

January 7, 2006


Dear Friend,

Thank you for participating in November's Presidio Playing Fields Workshop. We appreciate your time and we have benefited from your input. As promised, we are sending you this summary of the workshop, the public feedback we received, and next steps. We look forward to continuing to work with you to make the Presidio an exceptional park!

## 1. WORKSHOP SUMMARY

On November 15, 2006, the Presidio Trust hosted a workshop to give the public an opportunity to provide early input on a variety of playing field concepts that might work in the Presidio. The concepts were organized around three broad parameters: potential new fields, opportunities to increase the quality and functionality (and sometimes size) of existing fields, and the possible removal/replacement of Morton Street Field in Tennessee Hollow in order to daylight the underlying creek and restore the riparian corridor.

The workshop began with a presentation by the Presidio Trust and its consultant, Royston Hanamoto Alley & Abbey. Background information was provided about the history of recreation at the Presidio and relevant policies and plans governing management of the park's complex landscape. Preliminary playing field concepts for seven potential sites were then presented. Multiple concepts were presented for several of these sites.



Following the presentation, workshop participants broke into small groups to discuss and deliberate upon each of the preliminary concepts. Groups were asked to try and reach consensus as to whether they could collectively support (or not) each concept, and explain why. The groups presented their conclusions to the larger group, and documented their comments on worksheets which were collected by the Trust. A summary of the written and verbal feedback we received is provided below. The comments are organized by the seven playing field sites, followed by general comments.

## **Summary of Public Comments**

### ***Commissary West***

The reactions to the two alternatives for a new field at the Commissary West site were mixed. Two groups supported the idea, two groups could not reach consensus, and one group did not discuss this location. Based on the group worksheets, there appeared to be greater support for the option which provides a larger, more formalized playing field area, lending greater flexibility for various field configurations. Other feedback included:

- Consider pertinent historic and archaeological issues.
- Evaluate the impact of wind and other conditions at this site.
- Consider impact on further marsh expansion.
- Study the option of removing the PX to create another playing field.

### ***Doyle Drive Replacement***

Reactions to the Doyle Drive Replacement concept were also mixed. Under this concept, a new field would be located atop the future (planned) tunnel containing Highway 101 just north of the Main Post. Two groups supported this proposal while other groups either opposed the concept or did not provide comment. There was a general sense that this concept has potential, but was difficult to consider given the uncertain implementation timeline (~2010+). Other feedback included:

- Consider topography and general site functionality.
- Consider field location may appear “too artificial” in the context on the Main Post.
- Evaluate field appropriateness and link in the context of Crissy Field.

### ***Childcare Center***

Aside from one group’s concern that the site was too small, there was consensus that this option warranted further exploration. The connection to a field which historically existed near this location positively resonated with several of the groups. The lack of apparent environmental impacts and physical relationship to the Childcare Center was seen as positive attribute. Other feedback included:

- Consider drainage.
- Consider whether this field would be an adequate replacement location for Morton Street Field given size constraints.

### ***Paul Goode Cluster***

In general, there was support for retention of Paul Goode Field and support for enhancement of the field at Julius Kahn. No consensus was reached about Fill Site 1, although, more groups appeared to be supportive of the option that considered a new small practice field at Fill Site. Other feedback included:

- Consider the recreation needs of both youth and adults; there was a feeling from some participants that youth activities are given higher priority than adults.
- Evaluate potential effects of a field on El Polin Spring and possible “sand dune” restoration.
- Explore alternative field orientation schemes.
- Improve safety on West Pacific Avenue (special attention was requested for “dangerous trees” and traffic).
- Examine the feasibility of dispersing parking areas.
- Evaluate impact on surrounding neighborhoods (traffic and noise) and consult with neighbors during development.
- Elevate the overall priority given to conservation and wildlife protection.

### ***Fort Scott Cluster***

There was agreement from all groups that the Fort Scott area offered a promising opportunity for playing field development. The potential new field site located north of Storey Avenue received widespread support. Several of the reasons cited for supporting this proposal included: the presence of preexisting field infrastructure, physical separation from residential neighborhoods, and the distance from important natural areas such as Tennessee Hollow. Other feedback included:

- Consider revisions to further maximize field space, including expansion into the area underlying the former basketball courts.
- Evaluate if maintaining natural turf is appropriate.
- Determine if use of former bowling alley space (north of Storey Ave) is feasible.
- Create U-11 fields as opposed to U-8 field to met current demand.

### ***Pop Hicks Field***

The Pop Hicks Field concept received mixed reaction. The field is currently closed pending remediation of the underlying landfill. The concept presented for restoring the field would accommodate both a creek and playing field by reorienting the field and relocating existing parking. Many supported the reactivation of the field given its historic significance. There was a general sentiment that the impending remediation work posed a major challenge to reuse Pop Hicks in the near term. Others expressed concern regarding the potential environmental impact of having a playing field adjacent to a creek. Other feedback included:

- Consider relocating Pop Hicks to maximize restoration of the natural area near the creek.
- Consider accelerating the remediation schedule to bring the field back to active play sooner.

### ***Morton Street Field***

All of the groups agreed that the Morton Street Field could be replaced under the proper circumstances. Several groups remarked that Fort Scott offered the greatest potential as a replacement site. There was a strong sentiment amongst some participants that any replacement locations needed to be of comparable size and quality. Other feedback included:

- Consider the possibility of making the field “slimmer” to allow for stream restoration.
- A new field replacing Morton Field should be ready for active play before the existing field is removed.

### **Other Comments**

- Crissy Airfield should be considered as a prime location for replacement fields.
- If conflicts arise between the creek and fields, treat Tennessee Hollow as a priority as envisioned in the Trust’s land use plan.
- Consider use of bicycle facilities near fields, as well as potential shuttle service to minimize traffic and parking demands.
- There was interest expressed in taking a tour of Fill Site 1 and other areas to better understand issues.
- Provide additional background on the other field sites considered but dismissed by the Trust – to help give confidence that a thorough search was conducted.
- Provide additional information regarding the “realities” of each site such as timing issues, and constraints and opportunities that should be considered.
- Consider who will manage any new fields or upgraded fields, and who will get to use them.

## **2. NEXT STEPS**

These steps are intended to be responsive to your input, to advance the planning process, and culminate in an overall strategy for the future disposition of Presidio playing fields.

### ***Additional Background***

The Trust is developing a **Staff Report** that summarizes research and planning activities associated with playing fields. The Staff Report will address the sites previously considered, as well as the current sites, and will identify the constraints and opportunities associated with each. This report will be available in early February. Please e-mail or call us to let us know if you would like a copy. Copies will also be provided during the tour described below.

### ***Tour***

The Trust will provide a guided tour of the various playing field sites under consideration. Opportunities and constraints presented by each will be discussed. Come join us for this informal, interactive discussion! The tour will be held on **Saturday February 10<sup>th</sup> from 10am – 12noon**. Please **RSVP** as soon as possible as there will be limited seating capacity in the van.

### ***Workshop***

Trust staff will configure the various playing field options into several overall concepts that make the best use of opportunities in the Presidio. These draft concepts will be presented for public review and comment at a workshop on **Thursday, February 15 at 6:30pm** in the Presidio Officers' Club (50 Moraga Avenue). The goal is to identify a strategy for Presidio playing fields which has broad public support. We encourage you to attend, give us your feedback, and help us achieve this goal. This will be an interactive workshop, so please **RSVP** so we can plan accordingly. Thanks and we hope to see you there!

### **Contact Information:**

(415) 561-5414 or [planning@presidiotrust.gov](mailto:planning@presidiotrust.gov)

Presidio Trust Planning Department

34 Graham Street , P.O. Box 29052

San Francisco, CA 94129