

PRESIDIO TRUST PUBLIC BOARD MEETING – April 7, 2009

NOTE: The following is the best transcript available of the public Board meeting of the Presidio Trust Board of Directors held on April 7, 2009. It is based upon an audio recording of the meeting.

[Beginning of recorded material]

David Grubb: The time is 6:37. Tonight we are devoting the entire meeting to the plans for the Main Post. We appreciate you coming this evening and we look forward to hearing your comments. As you probably noticed, it is our practice to give preference to elected officials and to former trustees. Now we realize that they have a lot of time constraints, but they're here to give us their insight into the discussion topics and it's our way of thanking them so I hope you understand. Otherwise it's always as you sign up that's the way we go through the cards. So just so you understand, we do take this one thing. We think that's one way we can thank them in the process.

Now I want to make this point - all comments from the public whether received verbally in a meeting such as this one, written as notes and given to the people we have stationed on either side or sent to us via e-mail or by regular mail are treated equally, all become part of the public record and will be considered by the Trust. Again, let me thank you for being here. We appreciate your involvement. It makes a big difference to all of us.

To get started and to provide you with some background about the process we're engaged in, I'd like to ask Craig Middleton, our

Executive Director, to give you a presentation on where we are now. Craig?

Craig Middleton: Thanks, Dave. Before I start, I wanted to first of all welcome you and thank you for coming. I notice, I don't know quite why, but there are more people on this side than on that side. So if you need more room then spread out. Before I get started, I wanted to acknowledge supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier who today introduce a resolution honoring our friend, Red Kernan. I'd like to just say a couple things about Red before we get started. Red is not doing too well right now, and I would say that no one has devoted more time and more energy to the protection and to the future of the Presidio than Red.

[Applause]

No one has pursued positions with more vitality and integrity than Red. You can count on candor from Red, and he will push his position as hard as anyone can push a position. But you always know that no matter where you stand in that argument you know where you stand in terms of your friendship with him. He's always a friend. So I just wanted to say that we probably will disagree on a few things tonight. I don't expect that we'll agree on everything. But I think we can agree collectively to send our prayers out to Red Kernan, so thank you.

[Applause]

Tonight we're taking comment on the Main Post Update. And also after I speak I'd like to invite up the architect for the CAMP Project, Contemporary Art Museum. It is one of the key projects in this Main Post Update, and I thought you would enjoy hearing how the design has evolved for the CAMP Museum. But first let me describe the Main Post Update very briefly with you and tell you where we stand in the process.

A little context - the Presidio is a national park site. It's a National Historic Landmark District. Tonight we're going to talk about one aspect of the Presidio, once piece of the Presidio, the Main Post, which for generations has served as the center of the post, now park.

To do the Presidio justice is really to take steps to reveal and peel back the two and a half centuries of history that we call the Presidio history. The complexity of the Presidio's history is really not apparent easily to people who come to visit because it is a layered history. One building campaign often obscured the previous building campaign. So what we have are relics of these various eras that without context are hard to understand but with context can become a very important and powerful tool for understanding not only the history of the Presidio, the birthplace of San Francisco and the history of our city, but the history of the west and the American attitudes toward expansion as it moved west and to the Pacific.

So as we think about the Presidio's future, we find inspiration from its past. The Spanish established the Presidio in 1776 marking the earliest beginnings of San Francisco. The original adobe walls have been uncovered in the Officers' Club. And the foundations of El Presidio exist underneath the parking lots. In '46, 1846, John Fremont took the Presidio for California and for the United States, and it operated as a U.S. Army post until 1994 when it became part of the national park system. Throughout the centuries, the Presidio played a very important role, many different roles in fact, in the development of the west.

The Main Post evolved around a series of three open spaces: the Plaza de Armas at El Presidio, the Civil War Parade Ground and the Main Parade, which was created in the 1890's. The expansion of the Presidio is evident in successive building campaigns that provided distinction to the parade grounds and then later on demolished those buildings and replaced them with other buildings. Historically the Main Post was a busy place. Soldiers lived in the barracks, mustered on the parades, worked in the offices, socialized and attended ceremonial events all at the Main Post, in the clubs, on the parades, in the spaces between the buildings and in the buildings. One of the questions we ask ourselves at this point as we're thinking about the Main Post's future is how do we bring back this sense of the center, only this time as the center of a park rather than the center of an army post?

In later years after World War II, the Main Post was suburbanized. Barracks became office buildings, and soldiers and other personnel commuted to the park from outside of the park. They no longer lived in the barracks; they commuted. And so what they did with the parade grounds was turn them into parking lots. The El Presidio and the Main Parade are both parking lots. Buildings that served to delineate the parades were demolished making it very hard to define the parades to understand the difference between the Civil War Parade and the Main Parade for example.

So how do we redefine these spaces? How do we make them ripe and appropriate places for the community to gather? Plans to reestablish the Main Post, to restore it, to rehabilitate it began really almost 20 years ago in the late 1980s when the Base Realignment and Closure Commission determined that the Presidio would be closed as an army base and turned over to the National Park Service. At that time people began to wonder, “How do we do this? What are we going to do?” The General Management Plan Amendment followed and then the Presidio Trust Management Plan followed later. All of these plans had one thing in common or a number of things in common, but in terms of the Main Post they talked about it being the focal point for visitors and the Presidio community. They talked about cultural, educational and visitors serving uses as preferred uses in the Main Post.

So when we began to talk about what to do with the Main Post, we first talked about three organizing principles. These were that it

was important to reveal the history, to peel back some of these layers and to make them understandable to the public, that it was important to welcome people to the Presidio, and that the Main Post would become the place where people would gather first. The trail system would emanate from the Main Post and to the Main Post. Everything would start at the Main Post. Transit would come to the Main Post. And a visitor could get a glimpse of the history by going to a Heritage Center or Visitor Center in the Main Post before going out and exploring the rest of the park.

Now the Main Parade has the potential to be one of our city's and nation's, I think, most spectacular open spaces, particularly with some of the developments like Doyle Drive that I'll talk about in a second. You wouldn't know it; this is the Main Parade today. It doesn't look like one of the nation's great open spaces.

In 2007, the Presidio Trust adopted a conceptual plan for the Main Parade that would do a few things. It would green the Main Parade, tear up the pavement, put the parking on the periphery of the Main Post. Take it away from the center. Make the center a pedestrian-friendly area, reduce the width of the current parking lot to the original width of the parade ground so people could understand what the parade ground looked like and how large it used to be. There were buildings where all this other landscaping currently is in the plan. Those buildings have been demolished so it would reestablish that edge of the Presidio's Main Parade with landscaping and with a walk-through time so people could walk from the

Officers' Club or El Presidio in 1776 to the Bay and through that walk understand most of what happened during those two and a half centuries.

So let me talk about that. That project is sort of underway. Let me talk about some of the key projects in the Main Post Update. Now the Main Post Update may be referred at some points in tonight's discussions as the Main Post Update, the Preferred Alternative or the undertaking; it's all the same thing. The Main Post Update is essentially the plan for the Main Post.

We believe that history can be found throughout the Presidio. If you want to find out what Buffalo Soldiers did you go to the Cavalry barracks. If you want to find out about the Civil War era you can go to Funston Avenue. If you want to find out about 1898 and the Spanish-American War and the War of Philippine Independence and our involvement in that you can go to the Montgomery Street Barracks. So there are relics of the Presidio's history throughout the Presidio. But there is no one place where anyone can come and really understand what the totality of the history is so that they can get an orientation before they go out and see these specific pieces of it.

At El Presidio, we believe that is the place. We should have a heritage and archeological center at El Presidio in the current Officers' Club which has the adobe walls of the original El Presidio. So we proposed to put a heritage center and archeological center in

that building. And that archeological center will build on programs that currently exist. Currently the foundations of El Presidio are being uncovered each summer by Stanford students, Cal students in archeology who come and volunteer their time to do this.

This also offers us the opportunity to build on fourth-grade programs that are sort of in their youth but not fully developed. And these are programs for fourth graders who study California history. Why not have them all come to the Presidio at one time or another and see for themselves where San Francisco began in the northern most Presidio of the Spanish empire?

For most of the Presidio's history, the Main Post's history, people lived at the Main Post what our now offices were once barracks. Today very few people live on the Main Post. And so we asked ourselves, "Well how do you create or recreate that experience of spending a night in the Presidio? Would that be something that would be worth recreating?" Well the modern-day park iteration of that experience is a lodge. So we're proposing that there be a lodge, not a large lodge. In fact, in response to some comments that we've received over the months we've reduced the size of the proposed lodge by 15,000 feet. So in a new building there would be 110 rooms, and in an old building, Pershing Hall at the head of Funston Avenue, there would be another 19 rooms.

A Museum of Contemporary Art would be housed in a combination of new and historic buildings. The new building's understated and

subordinate to the historic scene yet creating a connection to the contemporary times while serving a distinctly civic purpose, that is museums being traditional anchors of public places in this country and throughout the world. The museum collection is one of the world's finest and its buildings in which the collection would be exhibited would be of the quality that has become synonymous with the Presidio.

Adding a contemporary building in a historic landscape requires great sensitivity to place. And we've worked very hard with our partner agencies, the National Park Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer as well as other organizations to figure out how to create an intervention that is appropriate. The work has been informed by the Secretary of Interiors' Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. It is continuing to develop through the consultation that is required as part of the National Historic Preservation Act. As part of this consultation, we and our partners developed some strategies for dealing with new construction in the Main Post. The strategies really relate to the Secretary's Standards, and you can find them in the back part of the Main Post Update. They're to provide guidance to the project teams that are proposing projects in the Main Post.

I'm pleased with the flexibility that designers have shown in these projects over time. You'll see that the projects have evolved

considerably. And most of this has involved reducing the size and visible impact, creating contemporary yet subordinate designs.

Let me move on to the other projects in the Main Post Update. The Historic Theater, Building 99 where Bob Hope once performed, has been vacant since the army left in 1994 despite numerous efforts to rehabilitate it. Numerous RFPs have resulted in our understanding that as a film venue this theater no longer works.

In 2007 the Trust received a proposal from the San Francisco Film Society, one of the first tenants in the Presidio, to rehabilitate this theater, add to it and create a permanent home for the San Francisco International Film Festival. They also propose year-round independent cinema, performing arts and community programs. Their proposal for rehabilitation of the theater would divide the original theater into two smaller theaters and would include an addition of 18,000 feet in order to accommodate accessibility requirements, create more public space and provide a third viewing room. The theater after rehabilitation would have about 600 seats total, that's about 30 percent less than the original facility has today, but it would be able to accommodate considerably more programming than is possible today.

The Interfaith Center has put forth a proposal for an addition of approximately 3,000 feet to the chapel. This is the chapel up the hill from the Golden Gate Club. The purpose is really to accommodate accessibility needs, provide for an elevator, that kind

of thing. And so we have included that in the Main Post Update as well.

The Preferred Alternative or the Main Post Update also takes into consideration one of the key benefits created by the rehabilitation or replacement of Doyle Drive. And that is a new ten-acre bluff that would be created by putting Doyle Drive into a tunnel creating ten acres of parkland on top of the tunnel and connecting finally, once again, the historic connection between the Presidio's Main Post and Crissy Field and the Bay.

We talked about one of our organizing themes as being sustainability. And the Trust is committed to making the Presidio sustainable in a number of ways - new landscapes, we'll use recycled water, our shuttle will reduce automobile usage, permeable surfaces will reduce storm water runoff, photovoltaic panels will reduce consumption of non-renewable energy.

We recognize that we have a lot to do to convert this historic military post into a model of 21st Century sustainability, but we've made a strong start. And I was particularly pleased yesterday to read in the New York Times an article by Dick Moe, who is the President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, laying out a rationale for using and reusing historic buildings rather than tearing them down to create platinum lead buildings or brand-new buildings that are more energy efficient. So we look forward to

working with the National Trust on this challenge to create a sustainable center in the historic Presidio.

Over the past two years, the Trust has reached out to the public in a number of different ways, through presentations, public workshops, tours, open houses. We've received over 2,000 comments on the Main Post. Public input has been varied. Opinions are diverse. But a few key points have surfaced, and I thought I'd just mention them. This list is certainly not meant to be all-inclusive.

Those who have participated in the process have wanted us to scale back the presence of new construction and protect and elevate the Presidio's history, a very common theme. The Presidio Trust has agreed, and the Preferred Alternative we believe reflects this.

There are concerns about the degree to which the character of the Main Post might change, and there are concerns about traffic and the adequacy of parking. The Trust is committed to restoring and maintaining the historic character of the Main Post and respecting the integrity of the Landmark District.

We also have been working on parking plans, and I will tell you that our assumptions are conservative. In fact, over the years as we have projected parking demand and then compared it with actuals, as time went on we have found that they are indeed conservative. Usually we need less parking than we have projected to need. The Main Post as I said earlier calls for moving the parking from the

center to the periphery, making a place much more friendly to pedestrians. The supply of parking would not be reduced, and less than half of the current parking at the Presidio is used, and that is used inefficiently. So we're predicting a need for about 2,100 spaces, and the Main Post Update has a parking plan in it that will show you exactly where those spaces would be located. We also planned to tackle parking demand in a number of ways - charging for parking that is now free and improving alternatives like the Presidio shuttle which has been a hit by anybody's measure.

We also need to deal with the issue of cut-through traffic in the park. I don't think we will ever solve traffic problems in the adjacent neighborhoods without dealing with that issue. We know that cut-through traffic represents a very substantial percentage of our total traffic, particularly at peak periods not surprisingly and that it impacts our neighbors who live near the gates. In fact, I think it's a much bigger problem frankly than any of the issues that we're dealing with tonight in terms of these new projects that we're proposing. For example, CAMP and the Presidio Lodge will each contribute about two percent to Presidio traffic. Cut-through traffic probably accounts for close to half.

I've seen some fliers in recent days that in my view are intended to frighten people about traffic impacts particularly on the Presidio Boulevard area and the Presidio Gate, promising that there will be a traffic light on every corner and that the Presidio Boulevard will ultimately feel like Bush Street with timed lights and lots of traffic.

So let me be clear. The Presidio Trust is not proposing traffic signals on the Presidio Boulevard. If we chose to do absolutely nothing to reduce traffic then in 30 years the City might be enticed into looking at traffic lights. But I can assure you that this would not happen without the input of people who live in that neighborhood and on those streets.

The more probable outcome is that we will employ strategies for reducing traffic that will eliminate any need to consider lights. And I pledge to you that we will work with you, with all the neighbors, in making that happen. Let me give you a real-world kind of current example of this - the intersection at Lombard and Lyon. We've seen no increase in traffic in that intersection since 2002 although we had predicted that there would be more traffic than there is today. But it is considered a failing intersection particularly at peak periods. We don't think there's a need for a traffic signal there.

We also realize that there are changes in the works with Doyle Drive. Doyle Drive will have an exit into the Presidio and an entrance onto Doyle Drive direction in from Doyle Drive which should relieve considerably the pressure on the gates.

So where are we in the planning process? As a federal agency the Trust is subject to the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. We've conducted these two processes in tandem. This slide gives you a conceptual sense of

their relation to each other, and the dotted red line shows where we are in the process.

The public comment period for the NEPA process, the SEIS, will end on April 27th. The Trust will continue the NHPA historic consultation after the 27th as we're preparing a final environmental document. Once the final documents are issued there will be a 30-day no-action period. If there is agreement on the historic consultation, only after there is agreement I should say, among the four signatory agencies that I mentioned earlier would we sign as a Record of Decision.

In the meantime, we want comments. We look forward to them. We want to hear from you. We encourage you to learn more by coming to our open houses which are every Friday and Saturday from 10:00 to 12:00 on the Main Post in Building 105 so you can look at a model and you can understand in more detail some of these projects. You can also speak tonight. As Dave said, you can submit your comments in writing. You can submit them online. You can e-mail them to us. We're trying to make it as easy as possible for you to give us your input. I can tell you that in my experience here, which has been about ten years, I can't think of one project that hasn't changed as the result of public input. It's very valuable and we really appreciate your coming out tonight.

With that I'd like to introduce Bryan Shiles with WRNS. Sam Nunes, his partner, is also here tonight. And Bryan's going to walk

you through some of the changes in the CAMP design, and then we'll open it for public comment.

Bryan Shiles: We're going to have a quick technology switchover here, but Mary Murphy has a few words she'd like to say.

Mary Murphy: I just wanted to say tonight while Bryan's getting his PowerPoint set up we just wanted to add the CAMP voice to that of the Presidio Trust. And I know many of the people who are here tonight. I've known Red Kernan for 20 years. I met him working on the Presidio when the SEIS for the army was first issued when the BRAC closure came down in 1990. I was pregnant with my eldest child who's now a freshman in college. And it's been great working with Red and we're thinking of him tonight. We'll miss him this evening. And he's just been a great friend to the Presidio and a great friend to all of us here, and I know our thoughts and prayers are with him and his family tonight.

Bryan Shiles: Hi. Thank you, Craig. The main point of tonight of course is to hear your comments. So I am not going to be too long at this. But the Trust did ask me and my partner, Sam, to walk you guys through a little bit of the thinking as to the current state of the design of the CAMP Museum. So I'm going to take about ten minutes to do that. And I really want to keep this relatively simple because I think that the ideas are relatively simple. And of course we hope that the simplicity results in an elegance that this program and this place deserve.

The architecture for the new museum really comes from two directions. One is an analysis and really a love of this place, the Presidio, its history, its topology, its ecology and its place in the City and frankly in the country. The other is the spectacular collection that the Fishers have put together. And it's really an amazing collection and I'm sure you've heard that and perhaps many of you know something about the collection. But it really is something that deserves a great place and a great place for generations. And it deserves a place of some drama and of some special character.

So the visitor experience, the experience of anyone in the City or the country coming to see this collection along with an analysis and a real love of the Presidio is where the architecture comes from.

Just a couple of slides here, and Craig did such a nice job of laying out the history of the Presidio so I don't want to repeat that, but maybe just a little bit of how our team sees this place or this time in the history of the Presidio.

This slide really speaks to our view that the Presidio really is the garden for the City or a garden for the City if not for the country. So I think we do have a rather broad and expansive view of the Presidio.

And the picture on the right speaks to a quality of the Presidio that we find quite beautiful and that is what we call a kind of middle landscape between what is built and what is natural between views out beyond to Marin and to the Bay and very intimate landscapes within the Presidio.

As Craig spoke to, the Main Post has been the historical cultural heart of the Presidio and really the heart or the center of activity. And from our standpoint we think that it makes sense that the Main Post go on to the future to be a place that is very active and continues to be the cultural heart of the Presidio. It's also the place where there are edges. There are streets. The buildings gather together to have a little bit more density. It is the most densely built part of the Presidio. For that reason as well we think that it's a good place for the museum.

Then there's the collection. As I said and as I think you must know, the collection is spectacular. And we showed this first shot of Ocean Park by Diebenkorn for a very specific reason. The way Diebenkorn used landscape, existing patterns of use, existing patterns of settlement is inspiration for an elucidated look at those patterns and made a very beautiful series of paintings from what really were existing conditions and landscapes is very inspiring to us. And of course Diebenkorn spent a good part of his career in the Bay Area and so we find that inspiring as well.

I don't want to go too much into all of these selections, but suffice it to say it is a very deep collection and a few artists so a visitor can go and get a very deep understanding of the complete work or the span of work of a number of our most important artists.

It's delightful actually, the connections between the collection and the Bay Area. You guys probably know or many of you probably know that Alexander Calder went to Lowell High School as did Diebenkorn I believe. So these connections to the Bay Area again are delightful. And there is a lot of Calder in the collection and quite a few Richard Serra - as you know grew up out in the Avenues. And this is a piece called, "Call Me Ishmael." And there are several large Richard Serra pieces, this one - another one called "Sequence," "Four Plates and Two Rods." There are a lot of large and beautiful Richard Serra sculptures that I think you'll see when I go through the plans were a major player in how the building was organized.

Again Craig really went through the history of the Presidio so I don't want to go much into that other than to say that we see the history as an open history. This is not the consummate moment for the Presidio nor for the Main Post. It's a very important moment. It's a very important moment in a terrific history, and we think it's our responsibility as a team to play a very careful and incisive role in that trajectory of history.

I want to just sort of point out a few of the building types that surround the Main Post and really some observations on our part as to how they influenced our design and our thinking. The barracks buildings your familiar with - they were buildings built for a very specific purpose with a lot of expediency and yet there's a lot of elegance and simple beauty to these buildings we believe, not the least of which is the line of porches. And the porches become a very important thing. Just as I spoke at the first slide about this middle landscape, the Presidio being between built and natural, these porch spaces are an intermediary between the inside and the outside. They're shadowed, their public, they soften the way buildings meet an edge, and they're just beautiful spaces.

There's a lot of different architecture around the Presidio, a lot of different tectonics, a lot of different construction types from the load-bearing bricks to cast concrete to the lightness of the wood, and there is a lot of this light wood in the Presidio all painted the beautiful, bright Presidio white.

These are the six army buildings, and these are very different kind of architecture, very solid, concrete buildings with punched openings. So I just wanted to point out that there are lots of different kinds of architecture and a lot that I didn't put up here, some not so wonderful perhaps in some people's eyes. But there's been a long history building in the Presidio with a lot of different types of architecture.

And I just pointed to or just showed you things that you can see. If you stand in the Main Parade or you walk around the Presidio there are things that influence the design and frankly influence the sense of place there that you can't see so readily, one of course is archeology. This is El Presidio. This is the site that I'll be speaking about in a little bit. And this big tan block right here is an area of important archeology that starts to delimit where we think was appropriate to build.

On the right side what you're seeing in this sort of purple swale right here is the topography of an old streambed which runs relative to this drawing right there. So there is topography that just got filled in, and again it was an old streambed. So there are things that you can't see when you're standing out there that had a big influence on the design.

I want to show you a series of four diagrams that I think speak to how we see the place. It's not exhaustive. There probably could have been six or eight more of these, but I'll spare you those. But I think these four do speak to how we see the Presidio and lead into how we've organized the building. And I think in a way this is probably the most important one.

And what this diagram on the left is speaking to is that what we see is that the Main Parade really is part of an open-space continuum from the Infantry Terrace all the way to the Bay. We think that it's very important that anything that happens in that Main Parade is

really part of and is deferential to that sense of an open continuum. And the picture on the right is taken from up on Infantry Terrace of course looking towards the Bay. And I think it's a slide that speaks to us because, again, it goes back to that middle landscape but also speaks to the fact that again we see this as an open space.

This diagram on the left really speaks to the graining of the buildings around the Main Parade. By graining I mean the long axis of the buildings are north to south. And so you get these edges that flank the Main Parade, and there's a kind of flow to the sense of space set up by those buildings.

This diagram is a bit of an overlay. There's like a tartan grid at the Main Parade because the buildings were grained north to south or south to north but typically entered east to west. And so the patterns of use and movement there run counter to the long axis of the buildings, and it sets up a pattern and a sense of place and a sense of use of the Main Parade.

And the last one is really just about the streets and sidewalks. And that may seem a little bit obvious, but the streets and the sidewalks are part of the permanence of the place. Arguello has moved three or four feet back and forth or six or eight feet or six or ten feet for hundreds of years, but it has primarily been here for a long time so people entering from the south to the north crossing Moraga to the Main Parade have memory and have a sense of place that has to do with how they've moved down Arguello for a long time, similarly

on Moraga moving from east to west. You're coming over a little bit of a knoll there approaching the square, and you're kind of rolling down as you head towards the barracks buildings. And these things live in people's memory and how you walk around the Main Parade as well and the sidewalks up Montgomery Street gives you thresholds. This is Bliss. When you're walking between the theater and Building 100 on Bliss you walk past the drip line of those buildings, the Main Parade opens up to you and that's a threshold moment. And how those moments and, again, those memories played into the design of the building was very important to us.

So here's the site plan. So a just a little straightforward stuff I guess. The project now is really on three sites. Building 101 here, an art-handling building here to the south of Moraga, and then the gallery building which is here, so that's one, two, three sites. And by utilizing three sites we were able to really push down and decant the scale of the whole project and also by pushing into the ground which I'll speak to a little bit later. Building 101 will be renovated into an administrative building, an outreach building, educational spaces, a large assembly space as well as artist studios. And so we like very much the idea that this project will help revitalize the line of barracks and bring some life to Montgomery Street.

This building is the art handling building again, and so all the back-of-house stuff, all the mechanical, loading, crating. Everything that isn't a gallery or what goes in 101 is in this building which is

primarily an underground building. It's two levels but completely underground except for six feet of wall at its perimeter. And then there's a connection with a tunnel under Moraga to the gallery building which is here. The gallery building is also two levels with one level pushed below grade and one level at grade. And as we talked about this, we refer to the upper level as the pavilion level and the lower level as the courtyard level. And the pavilion level is more or less if you were at the corner of Bliss and Montgomery right here, that is the entry level to the museum.

One of the things I want to point out in this plan is, again, going back to the diagram about the memory and the use and the patterns of movement around the Presidio you can see that Arguello comes through here as a walk. Sheridan comes through also as a walk and really sets the northern edge of the project. Moraga is unchanged. Moraga comes through. And Bliss comes right through the building which we'll see in this plan. Bliss comes through the building at the ground floor and you can enter either here off of Montgomery or here off of the Parade. So, again, those lines and those patterns come right through the building.

And so this is the pavilion level. And just a little bit about the program at this level - again, this is loading in back of house and again an underground building. And I don't have a picture of it, but if anyone can remember that along Moraga right now there is a berm right here and a kind of stone riprap wall. And this building will sit behind that berm. It won't remain exactly as it is. But that

same kind of landscaped wall idea is the primary expression of this building.

And then at this level, again, entries here and entries here, a public walk through the building. Ticketing would be here. This is the bookstore. And the bookstore is placed here, again, to participate with the head of Montgomery Street. And this is a café. The café would be open after hours. It would be public. And then there are two galleries. This is a traveling exhibit gallery here, and this is the most light-sensitive gallery and one that's really pushed into the earth at the southern end of the site. And this is the pavilion gallery here adjacent to a terrace here which is acting like one of the porches that I talked about on the barracks buildings. And, in fact, there are porches really all around this building. There are eave overhangs. There's a large porch here. There is an exterior loggia walkway here, so if you're walking up Montgomery from the north to the south you could come up a very gentle stair into an exterior loggia.

We are developing column elements here that are somehow reminiscent of the columns and the porches of the barracks buildings. So we really see that as the - we're on the head of Montgomery Street. On this building we are letting you cinch up to Montgomery Street and participate with the porches and the public life of the street with entry and bookstore.

That's the main level, the pavilion level. This is a stair that's open and behind glass that takes you down to the lower level. We felt it was very important that to the north and to the east that the building be as open and transparent as possible because that really is your primary view from the Main Parade. So this stair is behind glass. This gallery has a glass wall that opens out on to that terrace. So we think it's a very gracious and generous presentation to the Main Post.

Coming down that open stair that I just spoke to, you're coming down and you're looking over "Sequence." This is another large Richard Serra piece right here. And these pieces, both "Sequence" and "Call me Ishmael," were meant to be viewed from their level as well as from above. So putting them into these courtyards not only keeps them sort of out of the main view of the Presidio but it allows for public viewing of them down into the courtyards. And you can see here that "Sequence" being beside the stair is part of the internal sequence, sorry for the pun, of the museum.

This lower level, which we call the courtyard level 'cause there are one, two, three courtyards, is where the bulk of the permanent exhibit will reside, not that it won't ever change, but this is where the collection will reside in these three galleries.

A little bit about the sections here. This section is cut from south to north. This is the art-handling building. And one of the things I want to point out here really are the heights. And what you're

seeing, and I'm sorry it's a little bit faint, I'll try to trace it, that's the top of the theater building. This is the top of 100. That's the eave line of 100. And that's the eave line of the new porch of the CAMP.

A couple things we felt were important - we felt it was important that the eave line of the porch, of the loggia, of the way that the new building reaches out and extends into the landscape stay below the eave line of 100, that everything stayed below that. We thought that was a very important scale determiner. And also we felt like that from any distance the kind of, we call it the sort of Mary Poppins view, of the barracks buildings reaching the sky, that beautiful, animated profile, be the way that you continue to see the Main Parade meet the sky and we not interrupt that as much as possible. So you can see that the new section is a good bit below Building 100 right there.

So now there's a little bit of a tour through a model. What you're seeing here is looking straight down on the gallery site which is here, again, the art-handling and Building 101 is here. And what you are seeing is a living roof over the gallery building. And the living roof has a very specific contour or topography to it. And we see that line of the roof, which you'll see 'cause the model shots are going to swing down in a second, we see that line as really being a reconciliation between the gentle slope of the parade ground and the more energetic and steep slope of Infantry Terrace which is beyond here. So you can see by the shadows that there's a steeper set of

angles here stretching out to the parade ground there. You can also see the shadows here of the courtyards which recall the streambed and the topography of past times of the Presidio.

So now we're swinging down. We're looking from Arguello. We're up in the sky but we're looking down Arguello. And then you can start to see the contour of that roof. This is the sort of thrust of the café. And the café is pushed out so that when you're sitting in the café you would have a view of the Bay or of the great stand of trees in the hill of Infantry Terrace to the south.

This is looking down Montgomery. And you can see here that this edge is a tighter edge. And you can also see I think in this slide what we've tried to do is scale, which is that the building is clearly in our minds about landscape and it's about the sweep of landscape. But we've tried to scale the building to work with the surrounding scale of the buildings. And really the gallery building chunks into three pieces. There's the Traveling Exhibits Gallery which in scale is very similar to the Theater Building. There's the Bliss Breezeway as we call it. Bliss kind of goes through the building as the public way. And that dimension is very similar to the dimension between the Theater Building and Building 100 of Bliss. And then there's the gallery to the north which is about the same in scale as Building 100. So there are these chunks of scales to the building but all subservient to this kind of sweep of landscape that we think ties to the larger topology of the Presidio.

These are the porch or the column elements that I was speaking to earlier, and you see the exterior loggia there leading to the entry.

And this shot really from the east looking west I think probably shows best this idea that there is one contour which organizes the roof. This is the porch to the north. And you can see that there's a steeper set of contours for Infantry Terrace and then the long sweep reaching out towards the parade ground.

Materials are very important to us and the history of building materials in the Presidio as well. And what you see on the left is a retaining wall up on Infantry Terrace. And there are a lot of stone walls. And what you see on the right of course is the wood [unintelligible] in the Presidio white. And these are two materials that we would absolutely see deploying in the new gallery building. There is a lot of retaining around the courtyards. And we would see the walls that set up those courtyards as being stone to compliment the stone that is around the Presidio. And we would see the eaves and soffits of the porches as being lacquered wood and lacquered the Presidio white, which works of course with all the Presidio white that you've seen in previous shots.

This is a shot up Montgomery Street. And I'll leave you with this slide; this is the last slide, which I think speaks to our team's hope for the building that in terms of how the building fits into the broader context of the Presidio, it's part of that open landscape continuum. It's part of a bigger picture of the Presidio and its

elegance, and hopefully its drama is very much derived of the place. On the other hand, the experience of the art and the experience of the interior should be worthy of the spectacular collection. It should be light. It should be pavilion-like. It should be airy. It should support a magnificence that is this collection yet always refer back to and give you views and connection to the Presidio like a park pavilion should.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you, Bryan, and thank you, Craig. All right. We'll get started. We're going to take a break at about 8:30 just so everybody knows that. It's about an hour from now. So we are going to limit the conversations or your comments to three minutes and we'll try that. I have to say though if we see that we're not going to get through in a reasonable time we're going to cut them to two minutes. But I want to start with three because we promised that, and we will try to continue. So with those let's get going. First three names - first is Toby Rosenblatt, second is Amy Meyer and third is Robert Infelise - I guess is how you say it.

Toby Rosenblatt: Good evening. For the record, I'm Tony Rosenblatt. I served as the founding chair of the Presidio Trust Board and have been devoting volunteer time to the Presidio for the last two decades with the Trust, GGNRA and GGNPC.

I've had received briefings on the Main Post plan, the Update and earlier tonight a detailed briefing on the latest designs for CAMP. To the long-term benefit of the Presidio and the public, the difficult process has now yielded a project and a program that is exemplary. The issues raised in the process are being addressed. Compliance with relevant laws, regulations and guidelines are being accomplished.

The proposal now for CAMP incorporates the appropriate balance about standing design with the program needs and the public benefit. The architecture provides the contemporary imagery for this century just as prior Presidio buildings did for theirs. The massing and placement are sympathetic to the Main Parade, open space in the surrounding buildings, the whole is respectful of the green goals for sustainability.

It is clear now that these architects and the project proponents understand the context needed to respect and enhance the Presidio, indeed they get it.

The program being proposed, the art of incomparable scope and quality, the endowed supporting foundation, the incorporation of public amenities and education is clearly of a world-class nature. For this to come to the Presidio is a contribution beyond anything we could have imagined when we initiated the Trust and negotiated with Congress to save this national park and respond for the public benefit.

I urge you as the process is completed to accept and approve the whole of the CAMP project and program. I would ask you also to consider two other points as you approach the final decisions. This plan now meets the legal requirements and Trust goals. But is it appropriate to the public experience of this national park? If there is too much urban accommodation and design, the very experience the public seeks could be severely diminished. It's a question of balance. In that context of balance I suggest that the lodge and the expansion of the theater be deleted from this plan. That would allow reducing new construction by 100,000 square feet and allow more open-space design elements for those sites. The Main Post will be enlivened, but I don't believe the Main Post needs a lodge or a larger theater. Neither of these are likely to be economically viable but they will generate urban density issues, and their amenities are available elsewhere within minutes from the Presidio.

Reduction of CAMP by the way should not be a consideration as the scope of the collection and the related public programs require the size and configuration now proposed.

The other issue to consider is traffic flow. Ten intersections will reach levels of service F. Fifty percent of the traffic coming through the Presidio and Lombard gates is through traffic. When Doyle Drive is complete with the direct Girard exit it will only be worse. I urge you to plan for this density issue. The layout of the roads needs to be changed so as to discourage substantially through

traffic. This is a density that won't be served by traffic calming and stoplights. Road closures and rerouting of traffic is the bold answer that will be needed. It is a known problem that needs to be solved now before the commuter politics make the changes impossible.

To return to my primary interest and that of the highest priority for the Trust now, the CAMP proposal as it is now planned is a gift to the public that comes within the promise and values of the Presidio, and I urge its approval for this great national park. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you, Toby. Amy?

Amy Meyer: Yes, Amy Meyer. I was a member of the Board under Toby's presidency. I want to begin with and I have been involved with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for 39 years. I run People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I have to comment first of all on the public process that has brought us here tonight. It's not a good public process. It's a hearing in the middle of Easter week and the night before Passover begins. And I have to tell you that not in 40 years of public policy work have I ever seen something like this.

[Applause]

The Trust's own Director of Planning is absent tonight. Several organizations and individuals asked that this hearing be postponed so the public would have the full information from the meeting on April 21st for the Section 106 process, for historical compliance, and the Section 213 process regarding the effects of the proposed construction on the National Historic Landmark District. Again, with this information not available, why is the Board holding this hearing now?

Today at a SPUR's noon meeting I heard the presentation that the architect just gave. I am very grateful for that because up until that point today I didn't know really what this would look like. I'm afraid that I am left with the impression of a giant glass house on the Main Parade with the Main Parade as its front lawn. It's the wrong location for a good project.

[Applause]

I do recommend that you go and see the Building 105 display on the Presidio that's open from 10:00 to 12:00 on Fridays and Saturdays. You will get some idea but nothing like what you saw today.

The major problem with the whole thing is that the Main Post Update project did not tie off the 2002 PTMP, Presidio Trust Management Plan. You have been presiding over a donor-driven disaster for nearly two years.

[Applause]

That is that the decision to urbanize the Main Post, and with this I fully agree with Toby Rosenblatt, was not brought forth before any consideration of CAMP, the lodge and the theater. A national park is a special place, and the heart of the Presidio is the heart of a National Historic Landmark District, the highest form of protection given in the national park system. And that is what you predominate and what is kept and added in particular to the center. The plan just gives too much central place to a contemporary art museum. On Crissy Field it would have been fine, you know, where the Sports Basement is.

The Park Service works with incremental additions, and that's what's been done to enliven the Main Parade. And I go along with what Dick Moe said as cited by Craig, "That's what the theater should have looked at. How can we lose a historic building?"

I want to tell you the Trust is always going to be dependent on public support. We had good public support from 2002 to 2007. And this support has deteriorated and it is a real crying shame.

[Applause]

Robert Infelise: My name is Bob Infelise. In addition to practicing law I'm a lecturer at the law school at UC Berkeley. Each spring I teach a course called The Workshop on Development and the Environment.

The class is intended to submerge the students in the intricacies of the real world. We select a particular development problem and proceed to learn everything we can about the issues, analyze the relevant law, study the non-legal issues and ultimately formulate reasoned opinions.

As part of that process, we bring in stakeholders to educate the class and articulate the full continuum of perspectives. This semester we focused on the future of the Presidio. The class heard from among others representatives of the Presidio Trust, a former member of the Board, the former planning director for the Trust, Mr. Fisher's counsel and architects and representatives of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

We also hosted members of community groups including the Presidio Historical Association and the Marina Community Association opposed to the plans for a contemporary museum in the Main Post area. The class was particularly honored to meet with supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier who could not have been more generous with her time.

The nine students in the workshop are among the best UC Berkeley Law School has to offer. They will be submitting written comments to the Draft Supplemental EIS in the coming weeks. For now these future lawyers will provide a mere summary of portions of those written comments. None of these students grew up in San Francisco and none currently live in the City. But what the students

lack in personal connection they compensate with intelligence, a depth of analysis and most important cold, hard objectivity. On behalf of the entire class we thank you for the opportunity to address the Board about the Draft EIS.

David Grubb: Thank you. The next speaker would be April Elliott, and then she would be followed by Rob Moreno and then Jennifer Murakami.

April Elliott: Good evening, my name is April Elliott. I'm a student at Berkeley Law. The Trust has taken substantial and meaningful steps to address key concerns about the proposed Main Post Update. In particular, the revised plan makes critical improvements to the CAMP design in size and appearance as well as parking availability and a lodge. These changes address both general concerns as well as historic preservation concerns. In fact, while as a class we have concerns with the process and the selection of the Main Post as a location for CAMP, we support this design if CAMP is to be located in the Main Post.

Whereas the initial design was very prominent at the head of the post, the new design is much more subdued. The reduction from 88,000 square feet of new, above-ground construction to 40,000 square feet of new above-ground construction reflects a concerted effort to reduce the visual impact of CAMP. The reduction in the height of the building to less than 30 feet instead of 50 feet as originally planned is also very important. The new design sits below the height of the Montgomery Street Barracks so that if

standing east of the gallery and looking west the roofline of the barracks is visible as well as the bridge.

The green roof is noteworthy as is the reduction in blank wall space in favor of windows and terraces. The overall effect of the new design is to melt into the landscape.

In contrast to the current state of the Main Post which is dominated by an unsightly parking lot and a not particularly visually-appealing building at the head of the post, this design will green the parade grounds and add a low-profile, open and well-integrated building. The overall impact is an improvement not only over the previous design but also over the status quo. Furthermore, the design appears to be a much better fit for the Secretary of Interior's historic preservation design standards. The building is clearly of its time and distinct from the barracks and other buildings at the post yet it's also complimentary and unlike the previous design allows historic buildings in the post and the art collection to be the draw instead of calling attention to the building itself.

So these changes are important not just for aesthetic purposes but also to meet the requirements set forth in the National Historic Preservation Act. Improvements have been made to the lodge as well, decreasing the size and adding spaces between buildings to make a more permeable barrier between the parade grounds. The increase in parking capacity is another key component that addresses very real concerns of the community. The plans would

create a better parking situation than the previous design while being less intrusive and wasteful than the current parking situation.

In sum, we recognize and appreciate the meaningful changes the Trust has made in the new plan and the Trust's efforts to better conform the design to the needs and interests of the public as well as the historic preservation standards. The new design clearly embodies a move in the right direction.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. Rob Moreno?

Rob Moreno: Good evening. My name is Rob Moreno. I'm a second-year law student at Berkeley. My colleague, Jen Murakami, and I are addressing the legality of new construction in the Main Post. This will likely be a major issue in any litigation. In our written comments we're going to address these issues in further detail, but today we'd like to highlight the legal issues of new construction.

Applicable statutes prohibit new construction in the Presidio. If the Trust wants to build a new building, an existing building must first be demolished and a replacement of similar size can then be built. This means similar square footage and height. The statutes seem to only allow a one-for-one building swap. Accordingly the National Park Service said that a number of smaller buildings cannot be demolished to accumulate credit for one large building.

Notwithstanding, the Presidio Trust argues that they are allowed to bank square footage meaning they can demolish multiple buildings in the Presidio and add their square footage together.

The District Court for the Northern District of California in a case called Sierra Club versus John O. Marsh said the statute is not ambiguous and the banking theory is wrong. The court said it must be one building down in exchange for one building of similar size up. Square footage added from multiple demolished buildings is irrelevant. The court reasoned that Congress didn't say banking is allowed and therefore it's not allowed. Granted there are some minor factual differences between the current situation and the Marsh case, and therefore the precedential value of the Marsh case is unclear. However, under Section 104(h) of the Trust Act, that same court that decided the Marsh case would hear any litigation concerning the current Main Post Update. This could potentially result in the lodge, the theater and CAMP being disallowed.

Let's analyze these buildings under the one-up/one-down rule. For the lodge they're demolishing a 32,000-square-foot building and replacing it with an up to 80,000-square-foot building. The new building is almost three times the size of the demolished building, thus the lodge would have to be dramatically scaled down to comply with law. For the contemporary art museum two buildings are being demolished each around 11,000 square feet and replaced with two new buildings. One is 70,000 square feet and the other is 30,000 square feet. This is a real concern as the new buildings are

nowhere near a similar size to the demolished buildings. The Trust should be very concerned with finding a way to comply with the one-up/one-down rule.

Unless they dramatically scale down the size of the two CAMP buildings or construct a third and fourth building, CAMP likely violates the statutes. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Jennifer Murakami. And Jennifer will be followed by Shea Coulson and Louise Gibbons.

Jennifer Murakami: Good evening. My name is Jennifer Murakami, and I'm a second-year student at Berkeley Law. To add to what my colleague, Rob, said, we note that concerns related to Section 104(c)(3) of the Presidio Trust Act aren't new. Similar questions, namely whether the statute requires new construction within the footprint of demolished buildings and whether square footage can be banked from the demolition of smaller buildings to allow for larger structures, were sounded a decade ago with regard to the Letterman Complex. Since last year, several commentators have resurrected these concerns. Yet instead of substantially addressing these recurring issues, the Trust continues to provide insufficient justifications to the most recent planning documents.

First, in the Main Post Update, the Trust justifies banking square footage to build large structures such as CAMP and the lodge by noting that the practice was “inherent” in the planning of the Letterman Complex and the Public Health Service Hospital. However, just because the Trust has done something in the past does not necessarily follow that the action was legal.

Next, in the recent Supplement to the Draft SEIS, the Trust refers readers to its old June 2008 Main Post Update SEIS in which it briefly discusses its compliance with the Presidio Trust Act. There the Trust conclusorily states that the Trust Act’s legislative history as well as past U.S. Army and National Park Service practices support the banking of square footage for new construction outside of the footprint of demolished building.

The Trust does not elaborate on these claims. In fact, the reference to past army practices under the analogous GGNRA legislation is misleading for it disregards the contrary findings from *Sierra Club v. John O. Marsh* already referenced by my colleague.

In July 2008, the Trust received several letters referring to this case and was also told about it at public hearings and therefore should have addressed it more thoroughly in these recent documents.

The Trust should attempt to resolve once and for all the meaning of Section 104(c)(3). While some critics insist upon a rigid one-up/one-down rule, we also understand that compelling reasons may

exist for the Trust's broader, more flexible interpretation. Whatever the case, it would be constructive for the Trust to find support for its position from a neutral authority. An example might be pursuing declaratory judgment from a court. The Trust could even go further and push for a legislative amendment that clarifies the statute.

While it's true that the Trust retains by discretion in its management of the Presidio, glossing over this central issue does little to quell the genuine and persistent concerns of its critics. This is problematic for several reasons. First, the renovation of the Main Post is likely not the last project that will require demolition of old buildings and new construction. Second, the language of the Presidio Trust Act might be used as a model for future parks. And lastly, acrimonious litigation of this issue may overshadow the noteworthy strides that the Trust has already made in developing a great national park. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. Shea Coulson?

Shea Coulson: My name is Shea Coulson, and I'm a third-year Berkeley law student. I'm going to address the contentious question of whether the Main Post is an appropriate site for the development of a modern art museum.

Given the clashing values and perspectives here, it seems likely that litigation will happen as my colleagues have pointed out. I would like to align some of the most important competing conceptions about the development of a modern art museum in the Presidio. I do this with a hope that better dialogue between these competing groups and perspectives can arise if each group understands the perspectives of others more rationally both for this issue and in future projects.

Here are some of the most important competing conceptions - firstly the Presidio Historical Association. This group sees history as a discreet period of time that must be preserved and not developed or progressed. For them the purpose of the Main Post is to preserve this particular conception of history. Accordingly, the Presidio Historic Association has told us that they will sue if the museum goes into the Main Post. Secondly, the Marina Neighborhood Association. This association has two main concepts underlying how they view the Presidio. Firstly, the Presidio is a natural and beautiful low-development landscape. Secondly, that the Presidio space should be considered mostly insofar as it impacts the private residents. Accordingly, these basic concepts coupled with traffic concerns mean that this group or other Marina residents will likely sue if the art museum goes into Crissy Field. Needless to say that both the Main Post site and the Crissy Field site are prime for litigation making a solution difficult.

And we heard tonight from Don Fisher's architects, and they're basically viewing the Presidio as a site of living history. They believe history becomes relevant through its interpretation through time. They have tried to create a design that would facilitate the Main Post as a contemporaneously-used space that would juxtapose current life with the history of the site and the process of its development over time.

It may seem as though this view is incompatible with the Presidio Historical Association's view, but this is not necessarily true. Both groups are interested in preserving the history of the site and making that history relevant to contemporary society. This is their common ground despite what they seem to think. Perhaps if these two groups talked to each other a better dialogue would ensue.

And lastly I'd just like to address the donor himself, Don Fisher. I think one basic to keep in mind here is that this collection is a gift to the City. There is a possibility that this museum may be taken elsewhere either outside the Presidio or even outside of San Francisco. And I just would like to ask that each stakeholder should carefully consider the ramifications of such a move and ask not only whether this is in the best interests of their particular group but whether it's in the best interest of any larger groups they belong to such as being residents of San Francisco or the Bay Area. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Louise Gibbons and then she will be followed by Stefanie Gitler and Heather Haney.

Louise Gibbons: My name is Louise Gibbons from Berkeley Law. While I am ultimately in favor of CAMP, I would like to comment on the overall process of the project proposal and how I think much of the current animosity toward it could have been avoided. Specifically, I believe the release of the original proposal caused stakeholders to become defensive and dig in their heels in opposition to CAMP.

Our class was given a number of explanations as to why such an aggressive proposal was originally put forth. Supervisor Alioto-Pier suggested that the Trust didn't anticipate the negative feedback and thought the public would enthusiastically receive Fisher's gift. It is unrealistic to assume that there wouldn't be some pushback from the community especially given the controversies surrounding past Presidio development projects. In fact, the Trust mentioned to us that it anticipated some criticism of the proposal but allowed the Fishers to release it to the public regardless. A last explanation given to us was that the Trust was overconfident being on federal land and knowing that Fisher wanted to avoid City politics but wanted the collection to remain in San Francisco.

Moving forward, I strongly encourage the Trust to engage in more informal collaboration with key interest groups before presenting projects to the general public. For example, the Trust could have

met with neighborhood representatives to solicit feedback on the proposal before its release. In addition, the Trust could have consulted with historic groups to make sure the proposal met various historical legal requirements. This would have divided the historical community into groups exclusively concerned with the adherence to historical preservation requirements which are now believed to be met by the revised proposal compared to groups who simply took issue with the concept of having a modern art museum at the location.

In fairness, it is important to note that the Trust has been incredibly receptive to the public comments and has made drastic changes to the original proposal. In fact, many of the interest groups are now to blame for their unwillingness to compromise. However, had the Trust presented the current more reasonable proposal as a starting platform, I think the public discourse could have been much more constructive.

In general, I believe that the Trust needs to provide greater clarity and transparency in sharing information. For example, our class submitted a FOIA request to the Trust that it waited to reject preventing our class from appealing in time to review the documents before the close of the public comment period. Although there may have been some valid errors in the request, our class believes that a number of the document categories were properly specified.

That being said, I truly believe that the Trust has the best intentions of the Presidio in mind and has done a wonderful job so far with the development of the park. The Trust and the community need to build a greater rapport and work constructively together to graciously accept this generous gift from Don Fisher. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Stephanie Gitler?

Stephanie Gitler: Yes. My name is Stephanie Gitler, and I'm a third-year at Berkeley Law. I would first like to start by noting that I think the current design for the museum is a vast improvement over the old design and I do think it would work very well in its proposed location. I'm generally in support of CAMP.

That being said, after reading through both the 2008 and more recent 2009 versions of the SEIS and listening to various constituents discuss their views on the proposal I do not think that enough consideration was given to the location at the commissary on Crissy Field.

The 2009 SEIS notes that while most commentators to the 2008 SEIS were against the development of CAMP on the Main Post, many were open to it being located elsewhere in the Presidio as had the public commenting sessions indicated in the planning process. Though the commissary was included as part of Alternative 1 in the

SEIS, it was only considered from a rehabilitation point of view. Imagine though a modern building at that location in the same footprint at the commissary so as to avoid one-up/one-down issues. The building could be the next modern architectural marvel, the next Sydney Opera House of the San Francisco Bay.

In an effort to support the Main Post location, the EIS places an emphasis on the fact that having CAMP at the Main Post would attract people to other buildings in that area. However, the commissary site is not too far away as to distract people from exploring the Main Post area on a single trip, particularly once the green is extended over Doyle Drive.

Though theoretically it may take longer to build the museum at the commissary location due to the construction, the litigation that is bound to occur when the museum is sited at the Main Post may serve to equalize the length of time it takes to build at these two locations.

In some ways the process indicates that the Trust had really sold itself on the idea of having the Main Post be the cultural center as shown in documents dating back to 2002 and because of this sort of expected everyone to buy into the idea of having a modern art museum at the heart of this cultural area. But really that led people in San Francisco to feeling as though the decision to put the museum there had already been made without their input and without a consideration of other options.

Some of the people we have spoken to in the past few months have indicated that Mr. Fisher has made his gift contingent on the location effectively removing the option of putting it anywhere but the Main Post in the Presidio. If that is true then the Trust should be transparent about that fact and not lead people to think that there is actual potential to have it elsewhere. The fact that we have spoken to a number of people involved in this project and no one seems to have any real idea about the potential to have a museum at the commissary sort of speaks to this lack of transparency. Of course, the commissary location would appease those who don't believe that a museum fits in with the theme of the Main Parade, it would certainly put more pressure on those living in the nearby neighborhoods with increased traffic. However, it would also mean increased businesses to their restaurants and retail stores so balance could be achieved.

Politics almost certainly comes into play when trying to figure out the location of a museum set to attract thousands of visitors each year, but all we ask for is transparency in the factors that you are using to make your final decision in the location of this building. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Heather Haney, and then Jamey Volker, and then Sumit Mallick.

Heather Haney: My name is Heather Haney. Before coming to Berkeley Law I spent four years as an environmental consultant in San Diego where I wrote and analyzed technical environmental documents for both private and governmental clients.

I'm speaking today on the general issues of the recently released supplement to the EIS. The first is a general scoping issue. The Trust has narrowed their purpose and needs section and have unduly constrained the range of alternatives so that their current Preferred Alternative is the only logical conclusion. Some of my fellow students have discussed this issue in more detail during their statements, but I believe a more thorough analysis of non-main point locations for both the museum and the lodge is still required.

The second issue is the general difficulties in comparing this revised proposal alternative to the previous Draft Supplement. Because of mislabeled and unlabeled building references and virtual omission of all other alternatives, it is extremely difficult to evaluate the analysis between the original EIS alternatives and this current document. Assuming that the general public and the agencies will be able to refer consistently between these two documents without any cross-references is impractical.

My final concerns are descriptions of the proposed project. Table 2 lists all of the alternatives and makes references to buildings that are either on Figure 1, Figure 13 or on neither. All of the buildings need to be specifically referenced by which figure they can be

found on. In addition, the existing buildings that will be removed should be shown at least as faded outlines on all related figures for consistency.

The project description on page six begins by explicitly describing which buildings will be devoted to each specific use ostensibly calling out all of the building numbers. However, it glosses over 82,000 square feet of food and retail services calling these buildings additional community services. There are no references to exact buildings. As such, this appears to be a disingenuous attempt to conceal or at least obscure the true nature of these buildings.

[Applause]

The uses of Buildings 222 through 229 must be thoroughly described and analyzed for their need. Multiple buildings on Figure 1 are shaded as particular uses yet they are never discussed in project descriptions or in Figure 2. Building 51, which is not Pershing Hall, appears to shift from residential to lodging. Building 45 is near the Archeology Lab and is shaded for cultural and education. And Buildings 95 and 97 are shaded retail. None of these four buildings are ever discussed in the text except Building 97 which is stated to be used as visitor serving or program use. Are these buildings included in your square footage calculations? Are they analyzed against the previous alternatives in your Draft EIS?

Finally, there are no building-specific demolition numbers, only an aggregate of the total demolition effectively eliminating any analysis of the one-up/one-down rule. This document is a final supplement, and the level of vague references, discrepancies and questions that arise are troubling. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. Jamey Volker?

Jamey Volker: Good evening. My name is Jamey Volker, and I'm a third-year city planning and law student at UC Berkeley. I generally support the proposed Main Post developments, but I'm here tonight to share three constructive criticisms of the EIS transportation analysis.

My first criticism is the description of the baseline environment is inadequate which vitiates the remainder of the analysis. Most prominently, the EIS does not discuss anywhere the planned Muni service cutbacks or how the Trust will deal with them. The SF Municipal Transportation Agency is planning to eliminate service on the 29 Sunset Line north of Baker Beach and service on the 41 Union between Lyon and Steiner. This will be a significant reduction in transit service. For example, without the 41 there will be only one Muni line running from BART to the Presidio border.

A second point about the baseline description is that it would be very useful to have traffic numbers at the relevant intersections

from when the army was still using the Presidio. A discussion of the traffic problems experienced during that period and the measures useful are used to reduce those impacts would also be beneficial.

My second criticism is that there is an inadequate description of most of the mitigation measures listed in the EIS which makes it extremely difficult to adequately assess the project alternatives and impacts. For one, what would providing “express bus service to regional transit connections” entail? Some specifics would definitely be nice. The EIS also states that the parking management measures under the Preferred Alternative “would be more intensive than those previously considered in the final PTMP EIS.” What does this mean? Another example is Mitigation Measure TR19 which states that, “If TDM goals are not being reached, the Trust would implement more aggressive strategies or intensify components of the existing program.” That’s great in theory, but I’d like to see some specifics.

Lastly, there is too much referencing to outside documents for specific data and mitigation measures. This makes it extremely difficult to review the EIS and the rationality of its conclusions.

My final suggestion is that additional mitigation measures should be provided. For instance, the Trust should commission more buses for use as shuttles for visitors. Currently the PresidiGo Downtown Shuttle is only available for use by visitors during very limited

hours unless you have a Muni passport. The Trust should at least make shuttles available for use by student and other groups to connect them with other regional transportation such as BART.

Relatedly, the Trust should improve transit service to meet increased nighttime travel associated with lodge use and attendance to performances at the theater, Anza Esplanade and elsewhere. Currently, there is no transit service to the Main Post for visitors past 7:30 p.m.

The final point is that the Trust needs to work with Muni to provide easy-to-understand route and transfer information at the Main Post Transit Center and elsewhere in the Presidio. I've personally found the info there to be lacking or difficult to understand. Transferring is one of the largest deterrents to transit use, and the Trust should work on transferring as easy as possible. Thank you for your time.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Sumit Mallick.

Sumit Mallick: My name is Sumit Mallick, and I'm a second-year law student at Berkeley. On behalf of all my colleagues I'd like to thank the Trust for this opportunity to address you with some of our concerns.

An aspect that seems lost on many neighbors and opponents of the CAMP museum is the tremendous gift that Mr. Fisher is providing

to the City. Mr. Fisher's collection has been recognized as one of the top [unintelligible] collections in the world. A gift of this caliber of arts to the public one would hope would transcend the not-in-my-backyard mentality of opponents. But their vision has been clouded by personal motivations and a disturbing reaction to the benefactor of this gift, Mr. Don Fisher. This present seems evident as opponents point to a modern art museum not fitting to the historic purpose of the Main Post yet are not concerned with how a Walt Disney museum fits in that purpose.

It seems noteworthy to mention that Mr. Fisher has donated millions of his personal fortune to improve lives of many in the City, particularly its children. And while his politics and persona may not be aligned with many of his opponents, it is vastly unfair to use that prejudice to predetermine the merits or his motivations for this gift.

Personal motivations of opponents have also led to myopic vision of what a national park should be. The current condition of the Main Post is a parking lot enjoyed only by surrounding neighbors may be ideal for local residents, but the Presidio's mission as a national park is to maintain a resource for all the nation's citizens, not just those wealthy enough to afford adjoining property.

[Applause]

The proposal makes great strides in revitalizing the Presidio through the greening of the parking lot and [unintelligible] of the barracks. Beyond the physical upgrade is a creation of art [unintelligible] and exposure to an art collection of this ilk is a benefit that cannot be measured. It is also worth knowing that the ancillary benefits this project will create in terms of jobs through construction staffing the museum as well as the influx of tourist dollars.

The opponents of this museum are not alone in having lost perspective of the purpose of the Presidio. This Trust needs to remember that in its duty to preserve the park for our nation's citizens it cannot ignore the citizens who are most affected by this proposal. The disregard for neighbors' concerns, lack of inclusion of community shareholders and secrecy with which this plan has been revealed and developed can only be accurately described as poor governance. Whatever legal authority the Trust may think it possesses to act in a bubble, it must realize that it is beholden to its citizens, particularly the ones whose lives will be directly affected by your proposal.

It is in that duty owes the public a frank and open discussion about the details about the proposal and all facets of inception and operation. It is clear from my objective point of view that if both sides on the table do not begin to put aside hard feelings and personal motivations and consider the best interests of the City this tremendous gift will be lost.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. Dan Beyer followed by Mike Strong and then Charles Dilworth.

Dan Beyer: Good evening. My name is Dan Beyer. I think what is shown here tonight would be a wonderful mixture of old and new working together to compliment one of the finest pieces of property in the United States and that's the Presidio. I think we've seen this in other places, other countries. It's happened in France around the older parts of France with the new Pompidou Center coming in, places like this. We've seen it happen here in our own City in Golden Gate Park with the new de Young Museum and the Academy of Science and how it compliments Golden Gate Park and how they're working together to make that one of the most beautiful places you can go to, enjoy the outdoors and enjoy world-class art and one of the world's finest science museums for us to take our children, our grandchildren, our friends to enjoy.

[Applause]

An opportunity to bring a world-class art collection like this to the City to compliment what's here already is unprecedented. Cities around the world would die to be able to have this. For us to have this opportunity by one of our citizens to give it to us is just fantastic. How many times do you have the good fortune to have a benefactor of this magnitude walk in and give the City, the area, the

place where he grew up and worked and loved to the City and the people of the area to enjoy and to have for the rest of their lives? The new design I think compliments the traditional design of the Presidio. As the architects showed, it works in. Is it modern? Is it new? Yes. But it does compliment what is there.

My wife is a professional in the health industry, and in her private time she's an artist and a musician. For her to have the ability to go see a place like this to enjoy it, to have it there at any time is just a great thing, and I really hope to see this happen. Retaining our heritage as well as accepting change is necessary and is a must if a community is to survive and flourish. I thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. Mike Strong?

Mike Strong: Hi. I'm Mike Strong. I thank you for holding this forum and thanks to everybody. People are here because they care a lot about the Presidio. They want to see the right thing done. Not everybody sees that the same way, but I think it's important for everybody to make the effort to come here and to just share their ideas, and hopefully from that comes what is truly best for the Presidio.

One comment from me about just a personal connection - I think that the place itself is nothing without the people who are here to enjoy and share the space. Myself, my grandfather was an active

military in World War II stationed at the Presidio, my mom born there. Many years later I come here to raise my own family. I've enjoyed the Presidio from the playground at Julius Kahn to runs on Crissy Field to bike rides through the hills of Presidio. And one thing that always struck me in the time that we spent here was that it was like there were echoes of the history of the previous use of the Presidio at the Main Parade but a lack of vitality to me or just a missed opportunity for more people to establish personal connections like my relatives did and like I want to see in the future for others. To me, taking the surface parking lot and greening it, introducing a cultural institution with an educational focus as is proposed here I think is a tremendous opportunity for a new chapter for the Presidio to take to build on the history and to really engage not just the local community but the world at large. This is an opportunity for this place to become truly a world-renowned location within San Francisco. And I think it's one that should be respected. The gift that's been offered by Don Fisher, his personal connection both with a love for art and the City of San Francisco I think is a treasure and one that we should be doing everything we can to try to accommodate, respecting the Presidio, respecting its own history but finding work with everybody's input here to make that happen and so we can all benefit from it. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Charles Dilworth followed by Mike Neumann and David Marks.

Charles Dilworth: Good evening. My name is Charles Dilworth, FAIA, and I am not a UC Berkeley law student.

[Applause]

Charles Dilworth: My wife was though. I've been a resident of and a practicing architect in San Francisco for over 25 years, and I'm here today to speak in strong support for the revised design for the Contemporary Arts Museum at the Presidio. I believe that the new design created by the San Francisco firm, WRNS Studio, is honorable, intelligent and appropriate, all of those things because it respects the special dignity of the Presidio and its history. This new design for CAMP makes a persuasive case for balance where the Fisher collection can be retained for the public and where the Presidio can be enriched through a coherent architectural dialogue, one that speaks directly to the beauty of the Presidio, the Bay and to northern California's incomparable landscape. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Mike Neumann, David Marks followed by Laura Rodormer.

Mike Neumann: Good evening, directors. My name is Mike Neumann, and there's absolutely nothing I could say that could top the fellow who preceded me so I won't attempt to. But I will say that San Franciscans have an uncanny history of not appreciating the new. So what we have here is a case of the shock of the new, and I

happen to feel that this museum will do everything that everybody that's preceded me will do. It will bring vitality. I think that our local architect, WRNS, and I thank you for going with somebody local, that's a very nice and refreshing thought, have really captured . . .

[Applause]

. . . the moment and have given this a wonderful pallet and a template to showcase this work which I'm not sure of all of it what it is, but a nice [unintelligible] is a nice [unintelligible]. So with that simplicity I will say I am a 35-year resident of San Francisco, and I think this is a fantastic idea so please approve it.

[Applause]

David Grubb: David Marks.

David Marks: Hello. I'm David Marks. I am a native of the San Francisco Bay Area. The CAMP project is an incredible gift to the residents and to visitors of the Bay Area not to mention the Presidio itself. I cannot think of a more perfect location allowing the public to experience the cultural richness of contemporary art in a setting as beautiful as the Presidio. It is a museum that I look forward to experiencing with my family.

Architecturally, the CAMP project itself is magnificent yet sensitive and blends beautifully into the surroundings. The project makes economic sense for the future Presidio and for the neighboring residents. I urge you to approve the proposed CAMP project. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Laura Ro - you'll pronounce it perfectly I'm sure.

Laura Rodormer: Thank you, yes. Laura Rodormer. Thank you for the opportunity. And I've been a neighbor of the Presidio for the past decade and really enjoyed the environmental, historic and social aspects of the Presidio and thoroughly recognize that the national parks and the Presidio in particular do need to change with the times and really accommodate for the future. And so I really enjoyed the opportunity to learn today about the new design for the CAMP program. And I truly support it and think that it's wonderful opportunity. And I'm really encouraged by the sustainability that's being incorporated into the design as well as the whole portfolio of the Presidio. And I hope that with this particular project and many of the others that you'll pursue in the future that you'll really encourage all of your consultants to look at all of the opportunities to maximize sustainability and in doing so look at all of the synergies that can take place within one project as well as the synergies among other projects.

And since this project is going to be such a high-level green facility, I really hope that you take the opportunity to use it as a template for what parks are, and that's a learning opportunity for the people of the community. And this building has the opportunity to also serve as a learning tool for the community as it's designed, as it's built and as it's operated. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Alex Serriere, Tim Sullivan and Brian Kellmann.

Alex Serriere: I'll keep this short and sweet, but as a native of San Francisco who took his first steps in Cow Hollow and a current resident of the Bay Area, I have to say that I strongly support the contemporary art museum and think it would be a great addition to the Presidio. It would be an excellent destination for both locals and national residents to come to San Francisco and participate in what I think is a wonderful area, and obviously I've stayed here so I think it's great. Thank you.

[Applause]

Tim Sullivan: Good evening. My name is Tim Sullivan. It's been great to learn more about the Main Post project tonight. As I was listening to the presentation it occurred to me that this is one step in a continuing series of steps of the significant renovations that still are going on at

the Presidio that will continue to go on at the Presidio and that our generation, our children, future generations will enjoy.

At the same time, and one of the things that's unique about the way the Presidio's set up is that this park needs to be self-sustaining financially in the near future. Then this Board I believe has the obligation to pursue opportunities like that which Mr. Fisher has presented, to be able to fill both the goal of providing a park that the whole nation can enjoy and at the same time doing it in a financially-responsible manner. And I see the effort tonight is being consistent with both of those goals.

The second thing, and I think Bryan and Craig both alluded to this, the Main Post has historically been a destination site going as far back as the founding of the Presidio. Today it just isn't. It's a big parking lot. And I've been there with relatives and my kids and it's really not that interesting. CAMP really provides an opportunity to make this a dynamic destination again, and to me it's very exciting. Historic or not, if there's no reason for people to visit this site then it's really not an effective use of the public land and the public trust. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Brian Kellmann then Teresa Abrahamsohn I guess it is and then Eric Cronwall.

Brian Kellmann: Hi, I'm Brian Kellmann, and I just want to say that I fully support the CAMP project and I think it would be a great addition to the Presidio and to the City of San Francisco. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you.

Teresa Abrahamsohn: I'm Teresa Abrahamsohn. Thank you for pronouncing my name correctly. It's a tough one. I'm a native of San Francisco, went away to college but came back because I love the Bay Area, the people, the environment. And I think this CAMP project is a great addition to the Presidio. I'm a very big nature lover. I love national parks. I've been to a lot of them. And I think that being that San Francisco is a very different, diverse city that this CAMP museum really brings that to the Presidio and I think it adds to the historical value of it. It's bringing people in who are going to learn about the Presidio who may never have thought about going there. And also those people who come to the Presidio because it is a national park have the opportunity to be exposed to modern art which they may never have thought of before. So I think the redesign is a great addition. It really flows into the Presidio, the layout, and I support the project. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Eric Corn . . .

Eric Cronwall: That's Eric Cronwall. I have been a resident of the Bay Area since 2001 and have chosen the area to raise my two sons. And one of the things that we love to do at least once a month is to go visit one of the museums in the Bay Area. We're members at California Academy of Sciences because we're so impressed with that facility. We've been to the Monterey Bay Aquarium down in the Monterey Peninsula area, the Tech Museum, the SF MOMA. I am very impressed with the quality of museums in the area and believe that supporting a project like the Contemporary Art Museum for the Presidio is very important and will be another touchstone in the memories of my children and the children throughout the Bay Area and people who come and visit this area. It is paramount that we come up with some sort of anchor for the Presidio and for the whole project, and I believe that the CAMP museum is going to be the anchor for the project. Thank you for your time.

David Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Ronald Chase, Manuel Flores and Richard Covert.

Ronald Chase: Hi, I'm Ronald Chase. I run the San Francisco Art and Film Program for teenagers and I've been the arts critic for KLW for I guess the last 35 years.

I come as a citizen that really actually wants to be - I'm very proud of our city and I'm really conscious about its destination as an art center in the north. I think people always talk about the first-rate art collection that's being offered in the Presidio, but they really don't put their finger on why it's so important in this area. One of the reasons is that people say, "Oh, it's a collection in depth." But what that really means is there are some very first-rate artists that the Fishers have collected over the years and they give us a kind of substance about their development and growth that just doesn't exist in the other museums here. Like the SF Museum is growing enormously, but it maybe has one Agnes Martin; the Fishers have a roomful. And I think what that does as an impact for young people, for people that want to study art, is enormous.

I started on the other side of the fence. I saw the photograph of the museum - big, modern box down in the Presidio. Are they crazy? Why do they want to put it there? But I went and really studied. I listened to the architect. I studied the model. I saw how it was growing and trying to adapt to all of the criticism that was being given. I basically went through the processes of their addressing the traffic. They're addressing all of the criticisms that came and then of course you have this wonderful greening of this terrible parking lot that as long as it's there the Presidio does not have any visual integrity whatsoever. It doesn't even have any historic integrity.

[Applause]

It is just an eye sore that people drive through and they go, “Why is that there? I thought this was supposed to be a national park that everybody loved, came to and participated in.” I think this museum will give it that kind of feeling that all San Franciscans can really love and can be very proud of. It will bring substance to the historical part that arguably is very beautiful and has certain kinds of moments, that this can actually make it a dynamic presence in San Francisco. So I really beg you not to reject it because I think you will be impoverishing us all. Thank you.

[Applause]

Manuel Flores: Good evening, fellow Board members, members of the audience. My name is Manuel Flores. I’m a 28-year proud member of the Carpenters Union, Local 22 in San Francisco. And believe me I’ve got the knees and the feet to prove it. Right now it is no secret that jobs right now are far and few between and they’re hard to come by and they’re a struggle, and they’re a struggle to get and they’re a struggle to get approved. And our office strongly supports this project. We see it as a tremendous opportunity, and we think it’s a beautiful project, especially what Mr. Fisher is doing. And right now at this time I’d like to read a letter from one of my constituents who’s not able to be here tonight. He’s at a seminar. And I’d like to at this moment read the letter from our corporate office in Oakland.

“Dear Presidio Trust, I am writing to encourage you to support the Contemporary Art Museum at the Presidio and its new redesign. This project will serve as a local economic stimulus package on top of the cultural and educational benefits. I write to you both as a Bay Area resident and director of governmental relations for the Northern California Carpenters Regional Council, a union that represents close to 40,000 workers in Northern California. CAMP will provide hundreds of jobs for many of those Bay Area families and in these hard economic times we cannot afford to pass up opportunities that offer employment and living wages. Throughout this process I have been impressed by the CAMP’s team commitment to an open process, and I believe that the final design will be a great fit for the future of the Main Post and San Francisco as a whole.” Signed, Mr. Paul Cohen, Director of Public and Governmental Relations.

And with that, I want to thank you for the time and opportunity you’ve given me to come here and speak, and we look for you support and encouragement and support of the project. Thank you.

David Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: After Mr. Covert we’re going to take our break. And I’m going to read five names, the next five after that just so you know them. They are Lori Brooke, Don Green, Shirley Hansen, Jane Morrison

and Richard Hansen, so they're the next five after Mr. Covert, after the break.

Richard Covert: Yes, my name is Richard Covert. I've been hiking and biking in the Presidio for 40 years, and I look forward to the time hopefully when I can get on my bike and ride over and view the Fisher Art Collection in the Presidio.

[Applause]

Some of the opponents of the museum say it's an inappropriate land use. Well, right now in the Presidio we have the Lucas office building. We have a sports goods store. We have several bar restaurants, I think at least four. We have a golf course and a bowling alley. And if golf courses, bowling alleys and bar/restaurants have enough redeeming educational, cultural and recreational value to be able to stay in the Presidio, for the life of me I don't understand what is defective and deficient about the proposed Fisher art museum.

If the Main Post is an appropriate venue for a museum devoted to the history of Mickey Mouse, Goofy and Donald Duck, why is it inappropriate for a museum of modern art? I love Mickey Mouse. I love Donald Duck. I read those comics when I was a kid. Now I'm a much older man and I appreciate modern art, and I think there's a place for both of them.

There's a fear expressed by many of the opponents that the Fisher Museum will somehow overwhelm the Presidio, Cow Hollow and the Marina District with traffic, and it just isn't going to happen and there's a reason why. Museums don't have peak-hour traffic demand periods like office buildings or restaurants. The traffic in and out of the museums is spread across the entire day so the effect of the museum on the traffic will be virtually unnoticeable at any particular moment in time. Now the proof of this is actually the Legion of Honor out in Sea Cliff. At the most popular special showings you don't have traffic jams in Sea Cliff caused by the Legion of Honor.

I think you need signals and Lombard and Lyon and Lombard and Letterman right now. You need them whether or not any development takes place at the Main Post. And the reason why is this cutoff problem of people using the Presidio as a shortcut between the Richmond District and the Marina, but that has nothing to do with development at the Main Post.

In closing I just ask the members of the Board of Trustees most of the arguments that were being made against the Fisher Museum were made against the new de Young in Golden Gate Park. Thank God the naysayers did not prevail there. This is a wonderful opportunity for San Francisco. Thank you.

[Applause]

Male Voice: Okay. There's a good suggestion that's been made before we take our break. There is a total of 81 comments. We are now at number 25, so just so everybody gives everybody an idea. Again I will say what I said in the beginning. Whether you make a comment orally or you write them on a piece of paper and give them to our people at the exits, they all are treated exactly the same. So I just want to say that once again. If you can do that it would be great. Thank you.

David Grubb: Let me change that to 125. We just got some more.

Female Voice: Okay. We're ready. We're on.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible] One moment, please.

Male Voice: Did anybody ever figure that out [cross-talk]?

Male Voice: I don't know.

Male Voice: Well, even if you had one per 1,000 [cross-talk] -

David Grubb: Is this working? Yeah. Let's get started again if we can.

Male Voice: We used to even know how many people were at SFO.

Male Voice: I should know that.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible]

David Grubb: I read five names. Are they around right now? The first one is Lori Brooke. Lori, before you start, I just wanted to clarify something that I think might have been said. There was a reference in one of the comments to the fact that - or the thought that these were the final documents that we're talking about. They're not final documents. They're draft documents. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you. Lori?

Lori Brooke: There we go. All right. Good evening. My name is Lori Brooke, and I am the president of the Cow Hollow Association which represents over 1,800 residents. In preparing tonight's comments, I reviewed some of my past speeches. And, sadly, I could have just reread one of them.

The same fundamental issues that plague these plans in the past still exist today. Your environmental report confirms what the public has been saying all along. The traffic generated by the Preferred Alternative is so significant that you now must place at least ten new traffic lights in the Presidio and in the surrounding neighborhoods to mitigate these adverse effects. You are pushing a problem you knowingly created onto the tenants of the Presidio and the residents of San Francisco.

Craig, you mentioned earlier, at the beginning, that these lights weren't going to go in if you could reduce the demand. But it's you

guys that are creating the demand. So I don't know if we can rest assured that the demand will be brought down to a level that the lights won't be needed. These traffic and parking problems are not just future projections. They are real today. Just go down to West Crissy Field where the new climbing gym and La Petite Baleen Pool has opened, alongside San Francisco Gymnastics, to see what cumulative effects it can create. Most days there are no parking spots anywhere reasonably close. People parked along Mason Street have trouble backing out because of the constant flow of cars. There are still two more large buildings yet to be leased. What traffic will they generate? And where will their customers park?

This situation is even worse on a weekend where, throughout the park, it is becoming increasingly dangerous for pedestrians and bikers. You do not need to build more tourist attractions. People already come here, and the attraction is the park itself.

[Applause]

The situation I just described at West Crissy is small scale compared to what is projected for the Main Post. The Disney Museum has not yet opened. You should wait to see the impact of that museum before you add the cumulative effect of another large museum, hotel and theater in the Main Post.

Whether the Fisher Museum and hotel were completely buried underground or floating above the burden of over two million more

visitors per year to the park by cars, taxis and tour busses still exists. The Presidio is inadequately served by public transportation and will only get worse with Muni's planned budget cuts.

We ask that you revisit the results from the three workshops held last year, which included input from the public and the preservation agencies as to the appropriate need and purpose for the Main Post and suggested ways to achieve them. Starting there would result in alternatives that are in the best interest of the park, the public and future generations and not waste the time and resources of those individuals and organizations that submit bids for these projects.

We ask that you choose to avoid rather than mitigate the adverse effects to the Main Post and the neighborhoods predicted in your report. The reputation of the Trust has suffered through this process. It's time you take steps to show the public that you hear our concerns and will respond.

The first small step would be to extend the comment period another 45 days to allow for the public to digest the results of the Section 106 meeting being held less than a week from the comment deadline. We also ask for the 213 Report to be made public so that we can understand and incorporate the Advisory Council's position on these plans. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Don Green?

Donald Green: I'm Donald Green. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the Board of Supervisors - Presidio Neighborhood Working Group - that was appointed last July with a resolution introduced by Alioto-Pier and approved the Board. The Board made a resolution also - I guess, last month voted on nine to two to urge the Fishers to put their museum in the City.

The Mayor had a meeting with the Fishers last week asking the same thing. Mr. Fisher still has his eyes set on the Presidio. I'm also speaking as a former executive at the Office of Management and Budget at Stanford Research Institute. It's interesting. One of our colleagues pointed out that an SRI study not too long ago pointed out that ten percent of the adult population goes to museums. Five percent go to art museums. And two percent go to contemporary art museums.

The most important point to make, I think, is that the Presidio Trust in its current budget has \$100 million allocated for various improvements in the Montgomery Street Barracks and other areas that will provide about 80,000 square feet of public space in those historic buildings with programs relative to the history of the park that the public can enjoy. So your current estimated visitation will be 1.6 million. And you're going to add Fisher's 400,000, which is a 25-percent increase.

And, Craig, I'm a little surprised, since I studied SEIS carefully, which does talk about traffic and levels of service and the need for signals - and I spoke to the City today about that. And you just cavalierly said, "Don't worry. We won't put signals in." Let me say that one of the obligations of the Trust is to cooperate with the regional authority in which you operate as a federal agency. That's the City of San Francisco.

They have now told you that they prefer that - that museum in the City. Why? Because it's City policy as enunciated by the Planning Commission to put new attractions where it's transit-friendly. The northwest part of the City is not transit-friendly. It's being cut back. The MTA, the Municipal Transportation Agency . . . whatever they report to us, we forward it to you. It said they have no funds and no ability to introduce the transit you want to bring more people to the Presidio. Therefore, it will be car-dependent.

You need the MTA approval to determine whether you do or don't need traffic signals in the neighborhood communities. And it'll finally be approved by the Board of Supervisors. You need their approval. And I don't see how you can possibly introduce an extra 25 percent visitation and this museum that Mr. Fisher wants without the approval of the City or Board of Supervisors and MTA.

Lastly, the National Park Service, who you're also reporting to, has a policy of discouraging private vehicles and vehicles in national parks. This is a national park. You're deliberately putting a major

attraction in the middle of the park. The only way to get there is by vehicle. I came back from Monticello the other day where they have vehicles on the periphery. You guys are doing it exactly wrong.

You've spent a million dollars on an SEIS that never should have been written if you had asked the Park Service ahead of time. I urge you to vote this thing down in the next two months. Give us the time we need to reread the stuff, because you keep changing the rules on. And don't make us go through this again.

Four of you members will not be sitting there within two or three months when the President appoints new four members. And I think you're going to have egg on your face if you approve this even preliminarily, and the new Board comes in and says "no". We need civic - urban planning expertise. It's required by the law. We have resource conservation, extensive experience and skills required by the law for two members; we don't have it. So I hope you'll do your job better than you have done up to now.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. I would urge us to stick within the three minutes or we'll be here for a long time.

Shirley Hansen: I'll try. I'm Shirley Hansen. And some of the previous speakers have implied that Donald Fisher is donating his art collection. I

believe he maintains ownership. Donald is building a building, storage. He does not have to pay taxes for this storage because it's in a national park.

With climate change and global warming threatening the very survival of civilization, why is a huge art museum being proposed for the Presidio's historic Main Parade Grounds miles away from the center of San Francisco tourism? Such an endeavor would increase automobile traffic and grow our carbon footprint. It would be far more environmentally efficient to develop a museum venue for the Fisher family collection of contemporary art closer to the many hotels, restaurants and public transportation hubs in downtown San Francisco closer to other museums, such as MOMA and Asian Art.

A central location would also be far more convenient for school children. This museum is being proposed in the guise of revitalizing the Presidio. In fact, we do not need thousands of cars driving to and around the Presidio. San Francisco's problem is to demonstrate mature and meaningful response to the impending devastation of global climate change, not a lack of vitality in the heart of the Presidio. And if nothing is done to substantially improve public transit, we can't expect that gasoline is going to be cheap, as it is now, and that tourists - in future years tourists will be just coming to and fro like they can at the present time. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Jane Morrison?

Jane Morrison: That's me. I have a question, which I hope you can answer tonight. I have never read that Fisher is paid anything for the use of the land here. As I understand it, your chief challenge is to maintain this as a park with trees and views and recreation areas but that you have to - the way Congress comprised you have to raise enough money to pay the monthly cost of operating the park. So I want to know what is, is Mr. Fisher paying as a monthly contribution to that, because I haven't heard it mentioned. Can you tell me that?

Male Voice: Yeah. I'll answer that. We don't have a number. But there is no doubt that Mr. Fisher's proposal includes payment.

Jane Morrison: And we don't know any idea what that'll be?

[Unintelligible]

Jane Morrison: [Laughs] Well, I think we have to insist on that. The other problem is who is going to pay for the extra Muni that will be needed to get people here. The Muni is already cutting back because it's short of funds. So I think if there's going to be an attraction here that would attract people, as he would hope, then how is it going to be?

I'm also a past chair of the San Francisco Democratic Party. And last year we passed a resolution opposing this on the grounds that it

ought to be in the downtown area. We really appreciate the fact that Fisher is going to share this with us. We think it should be in the downtown area so that conventioners, school children, tourists, visitors, office workers will be able to see it and that it should not be out here where it's an extra trip on the Muni or a taxi or parking. Where are you going to get enough parking if it attracts anybody? There are a lot of questions. And I hope that you'll charge - consider that you're charging an adequate fee from anyone who takes that much space and adds that much to it.

But the Presidio is not really - it shouldn't have been - had this measure anyway, where you have to pay for itself. But other parts don't. And that was just a compromise with the Republican Party which wanted to sell the whole thing off as real estate. So remember that when you're trying to decide what to do. And thank you very much.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Richard Hansen?

Judy Wessing: I'm not Richard Hansen. Richard Hansen gave me a statement that he asked me to write. And it's not from Richard Hansen but Richard Emerson. So if I may proceed to put this in the record . . . My name is Judy Wessing.

“This letter is being read on my behalf since I am unable to attend the Board meeting in person. My name is Richard Emerson, and we live on the 3200 block of Pacific Avenue, just outside the Presidio Gate. I am unable to attend in person, as is true of many of my neighbors due to this meeting being scheduled on the holiday week when many schools have vacation, and families leave town.

I want to begin by noting that my wife and I are lovers of art, historic preservation, our Presidio Heights neighborhood, the Presidio park, and San Francisco itself. It is a real shame that all of these have come into conflict. First, I’d like to note that I am strongly opposed to the introduction of a new, contemporary structure to the historic parade ground of the Presidio park.

Reading the submissions by your partner entities, such as the National Park Service, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and California Historic, it is clear that all are strongly against the new structures and the demolition of existing structures. And the National Park Service goes so far as to say that the parade ground could lose its national historic landmark status as a result.

I do not understand why the Presidio Trust is pursuing this in light of such strong opposition. Further, I do not believe that in its current plans for the development, including CAMP and the hotel, the Presidio Trust is appreciating its impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. It is no small achievement for all 33 neighborhood associations to come out against this development.

The primary reason is due to increased traffic. The Presidio Trust's own projections, which we view to be optimistic, show key intersections into surrounding neighborhoods going from C quality to F quality. The mitigation strategy proposed of putting traffic lights throughout the Presidio park and through key neighborhood streets, such as all along Pacific Avenue and Arguello will irrevocably change the character of the neighborhoods.

For instance, the speeds will increase dramatically. Delays will occur to the residents as they have to wait at synchronized lights to cross Pacific, and computers will now use this quicker way as a means, for example, of commuting from Marin to UCSF Med Center. As lights turn red, people will turn into the secondary streets of the neighborhood further increasing traffic. I worry also about safety as children from Town and University School need to cross a busy road, like Pacific, to get to their playing fields and the park.”

I've only got half a page, and it's big print. “I also want to say that I know several of the Presidio Trust Board members personally and respect them tremendously. I know they are doing their best for what they believe. And the past work, such as Crissy Field, has been magnificent. I also have tremendous respect and admiration for Mr. Don Fisher and what he has done for the City. I admire that he wants to provide San Francisco and the broader community access to what I understand is a remarkable art collection. I am

excited to become a member of and visit his museum. I just am opposed to its proposed location.” I’ll submit the balance, unless you want me to finish the page.

David Grubb: No. Thank you. Please give it to us. Thank you. Laurie Armstrong? Daniel Ewald?

[Applause]

Laurie Armstrong: Good evening. My name is Laurie Armstrong. I’m the Vice President of Public Affairs with the San Francisco Convention and Visitors Bureau. The Convention and Visitors Bureau believes that the concepts presented in the Main Post Update provide an innovative way to tie the unique nature of the Presidio the visitor industry ecosystem. The Presidio Trust Management Plan speaks to the opportunity for diverse and meaningful visitor experiences in the park. The variety of facilities and attractions planned make it even more what we call “an only in San Francisco experience.” Where else can you explore history, art and nature bordered by the ocean, the Bay, the world’s most famous bridge, and one of America’s most exciting cities?

Keeping the incredible art collection that is proposed for the CAMP project in San Francisco is vitally important. San Francisco’s prominence as a center for the arts and culture is a significant draw for visitors. The new museum will provide another reason for visitors to stay longer and return sooner. Obviously, many

decisions need to be made about the location and design, and we'll leave those for others to make.

The one thing we know for sure is that this is an opportunity that San Francisco cannot pass up. The transit hub concept is also integral to the success of the Presidio as a visitor draw. Providing easy and economical transportation is not only the right thing to do from a green perspective. It will encourage our hotel guests, the majority of whom do not come by car, to explore what will be both the oldest and newest parts of the City.

The Presidio itself is an important component in the SFCVB's efforts to attract future visitors as it continues the transition from post to park. It provides one more unique tool to attract visitors from throughout the region, the country and around the world.
Thank you.

David Grubb: Thank you.

[Applause]

Daniel Ewald: Good evening. My name is Daniel Ewald, and I am a San Francisco resident. And I strongly support this new iteration of CAMP and support this location on the Main Post. This project is an enormous challenge. And the successful reuse of a former military base on such a stunning site requires balance and sensitivity to qualities of this building and its planning and body.

The design is simple yet sophisticated. The form is modest yet elegant. It's low scale. It's appropriate, sensitive and respectful to its site and to the historic structures surrounding it.

If the Presidio is going to fully realize its potential as a physical and cultural asset to the City, it needs to be an active and living and growing and developing space. And the Main Post has historically been this place. San Francisco has had a long and successful history of museums in its parks. And this is an opportunity and a plan to create yet another. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: The next three names are Geoffrey King, Thomas Keller and Jeff Smith. Okay?

Geoffrey King: Hello. I'm Geoffrey King. Gosh, I feel like I should have had a prepared statement here. So, first of all, I just want to say that I strongly support the CAMP project. For me, there's no real reason to go to the Presidio right now. Now there really isn't. I'm trying to think of a reason that I've ever gone there that wasn't because there was a client that was there, or maybe a friend was renting one of the barracks.

But there's no real reason. And, as a national park, the whole reason for a national park is for people to come and enjoy the landscape. As a matter of fact, in my whole life no one has ever

said to me, “Hey, let’s go to the Presidio.” Never. This project - this is a reason to go to the Presidio. And not just that - and while I would agree with the gentleman who came here before from the contractors union - from the carpenters union said it will create jobs. Well, I think that’s true.

But any project located anywhere in San Francisco and anywhere in the Bay Area would create jobs. But what this would do that’s unique from, say, a project in the SOMA District is that post-construction, once this project is completed, it has the ability to continue to support the economy locally around the Presidio businesses, the restaurants, the hotels, the lodging areas, the Marina District on Lombard. I’m sure a lot of those business owners would gladly appreciate the increased traffic, the increased business, increase of revenue, which has a longevity effect. So, in closing, I strongly support the CAMP project. And this would truly give me a reason to visit the Presidio. Thank you.

[Applause]

Jeff Smith: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jeff Smith. And I want to just take this opportunity to express my strong support for the CAMP project. It seems unbelievable to me that we might lose this opportunity to have the Fisher art collection displayed in the Bay Area. And I agree with the last speaker. And it’s pretty hard to think of a time that somebody has said, “Let’s go to the Presidio.” This would be a great destination for tourists and

family and visitors that come to the Bay Area. Thank you for the opportunity.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. The next three names are Nathaniel Haynes, Sandy Osborne and Shannon Louie.

Nathaniel Haynes: I'm Nathaniel Haynes. I am a resident of San Francisco and an architect. I think we all want to preserve the Presidio. And it's my conviction that adaptive reuse of the site of the Main Post is really the best way to secure that preservation. I throw my full support behind the Contemporary Art Museum in the Presidio. I really believe that CAMP is an enormous cultural asset. It'll create a center of gravity upon which the other public functions can be realized and take shape. The prominence of the Main Post demands a public function. And I think CAMP satisfies this in the best possible way as a center for arts and for learning.

The Main Post also demands a museum that is sensitive to the context and its design. After studying the design of the museum and seeing the project presented twice, I'm really convinced that this proposal is sensitive to both the existing buildings, the context of the existing buildings, and to the context of history. And it really provides a nice focus for the history of the Main Post as a vibrant public space.

What would really be tragic, I think, is for this museum to get picked up and moved outside of the Presidio, outside of San Francisco, and for us to lose this enormous endowment, something that is a cultural legacy. I also think it would be tragic to move this Presidio to a more obscure location - or - I'm sorry - the museum to a more obscure location in the Presidio. I think there are a lot of people who think, not in my backyard. But I don't understand why. I say, "Yes, in my backyard." And I encourage people who are concerned about traffic to lobby the City for better bus routes once the museum is up and running. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Sandy Osborne? Shannon Louie? Scott Anderson? Esther Jennings? David Bancroft?

Male Voice: He's waving there.

[Unintelligible]

Male Voice: David Bancroft.

Male Voice: Oh, yeah. The lawyer.

David Grubb: He's leaving.

[Cross-talk]

Male Voice: He's coming.

David Grubb: Oh, I'm sorry.

David Bancroft: Survival of the fittest. My name is David Bancroft. I've been a resident of the City for over 40 years. I came tonight to say a whole bunch of things. But many of them have been very well by others. Here is the nut of it all - what you still have is well over 200,000 square feet of new construction with the Fisher pushed out to the property lines with its terraces and its outdoor sculptures.

It has gone - I enjoyed the architect's speech. Architects have a wonderful way of speaking about things as being redolent of this, reminiscent of that, evocative of this. What we have gone here - we have gone from a cube model glass-and-steel building to something that - well, I guess, it's redolent and evocative of something pretty close to a Shell station. [Laughter. Applause.] That's a curt remark. And I don't mean to completely disparage the architect's work. But he's faced a problem. And the problem is that a contemporary art museum on the parade ground is a square peg in a round hole. And he's done his best to make it fit. But it just doesn't fly. It still is at the top center of the parade ground, dominating its entire landscape.

I want to talk to you about two or three other things. The first thing I want to talk to you about is listening to us when - and I mean

really listening to us. You have to know that much of the part of the public has the clear impression that you have not. It's commonly thought - and, indeed, I must report to you that I had this conversation with one of the trustees - that in every major project there is always somebody who protests. You can expect that. I mean, this is San Francisco.

But I want to recall for you two protests. I think all of us may be old enough to remember the protests over the central freeway, a project that was going to take the central freeway all the way down to the Golden Gate Bridge. And I think we recall the protest about the abolition of the cable cars. I don't think there's - and that was a public protest - a person in this room that doesn't thank heaven for that citizen opposition. And so here, I think, I want you - to ask you to really listen.

I think there is a way of proceeding incrementally here. Mr. Rosenblatt referred to it. And that is you should proceed incrementally with a five- to ten-year plan. My difference with Mr. Rosenblatt is, is that he wants to proceed incrementally as a starting point with the Fisher Museum. I suggest to you that what you ought to be doing is proceeding incrementally with a robust, well thought out, structured program for public events, exhibitions, exhibits on the Presidio and then take it from there, and not start with a radical project which will make an indelible footprint on this beautiful Presidio for the next 150 to 200 years. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Rebecca Evans? Jim Lazarus? Charlie Castillo, I guess is how you say it . . .

Rebecca Evans: My name is Rebecca Evans. I'm here representing the Sierra Club, which has about 9,000 members in the City and 750,000 nationally. We do oppose the location of the museum, the art museum, at the Presidio. We've been participating in the Presidio Neighborhood Representative Work Group. We support the efforts to move the museum - or to move Mr. Fisher's art collection to a place that is more transit-accessible for the City, for the region, and for the nation.

However wonderful the architecture is and wonderful the collection is it does not belong in a contemporary building at this site. I find it interesting that one of the things in the document talks about adhering to the participation in the National Park Service Climate-Friendly Park Initiative. I do not understand how creating a large demand for traffic and visitation, which is not supported by transportation, is going to be climate-friendly to the park, to the Main Post in particular.

As a member of the Transit Effectiveness Project with the City, which was a two-year process period, I did lobby heavily for Muni to increase its transportation service to the Presidio and not cut it back. But, as you probably know, the City doesn't have the money

for that. And some of you may have seen or have read articles or the report from Muni about the cost of the City for capital costs and for service costs for providing the service that would be required to service this museum.

The other thing I would like to encourage - some months ago there was a meeting between the Muni and some of the other transit people - and it was hoped that those meetings would continue - people from the National Park Service, from the Presidio, etc. And there was one meeting. And there has not been a second meeting.

And I think that the process here - all of you have heard the problems that the public has with it. I think the process has been flawed. I think it has not been transparent. I think that the law students were wonderful. I applaud them. And I [applause] - it's hard to follow someone like that.

But they were really incredible. And at least one of those students is a second-generation attorney. And I think he's going to be a fine attorney. But I do want you to listen to us. I think Mr. Bancroft was quite correct. You need to listen to us and start from a different place and not with this building. Thank you.

[Applause]

Charlie Castillo: Good evening. I am Carlos Castillo, "Charlie" for friends. I am working almost 14 years at the bowling center. I tell Mr. Fisher

pick out other buildings. We have a lot of buildings in Presidio. And San Francisco need Presidio Bowling Center; and, also, the little kids need a place nice, safe, clean, nice employees. And really the kids enjoy and adults enjoy the bowling center. And pick another building. There is a lot of buildings. Muchas gracias.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Is Tina Hogan -

Tina Hogan: My name is Tina Hogan. And I strongly support locating CAMP in the Presidio. I have four points to make. One is the quality of the art collection; two, museums in San Francisco; three, economic stimulus; and, four, the current design.

The Fisher art collection is extraordinary, and it needs to remain in San Francisco and be open to the public. It is a wonderful that the Fishers are willing to share that with all to enhance San Francisco and the art world.

Second, there are other major museums in San Francisco throughout the City. De Young is in Golden Park; Palace of Legion in the Richmond; Asian Art Museum at Civic Center; and the Museum of Modern Art and the Jewish Museum at Yerba Buena. The only museums that I'm aware in the northern part of San Francisco is the small Italian museo in Fort Mason and the Walt Disney Museum. Having a world-class museum with a design by a

world-class architect would be a major contribution to the Presidio/Marina portion of the City. In many ways it would be a balance to the Letterman Center for the Arts, which sits diagonally across the Main Parade field.

Third, CAMP would revitalize the Main Post by bringing a number of individuals, both local and from outside San Francisco, to see the museum and to also contribute to the fiscal and economic viability of other tenants in the Presidio and the area. And, in another way, it's going to be its own economic stimulus plan. This project is very large. It's going to have design professionals, architects, engineers. And, Mr. Chairman, I know you can think of all those contractors - general contractors, subcontractors, specialty contractors for a museum - that will all employ suppliers and laborers.

And, finally, as an ongoing asset of the Presidio, it'll be making a major financial contribution to the Presidio Trust to help it meet its mandate to be self-sustaining by the required deadline. I like the Preferred Alternative. I think it provides a vision that incorporates and has been extremely responsive to public opinion and comment. I like the architect's presentation. It's scaled down, it's appropriate to the site, and I think it's absolutely a project worth approving. Again, I support the CAMP.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. Lucia Bogatay? Chris Wright? And Whitney Hall?

Lucia Bogatay: Sorry. I thought about vaulting over the chairs. But I tried that earlier. It didn't work very well. I think the Presidio Trust is reaping the rewards of its opportunistic approach to planning. For years now you've been taking anything that came down the pike; as a result - and failed completely to effectively interpret its history. No wonder people think a modern art museum belongs here.

But that's not what I planned to say. I'm still thinking of Red and channeling him. So I'm going to be nicer than that. I'm an architect, a preservationist. I was a Landmarks Board member. I'm a member of the Presidio Historical Association. And my true remarks were inspired by the brilliant artist, Andrew Goldsworthy, whose piece in the Presidio is called "Spire" and by the equally wonderful Patrick Dougherty piece in the Civic Center called "Upper Crust."

As you know, the Goldsworthy piece is a solemn bundle of cypress trunks assembled into a slender spire near the Presidio Golf Course. The Dougherty piece is a group of dancing, translucent shapes woven from twigs into the tops of the trees in the Civic Center. These pieces are both examples of the only type of art which is truly appropriate in public spaces, which are important for other reasons than art, such as military and cultural history or city government. These works are relatively temporary and fugitive and intentionally reversible. They make us think about the relationship of man to

nature, to landscape, and to history and about issues of time, dissolution, of life and death. The relatively ephemeral nature of these works is the defining part of their excitement and appeal.

But, in contrast to public art, the new buildings proposed for the Main Post are none of these things. They are larger in area and volume than all the built structures that surround the Main Parade. The changes they cause will be permanent and irreversible. They will destroy all the archeology under them.

And now they're pushed down. There's even more loss. They will have a devastating effect on the purpose and significance of the Presidio National Historic Landmark District. They will contribute nothing to the understanding of life and death but only to the folly resulting from the triumph of power, money and influence over common sense. As they are also bad art, why not hire Christo to wrap up the Main Post. That would animate it beautifully, and it wouldn't kill it.

[Laughter. Applause.]

Chris Wright: Good evening. My name is Chris Wright. As the Executive Director of the Committee on Jobs, an advocacy organization for businesses in San Francisco, I'm here this evening to express my support for the CAMP. I'm also a resident who was raised in a family in Inner Richmond. And I look forward to bringing my son

to the Presidio to benefit from the Fisher family's world-class art collection.

This is a precious gift to San Francisco, as well as to the region. And it will serve as one additional reason for people to want to visit our great city, stay in our hotels, eat in our restaurants, and shop on diverse merchant corridors. I think this of growing importance given the fact that there's now at least two dozen open storefronts on Chestnut Street. And I think that number is growing by the week.

I also - I take issue with some of the opponents here tonight who claim that a museum of this nature can only be and deserves to be in the downtown corridor. I can think of three of the City's, in my opinion, best museums, and they all reside in parks. I would also add to that, obviously, that's the de Young, the Academy and the Legion of Honor. I would also add to that the Randall Museum. They all reside in parks. And I think they work well in the park. And I think they also add to the community that they're near.

Also, additionally, after observing this public process for some time, I believe it has been very conclusive and transparent. I also hope that you, as members of the Board of the Presidio Trust, will accept and approve this project. Thank you for your consideration.

[Applause]

Whitney Hall: Whitney Hall, a member of the Presidio Historical Association. I've been working with the Presidio issues for over 30 years. First, I'd like to speak to the public on one or two points because there seems to be some misperception. One is the question of the financial necessity of these buildings. Long ago the Trust reported that it is financially in the black and that the financial imperative, therefore, for these projects is removed. That circumstance did not exist at the time of the Disney Museum getting permission and starting their process to renovate an existing historical building for their museum.

To the comments, "Well, it's a dead space; nothing is happening," I say, "Amen." For 11 years after the Army Museum was closed the only public attraction on Main Post has been a bookstore in the Officers' Club. There has been no proper visitor's center. There has been no [unintelligible] museum. And I thank you, Craig, for recognizing the need for that. It's something called the Heritage Center. We don't know yet what that really will be.

But the long tribute to the Presidio's history you gave as the preamble to your comments was very welcome, and I'm glad I could hear that. The discussion this evening has been spirited and goes to the point, I think, Craig made that different people can legitimately look at the situation in different ways. I was disappointed by the level of discussion, because the real issue is not CAMP or no CAMP, or hotel or no hotel, or a movie theater or no movie theater. The real issue, the undertaking, is not CAMP. The

undertaking is the planning principles by which the Presidio will be governed as a national park. And we haven't talked about that.

We've heard about a San Francisco park. We've heard about kind of Pacific Heights park. We heard about, "This is my backyard." But we've not heard the Presidio discussed in terms of a national park. What a national park is, is clearly defined in law. And what can occur or not occur there is clearly defined in law and the regulations derived there from. On at least two occasions the Presidio Trust has expressed that those laws do not apply, that they are independent of those laws. This is a serious matter. It needs to be addressed. It can only be addressed in the highest level of Congress or the courts.

But that's what underlies this whole debate. We would not be here arguing if this were a municipal park, this was the Board of Supervisors, and they could decide what happens in a municipal park. This is a national park of national importance. So what's appropriate here for national visitors to come? Set aside your neighborhood interest, and ask yourselves, "What is this as a national park?" Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: The next one is Jason White, Dennis Conaghan and Steve Beck.

Jason Wright: It's Jason Wright for the record. Let me just start by saying that I like both art and history. And the architect mentioned earlier that they see the site as having continued importance even to now and continuing forward. The period of significance of the Presidio though is defined as 1776 through 1945 in the 1993 Landmark update.

But in its current updated draft, 85 percent - Draft Update is expanding this period of significance from 1776 to 1945 - 1994 - I'm sorry - the entire period of the military occupation. The Presidio is a landmark for its military history. A property will not be de-listed as a National Historic Landmark District if it retains its integrity. Integrity is defined as the ability of a property to convey its significance. I argue that the Main Parade in the Presidio will not be able to convey its military history, will not retain integrity, and will likely lose its designation as a historic landmark with an art museum at the head of the Parade, a hotel as its side, and demolition of contributing historic buildings.

As an art lover and a history lover, let us appreciate the art without killing the history. Outside of the Presidio, the art can be viewed anywhere. And this is not so with the history of the Presidio. And I've been hearing people talk tonight also about the de Young and Golden Gate Park. And I just want to point out that Golden Gate Park is not a National Historic Landmark District and does not operate under those constraints. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Dennis or Steve? Okay. Deborah Frieden and James Ream.

Male Voice: There's James.

David Grubb: Okay. The next one is Gary Widman.

Deborah Frieden: I'm Deborah Frieden. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'll be very brief because it's a long night. And many speakers have already said some very eloquent things. I strongly support the CAMP project. I believe that the cultural district concept for the Main Post is perfectly appropriate and will benefit the park long term.

I think that the energy and vibrancy of a major high-quality institution of this type will bring a lot of activity, energy, popular appeal to the neighborhood of the Main Post. I think it'll also support the other nonprofits and cultural institutions that have located there. I also think it's good for San Francisco. We all have chosen to live in an amazing city. Cities are vibrant, messy places. They contain things that don't appeal to every single one of us.

But that's what makes them exciting. Because they're messy, and we have to bump against each other, and we bump up against different views, we need to understand that we've chosen that life. We've chosen to be in a place where people appreciate different

amenities and different aspects of our life here. And I think that Presidio is a very big place. And by locating CAMP at the Main Post and consolidating a lot of the energy and activity there, it not only benefits the Main Post, but it allows the balance of the Presidio to remain a quieter, more landscape and park type environment. And I absolutely believe that parks and art museums and cultural amenities are very important and well-connected and that the appreciation of nature and art is very consistent. So I strongly support this.

And I think the design has been developed now to a point that it is highly sensitive to the park. And it's very elegant, very understated and, I think, owes a lot of respect to the park or shows a lot of respect to the park. Thank you.

[Applause]

Gary Widman: Well, I'm Gary Widman, President of the Presidio Historical Association.

David Grubb: Excuse me, Gary. I think -

Gary Widman: Oh, I'm sorry.

David Grubb: James Ream is in the first . . .

Gary Widman: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Jim.

David Grubb: Jim is first.

Gary Widman: Okay. No problem.

James Ream: My name is Jim Ream, past President of the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors and architect of the Julius Kahn Recreation Clubhouse. I'd like to direct the Trust's attention to an idea that has not been addressed here tonight, if you can believe that's possible [laughter] and that is the very best use of this absolutely crucial site in the Presidio.

My wife and I have just returned from visiting six national parks and monuments in the southwest. Key to each of these visits was the first visit, the visitor's center to learn about the special features, where they were, how to get there, and their importance to the history of the park. We could then plan to maximize our visit experience. Each visitor's center was easy to find. Each had visual displays to increase our understanding of what we were about to experience.

At this crucial stage of the Presidio's development, we may not let the opportunity to create an outstanding visitor's center slip away. Imagine with me - there is one ideal location for our visitor's center, at the intersection of our historic structures, between the Officers' Club and the Montgomery Street Barracks [applause] at the head of the Main Parade Ground. The site would provide through broad

windows in an architecture in sympathy with the historic context a direct physical and visual connection to the history the visitors have come to experience.

A new visitor's history center would avoid making the mistake of trying to fit an undefined program into an existing envelope, the Officers' Club. As an architect, I can say that the only way for a successful outcome is to define and take the size of what you want to house, then size the envelope required to contain that program. To start with the envelope would be the equivalent of buying a suit and then go looking for a person to fit into it. [Laughter]

I would venture to say that each of the six visitor's centers we visited were not funded by private subscription but were built by the park as an essential element in the park experience. Therefore, the lack of a private benefactor should not prevent us from having a fine visitor's center. I ask the Trust to start a financial plan to build a visitor's history, cultural center worthy of this great national park as soon as funding can be in place. And the only great place for a great center is at the head of the Main Parade Ground.

Just one postscript, if I may - the semi-subterranean design proposed for the new art museum looks like a building that is trying to get away, to be semi-invisible so as not to offend. Even the building wants to be on another site. Thank you.

[Applause]

Gary Widman: Thank you. I'm Gary Widman, Presidio Historical Association. I'm going to abandon my prepared remarks a little bit. Maybe I can get back to them. But it seems to that the central question that you face is whether you build an art museum that destroys a historic area or whether you build it somewhere else. All of the statements that have favored the art museum could have been made equally strongly about any other location.

But you have the alternative of putting that museum somewhere else, inside or outside of the Presidio. Don Fisher has never suggested that he would take it to New York City or Chicago if he couldn't have precisely that spot in the Main Post. As we recall from his staff, he originally started off wanting the Crissy Field site. And that's actually where it should end up.

And the reason it should end up there is because you then preserve the history. If you have four-year-old child, you don't let them say to a friend, "Oh, you can look at my toys, if I can destroy yours first." But that's what you're allowing to happen here. Also, we need to remember that you are a trust. You know what a trust means. You know what you swore in your oath of office.

And you swore to uphold the Trust Act. The Trust Act requires that you prevent new development, not that you foster it. And this is particularly true for the Main Post, which is a National Historic Landmark District, the most rare and important type of historic area

that this country can define. The Lucas building - people have said, “Well, you have an apparel store, and you have the Lucas building.” Yes, they were off around the outside. They were not in the most important part of the National Historic Landmark District.

By proceeding with this project you are violating the Trust Act. You sought proposals to build over 250,000 square feet of new construction in an area where the Presidio Trust Management Plan, at the time you did that, said that you should not be building that. You’re violating your promises to the public that you gave when you adopted the Presidio Trust Management Plan. You’re violating your mission statement. And you’re violating the Presidio Trust Act.

In closing, I’m reminded of the provision in the new bestselling book, “Outliers,” and probably many of you have read that. He discusses the very interesting fact that there are more plane crashes in situations where the pilot feels that he doesn’t really have to listen to the copilot. The plane crashes go down when the pilot is put in a side seat. For whatever reason, as many people have said so far, you have not listened to the consistent statements rejecting these plans that have gone on since 2006 through multiple hearings up until tonight. Tonight is the first time you’ve had anyone speak up substantially in favor. But all of the people who have been familiar with the issues have been opposing this for years. And it would benefit the future of the Trust. It would benefit the future of the public if we were heard. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Peter Buxtun? I hope I've said that right. Bob Fluegge and Rob Connolly?

Peter Buxtun: Good evening. My name is Peter Buxtun. And I have first a little reminder that we sit here very near the cemetery where people who survived - soldiers who survived the Civil War, went on, spent their lives here in San Francisco, such as remained of them, and are now enshrined there. Also, this location was the end of the railroad line that brought many people from all over the United States to become soldiers. And many of them went off to the battlefields of Asia starting 1898 and on through World War II and Vietnam. We know all those stories. And many of them also were gathered from California and sent eastward and fought in Europe. Many of them did not come back. That is part of the history that we now share here.

And I have a question for you all. Why had no one asked it before? Has Mr. Fisher served in uniform? Are we entitled to know that? Does anyone know here? I would like to know. I have nothing against him. I have nothing against his art. But I have another question. Why, being that it is so simple to do, has there been no catalog, a colored catalog, of this world-class, highly-praised, precious collection that will be available to us, the citizens of San Francisco? Where is the color catalog? How cheap would it be?

I'll chip in \$100 for the damn thing. I want to see what these paintings look like.

I have one friend who has actually seen the paintings. She was part of a small group of people of some influence who were invited to go and see the paintings. Why has that courtesy not been extended to the rest of us? Now I have another thought for us. Once we break the ice and make a personal monument to a wealthy person, a generous person, from what I have been told, how long will it be before we will have statues of dead politicians up and down the Presidio, the area where our soldiers were marshaled to go off to war?

There are many reasons to oppose the plan as it has been laid out. If I had a little more time, I would do some more of these thoughts here. But I'm afraid we are buying a pig in a poke. And we should take a better look at it. And, frankly, one last observation . . . I've seen the models of the proposed building, and, frankly, it looks like a country club in a second-rate, small city somewhere else in the country. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Bob Fluegge? Rob Connolly? Jan Blum?

Jan Blum: I'm number 57 for all you interested people. My name is Jan Blum. I'm a park user, a volunteer and a park advocate. The Trust

planners have frequently said to me that the public only tells me what they do not want on the Main Post in the Presidio. However, it has been my experience that for years the public has been telling the Trust what they do want. But the Trust apparently is not able to hear this.

The messages I have heard repetitively recently are that the public wants respect for the integrity of Main Post and to honor the status of the Presidio as a National Historic Landmark District. Specific messages are that, first, lodging is just fine if it follow the Presidio Trust Act guidelines. Reusing historic and vacant buildings for lodging would have great public appeal. Secondly, a museum location has already been approved on the Presidio at the Crissy Field site; so why not use it and avoid destroying the Main Post integrity?

Alternatively, the public does support Mayor Newsom who has said that the idea of a contemporary art museum as a gift to the City is absolutely wonderful. We all agree. And we highly encourage the donor to work aggressively with the Chamber, with San Francisco Visitors Bureau, and the Mayor to overcome the hurdles that prevent him from giving it to the City of San Francisco.

Thirdly, we need to develop a comprehensive, achievable and sustainable transportation and parking plan. Finally, it has been said over and over that what is wanted is a great history center which does justice to the Presidio and interprets its unique role in

the history of the United States. Above all, what is really needed is that the Trust find the will to change their outdated business model and forge a new way of working openly and honestly in close collaboration with the public and the agencies to protect the National Historic Landmark District and achieve a shared vision for the Presidio.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Melanie Blum and Deva Santiago and Don Bourne.

Melanie Blum: I'm Melanie Blum. I would like to ask that everyone look at the current design that has been proposed by WRNS with an open mind. Open minds learn and grow. The art collection that CAMP will house is world-class and will culturally enhance and enrich visitors to the museum and teach children more about what the world of art has to offer.

People who object because of traffic or lack of parking are being short-sighted. I believe these issues can be adequately addressed. But to reject CAMP really eliminates an opportunity for many to see one of the most spectacular art collections in the world. Revitalizing the Main Post is critical to the visitor experience in the park. Parks should be places to learn, to grow, to explore and to welcome visitors who want to have different experiences. CAMP is dynamic and will attract visitors from all around the world and, in conjunction with the Disney Museum, the Presidio Theatre, and

other cultural offerings, will make the Main Post a vital and active community and offer many educational experiences for our youth. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Just a minute, Tom. Deva Santiago? Okay. Don?

Don Bourne: My name is Don Bourne. And I just say that I think we've got a tremendous opportunity with the Main Post Update and the museum. And just to reiterate, as she has said, it brings vibrance to the Presidio and, I think, will be a tremendous asset, the CAMP museum and Mr. Fisher's contribution of his art work.

But I also might mention that I'm a resident of the City and live not far from the Jewish Museum. And to me that is another example of where you have the old and the new coming together; and the contemporary cube that is attached to a historic building and right next door to the stately St. Pat's Church. And every time I walk by, I think it has not missed an opportunity. There's some tourists out there taking a picture, a photographic opportunity.

And I think we're creating the same situation at the Presidio where we had the ability to bring what great neighborhoods and great cities have as the - a mixture of architecture, an integration of culture and the great outdoors. And I think that the project is a

tremendous asset to the City and recommend it going forward full speed ahead. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Thank you. I'm going to read three more names. And then we'll take another break for ten minutes. John Loomis, Graham Leggat, and Carol Koffel, I guess it is . . . K-O-F-F-E-L is what I read. John? Graham?

Graham Leggat: Present, your honor.

[Laughter]

David Grubb: Thank you. I never thought I'd get there.

Graham Leggat: It was just a matter of time. My name is Graham Leggat. I don't want to talk about the practical or legal aspects, which are complicated and I'm sure require a great deal more thought but, rather, to the spirit and vision of this project. I am a former executive at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City and the Film Society in Lincoln Center there also. Those are the two finest institutions of their kind in the world. Now I run the San Francisco Film Society. The San Francisco Film Society is the organization that proposes to build not merely a movie theater or a multiplex, as it's sometimes been misrepresented, but an international film center in the Presidio.

On behalf of the Board and staff of my organization, I want to say that we are unanimously in favor not only of the Contemporary Art Museum of the Presidio, which seems to us an unalloyed gift to the general public, not only of the City but whoever cares to be part of it. But, more importantly, we're unanimously in favor of the redevelopment plan as a whole. And I'm frankly surprised, although it was predictable, that the museum has been such a lightning rod and that more attention has not been paid to what I think is the genius of the many aspects of the redevelopment plan.

It's such that it's not merely a redevelopment. It's a complete and utter transformation of the Main Post. And it's extraordinary.
Excuse me?

Female Voice: [Unintelligible]

Graham Leggat: Yeah. I work six to seven days a week on the Main Post. That's where our offices are. And I can say with authority that sadly there's nothing there, several acres of asphalt, a faint whiff of history, certainly, but no beating heart. There's no community, civic or cultural life. And what you have proposed, Trust and Board, through the preferred plan is something that will bring to life with variety and vibrancy and diversity that area.

If the redevelopment plan fails, you will be presiding over the undertaking. But if it passes, as I hope it will, it will instead be a

resurrection of bringing to life an animation - an activation of the first order. Great cities are made through the gifts and visions of great men and women. And this is one of these moments. San Francisco thinks of itself sometimes as a great city. It's certainly a progressive frontier. But at its worst, it's a hopelessly parochial little duchy. And I'm afraid that if this plan is defeated that's where we'll find ourselves.

The decision to me and my organization is clear. We are wholly and completely in support, as I said, not only of the Contemporary Art Museum in the Presidio, which has received a wonderful, new design under the stewardship of WRNS, but of the plan as a whole, which includes not only acres of green space, the bringing underground of Doyle Drive, a history center which speaks to many of the issues brought up by the opponents of this plan, an international film center, and a world-class contemporary art museum. I think your decision is clear. And I wish you all the best with it. Thank you.

[Applause]

David Grubb: Graham Leggat?

[Unintelligible]

David Grubb: Oh. I'm sorry. And Carol Koffel? I guess with that we'll take a ten-minute break. And we'll be back in ten minutes. Thank you.

David Grubb: There we go. Okay, are you ready? Mary Robinson?

Mary Robinson: What number am I?

David Grubb: 65. We have 126 total.

Male Voice: I need more lunch.

David Grubb: I'd suggest another couple. All right. Mary Robinson, Victor Myerhoff.

Female Voice: Meri Jaye.

David Grubb: Meri Jane?

Male Voice: Meri Jaye.

David Grubb: Meri Jaye, I guess.

Male Voice: I saw Lou's in here now.

Female Voice: Looks like someone's here.

David Grubb: It could be Victor Myerhoff.

Victor Myerhoff: Good evening, Board members and Mr. Middleton. I hope you all know me by now, but for those of you who do not, I'm Victor Myerhoff, proprietor of the Presidio Bowling Center. This is primetime bowling right now. I don't know why everybody went home and went to sleep.

Male Voice: Bowling.

Victor Myerhoff: Once again, I'm here to try and save bowling in the Presidio. I want to make it clear that I'm here tonight on behalf of our patrons and employees, and not on behalf of myself. While I get great pleasure in being the proprietor of the bowling center, I will be the one losing the least if bowling disappears from the Presidio landscape. The biggest losers will be the public and our employees.

Over the past 20 months I've heard thousands of comments regarding the proposed actions at the Main Post, and the one comment I have never heard is that bowling should not be in the Presidio. Even the few in favor of the museum hope that bowling could be relocated.

On December 12th, after the last public meeting, my employees took it upon themselves to take up a petition. To date they have approximately 5,000 signatures opposing closing the current center with no plans to relocate it. Currently our lease is set to expire in just 23 days. That's only three days after the close of the public comments for this round of documents.

With the required final draft documents and final documents still to come, I have no idea why the Trust is intent on taking bowling away from the public so early. I've offered to assist in removing the assets from the building, and moving them to another location for liquidation if necessary. That would take us about two weeks to complete. Please reconsider our closing date and allow us to stay open at least until the ROD is issued, and all legal issues have been resolved.

On the relocation front, within the next 30 days we will be submitting a proposal to relocate the bowling center to Building 937 on West Crissy Field. The building has the perfect dimensions to be a bowling center. For this proposal to become reality it's going to take a large commitment by the Presidio Trust in terms of lease length and some out-of-the-box thinking. The costs to rehabilitate Building 937 are more than double that of new construction. I know there are other proposals for that building, but in my professional opinion that is the last building on Crissy Field that is suitable for a bowling center. If our proposal is unsuccessful and the building is used for another venture, then the SEIS would be inaccurate stating that bowling could be relocated to rehabilitated building in that area. I hope each of you follows the progress of our proposal, and that each of you will be our advocate in making this a reality. As public servants I hope you will give the public what they are asking for. Thank you.

David Grubb: Is it Meri Jaye?

Meri Jaye: Good evening. I'm Mrs. Meri Jaye. My company in the City of San Francisco is dedicated to marine architecture engineering. And I wish to state that my life has been dedicated to the arts. It would appear to me that I should forgive you. I think all of you have been misguided.

I'm not ready to forgive Mr. Fisher. He's only been misguided in his selection of what he calls art. And can we put aside from now on not to hear the expression "world class" again? To me Andy Warhol, [este] Andy Warhol, [este] Andy Warhol is poster art, the way that I studied art. I simply don't want it to be considered "world class" art any longer. I want us to respect. I want you to consider. The citizens of this city dearly love and are loyal to the history of the City. You cannot refer to that sacred parade ground as a parking lot. I heard that earlier this evening.

We want you to reconsider, sir, what is a totally ludicrous design for the Presidio of San Francisco. I drive through every day. You have done a superb job in the restoration of the Presidio. You have peace, tranquility, excellent restaurants. You can't imagine, the moment you enter the gate there's a great sense of harmony. You are going to try and impose this man?

Well, a power broker in San Francisco is very strong. We are a small city. But please put aside the power broker. I know what

pressures you are under. I'm a business woman. I appreciate the pressures you are under, but we cannot permit such a glass cube to be put next to sacred ground, and I'll thank you for considering that.

David Grubb: Steven Aiello, I guess is how you say it, A-I-E-L-L-O? Javed. . .

Female Voice: Umerani?

David Grubb: Emerandale? Umerani, I guess. Umerani, I'm sorry.

Steven Aiello: Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Steven Aiello. I'm a resident of the Bayview neighborhood. I was born here in San Francisco, but raised up in Sonoma County, so that puts me in the somewhat unique position of being both a native and a transplant. And I just wanted to relate why I think this is the perfect location for this museum.

When I was growing up in Petaluma, our next door neighbors were the Browns. Chet Brown was an Army man who continually always had good things to say about the Presidio. The thing that I remember most about Chet is him collecting golf balls at the Presidio golf course and teeing them up on his front lawn, and driving them across Ely Boulevard south into the vacant farm across the street. It provided hours of endless entertainment watching him tee up and practice his swing.

The reason that I bring that up is because there is what seems to me to be sort of an unspoken issue, this tension between art and the military. I think it's somewhat of a false tension. The reason why I think this is a very good location for this museum is that art is, in my opinion, the free expression of our understanding of the human condition.

I haven't seen the Fisher collection. I'm familiar with the names of some of the artists that are locally-rooted. They're in that collection that Ben brought out. I like some of them, I don't think I probably like others of them, but I think they all have value, or I don't think anyone would say they're not art.

What I respect about the military, and its service and sacrifice, is that its sacred honor is to defend that freedom. It's to defend that freedom of expression. There are some wags, I think, who would say this is nothing more than art or ego in posing itself on the Presidio. I would reverse that. I would say that this is our military protecting our expression. So the axial location of this on a parade ground, its position at the top of the parade ground, I think is a very useful place for us to be reminded of our most sacred of freedoms, which is the first amendment.

I'm an architect by training. I really enjoyed the presentation from the law school students at Cal. That's where I got my degree in architecture. It was thoroughly refreshing to hear their youthful objectivity. I only wish that at this age of nearly 40 I could be so

subjective. Unfortunately, at this point, the only objectivity I found is that I am subjective. That's my opinion, take it for what it's worth, and I urge you to approve this design. Thank you.

Javed Umerani: Respected Board members and the esteemed audience, my name is Javed Umerani. I am a San Francisco Bay Area resident. Ask anyone and they will share their vivid memories of past, of visiting civic and cultural venues, and of experiencing the rich heritage. CAMP is one such opportunity destined for profoundly positive impact.

It is a unique convergence that Fisher family is sharing the priceless art collection with the community at large, and the project assimilating so naturally in its setting. CAMP is in keeping with the rich visual and cultural arts tradition of San Francisco. I urge the Board to support the design professionals in developing the enhanced experience at the Presidio. Thank you.

David Grubb: Thank you. Barbara Wanvig, I guess it is, Wanvig, W-A-N-V-I-G. She's coming? Okay. Next would be Charlotte Hennessy, and then Diana Ketcham.

Barbara Wanvig: Thank you for holding this hearing tonight. I am Barbara Wanvig, a 32-year San Francisco resident, active in the community and its museums, a neighbor of the Presidio, and a frequent user of this precious part of American History.

I appreciate, tonight, Mr. Middleton acknowledging the historic importance of the Presidio as well as same acknowledgement from the architect. And I really was endeared by Whitney Hall's focus on the proper management of a national park.

Many good things are happening to enhance the Presidio's beauty, but CAMP unfortunately is not one of them. I'm sad to say that what troubles me deeply is what seems to be the inherent dishonesty of the entire process, and the Trust rather finagling with incomplete documents and statements that tend to keep the public confused.

To even accept this proposal for consideration, the Trust has had to ignore its own Presidio master plan, and the federal law and regulations that establish the Presidio as a national historic landmark in the first place, and made the Trust itself the sacred keeper of all that historic landmark status implies.

You know that as of last April the National Park Service told the Trust its museum amendment proposals were harmful to the historic integrity of the Main Post portion of the National Historic Landmark District, and that is what makes up the Presidio. And the Park Service refused to approve your master plan and the design guideline changes needed to accommodate the construction of CAMP.

Beyond that and also somewhat dishonest, the Fishers have been spinning their art collection as a gift to the people of San Francisco,

and you've heard other people say tonight that this is untrue. They're not giving the art to the Presidio, the City, the Trust or the National Park Service. They're retaining complete ownership and control. The only gift part is the dreadful building, which is now two buildings, which violate historic landmark district laws because of their outrageously non-conforming scale and style.

Also somewhat dishonest is the fact that more is unknown about all of this than is known. Exact dimensions of the revised current plans are not fully disclosed. Architect schematics are designed to make the main building look smaller than actuality, and this is a common trick achieved by elevating the viewer's eye, which architects do all the time.

Also the ground lease agreement between Fisher and the Trust seems to be either confusing or a secret. We've heard two different explanations of that. Is Mr. Fisher going to pay market-rate ground lease fees? Will there be revenue-sharing agreement? No one knows. Long-range upkeep, staffing and endowment financing are a secret. For all we know the American taxpayer could be stuck with a white elephant of an oversized development and a non-conforming design that few people want and which is in the worse possible location for such a disaster.

The Trust has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars preparing and advocating proposals which it knew, or should have known, would violate the law and is preparing to spend more. The opponents are

truly outraged and dismayed because Mr. Fisher seems to be using the power of his vast wealth and influence. . .

David Grubb: Ma'am?

Barbara Wanvig: . . .to pressure the Trust.

David Grubb: You have gone past the three minutes so. . .

Barbara Wanvig: Thank you for allowing me to speak.

David Grubb: Please give us your full comments and we'll take them that way, if you don't mind.

Barbara Wanvig: I will do that. Thank you.

David Grubb: Thank you. Charlotte Hennessy?

Charlotte Hennessy: In 1994 when the Presidio was going from post to park, there appeared in the newspaper a riddle by an army officer. It went like this, "What was a park before it became a park?" And you guess at the answer. Anybody want to guess? The Presidio. At the time I had just returned to start working for the National Park Service, and I thought oh, they're just being so cynical and so pessimistic, and this is not right. They would never let that happen. Unfortunately it is happening. It's a prophesy, I'm sorry to say.

To me when you say there's magic - in the last meeting you talked about the magic in the Presidio, but you failed to see that that magic will disappear into thin air with these what you call the undertaking, which in my opinion should go to the undertaker pretty soon.

The Presidio is an oasis. How many oases are there in San Francisco? Not too many. You talk about developing, developing. You're so fascinated with bringing people in. People trickle in to the Presidio as they're supposed to when they need to get away from the crowd. The whole point of your appointment was to get away from the crowds - was to protect the Presidio so people can have a place to get away from the crowd, can have a place to talk about history, can have a place to see what nature is all about.

I have to say you've done a great job with the natural resources management and the management of the residences. You've done such good work. Unfortunately I only have a minute so I can't go into that. But I don't want you to jeopardize and nullify all the good work you've done by doing a project that is so completely over the top ridiculous. You were hired to prevent, not promulgate, land development. Do you see the Presidio as a national historic landmark or do you see it as prime real estate, because those are entirely two different things.

Henry J. Kaiser, as you probably know, was the industrialist who was quite well-respected of the World War II era, and a socially-responsible man. He had a motto which was - you've probably

heard it - “find a need and fill it.” I’m thinking that the Presidio Trust motto is, “find an empty space and fill it.”

I don’t even want to get into the traffic, and the gridlock, and the noise pollution, and the air pollution because you’ve heard all that before, but that was another comment. I really wonder, how much money would it take to bring that arrow that’s down at the Embarcadero, the Cupid’s arrow, and put it in the Main Parade Ground? Could we do that? Because at least if you did that, you could move that. But you put those buildings down, you can’t move those. And believe me, the arrow would actually not be as absurd as the buildings. Thank you.

David Grubb: Diane Ketcham, Harry William Smith, Patricia Vaughey. Go ahead.

Harry William Smith: Good evening, Board, Mr. Middleton. My name is Harry William Smith. I’m President of Smith & Smith Landscape Architects at 1501 North Point Street in the Marina. I speak for myself and my staff that this contemporary art collection venue will culturally enrich and enliven the Presidio experience for the national and Bay Area legacy for future generations.

It will complete, inform site-specific landscape planning and open-space design goals with appropriate treatments for the Presidio park Main Post. It will forever contrast and treasure historical and educational traditions through human discovery and enjoyment.

With courage, respect, pride and conviction, please lead and approve the WRNS studio and Fisher collection venue. Thank you very much.

Patricia Vaughey: Patricia Vaughey, Marina/Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants. Our motto is to “preserve the past and to enhance the future.” John Burton’s idea for the Presidio was a park in an urban setting, not an urban park in an urban setting. With this plan you’re doing an urban park in an urban setting, which is not acceptable according to the Trust Act.

This is not redevelopment, as Mr. Leggat said. This is bad planning. The hotel - one most of the exciting things people do when they come to San Francisco, go and close the door at Alcatraz. Why not take the barracks and let these people sleep in the barracks instead of having a big hotel?

The theater - why not leave the theater as it is and not have a, I think it was a 27-foot bar in the middle of one of the drawings that we’ve seen. What is this, a party house? It’s not a movie house. Look into what really is happening there.

Also look at the impacts upon the one, two, three, four, five small single-screen theaters that we’ve either saved to single screen or made it into multiple screen around the Presidio. The Presidio, the Marina, now the Metro, the Vogue and the Clay. You are hurting

the economic status of your neighbors, and you're really hurting me because I saved three of them, and it almost took my health.

Number four, creative designs, this isn't it. The big thing you didn't do is look at all of the alternative sites in the Presidio, and one of the them is the Wherry housing site, which the housing is coming down. Up on that cliff right next to Sea Cliff, it would be a beautiful site with adequate parking, but the rich Sea Cliff people do not want anything near them. We have everything dumped on the Marina/Cow Hollow for development, and we really think you should consider other alternatives, and you've broken the law by not looking at all of these alternatives.

The last and foremost thing is there was a misstatement about my street that I am head of. Chestnut Street has four vacancies. The reason why we have four vacancies is that we've worked very hard at getting a viable mix of services and uses in the Marina/Cow Hollow, particularly on Chestnut Street.

I would like to have a meeting with each one of you so that you could see where we're coming on. I do not like the smut campaign that's been done by the management campaign and the Fisher people that we're all NIMBYs and we don't like art. It's incorrect, and it's going to backfire on you royally. Bye-bye.

David Grubb:

Nora Gibbons, Bill Hudson.

Bill Hudson: Yeah. My name is Bill Hudson. I'm a resident of the Presidio Heights area. I'd like to start by seconding the comments that were made by the two former trustees about the process that has led us to the point where we are at right now, and the substance of the CAMP proposal. I thought they made very cogent points.

This is the second public meeting that I've been associated with today. The first was down in City Hall regarding the Muni cutbacks, and I think that any assumptions around public transit to the site have to be scaled back pretty severely, which will only further accentuate the traffic problems that might be created by the plan as it exists to date.

As a resident at the Presidio Gate I can only tell you that the institution of lights that would accelerate traffic flow there poses a very serious threat to the pedestrian traffic. I have two young sons, and I worry for their well-being. I guess I'd like to think that Mr. Middleton's calming remarks about that doesn't need to happen, and all the rest are great to hear. But I see the traffic counters and I see the surveyors who are out there today, and it doesn't seem to me like he's talking about futures. It seems like he's talking about the present.

I guess a final observation, I was very heartened to hear the discussion about the history center that is in the plans, but I guess I would observe that the Trust has been husbanding this property since 1994, and we don't have a substantive real history center in

this plan. The money that has been spent on this plan so far has been spent on the commercial ventures of a hotel, a movie theater and a museum.

I don't see where there is money going to actually fund the creation of a history center for this great historic asset that we have here, which should be the primary actions of this Trust at the outset is to make sure that that happens. It seems to me, regrettably, that we're on a path where the dollars that are available are going to simply be funding litigation for many months to come that could well endow such a history center. Thank you.

David Grubb: Brad Andersen and Darrell Herbert.

Brad Andersen: Mr. Middleton and the Board, I'm Brad Andersen. I've lived in San Francisco for 15 years, and I live in the Marina. The concerns I have are, I don't understand how the Trust follows the rules and regulations where you take one building down and put one building up. There seems to be three.

Second concern is you're going from approximately 82,000 square feet to 230,000 square feet which is 3X. We all understand the documents have changed as they do over time, but it appears that a lot of the public don't know the change that had been made, and a lot of things we have seen for the very first time we're seeing tonight.

I did want to make a comment that I think the forum itself has been helpful, at least to me, because the last time we were here was the first time I heard about the bowling alley, and I certainly have a lot of empathy as far as the children and be able to have activities for the kids, so I'm behind the bowling alley.

As far as the traffic and the expenses are concerned, right now it's about 1,600 people per day, every day of the year. And with the new museum it would be about 3,500 people, or about 2X that time. Muni says about \$19 million to get bus service going here. I don't where that's going to come from. I haven't seen a real good plan as far as where that is and who's going to pay for that one.

And I guess given the amount of time and money that's spent - both the Board and the public - I would ask that you at least look at about a 60-day delay period before you make another decision going forward. Thank you.

David Grubb: Darrell Herbert?

Darrell Herbert: Yes, my name is Darrell Herbert. I'm not either for the museum or against the museum. One of the things that I am against is that we are a casualty of it. I work for the Presidio Bowling Center. I've been there for the past nine years. I'm the youth director there. All the talk tonight I've heard about fancy this, fancy that, and I haven't heard nothing - other than this gentleman here - that just spoke up about kids. I don't know about you guys, but when I think of a park

I think of swings, trees, hiking trails, things that are fun to kids. And eliminating the Presidio Bowling Center, which we attract so many kids on a daily, yearly, monthly basis, would be tragic. We run the youth program there. We have kids from age two to 102 that come in and bowl. That's the good thing about bowling. It doesn't make a difference how old you are. We do have a lot of kids that bowl there.

This is something that I just received today by one of the girls from one of the schools that use our facility. She's a fourth grader. She says, "Hi. My name is [Ellen Slins]. I'm a fourth grader at Hamlin School. To help you out we got 100 kids to sign a petition to keep the bowling alley open. Here's a copy if you'd like." She also puts her e-mail address and her home address on here. And this is from fourth graders, okay.

You guys have said before that you guys were going to try to do your best to keep the bowling in the Presidio. And with 23 days left and nothing that's come beyond that, I wanted to know what you guys are going to try to do to keep bowling in Presidio? How dedicated are you at doing that? It doesn't have to be a great answer, just something saying look, we're willing to work with Mr. Meyerhoff. We're doing so. I haven't seen it yet. And with that, there's nothing for kids to do as it is anyhow. You take this away and there'll be that less for them to do.

People and some guys said earlier about coming into Presidio and saying what to come there for. There's plenty of stuff to come there for. I've been working there for nine years, and there's stuff that I'm learning every day there, coming in the Presidio, driving through - whether it be historic, whether it be something that just says wow, I didn't know this exists.

You guys so far have done a great job in revitalizing some of the other stuff. You need to take a look at the whole picture here, all right? Museum, rather it's there that, I mean - I hope you take a look about that. The problem with that is, I think you hit everybody with it and not tell everybody exactly what was going to go on as time goes along. It was just, this is what we're going to do and this is what's being presented. And no one really knows.

Some lady said earlier, "What is Mr. Fisher going to be paying for this?" Nobody had an answer for it, but there's a lot of stuff that people would really like to know. But my concern here right now is to keep the bowling center open, whether it be either a current location until you guys figure out what's going to happen with this museum, whether it's going to go through or not, or at another location down at the Marina Greens which you guys had suggested to begin with.

In any case I hope you do consider that and work with us in any way we can in keeping the Presidio Bowling Center open. Thank you very much.

David Grubb: Brian Lim? Joseph Stefani?

Brian Lim: Hi. My name is Brian Lim. I'm president of the Presidio All Stars Junior All Stars Tournament Club. We bowl tournaments all over the place for scholarship money and whatnot. I'm going to keep this short. We really want to see bowling in the Presidio. Until you guys either give us an extension, or relocate us or whatnot, we can't really do anything. We can't start a new season for a league, we can't bowl in tournaments. And without that, we have no scholarship. We can't have an opportunity to win scholarship money for college. So going off what Darrell said, I'd like to see you guys with answers to what's going to happen to the ball. Thank you.

David Grubb: Joseph Stefani?

Male Voice: Call more names.

David Grubb: Jimmy Eng? I guess that's it, E-N-G. Paul Wermer? William Shepard? Sounds familiar. And Carol Brownson?

Jimmy Eng: Good evening, Directors. Let me start by saying how disappointed I am to hear that you've let the bowling alley get to this state with no direction given the length of time it's going to be before anything happens to that site. I'm extremely disappointed, because

that is a betrayal of a public trust. That is a failure to behave honorably to people.

I do want to thank the U.C. Berkley students for highlighting the difficulty in reviewing the supplement to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. There are no clear references to what has changed. You read it, and some of it looks like it's a rewrite of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Not a supplement to it, but a rewrite.

There are subtle changes. It's taking us time to figure those out. Appendix A talks a lot to traffic, which is a real concern. It's not a NIMBY concern, it's a real concern. And it's not related strictly to CAMP or the Disney Museum. It is, however, a very real problem when you look at the traffic that is coming through the Presidio onto city streets. It is a safety issue. The metrics that you have used, the level of service, are wonderful for commute routes. They're great for Doyle Drive. They are pointless when you're trying to assess impact on a residential community where there are families, where there are children, where there are schools, where there are pedestrians.

So I would very much like to ask that, in fact, you extend the period to review this so we can do a decent analysis of what's going on, so we can talk to your traffic people and understand the assumptions and see what it's really telling us in the hope that maybe we will

find some solutions other than going to lawsuits. I guess I'll stop there. Thank you.

David Grubb: Carol Brownson? Alessandro . . .

Male Voice: William Shepard also?

David Grubb: Okay.

Carol Brownson: Deeming members of the Trust, thank you for this opportunity. I'm Carol Brownson. I'm here representing hundreds of thousands of Americans who are very poorly educated in American history. Only learned names and dates in school, so I've gone to historical novels, because that at least kept me interested. But you changed all that. It was your advertising. It was this.

I don't need historical novels. Look at the faces sitting on the Montgomery Street steps. Who are they? Why does the guy with the most stripes get a cat? Well, fortunately you've come out with some more information on that in this new big document. You've tossed me a minnow. Medical stewards pose before Montgomery Street Barracks. Well, that's something. It's a little more.

So I got involved, and what a process you've gotten me involved in. I couldn't just say, "Gee, I'd really like to learn some more history." Why isn't that the big development at the focal point? No, there's a process here. It's a very complicated legal process. Read this

document. It's that thick. Okay, I read it. Now there's another document that's also that thick with another name that's unpronounceable. It's a supplement to a supplemental, et cetera. And I started to read that and I thought I'd cry. And then I realized they were pictures, pictures again.

This isn't so silly because you've hired a firm, and the firm advertises its services by saying, "We help our clients communicate with their respective constituencies by facilitating a visual understanding of architectural and landscape designs." So I thought, aha. I can look at the pictures again. I'll get there. At least I'll get an idea. So I started with the cover of this. And what do I see on the cover of the new supplement to the supplemental, et cetera? Well, at the focal point of this cover picture is a lady taking off her shirt. Oh yeah, there's a lodge behind it.

Then in the section on education where you're going to educate some of us poorly-educated people, there's a group of students with a teacher who has a posture problem. She's standing there sort of like that. And the students are the usual group of not terribly interested students, and then there's one isolated black student at the back. Oh yeah, and there's a family of color wandering through.

That's the quality of the educational experience you want to present in this new proposal? Well, I think the process needs a little more time for us to read that big document and understand what it's really doing. Thank you.

William Shepard: I think you called my name a couple of minutes ago. William Shepard. Thank you.

David Grubb: Sure.

William Shepard: My name is William Shepard. I'm speaking on behalf of Lake Street Residents Association. A comment I didn't intend to make was brought up by the comments made by the bowling enthusiasts.

I'm really quite shocked that their lease is being terminated at the end of this month, where there's no reason to tear down that building anytime soon that I'm aware of. I don't understand it. At a later point maybe, Craig, one of your people can explain it to the group of us at NAPP, or the working group, or someone else. It just seems ridiculous to me that these people are being shut down in a matter of days here where this project is not due to come to any kind of finality for some months yet.

In any event, as we all agree, the Main Post is the heart of the Presidio. It is critical that the Board make a careful and wise decision permanently defining the future of the Main Post. That's your task, and you're in a position in doing this to succeed or fail. To succeed, your decision must be sensitive to the essential park values. After all, it's a national park. It's not Golden Gate Park, it's not a suburban development. You must be sensitive to the history and the remaining treasure of the historic structures on the

Main Post, of which there's nothing like it anywhere else in our country. It's a unique place. To fail, all you need to do is what some of you do best - think like developers and overdevelop. Overdevelop this critical piece of real estate with the predictable cumulative adverse impacts of parking, traffic, congestion that only will worsen over time.

Even if it does not meet - I'll skip ahead here. I only have a minute. How you have arrived at the current iteration of proposals as the one you choose to designate, the Preferred Alternative is mind-boggling when I think of your critical role in transitioning the Presidio from a military base to a national park. I do not understand how any of you can honestly think what we have before us is the best that you could do to carry out your charge.

Granted there have been some improvements particularly with regard to this scaling back the size of the lodge and coming up with a design that is compatible with the historic setting. I commend you for that. Then there's the Fisher complex that still reigns over the Main Parade. It's an ultra-modern, slick, massive complex. Only through tortured marketing hype can one claim it is comparable - compatible with an historic setting in which it is proposed to become the center of attention.

CAMP today, public relation site, markets it as suggesting that we only need to imagine wonderful things. Indeed, one needs to have a

very active imagination to conclude that the new additional Fisher complex is compatible with the historic setting which you will. . .

David Grubb: Could you give your comments to the desk? We'll take them that way. Thank you.

Alessandro Galli: Hi. My name is Alessandro. I am not a San Francisco resident, and I want to provide a very detached point of view. I'm simply a San Francisco lover. I came here for the first time three years ago, and I'm always looking forward the way to come back to the City. And every time I come back I try to go to the Presidio.

I read most of the comments this evening that it's probably not well-managed as an area and it needs improvement, and I really like the idea of having the green area instead of the parking lot. And I also like all the plans that Mr. Middleton did with the need to preserve the history of San Francisco and the history of this place, which is the birthplace of San Francisco. But the conclusion, it doesn't make sense for me. You cannot preserve this by destroying the area and building a museum, and it doesn't make sense.

Also I think people that are against having the museum in the Presidio are not against the museum itself. So I think the museum is great things for the City. To have this collection is really good. But I don't see the point why you need to destroy something and create something new.

And I'm coming from Italy, and we have thousand, million of people coming to Italy to see the ruin of an empire that existed thousands of years ago, and we preserve these ruins. We didn't preserve these by building very fancy and modern buildings right next to them or in the middle of them. And that's it. Thank you.

David Grubb: Michael Mueller, Scott Heldford. I guess this is how it's said. I think it's H-E-L-D-F-O-R, Heldford, I guess.

Female Voice: Heldford.

David Grubb: Heldford. Okay. Diana Horner? Boyd De Larios is next.

Male Voice: That might be Diana.

David Grubb: Yeah, that's Diana.

Diana Horner: Hello. Thank you for this opportunity. I just wanted to say that I am a resident of Presidio Heights, and very fortunate to be there, but definitely concerned about the impact of traffic. My husband grew up in our house, and he used to ride his bike when the Arguello Gate was closed. Now we see go-carts, we see cars, trucks, taxis, there's so much traffic already. I worry about the placement of CAMP and how that will continue to affect our neighborhood. It looks like a beautiful museum. Again, I just hope you consider its placement in the future. Thank you.

David Grubb: Thank you.

Boyd De Larios: Hi, I'm Boyd De Larios. I'm a Spanish California descendant. I'm one of the 106 consulting parties representing descendants of Anza and Portola expeditions. We have a unique view of history in that our families have been involved with the Presidio for 230 years. Now that is not 230 years ago, it's continuous in many cases.

So we have a special sense of betrayal for some of the things that are going on, and I have many things to say based on the comments that I've heard tonight. However, I would first like to tell you that you are subverting the purpose of the Congress in establishing this park. In the Presidio Trust Act, Section 101, which is Findings, Clause 3, it states, "Preservation of the cultural and historic integrity of the Presidio for the public use recognizes its significant role in the history of the United States."

The proposals that we're talking about here - promoted by the Presidio Trust - have misused the word cultural, and are directly threatening that culture and historic integrity. The history and culture of the Presidio are specific to this place. The Presidio Trust ignores the relevant and correct definition of culture, which is the intellectual content of a society or civilization.

The San Francisco Presidio has had changing military cultures for more than 200 years under the Spanish, Mexican and United States. Reasonable persons would expect that the primary themes of the

history and the culture of the San Francisco Presidio would be investigated, studied and interpreted on this site.

The Presidio Trust has acted as if promotion of artistic or intellectual pursuits such as opera, chess, film or contemporary art are its primary missions. Contemporary art or film are not primary cultural attributes of the Presidio itself. The Presidio Trust cannot legitimately override Congress' intent.

A bookstore might find more profit in selling mattresses, but lose its integrity as a bookstore. Similarly the Presidio Trust cannot legitimately change the culture of the San Francisco Presidio from military to artistic without destroying its cultural and historical integrity.

It's very late. I'm extremely tired. I believe everybody else is here. I reiterate some of the pain and resentment of having to be out here at this time of the year. The timing of the bowling alley is something that I find myself - the cessation of their contract - in great sympathy with, because throughout our process here we have had short notice.

We've been under threat continually in this process without a long-term horizon plan, and it was very difficult for the people who have participated in the process over the last year-and-a-half to do so because we never had sufficient warning of what was about to happen. I'll have to leave at that.

David Grubb: Jean Sweeney, Louise Frankel, Marianna Stark, Raymond Holland,
I guess?

Raymond Holland: Hi, I'm Raymond Holland. I don't think - I guess I'm the next. We just received the three new documents at the end of March, so we're still studying. I'm representing the Planning Association for the Richmond District, which is your southern border. It's the largest dues-paying membership neighborhood organization in San Francisco.

We submitted three pages of detailed comments with regard to the first set of documents that came in back in September, and let me just briefly go through them, because we haven't updated them. We're still reading all those complex documents to try to figure it out. Our position has been consistently no large-scale development at the Main Post - large scale building development at the Main Post. I think what the architects have done with the new museum is enormous improvement over what it was previously. It's great. It just doesn't belong there.

I have to echo Dave Bancroft that it's just a square peg in a round hole. I think we want the museum, but we just don't want it at the Main Post. The essence of the Presidio - by its very name and its history, of its historic and cultural context - is the military and nothing else, and it should be emphasized. Everything that's been

done so far in the development on the Presidio really hasn't emphasized that.

The heart and soul of the military - besides the cemetery - is the Main Post, and that should be emphasized. The latest addition of the Main Post Update, you have the Heritage Center in the back room of the Officers' Club. For a non-com, that's an insult. You have to go through the Officers' Club to find out the Heritage Center? You need to move that to the front stage.

The historic context of the military - going back not just to the U.S. Military, but looking at the Mexican and the Spanish, even though many of its officers were Portuguese - I think that's the history. Young persons need to come in and find out what the military history is - not just the national significance, but uniquely, also the local significance. The military has been absolutely essential in the fires of San Francisco throughout history. And even in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, they were out there directing traffic.

Because we're still trying to formulate our written comments - and we'll have them into you by the present closing date of April 27th - we'd like to ask for an extension to at least June, if not later, so at least we can submit some intelligible comments for you. Thank you.

David Grubb: Michael Austin, Jean Palmer, Ian Berke, B-E-R-K-E. I hope I'm saying that right. Tito Patri.

Male Voice: This could be Ian Berke.

David Grubb: Is this Ian Berke?

Ian Berke: Yes, it is.

David Grubb: Please. You first.

Ian Berke: My name is Ian Berke. I am a real estate broker. I live and work in San Francisco. I just cannot understand how the Trust Board can approve this museum in this location. Your approval ignores your mandated preservation mission, ignores the Secretary of Interior guidelines, ignores the parking and traffic issues, and ignores the clearly inappropriate siting of this modern building, yet you seem determined to develop the Main Parade Grounds - first with the Disney museum, soon a hotel, and now Mr. Fisher's museum.

Why is this building even considered here in the historic heart of the Presidio? Doesn't the Trust Act mandate the protection and preservation of historic resources in the Presidio? Where is the stewardship? If the Board had half the resolve to preserve and protect that they have had to ensuring that Mr. Fisher gets what he wants, we wouldn't even be here.

We can't even get transparency or candor from you. Is there a single person in this room - even earlier when the room was filled -

who doesn't think you long ago decided to approve this museum? These hearings are little more than window dressing. You spend a great deal of money publicizing each iteration Mr. Fisher's museum, and acting much like his paid assistants.

Who do you think you work for, Mr. Fisher or the American public? I don't even need to wait for an answer. You've answered clearly, and you should be ashamed.

Tito Patri:

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Tito Patri, and I'm a landscape architect currently working on design guidelines for Yosemite National Park, where the Secretary of Interior's Standards are iron. And I believe that they apply to the Presidio and to the parade ground.

The key word in the Secretary's Standards is compatibility. What does that mean? It means essentially that when the new building or a new proposal is suggested within the historic district that the vocabulary of that architecture and of the historic cultural landscape must be kept without mimicking the historic buildings.

The key elements of that vocabulary are scale - the sprawling buildings proposed for CAMP are not the compact footprints of the existing barracks buildings. Color, obviously the proposal is not related in any way to the color of the barracks buildings.

Shape, the building is in no way of similar shape to the barracks buildings - and in particular, roof shape is one of the most important components, and roof pitch. Obviously from the drawings the proposal for CAMP does not come anywhere near repeating or even referencing the roof shapes of the barracks. By the way, I think that the reality is that from many viewpoints on the ground the low pitches of the proposal will actually end up looking like a flat roof.

Finally, the context. I think one of the most important and consistent characteristics of the military compound is a repetition of similar components. And, in fact, the architect today, this evening, suggested that there were actually three components. So I think that on all of these counts the proposal does not come up to the standard that is required by the Secretary of Interior.

On a less technical point here, I'd like to suggest that the Fisher Family fund the greening of the parade ground, spend their \$10 million to do that, and then spend the rest of their money expanding their existing building where I have seen the collection, the Embarcadero, where they have a fantastic Bay view, where there is connection to ferry transit, to BART and to the Muni. So it's an excellent, easily accessible site. Thank you very much.

David Grubb: Thank you. Bert Fulmer, Merv Silberberg, Chuck Collins. Is he here? Paul Epstein, Lindsay Davidson.

Lindsay Davidson: Yes, Directors, my name is Lindsay Davidson. I live in Oakland, so I've come all the way over to the Presidio to comment tonight about what I think is both a good plan and a terrible plan.

In many respects there are aspects of the Presidio master plan for the area that are superb. For example, extending the parkway all the way across the Doyle Drive down to the waterfront is magnificent. It restores it back to a period of time well before we had any drive in that location.

But there are aspects to the museum design that are absolutely abhorrent in that they clash so tremendously with the surrounding context. Everywhere around the Presidio you can look out and you can see some of the inspirational structures which actually derived from the architecture of the Presidio.

You look at the Golden Gate Bridge. The reason the Golden Gate Bridge has the color it has is because of the barracks buildings that are right there on that main esplanade, or the main area of the Presidio. So what you're doing when we build a new, modernistic building in that place, like the landscape architect commended, it clashes with that vocabulary that is an integral part of what make the Presidio great.

The Presidio is more of a national park than it is just contained on the footprint of the original Presidio military base. It extends all the way across the Bay, all the way to the Golden Gate. It's a huge

national asset, and I think we're doing a disservice by building a pigeonhole little museum that buries its artwork below grade rather than doing something which captures the surrounding as a whole, blends with the surrounding as a whole, and bring some of those great art pieces out into the natural landscape. I would encourage that you have the benefactors rethink the design for the museum so it contributes to the park as a whole. Thank you.

David Grubb: Louise Williams, Peter Hirshberg, Judith Napp? There she is. Next person is Roddy Creedon.

Judith Hulka: I'm actually feeling like Judith Napp about now. I'm Judith Hulka, and I'm speaking for NAPP, the Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning. And we will, as always, provide extensive written comments. But I think the best thing that NAPP can do to contribute to this frustrating stalemate around the development of the Main Post right now is to respectfully ask the Presidio Trust to extend the public comment period.

As a matter of public record NAPP is here tonight to ask that the public comment period be extended for at least 60 days, from the April 27th date to Monday, June 29th, for the following reasons. The last time the plans of this magnitude for the Presidio were contemplated, it took a two-year public planning process and nine months of public comment to move forward. That was in 2002 when the Presidio Trust Management Plan was put together, that

many people in the surrounding neighborhoods worked on extensively.

Also the fact that the Section 106 process will only be completed a week before your current deadline of April 27th is not at all enough time for us to process the extensive documents and the impact of those decisions on the National Historic Landmark District. So for those two reasons we really want the public comment period extended.

NAPP has been a long-time civic steward of the Presidio National Park since 1989, as you know. We have serious concerns. We're putting a lot of time into this. We would like to do the due diligence, and we need that extra time. We pride ourselves on being collaborative, and not a confrontational group. So if you extend that extra time to us, I think it will be worth everyone's effort of good will, and we look forward to hearing about the extension. Thank you.

David Grubb: Will Connolly, Bill Applegate, Todd Smith, Judith Purpura, I guess it is, Purpura?

Male Voice: She's here.

David Grubb: And Judith Hoyem is next.

Judith Hoyem: All those other people aren't here? I am here because I am the mother of four children that has been living in San Francisco since 2001. And we moved to the Presidio in 2002 and lived there for five years. During that time I got to see the park change dramatically from a community-based neighborhood to watching buildings being rehabbed and changed into office space.

The traffic increased dramatically in the park from the time that we moved in until the time that we moved away. And now when we come back to the park there's even more traffic. We go to the park to enjoy the things the parks have to offer. We ride our bikes, my children go down to the Warming Hut, we play on the beach. And it's becoming dangerous to even ride your bike in the park.

The other things that are at the park for my kids to enjoy that they have enjoyed immensely were to be at the Presidio Bowling Center. My oldest child was on a bowling team for high schools. My youngest child just had a birthday party there. They have attended birthday parties with their friends. And my husband and my twins have had lots of time there doing family activities.

I know that the bowling center isn't a fabulous location and not a pretty building by any means, but this is a community center. I don't understand how an art museum is a community center. Anybody, can you tell yourselves, as a childhood memory, I remember going to the art museum and spending lots of hours there

bonding with my family? We go to museums, but that is not a community center that draws a community in day after day.

The Presidio was a military post, and most military posts have bowling centers. If we go forward developing the Presidio with large art museums, more office buildings, this takes away from a park. A park is a place where you come to enjoy your family and your friends, not to have massive tourism and attract people from far and wide to clog up the streets, and back up the traffic in the Lombard Gate.

I've watched it happen first hand, and I can't understand how this is something that isn't seriously considered when it's a national park. When I stand in Pershing Square where the flag stands and the monument to the general whose family died in a fire and look out onto the Bay, I can imagine what life might have been like all those years ago. With a contemporary building, that vision would be gone. Digging up a parking lot doesn't take millions of dollars. Putting sod in there is a simple fix.

David Grubb: Thank you. Nicholas Hاديaris, Judy Wessing?

Judy Wessing: Hi. I'm speaking for myself this time. Last name's pronounced Wessing. I wish Mr. Fisher had chosen to really serve the public interest by placing his art collection on a southern waterfront easily accessible by public transit, and providing an art education for students who live south of Market.

The students in the neighborhoods around the Presidio mostly attend private schools and have an excellent enriched art education and experience already. I ask you, members of the Trust, to see the Main Post as a preservation project and not as a redevelopment opportunity.

We're talking about a historic district in a national park that for 200 years was a military post. For many of us the Presidio is not part of urban life so much as it's a respite from it without actually having to leave town. Just look at the neighborhood. There's a chapel in the Golden Gate Club, a few minutes' walk up the street from where you propose to put the CAMP museum. It's a cozy venue used for recessions, conferences, memorial services with onsite parking. What will happen to this area, this historic space when thousands of people flood into the Main Post?

West of that, less than a thousand yards from the proposed CAMP site, is the national cemetery, the final resting place for 26,000 plus or minus patriotic war veterans. It's a place of quiet dignity on a military post, and national cemetery. I urge each of you to walk there, spend a little time, and seriously consider what that space will be like when you have a beehive happening in the Main Post area.

I've lived here for 43 years - Pacific Heights, Cow Hollow, Upper Haight, now Forest Hill. I do not go to the Presidio for an urban experience or seeking art, I go there to enjoy the Golden Gate

promenade, time on the waterfront, to attend events at the Officers' Club or the Golden Gate Club, or to place flowers on the gravesite of Colonel Coffin, and thank him for serving in World War I and World War II, and taking me hiking in national parks, particularly Yosemite.

Greening the parade ground is fine, but a modern art museum and a new lodge are ruinous additions. Please protect, preserve, emphasize the historic places already at the Presidio. See it as the historic park that it is. Respect the history and the stories of people who have served in the Presidio, and those who are there for eternity. Thank you.

David Grubb: Ellen Little? Oh, excuse me.

Peter Hadiaris: Nicholas Hadiaris is my six-year old boy, and it's little late for him. But I promised him that I would tell you on his behalf that he wants you to save the bowling alley. Thank you.

David Grubb: Thank you.

Peter Hadiaris: My turn to talk comes a little bit later on. That was for him.

David Grubb: Ellen Little, Leah Grant, Leah, I guess, Leah. One of those. It's getting to that time. Freda Koblick is next, and then Jacob Vink, I guess, or Virk, V-I-R-K or B-I-N-K. Excuse me.

Freda Koblick: Now for the night club act. The microphone came out of the holster, whatever. Thank you for staying along this late night. One of my friends wanted me to finish up her statement, which is very quick. Opponents to this art museum are truly outraged and dismayed because Mr. Fisher is using the power of his vast wealth and influence to pressure the Trust to break the law in order to accommodate his personal hobby. Sadly, the Trust seems to be rolling over.

I urge the Trust to take seriously the obvious widespread opposition to this museum on the Main Parade Ground. You stand to do great irreversible harm to a sacred historical heart of the National Historic Landmark District that is America's newest and most historically-significant national park.

This birthplace of the American west is a sacred place, not the monopoly board of a select few. What is the point of having laws to protect our national parks and our history if the rich and powerful can ignore these laws, and that is from my friend.

I also would like to say a couple of things that I've observed with dealing with the Fisher family over the last couple of years. First of all, the Presidio happens to be one of the three last old-growth forests within San Francisco's City and County. In addition, the Fisher family have, I think, greased the wheels of the City and County of San Francisco that make it easier to contemplate having their personal private collection, which is a marvelous collection, on

the national park, which is sort of like, why don't they choose Yosemite, or the Grand Canyon? It's of that stature, putting a personal museum in a national park.

What they have done in San Francisco is they've expropriated over ten, and they've got plans for 80 neighborhood parks to put plastic grass. They can do that for the Presidio instead. They always have been using EIS walkarounds, and they're doing the same with this process as well.

The Fisher family are very wealthy, and they're very, very well-known, and they're wonderful with art collections, but it's not their business to impose themselves on a national park. Thank you.

David Grubb: Nilson Reyes, Verna Shaheen, Keith Goldstein? Peter - well, this is Peter.

Nilson Reyes: Good evening. My name is Nilson Reyes, and I've got my daughter, Leslie Reyes. So I speak last time, and I want to tell you this project, I think it's okay. It's good. But they can find different place because this thing, is affect me and my family for months already, because we don't know if they're going to close, or that is the time to start finding another job.

Because we don't have one day, you and the guys, they're going to give my boss one place. Because every time we're asking, so where are we going to move? You're going to open another one?

The Presidio, the Trust, they're going to give you another place, another building? We don't know yet. We don't know yet. This is for months, like a year, or no.

My other partner employees, they say well, we have to find a job or not? We're waiting. We're just waiting because we don't know if tomorrow, next month, we're going to be making line for the people unemployed. So now it's made like, we [fly], because we don't know if we've a got a job now, like maybe tomorrow or next month, because we say - and my boss say - they're giving only to the end of this month. So maybe next month I'm going to make a line to collect the unemployment.

So I think it's time. It's time to give time to my boss or something, because we want to keep working. We want to keep working. My other partners, they say we hope keep the bowling open because we love the bowling. I work in that place for nine years already, and then I work Japantown Bowl. I be a mechanic for like 16 years. I'm the mechanic for 16 years in the bowling alley. In [unintelligible] I never bowl. But in this country I have a friend, so they teach me, teach me for the bowling. And then I say well, it's good.

I used to be a welder, and then now they say oh, it's fun. Be a mechanic bowling. But now they're closing all the bowling centers, so now I don't know where we're going, where I have to go. And

my other partners, we don't know yet. My girl want to say something.

Leslie Reyes: And no close the bowling.

David Grubb: Thank you. Peter Hadiaris again, and then Courtney Clarkson and Roy Leggitt.

Peter Hadiaris: Thank you. I think I've already said how much my family enjoys the bowling center and I hope that you just leave it where it is. I think in one very big sense in adopting the art gallery you've kind of missed the point.

The bowling alley, and the golf course, and the theater are what you should be focusing on because those are things that combine modern uses with history. These things were all put in by the military to entertain their soldiers, and to rip them out for something that has nothing to do with the history really doesn't make any sense to me, because these are the things, the aspects of military life that should be preserved for people to enjoy in the Presidio. I think in that sense the bowling alley, the golf course, and the theater should be the things that are most valuable, not something you simply cast aside or try to put in some other building somewhere, because that's something that is useful.

The bowling alley is very successful. It employs 25 people. On weekends you can wait up to an hour for a lane. My family went

there yesterday, and at 11:00 on a Monday night they were almost full. This has been a successful business that could stay open for a long time.

The second thing I wanted to say is I think the people who are proposing this are vastly underestimating the traffic problems. This area of the Main Post is served by three two-lane roads - Arguello, Presidio and Lombard, and the park is a two-lane road. Anybody who wants to see what the traffic would be like should go down to Golden Gate Park and the Inner Sunset around Lincoln and 9th Avenue on the weekend and see how the reopening of the Academy of Sciences has turned into complete gridlock. Nobody moves there for hours. They can take half-an-hour to drive through Golden Gate Park through that section, and anybody who lives in that area knows to avoid that part of the park on weekends. I think you're vastly underestimating the traffic problems.

The third thing I want to talk about is the architecture. I was kind of shocked to hear people talk about how this architecture blends with the neighboring buildings, because it doesn't. The neighboring buildings - I think it's called Georgian revival - they're characterized by brick construction, vertical lines, high roofs. To call this modern building to fit in because you put in a stone retaining wall and paint it white like some of the buildings is kind of like putting an overhang on a ranch house and saying that means it's going to fit in great in a neighborhood full of Tudors. It just doesn't work.

My fourth point was, I'm very concerned that Mr. Fisher retains an armature of his artwork. It's all very nice that he's generous now, but I'm not so certain what would happen to this museum if his heirs, in ten, or 20 or however many years decide not to be so generous, or if the GAP goes the way of Montgomery Ward or Emporium Capwell, which, you know, things happen. So I think that you need to be clear on that point as well. Thank you very much.

David Grubb: Thank you.

Verna Shaheen: Verna Shaheen, number 123 - auspicious, I think, and I should be home doing my taxes. As an appointed former trustee, Mr. Fisher should be prohibited from benefiting from his previous connections to the Presidio Trust. It appears that the current Board of Trustees is under pressure to serve a former trustee rather than serving the national park. If this is so, then clearly it is a breach of the fiduciary duty.

Further, if Mr. Fisher's potential gift is contingent upon its placement specifically on the parade ground, then it, in my mind, is not a true gift, and it would point to undue influence upon the trustees. Mr. Fisher's modern art probably doesn't belong anywhere in the Presidio, given the complications of this so-called gift. The architectural renderings need not be in vain, but could be

used, perhaps, to revitalize Hunter's Point or Mission Bay, keeping the acronym but just omitting the "P".

It's refreshing that our Mayor is not here this evening lending his staff to the project. In today's political climate and public insistence on transparency and rage over business and government scandals, there is little tolerance now for questionable projects like this with intriguing relationships among trustees and a former trustee.

As a San Francisco resident and member of various historical preservation organizations, I will put my money where my mouth is. If a lawsuit results, I will certainly open my checkbook to fight this proposed plan. For those who need a good reason to go to the Presidio, I might suggest attending the Memorial Day services at our national cemetery in the Presidio to honor those who served so we might enjoy our freedoms. Thank you.

David Grubb: Courtney Clarkson, Roy Leggitt?

Courtney Clarkson: I'm not that short. Hello, I'm Courtney Clarkson. I live six blocks from the Presidio, the southeast corner. I've been walking, and driving, and bird watching, and doing native plant habitat restoration in the Presidio for more than a decade. One of the things that I enjoy most about the Presidio is just being able to walk around and look at the beautiful buildings, and look at the fact that

there are trees, and there are now some native plants, and it is a park.

One of the most beautiful places, I think, in San Francisco is at the very top of the Main Parade Ground, just to be able to come from anywhere in San Francisco, or even the Bay Area, and stand at the top of the Main Parade Ground - in spite of the fact that you're looking at a lot of concrete, a lot of asphalt - and look down at the buildings, the Montgomery Street Barracks, the view of the Bay, the Marina, and it's one of the most beautiful places in San Francisco. And to stick a contemporary art museum in that location, I really think is absolutely blasphemous.

The Presidio should be about history. What about all the rest of those historic buildings that are sitting empty on the Main Post? Shouldn't we be filling them with entities connected to the history of the Post, the military, our country? Do you remember those wonderful exhibitions of American flags that we had in the Officers' Club? Shouldn't that be a more appropriate use instead of building a large modern building to house a modern art collection?

It seems to me that once you have the components in place that are appropriate for a national park - like a visitor's center, like a historical museum, like a military museum - at that point maybe think about something contemporary.

As you've heard all this evening - and I think I'm 126 on the list of people signed up to speak - you've heard from so many people who feel that this is totally the wrong type of building or enterprise to be going in the Presidio, and especially at this location. Thank you.

Roy Leggitt:

My name is Roy Leggitt. I am the second Leggitt to speak to you this evening, apparently. My view is very different than the prior speaker, and I'm actually not the first Leggitt to be involved at the Presidio. My grandfather was discharged from the Presidio following World War I, and he served here.

The historic context appears to be lost on you. The idea of a modern art museum, a modern art collection, an individual's art collection, none of that is offensive to me, but it is offensive to place that in an ignorant manner within the historic framework of the Presidio. It's simply inappropriate.

My profession is surrounding trees and horticulture. I'm a consulting arborist. And because of that role I have had opportunity to work upon national park properties on a number of occasions, most recently at Fort Baker East. There is a hotel within the former military base there, and there are new buildings there, but they're not right on the parade ground. They're set back. The historic framework is much more intact there than what I perceive this proposed museum and hotel will actually create on this parade ground.

I do hope that you'll respect the parade ground and the historic context of it, interpret it, and bring people there in order to appreciate the history of the place and the open spaces. Thank you.

David Grubb: I want to thank everybody. This gentleman was the last one - Mr. Leggitt. Thank you for your comments, and we'll use them, and we appreciate it very much. So thank you very much, thank the Board for another nice evening.

Male Voice: You have to do the time.

David Grubb: The time is 11:43, for anybody wants that sort of thing. Thank you all very much. Bye.

[End of Recorded Material]