

PRESIDIO TRUST PUBLIC BOARD MEETING – June 15, 2006

NOTE: The following is the best transcript available of the public Board meeting of the Presidio Trust Board of Directors held on June 15, 2006. It is based upon an audio recording of the meeting.

Dave Grubb: My name is Dave Grubb and I'm the chairman. I think we've been through this before. I know when we get to the public comment period, I have the list of the first groups and I will call them in the order in which they have signed up. And there will be approximately three minutes for each person, so we'll limit it to three minutes. With that, the time is now 6:40 and we have a little bit of business to do before we get to the public comment, so you'll have to bear with us.

The first thing on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the last meeting. So may I have any comments? May I have a motion to approve?

Lydia Beebe: So moved.

Dave Grubb: Is there a second?

Male Voice: Second.

Dave Grubb: Are there any questions or comments?

Female Voice: I have a question. [unintelligible]

Dave Grubb: Okay. With that correction, is everybody still okay with it?

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Dave Grubb: Read the question? The question is can we have an approval of the minutes for our last meeting?

Karen Cook: My comment was simply to reflect that I neglected the attendance of one of our staff members at the meeting on the minutes, so I'm going to add that.

Dave Grubb: We had the wrong name. All right. So it's been moved and seconded. All those in favor?

MANY: Aye.

Dave Grubb: Opposed?

Joe Yew: Mr. Chair?

Dave Grubb: Yes?

Joe Yew: I wasn't present at the meeting, so I'd like to abstain.

Female Voice: Under those conditions . . . [unintelligible].

Dave Grubb: All right. So those who attended the meeting please vote and those in favor, please say aye.

MANY: Aye.

Dave Grubb: Opposed? So the minutes are carried. We have a report on the third quarter budget adjustment.

Lydia Beebe: Dave, I would just like to say the Finance Committee just finished its meeting and we did review the proposal for the third quarter budget adjustment and we do recommend it, and I would like to make the motion to adopt this and put it before the group. And I would like to ask our CFO, Mike Rothman, to give us the highlights.

Mike Rothman: Thank you. You should each have a summary of the proposed changes; it's a single page. The most significant of the proposed changes that are recommended since the budget was last modified in February is the inclusion of a budgetary provision for the renovation of Building 1808 in the Public Health Service Hospital District, but a building that's excluded from the project under discussion later tonight. Budgetary authority granted now provides staff the ability to proceed with that project, but it's not our expectation to obligate those funds until subsequent to the completion of the record of decision on the Public Health Hospital project.

There are other projects identified, including the renovation of 1337 Polk Street and development of architectural plans, design plans, for a number of landscaping and other park improvements. I'd be happy to take any questions you have on that.

Dave Grubb: Any questions about the budget adjustments? We have a motion. Is there a second?

Curtis Feeny: Second.

Dave Grubb: All right, any other questions, comments? All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

Dave Grubb: Opposed? Carried. All right, now we'll get into the Executive Director's report.

Craig Middleton: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we do without the Executive Director's report and move right to the Public Health Service Hospital, given the number of people that are here to speak.

Dave Grubb: Well, that's true. Got out of that one. [Laughs] All right, shall we begin?

Male Voice: [unintelligible]

Craig Middleton: Thank you, everybody, for coming. It's such a beautiful night out, I'm glad to see so many people here instead of outside. I just wanted to give a little context and a little background on the subject that is the main event for tonight, the Public Health Service Hospital final EIS. So bear with me. I just want to spend a couple of minutes, go through some history and then talk about where we are and then open it up for public comment.

The plans to rehabilitate Public Health Service Hospital began in 2000 as part of the development of the Presidio Trust Management Plan,

PTMP. The management plan identified a mix of residential and educational uses for the Public Health Service Hospital complex. It's about 400,000 square feet of building space on 18 acres of already developed land. The PTMP EIS, Environmental Impact Statement, permitted an alternative that anticipated traffic impact in excess of that generated by a 350-unit project. The PTMP alternative is reflected in this EIS as Alternative 1. Many of you participated in that process and the majority of comments about Public Health Service Hospital at that time asked the Trust to consider converting the hospital to residential use.

When the Trust issued an RFP in 2003 to redevelop the Public Service Hospital we identified housing as the Trust-preferred use for the hospital building. We released an Environmental Assessment in February of 2004. We heard from many of you at that time that the development was too big and that our analysis of its impact was not sufficient. In response, we undertook the EIS and released a draft Environmental Impact Statement in August 2004. The final EIS was released on May 15 and includes responses to comments. This EIS analyzes the following four alternatives:

Alternative 1, as I mentioned, the PTMP or Presidio Trust Management Plan alternative, is the legally required no action alternative under NEPA. It reflects the Trust's adopted management plan as analyzed in the PTMP final EIS.

Alternative 2, affectionately known as Wings Retained/Trust Revised Alternative, would rehabilitate the historic buildings on the site as well

as the non-historic wing of Building 1801, which is the hospital building, for residential use with limited demolition and new construction. The gross square footage of occupied buildings would total 400,000 square feet, or what is there today, with approximately 230 residential units in 333,000 square feet and other uses in about 67,000 square feet. This alternative has been reduced from 350 units in the draft EIS.

Alternative 3, Wings Removed Alternative. Alternative 3 would rehabilitate the historic buildings on the site for residential use and would remove the non-historic wings of Building 1801, the main hospital, together with other non-historic buildings and additions. The gross square footage of occupied buildings would total about 275,000 square feet, also with up to 230 dwelling units. This alternative is the one that most commenters supported throughout the environmental review.

Alternative 4 is the Battery Caulfield Alternative. In this alternative we would rehabilitate historic buildings on the site for residential use, remove Building 1801's non-historic wings, as well as the other non-historic buildings and additions, and construct new residential buildings on Battery Caulfield, which is up the hill.

Alternative 2, as revised, is identified in the final EIS as the Preferred Alternative because it best meets the project's objectives.

We have taken formal comment on this project at four public meetings, have heard over 100 speakers, and have reviewed upwards

of 500 comment letters. In summary, the comments we've received center on two key points: the size of the project - the amount of square footage, the number of units, the number of bedrooms, the removal of the wing; and the increased traffic on neighborhood streets and dedicated access to the site.

For the past year we have been working to reduce the size of the project while preserving the historic hospital, the Presidio's largest historic structure, and also developing a project that a developer would be willing to do and that would return some revenue to the Presidio. We have increased the Presidio's return from the project by taking on specific and significant features of development - and those are the outbuildings 1804, the budget for which was just approved, and the Wyman Terrace housing units.

While the footprint of the new Preferred Alternative, Alternative 2, has remained the same, we've reduced the number of units by more than 30 percent, from 350 units to 230 units, thereby reducing traffic impact by 18 to 24 percent. We have also reduced the number of bedrooms from 414 to 367 or by about ten percent.

Traffic is a chief concern in every urban area. It is understandable that increased traffic in the neighborhood is a concern, especially for those neighbors immediately adjacent to the site on 14th and 15th Avenues. Just a word about the traffic analysis in the EIS. Traffic analyses generally are based on the number of residential units, not the number of people. Our traffic analysis is very conservative; we used the City's highest trip-generation rate for all the units. Had we applied the City's

lower rates for smaller units, the vehicle trips would have been about 12 percent lower.

We've talked over the months, I guess even years, about a direct access to the Presidio from the Public Health Service Hospital and to the Public Health Service Hospital site. And we've been working with CalTrans on that issue. CalTrans has to approve such a direct access and intersection on Highway 1 of Park Presidio. And I just wanted to quote from CalTrans to give you a sense of where we are on it. The quote is, "We question the overall benefit of the new access from the hospital to Park Presidio Boulevard. Granted, residents who live in proximity to the hospital are naturally concerned about the potential traffic generated by the proposed development. However, we find it difficult to see any justification for disrupting the travel of current Park Presidio Boulevard users in order to accommodate the relatively small amount of traffic generated by the proposed development, especially with existing ingress and egress that is likely to be functionally adequate to meet traffic needs of the development."

Now having said that - that coming from CalTrans - we are committed to continuing to work on that direct access with CalTrans and we appreciate the support and help that the City has offered and the Mayor's office and the Supervisors, particularly Supervisors McGoldrick and Alioto-Pier on this subject. So, we'll continue to work on that.

Another question that has been a central one for us during this debate is whether or not the project is needed for the Presidio's financial self-

sufficiency. And I would just say that the Trust's opportunities to generate revenue are limited to the amount of square footage that currently exists in the park. Our ability to sustain the Presidio's resources depends on generating a fair return from a multitude of projects. In other words, we have to make the most of each. The EIS takes a hard look, and the response to comments gives serious consideration to public concerns. Those concerns form the basis for the revision from the draft EIS to the final EIS.

For a number of years we've analyzed the site, its buildings, and how to reuse them. It's a complicated project - I think we all know that here. We've looked at all of the options without judgment and we've tried to go back to the Trust mission, which is to preserve historic buildings, protect the park, and generate the revenue that would support the park.

Just a word about process and then we'll get into the comments. Since the release of the final SEIS on May 15, we've received approximately 40 letters. And the 30-day wait period for the final SEIS will be over on June 19. After that time, the Board will deliberate on the analyses and the comments we've received in the past and tonight, and then we'll move toward a record of decision, which will present, amongst other information, the rationale for the decision about which development alternative we ultimately choose for the Public Health Service district.

If the Board would like, we can move right into public comment, unless anyone wanted to say anything.

Dave Grubb: One thing, though, I'd like to introduce the Board. Joe Yew, Curtis Feeny, Nancy Conner, Bill Wilson, Lydia Beebe and Bob Burke. So they're the Trust people.

Male Voice: And you.

Dave Grubb: And I guess I am. All right. So, let me just reiterate one other thing. Once again, we're going to limit the comments to three minutes each. When one minute is left, there will be signs held up sort of thing. And then 30 seconds, we'll do it again, and then a bell will ring when the time is up. We're just trying to make it good for everybody so we can get through this. All right. And our first comment will come from Supervisor McGoldrick. Yes, please talk into the microphones so everyone can hear.

Supervisor

Jake McGoldrick: Thank you very much, directors. It's very good of you to convene this meeting and as you can see, there are a lot of people very concerned. The Mayor, Gavin Newsom, and Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier and I have drafted a position that we think is important, particularly as regard to process. And you have a letter presumably in your file. Let me just highlight a couple of points from there.

You did, of course, receive on November 12, 2004 a letter in which we provided comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement and that is attached as part of the summary of our concerns here. The issue before you, of course, today, is one that has to do with a decision for

an alternative. But let me just say, on behalf of the Mayor - and there will be somebody speaking on behalf of the Mayor and Supervisor Alioto-Pier and my office - that we earnestly seek to participate in the process and helping to bring together the neighbors. We have, of course, very intimate involvement with the neighbors, with the residents here of San Francisco, and very much share issues that they are concerned about, particularly as concerns the provision of City services and the effects and the impact this would have on City services, particularly as Mr. Middleton has indicated, the effect on traffic mitigation issues; the measurements used and process and methodology used on measurement of those impacts; the issues regarding a continuing dialog with CalTrans, which we believe that we can help participate and [perhaps] be very useful in that; and including the participation, which we have had with Congressman Nancy Pelosi's office as well. And I think that if we could be of use, that would be the best thing that could come out of my presence here tonight on behalf of the other parties who are part of the public family of San Francisco as both the government.

We do recognize, of course, that you have a tough decision. We do support the Presidio Trust's mission to transform the Presidio from a post to park. I noted that the drafter of that park portion, I appreciate the alliterative quality as a former English teacher. So, Presidio from post to park is very important and we do certainly support that. Your mission, of course, is very difficult and you're looking for these creative solutions with the financial self-sufficiency that's hanging over your heads for, gosh, less than a decade to go, now. It's

unbelievable that we're approaching that date so quickly. But your mandate is there.

We know that the infrastructure issue, the preservation of the park issue, and of course the enhancement of the recreational facilities and the cultural and natural resources are all part of the complex, multi-layered juggling of important priorities that you have. Everything that you have to do that has to do with water, wastewater, public transportation, the services involved, the traffic mitigation measures, as I mentioned, the emergency services and so forth, all of those that we can be of some assistance, and perhaps of great assistance we would hope, would be the main issue that I bring to you here tonight on behalf of the City family.

We recognize that record of decision is coming pretty quickly and we do urge you to take into consideration all the comments that we've attached here, which very much reinforce a lot of the issues having to do with those that the neighbors have raised around density and many other issues. [bell rings] Is that the one-minute or two-minute? Is that three minutes? That's fine by me. Verbosity, as you know, is one of the afflictions of public officials. [Laughter] So I am happy that you have allowed us to speak here tonight. Thank you very much.

Dave Grubb: Thank you, Supervisor. [Applause] Kyri McClellan?

Kyri McClellan: Good evening. I'm Kyri McClellan and I'm here on behalf of the Mayor's office, as well as the sort of City family, as Supervisor McGoldrick spoke to. And I just want to say I started my day this

morning down at Lucas Digital Arts and a meeting with executives there talking about bringing the Olympics to San Francisco in 2016. And it is such an asset and I think it speaks to the Presidio's stewardship of your assets and I just want to sort of commend you on that and add that as context. I think the staff and the Board have done tremendous things and we're hopeful that this project could also be in that category one day. So thank you for that.

The Mayor and the Supervisors did send a letter; you have that in front of you. I urge you to take everything in there into consideration. We asked the PUC, we asked the Department of Parking and Traffic and a few others - Planning Department - to look into some of the critical issues and provide supplemental feedback to the comments we provided in November of 2004.

I think the chief concern and one I'm grateful to Craig for speaking to this, and we stand here today to say we want to work with you on the project variance and look and work closely with CalTrans. I think the City, along with the Transportation Authority and some of our other partnerships have a lot of leverage with CalTrans; we're working with them on so many other things that we're happy to sit down and work with you and work with the other interested parties and really to see if that is something that's viable and really explore that fully. So, we'll continue to be a partner in this and please - obviously you will take to heart all the things that you'll see tonight and I have great hope that the project will continue to evolve and ultimately be an asset as so many other things are here. Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you. [Applause] In order to help the time limit, I'm going to ask - I'll read three names. Would you please come up and be ready to speak when the other person is finished? Here's the first three: Winchell T. Hayward, California Heritage Council; Michael Alexander, SPUR; and Jim - I'm sorry, I can't - Marshall, is that it? I'm sorry. Thank you.

Winchell Hayward: I'm a member of the California Heritage Council. My name is Winchell Hayward and I am very much relieved to see that you're going with Alternative 2. That appears to be your preference because you are retaining the wings. There was a partial destruction of the wings planned, which would be very much self-defeating. And to that extent, we, the California Heritage Council, support the Alternative 2 that you're planning to follow. However, we look with some alarm upon the loss of income when you reduce the number of units from 350 to 230.

We might suggest that you consider what is the optimum number of units considering the existing layout and it would be self-defeating, I think, to try to demolish everything [as done] from scratch. It might work out better economically and also from the standpoint of construction time, if the existing arrangement of rooms could be coordinated into let's say an optimum number of units. It may not be feasible, but I hope it's going to be looked into so you can optimize the number of rooms. And also, with the larger rooms, you'd get a higher rent. So, that's my main comment. I'm sorry I haven't had a chance to look at this final EIS; all I have is this little piece of paper that I was handed at the door. But it's very significant, in my opinion, that

you're going to go with the Alternative 2, which will keep the wings. I thought that would be an important thing.

Now, I have copies of my letter here of July 6 and November 12, 2004, and I'd like to ask the Board if they would look at my letters of that time. I'm not sure how far my letters got at that time. But I discuss in my letters some other things, like about the traffic problem and other things related to this project. So without taking anymore time, I'll ask that if this is okay with the Chair, if I leave copies of these letters with your secretary for distribution to the full Board. Thank you very much.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

Michael Alexander: Good evening. My name is Michael Alexander. I'm a member of the Board of San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association. SPUR supported the original Alternative 2, recognizing the importance of housing to both the Presidio and to the City of San Francisco and did not try to make a distinction between the two jurisdictions. But I want to focus on the traffic and transportation issues that have been addressed in the response - the comments.

First of all, we appreciate very much the positive response to our suggestions about traffic demand management. Those really adequately address the comments and suggestions that we made that would help to improve the traffic situation that is of concern to so many people here and which we recognize is a legitimate concern to so many of the residents surrounding the Presidio. But I do want to

comment about the direct Presidio access and the dispiriting response that we heard reported this evening.

SPUR has had long experience in working on the Doyle Drive project over the past 15 years with this kind of response. San Francisco has also had experience with this kind of response and I'll give one example. At the intersection of Folsom and Fremont Streets a freeway off-ramp was constructed, which puts four lanes of traffic directly into what is going to be the new Folsom Boulevard, which is designed to be a pedestrian-friendly area, creates a five-way intersection, which is extraordinarily hazardous, cuts in two an entire block of housing, which is slated to be housing, which will help fund a new Trans-Bay transportation terminal. This came about because when the City thought it had an agreement to do a much less-intrusive, much more benign exit, at the last minute it was told, "Oh, we'll be happy to make that change order, but you have to pay for the change order." And the City said, "Wait a minute, we don't have an identified source of funds for that change order." And the result was that the off-ramp that nobody wanted got built.

This is a pattern and it will require great energy, great attention and great perseverance in order to overcome this. We think that that Park Presidio access needs to be built and that it shouldn't be costing \$10 million and years of studies in order to do what we urge you to persevere with that. Thank you.

Dave Grubb:

Thank you. [Applause]

- Jim Marshall: I do have a problem hearing, so I have to apologize. Chairman of the Board, thank you very much for this time. I did not hear Mr. Middleton, the number of units that they were planning on putting out there, but I say a minimum of 100, that'd be, say 150 automobiles, don't have that much parking space out there, correct? I know the area.
- Dave Grubb: I'm sorry, no, the number of units?
- Craig Middleton: Number of units, 230.
- Jim Marshall: Okay, 230. A car-and-a-half apiece, figure out how many cars they're going to have. Anyhow, this is not the main thing that I wanted to talk about. The main thing I have to say is the history of the 1800 area. I have quite a background out there. One of the things that I'm very concerned about, and I almost had tears - I haven't been out here for about eight years now - is the desecration that this Board has allowed at the U.S. Navy Maritime Cemetery out behind 1802. There are over 200 and some odd Navy veterans buried out there. Right now it's used as a dump. Think about it. I don't know how many people even know about it. I think that this Board should take some definite action on that particular thing. Also note, on your 1800 area, I notice that 1802 is left out of the loop, which is the old boiler room that has all of the main maintenance and service [tool]. The whole 1800 area you're not going to use those boilers?
- Dave Grubb: I don't know.

Craig Middleton: We'll look at that.

Dave Grubb: We'll look at it. I don't know what else to say.

Jim Marshall: The reason this is dear to my heart, I ran that operation out there for over 15 years. I ran the boiler room for ten. That's why I have a hearing aid. Gentlemen, I hope sometime you'll contact me if you want information on the 1800 buildings. Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you. There's a lot of similarities there. I listen to a lot of jackhammers. Ron Miguel of PAR, Matthew Zlatunich - I'm sorry if I'm not saying these right. I have to tell you I'm not good at this pronunciation. He's with the Golden Gate Audubon. And then Judith Hulka. Those are the next three.

Ron Miguel: Board members, thank you for having us here this evening. As you see, we're very pleased to see a full Board and personally I'm very pleased to see this large a representation so that you know how many people are interested. You have PAR's letter, you have PAR's previous letter on the subject. We have met with your staff many times and even with some of your Board members. I appreciated the remarks of Kyri McClellan and Supervisor McGoldrick, who we've also met with on this subject.

PAR, for those of you who are new on the Board and do not know us, is the largest neighborhood association in San Francisco, some 1,500 dues-paying households in the Richmond District, which forms the

border of the Presidio in that area and obviously is directly adjacent to this project.

We did not go into the environmental and very little into the financial aspects of this because there are others in this room and who have contacted you before who will deal with those subjects. Basically, we do not believe that the parking and traffic issues have been adequately resolved. We believe that the assumptions in the SEIS are based on incorrect figures and we give the reasons for that in our letter; I will not go into them in detail here. The traffic impacts will be felt not on the Presidio. You've already started to block the cut-through traffic going up through Battery Caulfield row. In order to stop that everyone's going to come out south into the Richmond District. They're not going to go up that road. We question how many of those high-end units are going to be used by employees of Presidio enterprises, which by the way was what your housing was supposed to handle to the greatest extent possible.

As far as the situation on the Highway 1 access, CalTrans sticks by their guns and then changes them, and San Francisco has been able to change them. We changed them where the 280 interface comes in before the ballpark. I served 14 years on the Central Freeway Task Force and we changed them drastically there. They can be modified. CalTrans basically handles freeways; they have a very bad time handling interchange with urban areas. That is absolutely essential to this. And by the way, you did not downgrade the size of the project; it's still 400,000 square feet no matter how you look at it. Thank you.

[Applause]

Matthew Zlatunich: Good evening. My name is Matthew Zlatunich and I'm here tonight as a representative of the Golden Gate Audubon Society. In response to the issuance of the final SEIS for the redevelopment of the Public Health Service Hospital, Golden Gate Audubon has the following comments to make.

Golden Gate Audubon does not support the Trust's Preferred Alternative. We believe that the revised Alternative 2 is not the best choice for wildlife within and in PHSH District. We also disagree with the Trust's assertion that the revised Alternative 2 is identical to Alternative 3. In comparison to Alternative 3, Alternative 2 has 29 percent greater residential population and a 47 percent greater daytime population. This represents a substantially greater degree of pressure placed upon the wildlife as a result of human presence, a presence that will no doubt have a greater negative impact on the surrounding wildlife. Additionally, Alternative 2 places 13 residences directly adjacent to the most sensitive wildlife habitat within the district.

Yet, from a financial standpoint, the choice of Alternative 2 over Alternative 3 will only produce about one-half of one percent more income for the Trust. We do not believe that one-half of one percent of additional income is worth risking the welfare of the wildlife that the Trust has been charged with protecting and preserving.

In addition to our objections to Alternative 2 and in reaction to changes made to mitigation measures, Golden Gate Audubon is now

compelled to withdraw our support for Alternative 3. Under the draft SEIS, mitigation NR-9 called for a permanent prohibition of possession or maintenance of pets. Under the final SEIS, for reasons unexplained, this mitigation measure has been disregarded. In light of the many problems and challenges of keeping park visitors and wildlife safe from the negative impact of domestic and feral pets, the renegeing of this key mitigation measure is illogical and, moreover, it is a giant step in the wrong direction.

To follow through with selection of the current Preferred Alternative would be a losing proposition for wildlife, a losing proposition for park visitors, and a losing proposition for the future excellence of the Presidio as a national park.

And so, members of the Trust, we urge you to reconsider the consequences of your decision. We challenge you to do what is right for our wildlife. Don't sacrifice our natural resources for a few dollars more and don't let our national park go to the dogs.

[Applause]

Judith Hulka: I'd also like to say I'm delighted that the full Board is here tonight. Thank you. My name is Judith Hulka and I'm president of NAPP, the Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning. We're a coalition of 11 neighborhood groups adjacent to the Presidio that was founded in 1989. We meet monthly and we've been working on this project certainly as long as the Trust has been. And we've also submitted public comment letters at every stage of the NEPA process.

It's very frustrating to us that, three years later, the Trust and the neighbors are still at the opposite ends of the pole. We really want to see this area developed; we love the park. We'd hoped to meet somewhere in the middle by now. It's frustrating that the Trust plans to develop the maximum allowable 400,000 square feet when NAPP has always preferred Alternative 3, the smaller project at 275,000 square feet. We would hope we would meet somewhere in the middle by now.

Yesterday, NAPP delivered a detailed public comment letter on the final SEIS to all trustees and Trust staff. It states that we think the Trust Preferred Alternative fails to meet the original stated project objectives, as referenced on page 15 of the Environmental Assessment. In general terms, our conclusions are that the project is still too big and, as a result, there will still be significant environmental and human impacts for which there are currently no mitigation plans. Traffic mitigation discussions, for example, have gone into limbo, as you heard tonight. We think historic preservation priorities are too low. NAPP believes that retaining the entirety of the non-historic wings is a questionable decision, at best. And perhaps most disturbing is our fear that the developer's economic gain seems to be driving the project at the expense of the neighborhoods in the City.

[Applause]

We urge each trustee to read our letter to understand our reasoning. Even to re-read our handful of past letters on the project that brought

us to these conclusions. Since the letters span three years, I'd be happy to supply an aggregate set if that would be helpful. We think that the Trust current plan is the wrong decision for the Presidio National Park. As our letter concludes, NAPP urges the Presidio Trust to reconsider this project in light of the overwhelming, consistent and broad-based criticism of the proposed over-development of the site. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: The next three names are Cat Allman, Daniel Stone, and Claudia Lewis.

Cat Allman: Actually, I think there are people here who are far more eloquent than I would be, so I'm going to cede my time. Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you. Daniel Stone?

Daniel Stone: As you've heard, my name is Dan Stone. I live on the northwest corner of 14th Avenue and Lake Street and I am concerned with the safety factor. Just to let you know, I went to Sutro School probably before most of you were born, when the block on which I live was an orphanage. A little bit of history for you.

This may also be more of a City problem than the Trust's problem, but the traffic at 14th Avenue and Lake Street in the early mornings sometimes requires two or three changes of the light at Lake and Park Presidio before we can get out of 14th Avenue where my garages are,

onto Lake Street. And I think that the Trust should consider the safety factor, particularly if there are going to be a lot of children living in the development and maybe going to Sutro School about getting them down 14th or 15th Avenue and across Lake Street if they're going to go to Sutro, which is the neighborhood school.

The traffic in the mornings - and as a matter of fact, it took two changes of the light on Park Presidio this afternoon around 5:30, 5:45 before I could get out of my garage onto Lake Street to come here. And the safety factor, as I say, for people who run - and as you may know, the runners don't pay much attention to stop signs - the people coming off Park Presidio who make U-turns at 14th Avenue and so forth. It is a dangerous situation at present and I think the Trust, in doing proper planning for the increased residences in the Presidio itself, should work even harder with the City to hopefully alleviate safety problems. Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

Claudia Lewis: My name is Claudia Lewis and I'm president of Richmond Presidio Neighbors. Eighteen months have passed since the last hearing. During this interim, despite pleas from the neighborhood groups and the City, the Trust did not engage in any dialog to come up with a solution that best protects the park's significant natural resources and preserves the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Time is running out for a cooperative resolution and opposition from many

diverse stakeholders is growing. Why? Because the Trust's new Preferred Alternative is no better than the last and the final EIS suggests you have broken your promise to aggressively pursue the creation of a Park Presidio Boulevard access with CalTrans, despite Mr. Middleton's comments tonight.

While you claim that the new 230-unit Alternative 2 will have less environmental impact, this is not the case. The total square footage will remain the same, 400,000 square feet. The amount of office space has increased. Your population projections reveal that the number of daily users - residents, employees and students - is reduced by only eight people; from 724 to 716. The young professionals and empty-nesters who can afford the new luxury apartments will all have cars. It is hard to fathom how the environmental and neighborhood impacts will be lessened as you claim when over 700 people with their pets will be actively using the site on a daily basis. While the technical traffic analysis suggests there will be a slight reduction in traffic from the old alternative, RPN continues to maintain that these studies are flawed and that the data is manipulated to mask project impacts.

Alternative 3, by contrast, would reduce the project's population by 33 percent. Why does the Trust continue to prefer the maximum hospital build-out? Because rehabilitating the hospital without the wings won't pencil out for Forest City. The lucrative rents are in the wings. Forest City's return on investment will be substantially more robust by keeping this architectural blunder intact. To permit the financial needs of the private developer to trump all other project objectives is a betrayal of the public trust.

Why is our opposition so passionate? Because this is the wrong decision for the park. When the Bayshore Beach housing comes down, the Public Health Service Hospital site will be the City's gateway to a spectacular natural habitat. To erect the City's largest residential apartment complex on the north side of the City, immediately adjacent to the Presidio's wildlife corridor and sensitive natural habitat makes no sense. It will permanently mar the one corner of the Presidio where preservation of natural resources could and should be paramount. Members of the Trust, please re-think your position and invite us to the table to reach an amicable solution before it's too late.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Okay, the next three speakers: Amy Meyer, Woody Scal and Andrea Lewin.

Amy Meyer: I'm Amy Meyer, a former Board member and representing People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I think the thing that hurts the most tonight is to hear the amount of acrimony that still remains. We have had some good collaborative work done on the Presidio at other times. A long time ago, when the Commissary Building was built, the City got together and actually helped reach a decision about that building that was a lot better than the original one. We also have been seeing that Doyle Drive has been improved as the result of a process that has been citizen-driven to help stand up against just a pure freeway solution for Doyle Drive.

What I'm sorry to hear is after looking at, well gee, they reduced the number of units and they're trying to do something about the traffic, that actually, unfortunately, there's something still so bothersome about the size of this project. And it's because we have a very changed situation from the time when that hospital was built; it's a hugely different world next to the City coming up against this institution. And I think a more collaborative process is needed. And I think, obviously, every effort has to be made to try to get some mitigation of the traffic impacts.

But I also - there's been considerable talk about the wings and, from an aesthetic point of view and what that building really stands for and looks like, it's not a wonderful solution. But there's something wrong. This is a national park. We fought hard for this piece of land. It was not in the park originally. It had been taken out, belonged to the Public Health Service and so when the legislation was passed it was not in the park. Later on, it rejoined the Presidio and the Army's idea was to sell it off. If it had been sold off, you would then have an intra-City battle going on here. But there's got to be a better way of getting - I mean, what we did is we were able to work with legislation and law to get this piece attached to the park. And I think there's got to be a better way to get the City residents and City standards working better with the standards that should apply to a national park. Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

Woody Scal: My name is Woody Scal and I also strongly oppose Alternative 2. Members of the Trust, I'd like to challenge your rationale for this project, its supposed financial return and its historic preservation mandate.

First, the lion's share of the financial benefit to you clearly comes from your development of the outbuildings; \$1.9 million per year with little traffic or environmental impact. We applaud this part of the development. Much less of your return, however, comes from the hospital itself; only \$680,000 - \$680,000 in ground rent and perhaps \$800,000 in this SDC revenue, which is not all profit. So you will net less than \$1.5 million from the hospital under Alternative 2. That's only two percent of the Presidio Trust's 2010 budget. In short, the development of the hospital building creates the vast amount of the impact and delivers relatively little financial benefit. Under Alternative 3, you'd get only \$80,000 less rent and perhaps \$500,000 less per year in total. And that difference is only one percent of the Presidio Trust's budget. I can see why Forest City wants Alternative 2. They make \$6.5 million in NOI versus \$2.8 million in Alternative 3. I cannot see why you favor it.

Regarding historic preservation, you say that you're required to redevelop the hospital. But frankly, Alternative 2 makes a mockery of historic preservation. It hides the original façade behind atrocious wings. Frankly, if you wanted to tear down this building, you could find a way to do it and private philanthropy would fund it.

So what should you do? First, find a way to make Alternative 3 work. You can do it, including Park Presidio access - you can make that happen. But lacking that, you'll be faced with a choice. Either agree to Alternative 2 with low returns and massive impact, or question the very validity of developing the hospital portion of the project.

Members of the Trust, is it too late to question the project? No! This project will last for a century. You finally have the facts and now it's time for each of you - not just a subcommittee, each of you - to dig into the numbers and exercise your judgment. A hundred years ago, John Muir fought to preserve Yosemite Valley and wise decision makers listened. In the '70s, people fought to protect the marine headlands and we are all the beneficiaries. Now it's your turn and this will be your legacy. Do you want to be known as the people who green-lighted this project that will be cursed by San Franciscans for generations to come? Or, do you want the recognition that will come with preserving this important corner of the park for posterity? Thank you.

[Applause]

Andrea Lewin: My name is Andrea Lewin and I'm a neighbor of the Public Health Service Hospital site. And I'm here to talk about the density figures that appear in the environmental filings that the Presidio Trust has made and I think that they are totally insufficient. I would draw your attention to the figures that say, in the environmental filings, that [posit] that the density of the project as you projected is 13 units per acre. That takes a lot of statistical maneuvering to come up with. That

makes 230 units - or the current number divided by 18 acres - for the City, that is. And unfortunately, that takes into account, Lobos Creek, the Presidio Greenlands, etcetera. When you made the comparison to the neighborhood adjacent to the Presidio site, you took a north/south grid and you left out of that Lobos Creek, Mountain Lake Park and the Presidio. So the comparison is totally imbalanced. This unit is much denser than anything that exists in the neighborhood, in the Richmond District itself.

I have a board here that shows that there are five developments in the Richmond District with more than 50 units. The largest one has 85 units. This is the entire Richmond District. You are minimally four times larger in one building than the largest building in the Richmond District. This is completely out of character with our neighborhood. It is going to create a lot of detrimental impacts for us. I personally will feel them, but I am not the only one. I work at home; I don't have to get to an office. I think you need to reconsider this. I think you need to reconsider a project this dense. I think you need to fact up to the fact you're talking about bringing in many day uses that add to the density of the project. And I think that it would be a good idea to consider downsizing it in the manner suggested by the other speakers. I'm happy to make this available to you if you're interested, but that's what I have to say about it.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Next three. Mark Weinstock, Jeff Judd and Jan Blum.

Mark Weinstock: From what I can tell, about 99.9 percent of the comments are against the Preferred Alternative 2 that seems to have been chosen. The comments are, too dense, there's no decent way in, there's no reasonable way out of the project, it's too unsightly with the non-historic wings, but yet we still have the same project after three years of making all these comments.

But now, sort of in sympathy with some of these other comments, after reading the final EIS, we know why you, the Trust, had to select the biggest possible development. We now know that the Trust will receive \$79,000 more per year in ground rent under the Preferred Alternative 2 than under another alternative - the one that the public, the National Park Service, the Sierra Club, the Golden Gate Audubon Society, the City of San Francisco, and pretty much everybody here supports - Alternative 3. Oh wait, I forgot one thing: The selected developer does not support Alternative 3.

Forest City does have \$7.4 billion of real estate assets. So why do they want to build Alternative 2 in a national park? Is it to preserve and enhance the cultural, natural, scenic and recreational resources of the Presidio for public use in perpetuity? I don't think so. That's actually - when I read it - that's the Presidio Trust's mission statement.

Forest City is a New York Stock Exchange-traded public company with demanding stockholders. So I understand. They need to make money; that makes sense to me. But this is not a win-win situation;

this is a win-lose situation. Forest City wins. They make a lot of money. The lovers of the park, the neighbors, lose. A huge development that cannot be undone for probably 100 years is built in a national park with the adjacent neighborhoods serving as Forest City's driveway.

I have one other thought that came to me after my interesting reading of the EIS. It reminds me of a situation that happened over at Fort Baker in Sausalito. And I don't know if the Board is familiar with that. But my understanding is that over at Fort Baker, the original plan was for a 500-unit Marriott Hotel. The City of Sausalito ended up filing a lawsuit. It was in the court system for three or four years. It's finally been settled after three or four years of trials and tribulations. They've now settled on a 144-unit development by the folks that built the Post Ranch Inn. It seems a little bit more reasonable, a little nicer than a 500-unit Marriott. I think we can equate that to what maybe we can do here. I hope we don't have to waste everyone's time and money for that long to come up with a reasonable solution. Hopefully we can do it a little bit faster here.

Even considering how difficult a site this is, I really do believe there is a reasonable solution out there. I believe there are some people in this room that have some reasonable ideas for a reasonable solution. I just don't think Alternative 2 is even close to being that reasonable solution. Thank you.

[Applause]

Jeff Judd: Good evening. My name is Jeffrey Judd and I live north of Lake, on 15th Avenue - literally ground zero for this project. I wanted to address the traffic discussion in the final Environmental Impact Statement. You have to do an environmental impact statement to take a hard look at the impacts that you expect might occur as a result of a project of this sort. If you read the Environmental Impact Statement closely, it seems like you've hardly taken a look. The reason I say that is because a hard look would be internally consistent, logical and based on facts that have some relevance to reality. And many aspects of your traffic analysis miss these features entirely. For instance, the no-action alternative is based on the usage that occurred during the Jewish Community Center when that was being used as a daycare center, which involves an intensive use of traffic; twice a day, people make a trip in and out as they drop off and pick up their children. Those counts were taken in 2001. When you compare the no-action alternative with the Alternative 2 that you've selected, the Environmental Impact Statement suggests that there would be greater traffic impact from no action in spite -

[Break in audio]

Jeff Judd: The traffic analysis ignores City guidelines. City guidelines require transportation impact analysis guidelines, which are based on studies of traffic patterns actually in the City. As Richmond/Presidio Neighbors' traffic consultant demonstrated, if you apply the City guidelines, the traffic is under-stated in your Environmental Impact Report by some 26 percent. That's because the guidelines your traffic consultant has used do not relate to the actual facts out in the real

world. You assume, in your traffic analysis, that 65 percent of the residents will use autos and 18 percent will use transit. Actual studies of traffic patterns in the neighborhood show that 78 percent use autos and ten percent use transit. When you factor that in, your traffic impact is under-stated by over 50 percent.

You assume that 25 percent of the project residents are going to leave through Battery Caulfield. And yet your own project says you're going to reduce the usage of Battery Caulfield. That's internally inconsistent.

Finally, the historical traffic volumes are based on nothing more than speculation as the Environmental Impact Statement concedes there are no reliable bases for historical traffic patterns when the site was used as a hospital. So that's based on whole cloth. The point is, the Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate and if you approve it and approve a project based on it, you will not have undertaken your responsibility as NEPA requires and the project, as everyone here acknowledges, is completely out of proportion to the neighborhood. Thank you.

[Applause]

Jan Blum: My name is Jan Blum and I am a part of a community of restoration volunteers in the Presidio and we call ourselves DIRT. I'm here partially to speak for what makes our park so special, which is the birds, the grass, the plants, the special species, the endangered plants that we have here - all of the things that never have a voice in these

public meetings. That was one of the reasons that DIRT got started, as we felt the natural resources needed a stronger voice from really inside, as a partner to the park.

Volunteers are critical to the Presidio National Park in meeting its obligation to the Organic Act of 1916, to conserve the scenery and the natural objects and the wildlife, and to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. This map that I have is an old map from 2001 when we were working on the Vegetation Management Plan. This is a Park Service map. It provides perspective on how critical the Public Health Service Hospital is in the entire Presidio for habitat and especially for the wildlife. The yellow is the current and potential natural habitat. And here's the Public Health Service Hospital, right here in the middle of all of this. The green is historic forest, which the critters use for habitat, for hiding, for feeding, for transportation. And the pink arrows display both the current and the potential wildlife corridors. The hospital sits right in front of some of the most endangered and special species on the Presidio, which in turn, supports a biologically rich array of wildlife.

The volunteers support encouraging the native quail that live off Battery Caulfield Road. Therefore, we support a residence-free Battery Caulfield Road in perpetuity. We support a traffic and parking lot free Battery Caulfield Road to ensure a safe and continuous wildlife corridor for all time, as promised in PTMP. We support protecting the native wildlife in this area; we want it to remain unimpaired for future generations. And therefore, we support a pet / off-leash-dog free district. [Applause] We support a smaller

residential footprint at 1801 where tenant stewardship and park sustainability are promoted to help protect the Presidio and its assets and not degrade them.

Should the Trust continue with its current plan to develop the District, volunteers will be rethinking their commitment to work on the Presidio. For if the Trust doesn't respect the integrity of its unique natural resources and derogates the imperative of the Organic Act, it may be that our thousands of volunteer hours could be better spent elsewhere. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: The next three are Ann Weinstock, Lindsey Van Meter and Mark Higbie.

Ann Weinstock: My name is Ann Weinstock. I'm a very ground-zero neighbor, but in addition to that I've gotten to know this project over the years with my involvement with NAPP - I'm the vice president of NAPP. I'm very active with the Richmond/Presidio neighbors, but my comment tonight is about my involvement with the Parks Conservancy. I am helping them with their fundraising on a very low level, but I'm a volunteer; I bring in the young families for them. And I'm very concerned that all of this negative feeling about this project and other decisions made are going to affect the long-term philanthropy for the Presidio. And that is my one point I really want to hit home tonight with. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Lindsey -

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Dave Grubb: I'm sorry?

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Dave Grubb: Oh, you want a mailing list?

Female Voice: [unintelligible]

Dave Grubb: Well, you got an official number. [Laughter] All right, Mark Higbie?

Mark Higbie: Ladies and gentlemen of the Trust, I'm also one more member of the hundreds and hundreds of Richmond/Presidio neighbors who oppose this project. We've been attempting to have a responsible conversation with you for almost three years. And although you pretended to listen, we know now you haven't. Because I feel now we are living a scene from Virgil's Aeneid. That, of course, would be the myth of the Trojan horse. But sadly, this project is no myth and we know what's in your horse.

Why do I say this? Because the difference between 716 people in your current Alternative and 724 in your former version is just eight people. And the difference of those eight people, the same 400,000 square feet, almost the same number of new car trips per day is, I'm sorry to say, a

Trojan horse. But let me tell you, the members of the Trust, that we, the neighbors of the Richmond District, are not the people of Troy. To call this a compromise treats every one of us here tonight with the same disdain as we were treated when the Trust called our concerns of our “small neighborhood group” parochial. Because what you want to build is incompatible with our neighborhood, it’s incompatible with our children, and it’s incompatible with our community’s values. And it is the values of our community - ones of trust, fellowship and working together - that have brought every single person who supports our cause here tonight.

So it makes me very sad to think that from where we started this conversation in 2003 to where we are today, how little you have listened, how little you have cared, makes the idea of Presidio Trust come to feel much less like a moniker and much more like an oxymoron. So please listen carefully, even after all this time, that this community is deeply organized, fiercely focused, and we’re ready for a fight.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: I’m sorry, I’m having a little trouble reading this writing here. Bob Stazel, is that what it is? And Mary Beth Stazel? Am I close to this at all? I apologize, I’m sorry.

Bob Stazel: My name is Bob Stazel. I came to San Francisco to be vice chairman of the Southern Pacific. And I only tell you that because I worked a lot with CalTrans. I have to tell you that I think all those of you who

are giving your time for this Trust, sitting on the Board, and are trying to figure out how to do the right thing are to be commended. But you've been dealt a lousy hand. Obviously, if you could start from scratch, as any businessperson would like to be able to do, you wouldn't have two gloomy, ugly wings on a building. You wouldn't have to have any urgency to making the money by a certain time that you now have to make. Unfortunately, however, it is your responsibility to end up with something that works. And while this community has many ideas about what might, it's ultimately your responsibility.

I don't believe you'll be able to work with CalTrans to get access. I've heard people here make the assumption that you can do that and you can do that for a reasonable price. I've dealt with a lot of flyovers with CalTrans. I'd be very surprised if this isn't [scored] a million dollars to do it; \$10 million might be someone's first guess, but that's a very expensive thing to do. I think that the traffic engineering studies, you've heard questioned.

You have heard from my neighbors who, I can tell you, represent an enormous richness of the fabric of this City; people who are very bright, very competent, very capable, and want the best for this City. You have a social contract that you need to make sure that you maintain. And the social contract requires being a good neighbor. In that regard, you need to think about the people who are going to live in this development. You want them to be part of this community. You want them to be able to experience the richness of this neighborhood, the qualities that are here. They won't do that if you build it as you are

now setting out to build it, because this neighborhood is not going to be a welcoming neighborhood. There is going to be a line.

And I guess you'll have to ask yourselves, and maybe you already have, maybe ask your lawyers the question, what can the City do to get in the way of this? There was a time when 15th Avenue ended in a circle and had a fountain in it; it didn't go in to the Presidio. Can the City cause that to happen again? Can you actually have a development if the City takes a position contrary to the assumptions of this development? I think not. Every businessman knows that at some time when you've got an idea that doesn't work and the costs to make it work are too great, you stop and you wait and you hope you'll find a better idea. I hope you can in this case. Thank you.

[Applause]

Mary Beth Stazel: Good evening. My name is Mary Beth Stazel. My husband and I live at Lake and 22nd Avenue. I, too, want to talk about the social contract. Because we, as Americans, share among us a social contract to be good neighbors. In San Francisco, neighbors' voices are heard and heeded in planning matters. You, on the other hand, as a Board, have autonomy and the authority to do what you please with this land. Good neighborliness lasts a long time. So I'm very afraid of neighbors' enmity.

First of all, the traffic impact. I just would say, "please." Is there anyone here who honestly believes the latest traffic study? It's so disingenuous on its face. You must do better than that; you just must.

Secondly, you tore down one hospital. That was a great idea. This one would be another really good candidate. And come up -

[Applause]

Start with something new. Something that really would work on the site, that was meant for the present day, that doesn't retain this strange building and this unworkable theme. Think about doing something new. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: I'm really going to do badly on this one. Chiuchiarelli? Is that close?
[Laughs] Okay, I'll leave it there, then. Josiah Clark and Kelly Neil, I guess, is the last one.

Nicky Chiuchiarelli: I'm Nicky Chiuchiarelli, one of your neighbors on 15th Avenue. And I've submitted a letter to Mr. Pelka, but I did want to raise two issues, particularly since the whole concept of traffic concerns seems to be major in this whole decision. In the final - and also the draft - there was indication that there was no actual or no historical data relative to the traffic activity with the hospital. And while there may be nothing truly documented, there are a lot of longtime neighbors in the area that know the numbers that were extrapolated using the ITE - and I'm not sure even which edition of the ITE was used - for the hospital trip generation, whatever that's called. In any event, none of that seems to be reflected in the final environmental impact study. And effectively,

what I would like to see is some indication, acknowledgement that there was a great deal of activity. I've lived on 15th Avenue since I was three. That's well over 45 years. And I have seen that hospital go through a variety of incarnations and I can tell you, in that time, there is no way that the maximum trip generations that were quoted in the analysis are possible.

Secondly, in looking at the revision - or the traffic study that was done in October of 2005, I question the validity or the - maybe not the accuracy - but whether or not it is a true representation of what would be considered normal traffic flow. In September and October, 14th and 15th Avenue between Lake and California Streets were having the PG&E gas pipe replacement being done. And that is a four- to six-week project. I checked with PG&E. On 15th Avenue, the project terminated on October 25th. So the bulk of the month, you had traffic that was obstructed. I know getting in and out of my driveway was a problem and I know traffic did not flow through. And I would imagine, given that period of time, people even coming through the gates were not, basically - might have actually altered their route, knowing that there was this project going on. Thank you.

[Applause]

Josiah Clark: Hi, my name is Josiah Clark. I grew up here in San Francisco and I'm a professional wildlife ecologist and have worked in the Presidio in a number of positions. Excuse me if this is a little bit broken up; I'm just kind of putting it together here.

The Presidio is a unique place. It's a natural resource, it's an outdoor classroom, and it has the potential to affect thousands of students, young people, each year. As was mentioned by a representative from the Golden Gate Audubon Society, Matt Zlatunich, many of the reasons for the opposition to the project were discussed. And I wanted to address what, specifically, this one-half of one percent, what this revenue would be affecting.

The National Park Service and the Presidio Trust calls on stewards and volunteers to support efforts in the national park to create habitats and make this a better place. However, what's going to happen will surely degrade the work that tens of thousands of volunteers donated their time to create. As an environmental consultant and lifelong resident, I can tell you that the impacts were not adequately addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement or in the Environmental Assessment and considering that this is a national park that mandates the protection of these natural resources, that's really not acceptable. Habitat created by stewards for their children to enjoy will be degraded. Habitat degradation, habitat fragmentation, increased traffic, habitat intrusion and traffic will lead to decreased biodiversity and for many urbanites, the Presidio is the most natural place that they have to experience nature.

We've all heard of the example of a canary in a coalmine. This is kind of a textbook example of an environmental indicator. And the Presidio still retains functional natural systems, natural processes, dozens of species of wildlife that have disappeared elsewhere in the City. Everyone can feel there is something special that still exists here in the

Presidio and everyone on the Board as well as people in this room need to realize that the quail, the garter snakes, the native habitats - these are our environmental indicators to a quality of life and a quality of visitor experience and sustainability itself.

So in summary, I would just ask you to go to some of these places - to Presidio Hills, to Quail Commons, to Lobos Creek - to really look. Go by yourself and listen to the noises there, the sounds. And just try to appreciate this remarkable natural resource that we have, to protect it for generations to come. Thank you.

[Applause]

Kelly Neil: Hi, my name is Kelly Neil and thank the Board for being here tonight and the Mayor's office as well, because what I have to say, he can probably help effect. I'm kind of one of the new kids on the block; I have been on Lake Street now - own a home there - since 2002. And basically, I have no studies, projections, stats, analyses or any models. What I'm talking about is real-world environment that's going on there parking-wise right now. We can't find parking today in front of our house. And four years ago, when I first got here, every day it was easy to find parking in front of my house all day long and now we can't find it at all there. People are parking in their driveways, on the sidewalks, now, and it's a mess. And what's happening is all these people are coming in to work in the City, they can't afford the \$50 downtown to park all day, are now bringing their cars and leaving them in front of our house all day long - and actually, all week long. And because we have no permit parking on our side of the block - the

west side of 19th or for the Presidio, and on the east side they do have permit parking there - everybody's parking over on our side of the street. So, you know, we have families and kids and we're walking the dogs and we can't find parking in front of our own houses now. And basically, it comes down to, and the consensus is on our whole block that we don't want this whole hospital built out at all. We want Alternative 4, you know, gone. So that's all I have to say.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Evan Hutton, John Guerrero, and Margot Parke, I think it is. Is there an Evan Hutton? I'm sorry?

Margot Parke: My name's Margot Parke and I don't see any of the two in front of me.

Dave Grubb: I don't see the other - go right ahead. Mr. Guerrero? Are you here? Please go right ahead - do you mind if he goes first?

Margot Parke: Okay, I don't live anywhere near the Public Health Service Hospital. And I'm here because I hear the passion and it was a whole different Board at the time that Letterman Digital Arts was going in. And the same passion was heard and nobody listened. So I really hope you'll listen to these wonderful people, who couldn't be clearer. We begged them not to build out 900,000 square feet at Lucas. They did and there's a building that's still empty. I think the number of cars on the street at the east end of the park, where I live, has grown enormously. And I was told that people aren't parking in the wonderful parking lots that George Lucas provided because he's charging his employees. So

they're parking all over the place. So please, please make this work. Let's not make two huge mistakes. Thank you.

[Applause]

John Guerrero: Hi, I'm John Leon Guerrero. I live at 3 14th Avenue, so I'm directly your neighbor. If something falls out my window, it's on your property. I can tell you about what it's like on my street. I don't think anybody on my street wants to see it turned into a one-way access point into 452 parking spots. Right now, you have to drive slow. There are cars parked on both sides. It's hard to turn around. It's fine, people know each other there, so we're courteous. Kids play; they draw on the sidewalks with chalk. My neighbors are confined to wheelchairs. Every once in a while, they'll take their wheelchairs out and relax in front of their house in the sun. We have joggers in front of my house all the time; people pushing baby strollers.

That's what it's like today. You turn this into a one-way access, I don't see how any of you could think that it's anything other than turning it into a little freeway between this new, whatever size project, and all the shopping on Clement and Geary. They're not going to be stopping off at our house to say hi; they're just going to be going right by to wherever they're trying to go. Most of the jobs around here are down in the Silicon Valley, so they're going to be rushing off to work.

And if you look at the placement of where the new project is and Highway 1, if money was not a concern, if permits or whatever were not a concern, it's a natural place for an intersection. There's no

reason not to do it there. The only thing I can think of is money and inconvenience. If this is all about doing the right thing, then I don't know why anything else is on the board. Your new residents will be able to get to faster traffic easier; they won't have to drive slow by my house and by the people on 15th. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: The next three are Ed Cooper, Jeff Judd again - we've already done that - Donald Green, and Steven Krefting, I guess it is.

Ed Cooper: Good evening. My name is Ed Cooper. I am a neighbor of yours on 15th Avenue between California and Lake. My wife and I have two small children and there are many other similar families on our block, so we've got lots of small children on the block. And as you might expect, my primary concerns relate to the added traffic and to the implications for the safety of the children on the block and also for the character of the block and the neighborhood.

To me, having reviewed the supplementary Environmental Impact Statement, the issues are actually pretty simple, despite the fact that it's 300 pages with a 500-page appendix. The Supplementary Impact Statement says that "Alternative 3 (sic) has been identified as the Trust's Preferred Alternative because it would meet the Trust's objectives without resulting in significant adverse effects." Meet the Trust's objectives without significant adverse effects. So I'm going to focus my comments on Alternative 2 versus Alternative 3.

First, there is really substantial evidence of adverse effects from Alternative 2 versus Alternative 3. The incremental traffic, I think, for most people is an obvious result, despite the analysis in the Impact Statement. The Department of the Interior and the EPA have both stated a clear preference for Alternative 3 versus Alternative 2. In addition, Alternative 2 would place some additional demands on City resources and across the board, there's an unclear commitment to funding those resources in all of these proposals.

What's less clear to me is the benefit to the Trust of Alternative 2 versus Alternative 3. According to your own financial analysis, buried in the appendix of the SEIS, there's only a four percent reduction in the financing costs, so not much up-front savings; a seven percent reduction in real annual revenue, or, as somebody said earlier, about a half of one percent additional income for the Trust. What is clear - what's very clear and is actually quite extraordinary - is the incremental benefit to your private developer party. For them, they save \$40 million in financing that's required; that's about a 40 percent savings. And they get \$4 million a year in additional annual revenue, an increase of 2.3 times, which is, again, extraordinary.

So I'll say it again. There are big negative impacts, there are truly marginal financial benefits to the Trust, and the potential risks to the other elements of your mission seem to me to be substantial as well. And there's a \$40 million savings with twice the revenue on an annual basis for a private developer from Cleveland, of all places.

I urge you to reconsider and adopt Alternative 3, which is still - let's not forget - a very large project. So we're still talking about 230 units, a project which would represent a building three times the size of the largest building in the Richmond as it is. And also, to continue to pursue vigorously access from Park Presidio. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Next person is Donald Green.

Donald Green: Thank you very much. I'm Donald Green, representing the Sierra Club. We've been working on the Trust issue since 1997 with the former Board, this Board, and with the staff. Our position on the Public Health Service hasn't changed. We believe that the smaller building, which will double the number of studio and one-bedroom apartments compared to the larger project, is what the Presidio Trust should vote for, because the purpose of housing in the park is not to provide housing for people outside the park, but to provide housing for people in the park. And as you know, there's a dearth of studios and one-bedrooms, and this would be provided under Alternative 3 in twice the capacity.

The other benefit that I'm a little surprised at, the EIS summary, most of the detail says that the historical value of the larger building is essentially equal to the historical value of the smaller building. That's palpably incorrect. If you ask any of the historic preservationists, they're going to tell you that the anchor-shaped building that was built in 1937 to represent the Marine's Hospital, is a much more historical

value than the building with the wing. So clearly, you're losing something by leaving the wings up. Secondly, the visual impact, for some strange reason in your summary, you say that it's identical whether you have the wings or you don't. If you look at your own two artist's sketches with or without the wings, I can't believe that anybody up there really believes that there's not a positive visual benefit by taking down the wings.

Now the main thrust of my remarks, assuming that there is a benefit to the smaller building, the issue is has the Trust considered, and is it willing to consider, putting additional funds into the project in order to get the smaller project and to allow the developer to have a slightly higher return? Instead of 6.5 percent, which he says is not enough on the small project where it is, where he's putting up \$15 million and getting a large tax credit, he wants ten percent, which he's getting from the larger project.

My suggestion, as a former member of the Office of Management and Budget in Yosemite Restoration Trust, is the Trust should consider increasing its investment from \$20 million of equity to \$25 million. That extra \$5 million would probably result in the developer being willing to finance the smaller project. You have the money. You're going to have \$80 to \$100 million in the next three to five years, from your own knowledge. You've just tonight shifted \$3 million into next year. You certainly can find \$5 million out of \$80 million in the next three to five years to fund the smaller project and allow a developer - this or some other - to go ahead and give the benefits that you ought to

be looking for and that we're certainly looking for. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Steven Krefting: Good evening and thank you for hearing our comment and also, I wanted to express my gratitude for the full attendance of the Board here this evening. My name is Steven Krefting and I'm the convener of the Presidio Environmental Council and also, as an aside, I live in Bernal Heights, but if I lived in Kansas, I would still care about this park; this is a remarkable place.

In general, the environmental community is concerned that the latest Preferred Alternative for the development of this site reinstates threats to important Presidio natural areas that we had thought were no longer so severely threatened. There are several concerns in this regard. Perhaps chief among them is the decision to allow people renting units in the Public Health Service Hospital to have pets. While it is stated that the tenants will be subject to the Presidio pet policy, it is our observation that this policy is not being very well enforced even now. The presence of cats and dogs at the Public Health Service site is a direct threat to the quail restoration efforts going on in the upper plateau and a general threat to the development of a wildlife corridor in this most natural area of the park. And as an aside, there is a small pocket of oak woodlands next to the Nike Swale that is really a magical jewel of remnant Presidio habitat. And if you haven't been there, I suggest you talk to Matt or Josiah and have them give you a tour.

Another threat comes from the sheer number of tenants anticipated. While the number of units has decreased substantially, the projected number of residents has not declined nearly as much. And in fact, the number of bedrooms has actually increased from the previous Preferred Alternative. So we find it questionable whether the new resident projections are accurate. And I would also second the comment to the fact that this is, again, providing the kind of housing that you already have a lot of and not the kind that the Presidio really needs of studios and one-bedrooms.

It's also a matter of great concern to us that a building or buildings in the upper plateau are being contemplated for residential use. Twenty-four hour a day usage of that location will have a direct and detrimental effect on the quail and other wildlife. Even use as a community building, while not quite as bad, could still have a significant impact on wildlife populations.

Finally I would like to express our disappointment that during the long period between the draft SEIS and this final, there was no communication that I'm aware of about the direction the plans were taking. Frankly, at the conclusion of the draft process, we thought the Trust and the developer seemed to be moving in a positive direction, and were quite surprised when the final was issued. Many of us had just been through a remarkably open planning process around the reconstruction of Doyle Drive. And I would urge the Trust to look at that as a model for community engagement in planning processes.

As just a summary, I would say that we oppose any Alternative that allows pets to reside in these buildings and if that is corrected, we would probably support Alternative 3. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Next three: Carl Grunfeld, Chuck Lantz and Andy Thornley I guess it is.

Carl Grunfeld: My name is Carl Grunfeld. I live by the Presidio, I run in the Presidio, I hike in the Presidio and I work by the Presidio. Like Ann, I'm a card-carrying member of the Golden Gate National Conservancy and I've supported the Presidio as a donor ever since it became open to the public and before I even moved to the neighborhood.

I share two things with you. First, I just left a board meeting where I, too, had to listen to what the public concern was and deal with a Trust. So I understand where you're coming from.

The other thing is, I actually work at the federal government institution that has the most impact on this neighborhood and is often accused of creating a great traffic problem. I'm a medical researcher at the Department of Veterans Affairs. And I can tell you that the amount of traffic that you will create with this project far exceeds what we do in our institution and will have a much greater impact.

Now, as a medical researcher, when I run through the Presidio of late, I have counted the cars in each of the parking areas. And I believe,

like everyone else, that your Environmental Impact Statement has grossly underestimated what the actual car usage is for all the reasons that were previously described. But I'll add in that most of the parking areas, currently, have cars that exceed the number of spaces. In one area, there are 15 cars routinely parked on the lawn.

I have lived in neighborhoods in which developments like this have been put in with mistaken environmental impact statements and they have been very destructive to traffic patterns and to the nature of the neighborhood. I moved from one that was destroyed by a development that was much smaller than this.

So I think you need to look at what you're doing and think about your role in the public trust and think about what a board of trustees do and I urge you to look into your conscience and not build a project of this extreme high density with this little egress in a neighborhood with which it is totally incompatible. If you do, I think you should be ashamed of yourselves.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Is there a Chuck Lantz here? L-A-N-T-Z? Okay. Andy Thornley?

Andy Thornley: Good evening, Board, I'm Andy Thornley. I'm with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. Yes, they're here tonight, too. I'm also a Richmond resident, but I will speak to you professionally.

You've received and incorporated the Bike Coalition's comments in the SEIS and thank you for that. I just want to remind everybody that the official Bike Route 69 runs along Battery Caulfield to the Golden Gate Bridge. And more importantly, City Bike Route 10 runs along Lake Street. There are very important corridors for bicyclists in both directions, so I'm here speaking on behalf of the 5,800 members of the Bicycle Coalition and the tens of thousands of bicyclists who pass along Lake Street and through the Presidio.

The transportation impact analysis, you heard from a lot of other people, it's gravely flawed. Just immediately, my eyes went to the summary showing that the do nothing option generates more trips than the development options. I'm not blind; that's wrong. I think that pretty much states the whole issue with this. We've already told you that the Park Presidio access point is an absolute prerequisite for any kind of development. Without that, there's just an absolutely fatal flaw in terms of the transportation impact. You've heard that from neighbors and others.

CalTrans' opinion that you heard earlier is discouraging, but it's not surprising. CalTrans builds highways and they ruin neighborhoods. Other people have told you that, but that's not to say that you shouldn't push at that if you really are intent on developing this. But on behalf of the Bike Coalition, I'm telling you that we would never be able to support anything that supported only the 14th/15th Avenue access.

The density analysis likewise seems disingenuous. The SEIS says that this development has a similar density to the neighborhood elsewhere. Well, it would if it was on City streets that were served by transit. It would if it was sitting at 15th and California. It's not. It's sitting up the hill in the Presidio. It's a bit of a walk, even at the 1 California level on the 30 Geary or any of the Park Presidio busses.

So on that basis, I'll just leave you with that - that we find the SEIS deficient and inadequate. We ask you to go back and make an honest estimate of the actual impacts [of the right of way] and the transportation impacts. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Julie Chever? I hope I'm saying that right, and William Shepherd are the next two.

Julie Chever: Good evening. I'm Julie Chever. Thank you very much for having this meeting. I'm a member of Planning Association for the Richmond and also the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board, which has caused me to learn about all the wonderful natural resource areas that happen to be right next to a lot of the mediation sites.

As Ron Miguel mentioned, members of PAR think that Alternative 2 understates the number of cars that occupants of Alternative 2 would have because of the demographics and rental market in San Francisco. We think that these units will be occupied either by well-to-do families

that have two or more cars or else by groups of single young people who also have multiple cars.

The SEIS says that the Presidio-wide mitigation measures [microphone falls] for parking is to try to get just the right balance so that you have a supply of parking to meet the demand of the residents of whatever project you have, but you keep it close to the actual demand so that people will be encouraged to look for other types of transit other than one person per car. The problem with this is, if your estimate of the number of cars is off, everything is thrown off and you won't have enough parking spaces and there will be spill-over in the neighborhood.

Just to take a worse-case scenario, which I know won't be the case, Alternative 2 would have 357 bedrooms. If every one of those bedrooms was occupied by two adults, each of whom owned a car, that would add up to 734 cars. It obviously wouldn't be that many cars, in fact, but I think it would be more than is estimated in the SEIS. The SEIS says that the peak parking demand, which would happen to be on the weekends for the Public Health Service Hospital District, would be 327 spaces and that estimate is not only for all residents, but also for any workers who happen to be there on the weekend, for visitors to the park, and maybe for visitors to residents as well.

My second concern, as others have mentioned, is about the impact of people and pets on natural resources. Even if most people obey the leash law, just one accidentally unleashed dog can do a lot of damage to quail and to sensitive plants. I notice that the SEIS says that if there

were 13 units in the upper plateau, no pets would be allowed there. So if you feel you could have that rule there, I don't see why you can't have the same rule for the hospital building.

Finally, as others have said, when you measure these greater traffic and parking impacts and the natural resource impacts against a very small incremental rental income to the Trust from Alternative 2 in comparison with Alternative 3, it just doesn't seem to be worth it. To use Amy Meyers' phrase in a different context, there must be a better way and I hope you can find it. Thank you very much.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

William Shepherd: I'm impressed that you're all still with us and appear to be attentive. I don't think I could sit through this long myself and listen to all of this. But I'm so impressed with my neighbors in the Richmond District and across San Francisco with what they've had to say this evening.

My name is Bill Shepherd. I'm president of the Lake Street Residents Association and board member of PAR and I serve on NAPP as well. I've worked on this project with various neighborhood associations and the Presidio Trust for the last three or four years and I really look forward to the culmination of this environmental legal process that we're going through here, because I think it puts you on one side of the table unable to communicate with us on the other side of the table.

And I look forward to this process ending and I welcome and ask that you include us in some of your deliberations on this project.

The Lake Street Residents Association is absolutely, adamantly opposed to the revised Alternative 2. It was opposed to the prior Alternative. Two years ago, when we were having discussions with one another, the Trust presented us with an Alternative 2 as the Preferred Alternative at the time. It also gave us, or the City gave us, some optimism that two stories of the wings, these atrocious hulks up there on the hill that we see when we go by the project, would be removed. We were also told by planning director of the Presidio Trust at the time that she had optimism that we could do something with CalTrans with the Park Presidio connector.

Two years have gone by. There's been no communication with us. I don't fault the Presidio Trust, necessarily, for it; I think their legal process probably got in the way of it - this environmental NEPA process. But that's what's happened. And what are we looking at now? A full six-story with a thing up on top of it as the final product and no CalTrans connector.

The people of the Richmond District feel betrayed by this process. We view this as a regression action by the Board, if they adopt this. The true, Preferred Alternative, as far as the people are concerned, is Alternative 3, the smaller project. And we hope that you will, after this process is over, meet with us and work with us to come up with some compromise between what you're saying is the Preferred Alternative and what the people want.

This project is too dense. It's too big. It's too intrusive. The traffic assumptions are false. They may come from some standardized thing that's used elsewhere, but to say that the traffic assumptions realistically should be based on the number of units as opposed to the number of people who live there is nonsense; it's utter nonsense. You look at the upscale units you have in the Presidio, you look at the upscale units in our neighborhood and for every adult, there's a car. It's not one per unit, it's for every adult, there's a car. And if you're going to operate on this assumption that it's one per unit after you've reduced the number of units, you're going to miss the mark. The traffic impact here is going to be excruciating for the neighborhood. Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Ed Alauaqui? I think that's how you say it. A-L-A-U-A-Q-U-I. Totton Heffelfinger, I think is the best I can -

Ed Alauaqui: Yeah, Ed Alauaqui. I'm a member of the Richmond Presidio Neighbors and have been coming to these meetings for about three years now. I'll be brief, but I think I can boil down my comments to three words. First being frustration that three years into this, we haven't been listened to. We are not anti-development, but we're anti-scope-of-development and I don't think we've been heard in that.

The second word it comes down to is trust. Think about that word.
We're trusting you to do what's in the best interests of everyone that's
concerned and not just the developer.

And the third word I would come down to is park. It's a park. Thank
you.

[Applause]

Totton Heffelfinger: Good evening.

Dave Grubb: Good evening.

Totton Heffelfinger: My name is Totton Heffelfinger.

Dave Grubb: Could you get a little closer to the microphone?

Totton Heffelfinger: For 50 years [unintelligible] part of it, and I'm very much aware of the
joys of the park. I'm a birdwatcher. I go out there, I ride my bicycle, I
hike, all these things. I'm going to be very brief because you've heard
a lot of testimony and I'm in agreement with a lot of it. What I get out
of what I've been listening to and what I read before I came here is the
following: the Preferred Alternative does not respond to neighborhood
concerns. It should be downscaled and revised in order to avoid traffic
and parking nightmares, to ensure pedestrian safety and to preserve
community values. As a resident of the area, I'm especially concerned
that the Presidio Trust has failed to respond to community concerns
and has not offered any solution to huge addition of traffic, which will

cause congestion in the area and a danger to residents. This proposed large increase of residential building, equivalent to adding, I understand, ten to 15 new blocks of residents in a concentrated location, is not right for our neighborhood and it should be drastically reduced. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Jonathan Bulkley and Paul Epstein?

Jonathan Bulkley: Ladies and gentlemen of the commission, my name is Jonathan Bulkley. I am an architect and I have lived within five blocks of this project for the last 38 years. I raised five children in the Richmond. And I want you to look at this. I'd like to know how many people in this audience are in favor of this project. Would you put your hands up, please? And how many are opposed? I think that gives you an idea of how we feel about the project. I won't reiterate all the technical stuff that you've heard, except to say that the traffic study was probably prepared by the same person who estimated that we'd have 80,000 people at the BridgeWalk in 1987. [Laughter]

Dave Grubb: I was there. [Laughter]

Jonathan Bulkley: The other thing that I'd particularly like to leave you with is that if you leave those wings up, you will be known as the perpetrators of the worst architectural atrocity since the Jack Tar Hotel.

[Laughter and applause]

When you see this many people come to a meeting - and I've been to a lot of meetings - and this is a lot, even though a number of people have left. This is one of the best-attended meetings and certainly the most unanimous meeting that I have ever seen. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Paul Epstein: Good evening. My name is Paul Epstein. I sit on a number of different committees and boards and all of that; it's not worth listing them. But I think Jonathan's statement is correct. Having sat at the table at a number of them, I rarely heard so many well-articulated statements on any issue. I won't repeat all of them, just some of them.

I think it's worth remembering a comment that Amy Meyer made early on. And that is, originally, this land was not part of the park. It was not part of the park and we all fought to get that included to avoid the threat of development.

[Applause]

Well, we wake up and what do we see? We see the threat of development. Now, I understand and I'm sympathetic with the Board's need to finance the Presidio's function. But the first obligation is to the park. And I'm here really speaking as a proponent for the park. I am a neighbor, but I really don't care about that. What I care about is doing something that's going to affect three generations. And I think the decisions that you make here have that impact and I

don't think those decisions should be made in a negative way to gain one or two percent of the budget.

Now, I recognize that there's a need to get revenue. I have a suggestion; I have a solution. And that solution is simple. The Presidio should act as its own developer. Instead of simply renting the land, having a ground lease, you will be able to have most, if not all, of the return from a much smaller project that would give you more revenue. Now I know there have been statements that you can't finance it and all of that. I don't believe that. I believe that if you instruct your staff to figure out a way to finance it as an in-house operation, as was suggested by the audit that was done by the Public Administration Group a few years ago - I've forgotten the technical name, but the staff can give you copies of that report - we can have our cake and eat it, too. You can have revenue and we can have a dramatically smaller project. And that would satisfy everybody, I think. And there is no barrier to that except will. And I think you ladies and gentlemen take your responsibility seriously and remember, it is a park, not a development opportunity. Build a smaller project, own the project, get the revenues, and the problem, I believe, is solved.

[Applause]

[End of tape 1 / Beginning of tape 2]

Dave Grubb: David Pascal?

John Paulsen: Good evening members of the Trust. My name is John Paulsen. I live on 16th and Lake and my children are going to be fifth-generation Lake Street residents, I'm proud to say. I just want to say very briefly, being a real estate professional for over 20 years in the development side of the business, that I think the last speaker had a lot of good points. I think just from a business standpoint, if you do a back-of-the-envelope, I think the Presidio's getting short-changed from a financial standpoint. I think part of the problem was due to the process of Letterman, the development, I think this site was sort of damaged goods in the development community.

I talked to a lot of people, major firms, who really didn't want to get involved with the project because they felt that it was not time well spent, to be polite. So I think that you've kind of inherited a tough situation. I think that Forest City is a very reputable firm, but I think a lot of the real estate players have not been interested because of a lot of ill will that went on with the Letterman RFP process.

So I just want to say I think that the wings and how the whole methodology here needs to be rethought. And I think that a viable solution could be met. I think there's plenty of FAR here. And my back-of-the-envelope, looking at the amount of revenues that the Presidio is getting, if you capitalize the 400,000 square feet at a market rate, I'm not quite getting to where the numbers should be. So I think it's time that the Presidio, just from a reasonable standpoint, just look at doing a small project. I think that at the end of the day, hopefully the Trust can garner the revenue that it needs and requires. I think all the neighbors are sympathetic to that. But I really think that the

project should be smaller and that the wings should come down.

Thank you.

Dave Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

David Pascal: Thank you. I'm David Pascal and I run a nonprofit organization that, among other things, advocates for environmental sustainability. We also engage from time to time in real estate development, so I've also had the unique pleasure of losing myself for hours in an artist's model.

But back to environmental sustainability. For all the talk of sustainability, I think it basically comes down to one fundamental axiom and that is this idea of balance. And that it is possible to reconcile a tangle of conflicting forces and find a way to bring them into balance and maintain that balance over a long period of time. And while I think we could argue ad nauseam about traffic analysis and environmental impacts and financial analysis, in fact I think it was Winston Churchill who once said, "The only statistics I believe are the ones I've doctored myself."

I think what is incontrovertible here tonight is that if you look at the equation that takes into account the community, the City of San Francisco, the Trust, Forest City, the environment that is the Presidio, I think that everybody would agree that that equation is fundamentally out of balance. And I think the request that underlies everything that

you've also heard tonight is a plea that there be some balance that you all find in that.

And I know that what we're asking you to do is that somebody's going to have to tell your friends and colleagues at Forest City that they need to leave a little bit of money on the table because it's the right thing to do. Not all the money, but a little bit. And I say friends and colleagues, because when the Trust was first established, the enabling legislation said that individuals that sit on the Trust should have experience in real estate development and in finance, because who's better to help the Presidio achieve its own sustainability than people who understand the game and know how to make things work and find the smart, sensible, creative, sustainable development opportunities that could preserve this place for future generations.

And so I think it's not an unreasonable request to tell Forest City - and I'm sure they've got plenty of very intelligent, creative people on their staff - to figure out a way to make a smaller-scale development pencil out. It's an extraordinary opportunity to be able to put a project in a site like this and I think that it is not only the right thing to do, the sustainable thing to do, but the balanced thing to do to make them figure out a way to make it work for everybody that's involved. Thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb:

Eloise Jonas?

Eloise Jonas: I just arrived not long ago, so maybe this came up. It's just a petty little question; I'm not going to repeat all the things that people have said before. I agree with all of them that I've heard. But I noticed in the newspaper articles that you plan to have a grocery store in the development. And I just wondered, is that only going to be able to be used by the people who live in the building? Or will it be able to be used by the whole City? Do you know about that, have you thought about it? Think of the number of cars that will be going in there. Am I supposed to ask questions?

Dave Grubb: Did you say grocery store?

Eloise Jonas: Yeah, I read in the newspaper there was going to be a grocery store included in the development and I just thought, oh my God; everybody in the neighborhood's going to be going into that grocery store. Or will it only be able to be used by people who live in the development? I just wondered if that was something that had been thought out or not. That would cause a huge amount of traffic. I live on 15th and Lake.

Craig Middleton: I don't think a grocery store is anticipated.

Eloise Jonas: Oh, it was in the paper. Really? Oh good. Okay. And the other question I had was, this developer - I was wondering, is it final? Are you married to this developer or could you change? Is this final?

Craig Middleton: Nothing is final.

Eloise Jonas: Are you totally committed?

Craig Middleton: No, nothing is final.

Eloise Jonas: Okay, thank you.

[Applause]

Dave Grubb: Okay. I'd like to thank everybody for your comments. We'll be doing a lot of discussion about them. And thank you all for coming. It's been a very good session and we heard you.

[Applause]

The time right now is 8:50. That means it's adjourned.