain Lake Park than anyone else in the neighborhood, all through my childhood.

Then I went away to college back east and became a full-time soccer player. I would regularly enter the Presidio right there through 14th and Lake with my Jewish father, my dear friend, the late Donald Herman. I see his wife, my neighbor, Sharon Herman, beside me, a woman that I love dearly, and I must pay my respects to.

I am very moved by many of the comments of the citizens here and others. This seems like a profoundly disturbing development for the area in which I grew up. I wondered, did anyone attend Greenfest? I know that there is a charge to make profitable this most extraordinary land. My first three years up here on Union and Lyon, before my parents bought a property on 14th Avenue between Lake and California. It is not my intention to offend anyone, I find it - it was almost [risible] that the two developments offered, as both comments, were similar. And yet there were words of praise about the creativity and the variety, and the look ahead. I think this is the dominant paradigm. I think it's inevitable that there will be an elitism that attends to this land, after the very many irruptions, and the alterations that will be permanent, and forever alter the character of the Richmond district of San Francisco. I think you'll want to move, dear lady, and it is not where you'll want to raise your family.

I'm sorry that there is a very shocking, and for many I imagine, offensive nature to my words. I feel compelled to speak. That this might develop, and those most unattractive aspects of that architecture remain in these creative projects. Again, that seems so odd to me. Again, I will be watching this with care of someone who had his childhood in this area and was the great beneficiary of the local beauty, of the sense of neighborhood, of the security, of the quiet aspects of the neighborhood, which I know are held so dear by those who have made their homes and lives there. And it will be changed so dramatically.

And as we heard testimony from the local residents, it seems that the City did not keep its agreement in certain contracts made in the developments of Lucasville. With regard, they did not keep their word in terms of the power supplies for the area, or something akin to that. Is that too rude to say, sir, to phrase it that way? I mean, I heard testimony like that this evening, sort of shocking to me.

[applause]

Toby Rosenblatt: All right. Any other speakers? All right, that concludes our meeting.  
It's now 8:25 and I thank you all for coming.