The Presidio Trust is the lead agency for this project, directing the planning, design, and construction effort and managing community outreach and engagement. The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, the non-profit partner to the Trust and the National Park Service, serves as the philanthropic and community engagement partner and supports park restoration and enhancement, education, and visitor service projects and programs. The National Park Service is engaged as the manager of the adjacent parklands at Crissy Field and as a partner in interpretation, visitor services and programming.
The Presidio Trust (lead agency), in consultation with the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy and the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, has prepared this environmental assessment (EA) to examine the potential environmental impacts of alternatives being considered for the Presidio Tunnel Tops (formerly New Presidio Parklands) project in the Presidio of San Francisco, California. The EA describes the need for the proposed project, alternatives, the existing environment that could be affected by the project, the potential impacts from each of the alternatives, and measures proposed to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate potential adverse effects on the environment. The EA, combined with the technical attachments to the EA including the finding of no significant impact and errata, comprise the full and complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) record of the analysis of environmental impacts and the Trust decision-making process for the project.

WHAT ARE THE PRESIDIO TUNNEL TOPS?
The Tunnel Tops are 14 acres of new, contiguous parklands atop and at the base of a dramatic bluff. The site is the result of the replacement of Doyle Drive, the 75 year-old freeway viaduct leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, with the Presidio Parkway, which includes an at-grade, tunnel-covered roadway. It extends from Lincoln Street to Mason Street, and from Halleck Street to the western portals of the new Main Post Tunnels and reconnects the two most expansive public spaces in the Presidio: the Main Post and the Bayfront at Crissy Field. The Visitor Center, in existing Building 210, is situated at the top of the bluff and will anchor a new visitor plaza. The Transit Center, in existing Building 215, will be remodeled to house a new café and expanded restroom facilities. The three acres at the base of the bluff will include the Youth Campus and the Learning Landscape, a nature playscape that will be open to the public. The Youth Campus is comprised of the newly renovated Crissy Field Center, in existing Building 603, two new buildings and a secured landscape. The new Lab building will be at the southeast corner of Building 603 and will provide two classroom spaces for youth programs. The new Field Station building will be southwest of Building 603. It will provide amenities for visitors and serve as a gateway to the Learning Landscape, situated to the west, adjacent to Mason Street. The Tunnel Tops have the potential to become a world-class public space, welcoming visitors of all backgrounds and confirming the Presidio as a definitive 21st Century national park site.

HOW CAN THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATE?
The Trust released the EA for public review on October 28, 2015. The Trust’s announcements invited public comment for a 45-day period, which was extended by 36 days in response to public comment. During the public comment period, the Trust held two informational workshops on November 4 and December 3, 2015 to allow participants to learn more about the project and issues covered in the EA, and to provide comments. Additionally, the Trust offered eight site tours between October 30, 2015 and January 15, 2016. The comment period is now closed. Please read this EA, visit http://www.presidio.gov/tunnel-tops for the latest information about this project, how to get involved, and to learn about upcoming project events.
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PURPOSE AND NEED
1 PURPOSE & NEED

PURPOSE

The Presidio Trust (Trust), working with the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (Conservancy) and the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (NPS), is designing a plan and programs for the New Presidio Parklands, 14 acres of new parklands that will be created in the Presidio atop a dramatic bluff with panoramic Golden Gate views (Figures 1 and 2). This opportunity came about as the result of the demolition of Doyle Drive, the 75-year-old freeway leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, which is being replaced by the Presidio Parkway, a new at-grade tunnel-covered roadway that will connect the two most public spaces in the Presidio: the historic Main Post and the bayfront at Crissy Field. The 14-acre project site also includes three acres of newly designed parklands adjacent to the Crissy Field Center (Building 603), including facilities and grounds for youth programs offered by the Trust, Conservancy and NPS.

BACKGROUND

For more than two centuries the Presidio was a major military post. Rising prominently above San Francisco Bay, it earned the title “defender of the Golden Gate.” Today, the 1,500-acre Presidio is a new kind of national park – a place of natural beauty, a site of great historic significance, and a unique public resource where people live, work and play. The parklands project is a vital chapter in the Presidio’s ongoing evolution. A portion of the elevated highway that cut through the Presidio for seven decades has been replaced with an at-grade roadway hidden from public view by discrete tunnels. This creates a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to establish a new 14-acre landscape that integrates the Presidio’s northern waterfront (Crissy Field) with the Presidio’s historic core (the Main Post) from which visitors can experience the Presidio, access the shoreline, and view the Golden Gate Bridge. The project site has the potential to become one of the most distinctive park sites in the country, welcoming a broad cross-section of local, national and international visitors to the Presidio. It is expected to offer a high quality park experience and feature an array of visitor-serving amenities and activities necessary to welcome the public, enrich their visit, and encourage them to return. The parklands project was foreseen in the Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP), the Trust’s land management plan for Area B (Trust 2002a).

“The reconstruction of Doyle Drive could reconnect the Main Post to Crissy Field both physically, by allowing for more access points between the two districts, and visually, by restoring important views of the shoreline and bay.” – PTMP, page 63
THE PRESIDIO

* PROJECT SITE

1 REGIONAL CONTEXT
NEED

Millions of people each year already enjoy the stunning views, landscape, and recreational opportunities at Crissy Field. Yet many do not realize that Crissy Field is a part of the Presidio. The reason is that when Doyle Drive, an elevated freeway to the Golden Gate Bridge, was constructed through the Presidio in 1937, it created a physical barrier separating the Main Post from the northern shoreline. Doyle Drive has been demolished and has been replaced by the Presidio Parkway. With the recent opening of this new at-grade tunnel-covered roadway, the waterfront can now be reconnected with the Presidio’s historic center. The New Presidio Parklands is a bridging site that sits atop or is adjacent to the new man-made tunnels. The southern edge of the site adjoins a historic formal military landscape, and the northern edge adjoins the restored Crissy Field Marsh. The site offers 360-degree views of the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco Bay, Alcatraz, the city skyline, the Main Parade, and the Presidio hills and forest.

VISION

The new parklands will welcome all visitors and offer a profound and glorious experience of the Golden Gate. The parklands project will be a platform for programs that celebrate and provide insight into all that can be seen from this new vantage point. The new parklands will provide information and services to make visitors comfortable. The new parklands will be embraced by our community, especially those who have not had opportunities to visit our national parks, as well as by general park visitors. The new parklands will be the gateway to the entire Presidio.

GOALS

The Trust, NPS and Conservancy hope to accomplish the following with this project:

• Honor the significance of the Presidio
• Offer a magnificent experience of the Golden Gate
• Welcome all
• Integrate the natural landscape of Crissy Field and the cultural landscape of the Main Post
• Create the best place to begin a Presidio experience
• Provide exceptional environmental learning opportunities
PROJECT SITE

The project site encompasses two interconnected areas:

- Parklands to be created above the roadway tunnels, including trails, overlooks and spaces that celebrate the spectacular views and inspire repeat visits. Picnic tables, camp fire sites, and interpretive environments for children and adults are ideas that have been contemplated to date. The designed landscape includes a reimagined Visitor Center (Building 210) that functions as a base camp for the 1,500-acre park, and that also hosts a Transit Center and food service. Here people would be invited to obtain the resources necessary for a great Presidio visit. The plaza (Zocalo) would be the hub for park transit and a primary trailhead to a network of 24 miles of trails and 19 miles of bikeways. The Visitor Center (Building 210) will welcome and orient guests, facilitate trip planning and introduce visitors to the Presidio and its significance.

- A revitalized Crissy Field Center and Youth Campus, located at the base of the project site, to become the regional hub for environmental literacy, youth leadership and service. The campus would provide larger and improved facilities for programs, add capacity for educator trainings, and allow community partners to take advantage of expanded collaboration while inviting a greater number of urban youth into the national park. The campus would include a historic building (Building 603) as well as adjacent construction. A “Learning Landscape” adjacent to the campus would provide a place-based experience and play environment geared primarily to children and their families and delivering high-quality, immersive environmental education experiences. The Learning Landscape would focus on the relationship between people and the land and how it has changed over time.

PARTNERS

The Presidio Trust is the lead agency for the New Presidio Parklands project, directing the planning, design, and construction effort and managing community outreach and engagement. The Golden Gate Parks Conservancy, the non-profit partner to the Trust and NPS, serves as the philanthropic and community engagement partner and supports park restoration and enhancement, education, and visitor service projects and programs. The National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area manages the adjacent parklands at Crissy Field and is a partner in interpretation, visitor services and programming.
PURPOSE AND CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

This environmental assessment (EA) identifies the environmental effects of redeveloping two interconnected sites: 1) approximately 11 acres of new parklands atop the new Presidio Parkway tunnels; a trailhead/plaza adjacent to the future Visitor Center that encourages visitors to explore the park; a park embankment connecting the Main Post to Crissy Field; and other park amenities such as trails, outlooks, picnic grounds and parking; and 2) an expanded and renovated Crissy Field Center within a new 3-acre Youth Campus and a Learning Landscape and other park amenities. The EA uses as its baseline conditions or “no project alternative” the preferred alternative analyzed in the Doyle Drive Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/R) (San Francisco County Transportation Authority, et al. 2008). In presenting this baseline condition, the EA summarizes and incorporates by reference the information and analysis presented in the Doyle Drive EIS/R for construction of the Presidio Parkway cut-and-cover tunnels extending from Building 106 to east of Halleck Street, installation of required substructures and ground water conveyance systems, and backfilling over the top of the tunnel to create the approved topography for the parklands project. The EA serves as the factual support for the conclusions in the draft finding of no significant impact (FONSI) (Attachment 1). The EA/FONSI will be made available for public review for a minimum of 30 days before the Trust makes its final determination whether to prepare an EIS or to proceed with the parklands project.

Concurrently with the EA analysis, the Trust also provided for the review of the parklands project under the consultation process required by Section 106 of the NHPA following formal guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and in accordance with the Presidio Trust Programmatic Agreement (PTPA). This process identifies the historic resources that may be affected by an undertaking, assesses the effects on historic resources through a finding of effect (FOE) (Attachment 2), and then looks for ways to “avoid, minimize, or mitigate” the effects identified in the FOE.

1 The Doyle Drive EIS/R can be viewed at the Presidio Trust Library or on the Presidio Parkway’s website at http://www.presidioparkway.org/project_docs/feis.aspx.

2 The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 is the principal federal law dealing with historic preservation. The procedures and terms in the PTPA, entered into with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Officer, the National Park Service, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation define how the Trust meets its statutory responsibilities under the NHPA. For more information on the NHPA, visit http://www.achp.gov/nhpp.html.
The EA is divided into four sections:

1. A brief discussion that substantiates the need for the parklands project

2. A summary of the public involvement process, a synopsis of agencies consulted, and issues raised during NHPA consultation

3. A description of the proposed project and alternatives, including those dismissed from further consideration

4. A discussion of the environmental impact of the proposed project and alternatives
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An EA must include a listing of the agencies contacted during preparation of the EA, including a synopsis of comments received from persons during scoping. The following describes the process used by the Trust to: 1) to encourage the participation of the public prior to preparation of the EA, and 2) consult with agencies to identify issues and seek their advice and expertise.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

The three partner agencies viewed public participation in the development of the parklands project as critical to its success, and engaged in a public process that drew feedback from across the Bay Area, the nation and the world. This public input was a key element in shaping the final concept design for the project. The outreach program offered more numerous and frequent feedback opportunities than any other Presidio planning effort to date. In particular, the Trust endeavored to have a presence in San Francisco neighborhoods that were farther away from the Presidio and to raise awareness among those who are not current users of the park. The program looked to extend a broad geographic and culturally diverse reach, providing input to the design from beyond the Presidio gates. The program was integrated with the design and environmental review process, ensuring that community engagement activities provided meaningful and timely input into the EA, and supported the best possible project design.

Public outreach for the parklands project was initiated on September 4, 2014 at a public forum that featured the release of creative visions by five renowned firms selected by the Trust to develop concept designs for the project site. From the concepts that emerged from the design firms and ideas generated by the public during this early phase of the project, the Trust and its selected design firm (James Corner Field Operations) explored and refined designs to develop the range of alternatives for environmental review. The Trust announced the beginning of public scoping pursuant to the NEPA on February 29, 2015 with the release of the Notification of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Assessment / Invitation to Participate and Comment (Trust 2015a). At a March 21, 2015 workshop, the design team consisting of Trust and James Corner Field Operations staff presented three preliminary concept designs for the new parklands, which formed the basis of the final concept design evaluated in the EA, and the two alternatives. The Trust accepted comments at a public Board of Directors meeting held on May 14, 2015 at which time the draft concept design was presented. While scoping to assist in the preparation of the EA ended on June 1, 2015, comments directed toward the new parklands were welcomed through October 8, 2015 when the final concept design was unveiled at a public Board of Directors meeting.
GOALS
Specific goals and outcomes for public outreach included:

1. A solid foundation of public knowledge around the parklands project and its goals. Raise awareness and share clear messaging about the place, the opportunity, and the process.

2. Informed design and environmental review process with clear avenues for public involvement and a high level of responsiveness and transparency. Help members of the public to participate and comment in meaningful, accessible, creative and engaging ways.

3. Broad outreach and engagement: increase inclusivity through the city. Invite everyone to the table, especially local audiences who are not yet regular Presidio users to define a shared vision for a once-in-a-lifetime project.

4. Community leadership and ownership of the parklands project. Invite community leaders (civic, business, cultural, philanthropic and educational) to explore and identify community needs and ideas through their networks to create a park vision.

APPROACH
The following strategies were implemented to ensure an inclusive, transparent and responsive public outreach process.

Public Presentations and Design Workshops
Multiple public presentations have been and will continue to be hosted at the Presidio, providing opportunities for the public to interact with the design team and learn more about the proposed project’s progress. These presentations were highly interactive, with the integration of brainstorming breakout sessions geared towards generating useful public feedback on design alternatives and environmental issues. The six workshops and presentations held in 2014 and 2015 have drawn more than 1,500 attendees. These workshops continued on a regular basis through early October 2015 when the final concept design was made public and shortly before this EA was circulated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 2014</td>
<td>Early Concepts and Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 29, 2015</td>
<td>Programming, Places and Visitor Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2015</td>
<td>Preliminary Concept Design and Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2015</td>
<td>Key Park Layers(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2015</td>
<td>Draft Concept Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 2015</td>
<td>Learning Landscape and Educational Elements for Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2015</td>
<td>Final Concept Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Included views and visual resources, circulation patterns, site history, the Learning Landscape, design alternatives, and the environmental review process.

**Neighborhood Roundtable Discussions**

In addition to Presidio meetings, the Trust hosted 20 interactive neighborhood roundtable discussions throughout San Francisco drawing 275 attendees. The purpose of these roundtables was to make the process open and accessible to neighborhoods and audiences throughout the city. Materials were translated into multiple languages to ensure participation from non-English-speaking residents, and outreach was conducted throughout the neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 1, 2015</th>
<th>Chinatown YMCA</th>
<th>Chinatown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2015</td>
<td>SPUR Urban Center</td>
<td>SOMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5, 2015</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco</td>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2015</td>
<td>SF Main Public Library - Latino Room</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2015</td>
<td>Black Cuisine Festival</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2015</td>
<td>Chinatown YMCA</td>
<td>Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2015</td>
<td>The Women's Building</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2015</td>
<td>Taraval Police Station</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2015</td>
<td>SPUR Urban Center</td>
<td>SOMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 2015</td>
<td>Ortega Library</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 2015</td>
<td>Chinatown YMCA</td>
<td>Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 2015</td>
<td>The Women's Building</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 2015</td>
<td>SPUR Urban Center</td>
<td>SOMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20, 2015</td>
<td>Ortega Library</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target neighborhoods included the Mission, Civic Center, Chinatown and the Sunset. The Trust also held roundtable discussions at SPUR to hear input from the planning and design community, as well as to provide access for those located in SOMA. In addition, an exhibition at the San Francisco Main Library featuring the Presidio and the parklands project was on display from May through October 2015.

**Special Interest Group Meetings and Special Events**

Specialized workshops (either onsite or at other venues) are held for targeted groups who are interested in being a part of the design process. Team members facilitate discussions to provide information about the parklands project and solicit input and feedback to be included in the design process. More than 400 individuals have attended these presentations since fall of 2014. The groups included Bayview Community Leaders (BMAGIC), the Bayview YMCA, Camping at the Presidio Youth Leaders (CAP Leaders), Inspiring Young Emerging Leaders (I-YEL), UC Berkeley design students, the San Francisco Road Runners Club, and the San Francisco Travel Association.

**Design Lab**

The Design Lab was opened and staffed seven-days a week. It presents the latest project designs and project background. The space is organized so that the public has the opportunity to draw, debate, engage and share ideas about how the project site should be designed and what the public can do there. Approximately 8,000 individuals have visited the lab since its opening in September 2014.

**Site Tours**

Weekly site tours have been held since May 2014 to encourage members of the public to learn more about the project site and the parklands project. To date, the Trust has hosted 60 tours with 550 attendees.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Feedback was captured at all of the engagement and input opportunities. Comments were collected in the form of emails, letters, printed comment cards, web-based surveys available on the project website[^3], and interactive boards and worksheets developed for use in the galleries and during public meetings. All comments were analyzed and documented in written reports. These reports were provided to parklands project staff for consideration during the design and environmental review process, as

[^3]: http://newpresidioparklands.org/.
well as to inform future programming and partnership opportunities. The reports were also available to the public on the parklands project website. In June 2015, the Trust’s public outreach shifted its focus towards a community leaders’ strategy to identify “Parkland Champions” to advocate for the diverse San Francisco population. The Champions advised the Trust on how to reach communities that are currently underrepresented in the Presidio.

**SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

The following tables summarize the number of individuals the Trust engaged and comments received between September 2014 and October 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER ENGAGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Website</td>
<td>30,000 Unique Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Lab at Presidio Trust Headquarters</td>
<td>8,000 Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, Workshops, and Presentations</td>
<td>2,300 Attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Site Tours</td>
<td>550 Attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF COMMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Cards and Online Surveys</td>
<td>1,000 Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on Interactive Boards and Charts</td>
<td>500 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdeasFest Gallery</td>
<td>400 Artwork Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails and Letters</td>
<td>100 Submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The following is a summary of key issues and concerns that emerged during the public outreach program to date. The information gained in this effort assisted the Trust in determining the scope of the EA and in refining the proposed project design.

**Views**

The magnificence of the view connects with many people. Whether it is the outward view towards the Golden Gate, the bay and the city, or the inward view back to the Main Post, Parade Grounds and the Presidio Forest, the 360-degree panoramic view is the experience to cherish and enhance.
Simplicity
There is a strong desire to “keep the design simple.” The design for the new parklands should fit in with the place, without clutter or overbuilding.

Diversity
The new parklands should provide a range of gathering spaces – small, medium and large, and informal indoor and outdoor - to serve a diverse range of users and groups.

Amenities
Community members mentioned the need to be family friendly and welcoming, with plentiful seating and picnic areas; active informal and affordable food options; restrooms, educational opportunities and convenient parking.

Flexibility
The energy and interest around the new parklands includes a desire for flexibility – a mix of places to quietly take in the view, to gather and assemble, and places to run, play and be active. Flexibility also means spaces that take advantage of the sun and also provide shelter from the wind.

Natural Resources
The new parklands are set within an extraordinary reserve of wild landscapes, ecological habitats and horticultural settings. Many people connected to the idea of a place that is in keeping with the character of its surroundings: simple, open and vegetated landscapes for people to explore and enjoy the surroundings.

History and Education
As a starting point for many Presidio and bayfront experiences, many envision the new parklands as a place of orientation, reflection and a meaningful experience. Some discussed the importance of recognizing the Ohlone presence on the project site and learning about the natural resources and military history of the Presidio.

Connections
Many said that it is essential to demystify the Presidio. It is confusing and connections should be clear and accessible. Reinforce visual connections, trail connections, transit connections and clarity how the new parklands connect to the rest of the Presidio and San Francisco, on foot and on public transportation.
Safety
For visitors less familiar with the Presidio, safety is a big concern. Park staffing, programs, lighting, sight lines should all be considerations.

Environmental Impacts
Many provided valuable feedback on what the design should avoid, such as structures that block views or kill birds, too much parking or too much lawn. A few individuals wished to see the Commissary removed and the Crissy Field Marsh expanded. Each of these concerns are addressed in Section 4 (Environmental Consequences) of the EA.

AGENCY REVIEW
The Trust coordinated with the following agencies for their review of the parklands project and to ensure compliance with any substantive environmental requirements, including consultation under the NHPA.

NEPA SCOPING PROCESS
As the manager of the adjacent parklands at Crissy Field and as a partner in interpretation, visitor services and programming for the Presidio at large, the National Park Service (NPS) was invited to collaborate closely on the parklands project with the Trust from the outset. In its scoping letter to the Trust (NPS 2015) (Attachment 3), the NPS acknowledged the Trust's “widespread, thoughtful public engagement and outreach” and responsiveness to the “depth of public comment and input received.” The NPS letter also:

• Supported the concepts being explored for the Presidio Visitor Center design for Building 210, and for expanding the Crissy Field Center and creating the Learning Landscape.
• Requested the effects on visual resources, visitation, water resources, transportation and parking, dark night sky, and climate change adaptation be addressed in the EA (refer to Section 4 in response).
• Supported the removal of Building 211 (Observation Post) and Building 610 (Sports Basement) as soon as possible.
• Expressed concern over the potential effect on access to and parking demand in Crissy Field (Area A) due to Trust projects.
• Informed the Trust of the planning process underway for “refreshing” (i.e., repairing and improving) Crissy Field (Area A).

We applaud the Presidio Trust on the engaging, creative and exciting planning process underway for the New Presidio Parklands and we look forward to the continued collaboration on this important project. – NPS (2015)
No other Federal, State or local agencies chose to participate in the scoping process for the parklands project.

**NHPA CONSULTATION PROCESS**

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) requires the Trust to take into account the effect of its undertakings on historic and cultural resources, including the Presidio National Historic Landmark District (NHLD). As a result of the consultation for the PTMP, the Trust entered into a Programmatic Agreement, which was updated in 2014 (Trust 2014a), with the SHPO, the ACHP and the NPS (signatory parties). The PTPA provides a framework for reviewing different types of projects, and for consulting with other parties under certain circumstances.

Consistent with the PTPA and ACHP regulations that recommend early integration of Section 106 compliance with NEPA and other agency processes, the Trust notified the PTPA parties of the undertaking and initiated consultation on the parklands project on August 29, 2014. A second consultation package was released to the PTPA parties on March 20, 2015 (following initiation of public scoping) which included a description of the preliminary concept designs for the project and the alternatives, and a proposed area of potential effect (APE). The SHPO responded via email (May 5, 2015) indicating concurrence with the proposed APE, a request for a list of contributing/non-contributing structures in the APE, clarification on the locations of the Anza Esplanade and Presidio Promenade, and additional information about the Trust's outdoor art policy. The NPS issued a comment letter on May 7, 2015, which offered some detailed design comments on each of the preliminary concepts and the alternatives, as well as recommendations on projects to consider for the cumulative effects analysis. The Trust gave serious consideration to each of the comments by modifying the concept design and focusing the EA analysis in response. The SHPO and NPS comments are provided in Attachment 3.

Following the release of the second consultation package, and leading up to the distribution of the EA, the Trust continued to provide information to the public, along with interested and PTPA parties. On September 11, 2015, the Trust released the supplemental design guidelines for signatory and concurring party review. The Trust also conducted outreach to Native American contacts that may have interest in the parklands project prior to the release of the EA. This EA is accompanied by a finding of effect (FOE) (Attachment 2), which puts forward a preliminary finding of “no adverse effect” for the undertaking, and a public review version of the supplemental design guidelines, which incorporate comments on the guidelines from earlier in October. Following the close of public comment on the EA, the Trust will circulate to all PTPA parties a summary of comments received and a request for a consultation meeting. The Trust will hold a consultation meeting with the signatory parties to seek consensus on the finding of “no adverse effect” prior to any signing of a finding of no significant impact (FONSI).
3 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES
3 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT & ALTERNATIVES

The following elements or features are based on Trust planning assumptions, management direction or policies and would be incorporated into the parklands project regardless of the alternative selected:

- The amount of fill over the tunnels would be coordinated with Caltrans based on requirements of the Vegetation Management Plan (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page 2-59).

- The form of the historic bluff between the Main Parade and Crissy Field would be evoked and the physical and visual connectivity would be maximized [Doyle Drive Built Environment Treatment Plan (BETP), page 8-2].

- The visual link between the Main Post bluff as seen from Crissy Field would be restored to preserve and enhance views [BETP, page 9-15 and Doyle Drive Architectural Criteria Report (DDACR), page 28].

- The top of the bluff would meet the existing grades at the Main Parade (DDACR, page 28).

- Permanent drainage features would be installed to allow groundwater to flow easily from the northern upgradient areas, under the tunnel, toward the bay. Soil moisture on the north side of the tunnel would be similar to existing conditions (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page 3-168).

- The bluff would be used as a vegetative transition between the upper and lower post, and plantings would be low in height, low maintenance, and evoke the historic feeling of the bluff (BETP, page 9-15 and DDACR, page 28).

- All areas affected by construction activities would be re-vegetated following agreed-upon design guidelines to their native or appropriate ornamental vegetation in designed landscaped areas (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page K-12).

- The Presidio Promenade would be incorporated into the project design and several pedestrian connections from the Main Post to Crissy Field would be provided with at least one accessible route (BETP, page 9-15 and DDACR, page 28).

---

4 The expected minimum depth to support native vegetation is approximately four feet at the crest of the tunnels.
• Building 210 would be rehabilitated as the Visitor Center in a separate action and Building 215 (Transit Center) would be retained.

• Building 201 would be returned to the site of the original building following completion of roadway construction activities and rehabilitated as part of the Presidio Parkway project (Doyle Drive EIS/R, pages 3-23 and 3-148).

• The project design would respect existing constraints, including loading and structural limitations over the tunnel. Cut and fill on the bluff would be balanced in order to reduce the need to import soils while maximizing space for overlooks and sculpting the bluff.

**ALTERNATIVE 1 – PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

The PTMP Update Alternative is the baseline or “no-project alternative” that was evaluated in the Doyle Drive EIS/R and anticipated in the 2002 PTMP and 2010 Main Post Update to the PTMP (Figure 3).

► The PTMP Update Alternative would be an open, largely undifferentiated landscape that is planted primarily with native vegetation with lawns surrounding the buildings. The project site would accommodate individuals and small groups.

► Paths would provide pedestrian north/south and east/west access.

► The Crissy Field Center (Building 603) would remain unchanged and the surrounding landscape would be largely native plants.

► The Observation Post (Building 211) would be reused for office space.

► Building 201 would be moved to its permanent location on the west side of Halleck Street and rehabilitated by the Presidio Parkway project. Building 210 would be rehabilitated as the new Visitor Center under a separate Trust action. Building 215 would remain as the Transit Center.

**Key elements:** Paths, expanse of native plantings, 35,573 square feet of building space, and 124 parking spaces.
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ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY

Building on the analysis contained in the Doyle Drive EIS/R, the Presidio Parkway Alternative responds to the Doyle Drive Built Environment Treatment Plan (San Francisco County Transportation Authority, et al. 2009) and is consistent with the Doyle Drive Architectural Criteria Report (Caltrans District 4 2008) (Figure 4).

- The Presidio Parkway Alternative would be an open and diverse landscape with differentiated areas that accommodate individuals, families, and groups of different sizes. The focal point of the alternative would be a large, civic promontory that accommodates larger groups for events and programs as well as informal gatherings. There would be a range of opportunities for interpretation and learning.

- A variety of paths would provide east/west and north/south access as well as different ways to traverse and scale the bluff.

- The Observation Post (Building 211) would be retained for special events and public uses.

- Building 201 would be moved to its permanent location on the west side of Halleck Street and rehabilitated by the Presidio Parkway project. Building 210 would be rehabilitated as the new Visitor Center under a separate Trust action. Building 215 would remain the Transit Center.

- The Crissy Field Center (Building 603) would be retained for youth programming and the adjacent landscape would be largely native plants and lawn used for recreation and other purposes.

Key elements: Gardens, lawns, and native plantings; visitor-serving plaza, central promontory with group fire pit, and areas to gather and sit; areas for programming; 35,573 square feet of building space; and 87 parking spaces.
ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS

The New Presidio Parklands Alternative is the “preferred alternative” developed by James Corner Field Operations (JCFO) in partnership with the New Presidio Parklands project team. The proposed project emerged from JCFO’s competition-winning design and subsequent public input (Figure 5). A complete description of the proposed project is available in the Concept Design documents (JCFO 2015a, 2015b).

- The New Presidio Parklands Alternative would support a range of group sizes as well as programs and experiences, from individual pursuits and small gatherings to programs, in diverse landscapes and settings.

- The Anza Esplanade would be extended to connect the Main Post to a Central Overlook, a central viewing and gathering point.

- The Observation Post (Building 211) would be demolished and replaced with the approximately 9,300 square-foot New Observation Post. The new building is conceived as an indoor-outdoor space ideal for shelter, programs, and events.

- A new plaza (Zocalo) would function as a main social and multi-functional arrival and gathering plaza between the Transit Center and the Visitor Center.

- A Cliff Walk would follow the edge of the embankment and connect visitors to the wider landscape.

- Three overlooks would be designed with simple walls, resembling both the historic batteries along the coast and recently constructed overlooks in the Presidio.

- A Terraced Amphitheater stepping down from the Central Overlook would offer extraordinary bridge views, provide space for gathering, orientation, interpretation, and programming, and connect the Central Overlook to the landscape below.

- A fully accessible Bluff Walk would traverse the embankment and connect the bluff top to Mason Street and the Learning Landscape. Stairs near the West Overlook would also connect down to the Learning Landscape.

- The Learning Landscape, which would include a renovated Crissy Field Center, new Field Station and Classroom buildings to house additional program space. The new buildings would not exceed 7,500 square feet in total and no single building would exceed 5,800 square feet.

“The Concept Design outlines the primary framework for the New Presidio Parklands: the routes, pathways, spaces and landscape settings are all choreographed to dramatically leverage the experience of being out ‘above the tunnels’ in the space of the bay.” – James Corner Field Operations (2015a)
ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) — NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS
**Key elements:** Lawns, gardens and meadows; pathways for strolling; nooks for seating and small gatherings; three overlooks; a central interpretive feature; 43,073 square feet of building space; and 53 parking spaces.

A comparison of the alternatives is provided in Table 1.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED**

**EXPAND CRISSY FIELD MARSH ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative was eliminated from further study because marsh expansion in the project site would severely limit the area available for educational uses associated with the Crissy Field Center and Learning Landscape. Expanding these facilities so that the number of youth educated on the project site can be increased from approximately 23,000 per year to 50,000-60,000 per year is a key goal of the proposed project, which supports a broader Trust goal of serving every child in San Francisco. Reaching these goals requires new educational facilities and outdoor learning environments that fill the entire project site.

Furthermore, this alternative would neither substantially improve the health nor ensure the long-term ecological viability of the marsh. As noted in the Crissy Field Marsh Expansion Study (Philip Williams & Associates, Ltd. 2004):

> **Future expansions to the existing marsh should include enlarging the area near the flood shoal in a radial direction so that increases in its current footprint would not reduce tidal circulation by “pinching” off the southeast portion of the lagoon near the footbridge. Circulation in this area is of particular concern due to the 72-inch outfall that discharges stormwater into the lagoon. Poor circulation could reduce the effective tidal prism as well as worsen water quality in areas of the lagoon where tidal exchange is low. Marsh expansion near the flood shoal would tend to mitigate these effects.**

Marsh expansion in this area could also have adverse effects on other resources. Major grading would be required in an area of predicted prehistoric archaeological sensitivity for buried deposits representative of seasonal collecting activities along the margins of the San Francisco Bay and its estuary. Excavation in the area would increase the possibility of encountering native soils with the potential for disturbing archaeological resources, affecting their physical integrity. In addition, excavation could pose a risk to human health or the environment as the area is within the Commissary/PX land use control (LUC) zone, which prohibits use as a “saltwater ecological habitat area or ecological special status habitat area.” Additional remediation measures would be required to mitigate the potential for exposure to contaminants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY UNIT</th>
<th>LEGEND KEY</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTMP Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Built Space</td>
<td>Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>35,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>35,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building(s) - Youth Campus</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building(s) - New Observation Post</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gathering Areas</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawns</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Native Plantings</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Landscape</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Linear Feet</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>8,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooks</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes Buildings 201, 210, 211, 215 and 603.
2 Includes the new Field station and Classroom buildings adjacent to Building 603 (no single building would exceed 5,800 GSF).
3 Includes all paved area (plazas, terraces, overlooks and paths), permeable paved areas (decomposed granite), and excludes Learning Landscape.
4 Includes bluff slope and native plantings in the Learning Landscape area.
5 Includes all hardscape and paths within Learning Landscape, and excludes native plantings.
6 Includes new sidewalks along Mason, Lincoln, French Court and Graham.
REMOVE COMMISSARY (BUILDING 610) ALTERNATIVE

This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it is beyond the scope of the project. The Trust intends to complete a design for the project site before initiating planning for the future of the Commissary site so that it can be informed and shaped by the vision for the proposed project. This sequence was strongly encouraged by members of the public as well as agency partners at the conclusion of the request for proposals for a cultural facility at the former Commissary site (Trust 2013a). Proceeding with the proposed project would not limit this alternative in the future.
1925 birds eye view showing project site.
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4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This section provides a discussion of the environmental impacts of the proposed project and alternatives. The discussion focuses on issues and concerns raised during scoping for which information is provided. For each resource, current conditions are first described, followed by a separate discussion of impacts, and concluding with a significance determination. Throughout the discussion, the 14-acre site is referred to as the “project site”, and the impact zone surrounding the project site is the “project area.” The section begins with a list of mitigation measures including those adopted from the Doyle Drive EIS/R and PTMP EIS that the Trust will commit to during the course of the parklands project.

MITIGATION COMMITMENTS

Doyle Drive EIS/R Mitigation Commitments

The Trust commits to maintain the ongoing coordination with the project’s partners that was fostered by Caltrans for the Presidio Parkway project. The following avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures were adapted from the Doyle Drive EIS/R and ROD. These measures include but are not limited to elements which would be designed into the parklands project, continued coordination with affected parties, and implementation of best management practices during construction. The Doyle Drive EIS/R, along with its appendices and all associated technical reports prepared for the Presidio Parkway project, are incorporated by reference into this EA.

Cultural Resources

- The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and the Trust will rehabilitate buildings and restore cultural landscape features consistent with applicable treatment plans and guidelines to avoid an adverse effect to the National Historic Landmark District (NHLD) (Doyle Drive ROD, page A-4).

Archaeological Resources

- The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and the Trust will follow Trust protocols for archaeological monitoring and for the treatment of archaeological resources and collections management and curation of recovered materials (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page K-13; Doyle Drive ROD, page A-4).

Visual Resources

- The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and/or the Trust will re-vegetate all disturbed areas as soon as practicable with native or appropriate ornamental vegetation. Revegetation and restoration will

5 The Doyle Drive EIS/R is available for review at http://www.presidioparkway.org/project_docs/feis.aspx.
be completed in accordance with the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) (Trust and NPS 2001) and standard Trust restoration practices. Vegetation maintenance will include replacing plants, maintaining erosion control materials and irrigation systems, controlling weeds, and removing trash and other debris. Plants will be checked for disease and pests (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page K-17; Doyle Drive ROD, page A-3).

**Biological Resources**

▶ The Trust will restore vegetation removed as a result of project construction activities in accordance with the 2001 VMP and standard Trust restoration practices and manage the revegetated areas (Doyle Drive ROD, page A-11).

▶ The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and the Trust will design lighting to minimize fugitive light outside the boundaries of the project (Doyle Drive ROD, page A-13).

▶ The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and the Trust will not use species listed as noxious weeds for erosion control and landscaping included in the construction of the project. Precautions may include: inspecting and cleaning construction equipment; implementing eradication strategies should an invasion occur; and discouraging colonization of invasive, non-native species by stabilizing disturbed soil areas affected by construction areas as soon as they are completed (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page K-11; Doyle Drive ROD, page A-14).

**Water Resources**

▶ The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust Contractors will implement Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs (SWPPPs) and follow Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges and potential for erosion and sedimentation during construction. Control measures could include construction of detention structures, installation of siltation fencing, appropriate grading practices, dust control, soil stabilization and temporary seeding (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page 3-177, Doyle Drive ROD, page A-5).

▶ The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust will incorporate flood protection features into project plans in low-lying portions of the project site that may be subject to rare flooding events (Doyle Drive ROD, page A-5).

▶ The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust will ensure that project plans contain measures to preserve surface and near-surface hydrology based on results of a hydrologic investigation (Doyle Drive ROD, page A-5).
Utilities

The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent will relocate all utilities affected by the Presidio Parkway project to provide the same level of service as the existing systems (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page 3-52). The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust will coordinate with the various utility providers regarding temporary and permanent utility relocations to minimize potential disruption of utility service during project construction (Doyle Drive ROD, page A-1).

Hazardous Substances

The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust will incorporate into the project the replacement of any engineering site controls required by the lead regulatory agency as a condition of site closure if soil is excavated within a site previously remediated by the Trust in accordance with a remedy approved by the lead regulatory agency (Doyle Drive EIS/R, pages 3-192 and K-7).

Air Quality

The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust Contractors will mitigate potential nuisance-type impacts by implementing BAAQMD’s basic dust control procedures identified in the most recent BAAQMD Guidelines, and will maintain project construction-related impacts at acceptable levels (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page 3-202; Doyle Drive ROD, page A-9).

The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust Contractors will use control technologies on construction equipment to reduce PM and NOx emissions per EPA Tier 4 emission standards (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page K-11; Doyle Drive ROD, page A-9).

Noise

The Presidio Parkway Project Proponent and Trust Contractors will adhere to applicable noise control specifications and implement appropriate avoidance and noise reduction measures to limit the temporary noise increase resulting from construction noise impacts (Doyle Drive EIS/R, page K-6, Doyle Drive ROD, page A-9).

PTMP ROD & MAIN POST UPDATE ROD MITIGATION COMMITMENTS

The Trust will implement, as necessary, the following mitigation measures identified in the PTMP Record of Decision (ROD) (Trust 2002b) and the Main Post Update ROD (Trust 2011a) to minimize or avoid environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project or alternatives. The mitigation measures are discussed in more detail within the impact discussion that follows. For measures that fall outside the jurisdiction of the Trust, the Trust will assist and encourage other agencies to implement the measures, and will monitor their performance.
Transportation

The Trust will provide bicycle and pedestrian amenities such as shelters, benches, water fountains, secure bicycle racks, route lighting, and other facilities to encourage travel by foot and bicycle (TR-9 Pedestrian/Bicycle Amenities, PTMP ROD, page 19).

The Trust will encourage Muni to increase frequency of service on existing Muni lines as warranted. Increased frequency on existing Muni lines with or without any extensions of these lines would increase the transit peak hour capacity, and consequently reduce passenger load factors on these lines (TR-10 Support Increased Muni Frequencies, PTMP ROD, page 19).

The Trust will signalize the Lincoln Boulevard/Girard Road intersection when needed (i.e., after implementing additional TDM measures and prior to the intersection operations deteriorating to LOS E or F). This intersection was recently reconstructed as part of the Presidio Parkway project with a southbound left-turn pocket and westbound right-turn pocket to provide additional capacity without signalizing the intersection. If weekend peak hour volumes are greater than weekday PM peak hour volumes, the additional turn lanes may not adequately improve the level of service to LOS D or better in the future. Additional measures such as event-specific bus service and/or traffic control officers may be needed during unusually large special events (TR-20 Lincoln Boulevard/Girard Road Intersection Improvements, PTMP ROD, page 22).

The Trust will encourage the NPS to implement parking regulations, time limits, and/or parking fees in Area A (notably, Crissy Field) to reduce impacts of fee parking in Area B. The Trust will provide assistance to the NPS to ensure coordination and consistency of parking management within both Areas A and B. Should the NPS choose not to adopt or enforce this measure, or is otherwise opposed to it, implementation of parking management control in Area B would affect parking for Crissy Field (Area A) (TR-21 Presidio-Wide Parking Management, PTMP ROD, page 23).

The Trust will periodically monitor implementation and effectiveness of its Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce automobile usage by all tenants, occupants and visitors (see Appendix D of the PTMP for full description). If the TDM performance standards as described in the PTMP are not being reached, the Trust will implement more aggressive TDM strategies or intensify components of the existing TDM program such as requiring tenant participation in more TDM program elements, and more frequent and/or extensive shuttle service (TR-22 TDM Program Monitoring, PTMP ROD, page 23).

The Trust will continue to implement parking management strategies during park-sponsored activities and special events to discourage single-occupant automobile usage, encourage alternative modes of
travel, and maximize use of available parking resources. Special events that could result in overflow parking will be coordinated and scheduled with the NPS based on parking availability. Events requiring large amounts of parking will not be scheduled concurrently with other events or Presidio peak parking demand periods if combined parking demand would exceed the available supply. Sponsors may be required to provide special transit, taxi and bicycle services during their events to reduce expected parking demand and promote use of public transit, biking, walking and remote parking lots (TR-24 Special Event Parking Management, PTMP ROD, page 24).

- The Trust will continue to monitor Muni operations and passenger loads within the Presidio. Continued monitoring of Muni service in the Presidio, and similar monitoring of Golden Gate Transit service at the Presidio would indicate any capacity problems, particularly on northbound Golden Gate Transit bus service during the PM peak hour. If the monitoring were to reveal insufficient capacity for northbound Presidio-generated passengers during the PM peak hour, potential improvements will be coordinated with the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (TR-25 Transit Service Monitoring Program, PTMP ROD, page 24).

- The Trust Contractor will develop a construction traffic management plan, which will include information on construction phases and duration, scheduling, proposed haul routes, permit parking, staging area management, visitor safety, detour routes, and pedestrian movements on adjacent routes. The plan will be reviewed with consideration of other individual projects in the Main Post as well as Presidio Parkway construction (TR-26 Construction Traffic Management Plan, PTMP ROD, page 24).

- The Trust will signalize the Lincoln Boulevard/Girard Road intersection when needed (i.e., after implementing additional TDM measures and prior to the intersection operations deteriorating to LOS E or F) (TR-28 Lincoln Boulevard/Graham Street Intersection Improvements, Main Post Update ROD, page A-2).

- The Trust will signalize the Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street intersection when needed (i.e., after implementing additional TDM measures and prior to the intersection operations deteriorating to LOS E or F) (TR-29 Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street Intersection Improvements, Main Post Update ROD, page A-2).
Biological Resources

The Trust will implement the following measures as warranted to protect wildlife and native plant communities:

- Schedule heavy equipment use, to the greatest extent feasible, to avoid areas where soils are wet and prone to compaction;
- Implement non-native wildlife control measures;
- Provide signage and/or other educational devices to encourage voluntary compliance with protection measures;
- Prevent unnecessary vehicular and human intrusion and use into native and sensitive habitat communities from adjacent construction, demolition and intensive special events and recreation activities;
- Prohibit the use of erosion control measures and mulches that contain non-native plant seeds;
- Prohibit the use of irrigation, fertilizers, and herbicides in areas adjacent to, or up-gradient from sensitive biologic resources; and
- Prepare interpretive materials and signage in areas of increased use adjacent to natural habitat areas and sensitive native plant communities (NR-5 Wildlife and Native Plant Communities, PTMP ROD, page 7).

The Trust will implement the following measures to reduce the effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat:

- A qualified wildlife biologist will conduct a site visit during project planning and assess the potential for any sensitive wildlife species, including bats, or their habitat to occur on or adjacent to the project site. If sensitive animal species are found, the project will be redesigned or project timeline modified in accordance with the biologist’s recommendations to avoid impacts. If avoidance is not feasible, species-specific and site-specific mitigation plans will be developed, and regulatory agency consultation pursued (if needed) to mitigate direct take and replace habitat for the impacted species; and
- Any vegetation removal will follow the park guidelines for protection of nesting birds. This includes guidelines on timing of vegetation and removal (NR-9 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, PTMP ROD, page 9).
Visitation

- The Trust will require appropriate permit conditions for special events to ensure that park resources are protected (CO-7 Special Events, PTMP ROD, page 15).

Water Resources

- The Trust will implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that encourage water conservation. Given the evolutionary nature of water conservation measures, the Trust will make provisions for the removal or addition of BMPs as the technical and economic reasonableness of measures are determined (UT-1 Demand Management Best Management Practices, PTMP ROD, page 25).

- The Trust will implement designs or measures to limit or eliminate impervious surfaces in order to reduce stormwater runoff volumes and improve water quality. The Trust will practice natural stormwater reduction by using on-site vegetation and landscaping as a filtration and retention system to the extent feasible. Projects will be reviewed to determine if stormwater flows could be limited through reduction of impervious surfaces and addition of porous surfaces (UT-7 Stormwater Reduction, PTMP ROD, page 28).

NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS EA MITIGATION COMMITMENTS

The Trust will apply the following mitigation measures informed by the EA review process, which will further minimize potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project or alternatives:

Transportation

- The Trust will consider making the Mason Street/Halleck Street intersection side-street stop-controlled when needed (i.e., after implementing any additional TDM measures to address other study intersections). Removing stop control on the Mason Street approaches and making the intersection a side street stop-controlled intersection would improve the operation for the Mason Street approaches, but delay would increase for the Halleck Street approach. Removing stop control on the Mason Street approaches would also negatively affect the pedestrian crossing at this intersection.

Visitation

- The Trust will limit special event capacity to avoid overcrowded conditions and to protect resources, and will require appropriate permit conditions for special events to ensure that supportable capacity levels will not be exceeded.

- The Trust will coordinate management actions and protection measures in Area B with the NPS to control visitation.
The NEPA requires an EA to discuss possible conflicts with the objectives of land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned.

**Light and Glare**
- The Trust will review both the interior and exterior lighting designs to ensure consistency with PTMP policies regarding light and with guiding principles set forth in the Trust’s standard measures for lighting.

**Biological Resources**
- The Trust will pursue best bird-safe construction practices for new buildings to reduce potential effects related to bird strikes and minimize the potential for adverse nighttime lighting effects on local or migratory wildlife.

**Water Resources**
- The Trust will implement applicable provisions for water management practices and water waste prevention established in the State’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

**Environmental Sustainability and Climate Preparedness**
- The Trust will adopt site-specific strategies identified in the EA to realize sustainability goals of the Trust’s Climate Action Agenda and make the new parklands resilient in the face of climatic extreme.

**CONSISTENCY WITH LAND USE PLANS AND POLICIES**

The project site is located on the Main Post and in the Crissy Field district in Area B of the Presidio, which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust, a federal agency. The consideration of planning principles and policies is carried out as an integral part of the Trust’s weighing of environmental and non-environmental factors in reaching a rational and balanced decision. The discussion of land use policy conflicts will be relied upon in the finding of no significant impact (Attachment 1) and used by the Trust’s Board of Directors as part of their decision whether to approve or disapprove the proposed project. Under the NEPA, however, the Trust has the authority to move forward with the proposed project, despite any possible policy conflict. Any potential conflicts with existing plans and policies that relate to physical environmental issues (such as increasing traffic) are evaluated as part of the impacts analyses elsewhere in Section 4 of the EA. The Doyle Drive EIS/R did not identify any conflicts between the new parklands and Presidio-wide land use and development goals.
Would any of the proposed alternatives be inconsistent with plans and policies that govern the project area?

PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN

The 2002 Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP) (Trust 2002a) is the Trust’s formally adopted statement of land use policy. The PTMP provides an interrelated set of planning principles and policies, which taken together provide the framework for the Trust’s decision-making and actions. Guidelines for the Main Post, since amended (see below), include a call for incorporating an open space connection between the Main Post and Crissy Field as part of the planning for reconstruction of Doyle Drive, and improved pedestrian and visual connections between the two areas (page 68). The guidelines for the Crissy Field district also include the need to explore options for safe and inviting open space connections between central Crissy Field and the Main Parade at the Main Post as part of Doyle Drive reconstruction (page 77). The approximately 7,500 square feet (sf) of new construction at the Crissy Field Center under Alternative 3 to enhance the function of Building 603 as encouraged by the PTMP would be accommodated within the maximum permitted (up to 70,000 sf) for the Crissy Field (Area B) district.

The PTMP committed the Trust to work collaboratively on the Crissy Field Marsh Expansion Study (“Marsh Study”) (Philip Williams & Associates, Ltd. 2004). The goal of the Marsh Study was to identify a broad array of options that would ensure the long-term ecological viability of Crissy Field Marsh. The project reduces the area into which Crissy Field Marsh could expand to the east of the Commissary and west of the Crissy Field Center. While this area was an option for future marsh expansion in the Marsh Study as part of the historic marsh footprint, the study found that expansion in this area is less critical for ensuring the health of the marsh compared to the area near the flood shoal in the east portion of the marsh.6

MAIN POST UPDATE TO THE PTMP

The 2010 Main Post Update (MPU) to the PTMP (Trust 2010a) amends the Main Post chapter (pages 62-69) of the PTMP and outlines implementation strategies keyed to the PTMP guidelines, each of which is numbered. The MPU acknowledges that the open bluff along the Main Post’s northern edge offers spectacular views of San Francisco Bay and the land features beyond, and calls for retaining and enhancing those views (Guideline G11, page 28). The demolition of Building 211 (9,294 sf) and replacement with new construction of the New Observation Post on the bluff top (9,294 sf) is within the maximum amount of building demolition (94,000 sf) and new construction (146,500 sf) identified in the MPU (Table 1, page 17).

6 “Future expansions to the existing marsh should include enlarging the area near the flood shoal in a radial direction so that increases in its current footprint would not reduce tidal circulation by “pinching” off the southeast portion of the lagoon near the footbridge. Circulation in this area is of particular concern due to the 72-inch outfall that discharges stormwater into the lagoon” (Crissy Field Marsh Expansion Study, page 3).
PRESIDIO TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS MASTER PLAN

The 2003 Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan (Trust and NPS 2003) established a comprehensive trails and bikeways network in the Presidio. The parklands project would advance the goals of the plan by enhancing the public’s exploration and experience of the Presidio and by improving connections between key features of the Presidio, notably through the Anza Esplanade and the Presidio Promenade.

PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

The 2001 Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) (Trust and NPS 2001) provides a management framework for rehabilitating and restoring the native plant and landscaped areas of the Presidio, and also guides the actions affecting the Presidio’s vegetation resources. The VMP divides vegetation resources into three zones: native plant communities, historic forest, and landscape vegetation. The project site falls fully within the landscape vegetation zone. Consistent with the primary objectives of the VMP, the parklands project would increase and restore open space in the Presidio. New landscaping elements would be sited and designed to be in keeping with the historic character-defining elements of the National Historic Landmark District.

CRISSY FIELD PLAN

The 1996 Crissy Field Plan (NPS 1996) calls for the cultural and ecological restoration of the 100-acre site “consistent with the National Park Service mission of conservation, while maintaining and enhancing Crissy Field as a ‘people place’, which welcomes a variety of recreational activities” (page 1-2). Restoring the Main Post bluff for recreation and visitor enjoyment while rehabilitating and preserving important historic resources and integrating natural values is consistent with the overall goal of the plan. The parklands project would enhance opportunities for Crissy Field visitors through providing facilities (restrooms, picnic tables, benches, wayside exhibits), a direct connection from the Main Post, access to accommodate people with physical disabilities, parking improvements and other site amenities.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN

The San Francisco Bay Plan (BCDC 1968), adopted by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission in 1968 and amended periodically since then, includes policies to guide future uses of the bay and shoreline and a set of maps which show where the policies should apply to the present bay and shoreline. The plan designates the Presidio as a waterfront park,7 beach priority use area in the San Francisco Bay Plan Map 4, Central Bay North. Plan Map 4 is accompanied by map

---

7 However, in accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act, the entire Presidio of San Francisco is excluded from the coastal zone. “Excluded from the coastal zone are lands the use of which is by law subject solely to the discretion of or which is held in trust by the Federal Government, its officers or agents.” Coastal Zone Management Act § 304, 16 U.S.C. § 1453(1).
notes, which are advisory and are not enforceable policies. The notes specifically state that areas within the jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust (Area B) should be developed as called for in the Trust’s general management plan (i.e., PTMP), and that alterations to Doyle Drive should preserve recreation opportunities within the waterfront park priority use area and preserve existing natural and cultural values or their restoration potential (page 116).

The BCDC reviews federal activities to assess their consistency with the Commission’s Amended Management Program for San Francisco Bay. In 2002, the BCDC found that, as part of the Trust’s consistency determination for the PTMP, future development to “enhance and maintain visual and physical (e.g., paths and bike trails) connections to Crissy Field” from the Main Post (Alternative 1), if consistent with a BCDC-reviewed Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan, would ensure that the public access proposed is also consistent with the Commission’s laws and policies and need not return to the Commission for further consistency review (BCDC 2002). Nonetheless, in 2009, Caltrans submitted the Presidio Parkway project, including the Main Post tunnel with landscaping above the tunnel (Alternative 2), to the Commission for a consistency determination, for which the Commission agreed that the project is consistent with the Commission’s Amended Management Program for San Francisco Bay. The BCDC concurred that the project would provide an opportunity to develop a new public park area above the tunnel, which would provide a direct pedestrian connection from the Main Post to Crissy Field (BCDC 2009). Alternative 3 includes detailed plans to implement the work envisioned in the PTMP, the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan, and the Doyle Drive EIS/R as authorized by the Commission. No conflicts with the San Francisco Bay Plan, Amended Management Program for San Francisco Bay, or BCDC policies have been identified. As a result, the proposed project is fully consistent with BCDC’s enforceable policies.

CONCLUSION

No inconsistencies exist between the proposed project and land use plans, policies and related regulatory requirements for the area concerned. The state’s (i.e., BCDC’s public access) interests have been accommodated through the proposed project’s consistency with the Trust’s own land use controls and the proposed project is fully consistent with BCDC’s enforceable policies. Building removal and new construction would be within the parameters for both building demolition and new construction set in the PTMP and MPU.

---

6 The BCDC found the Trails Plan to be consistent with its existing policies in 2003 (BCDC 2003).
TRANSPORTATION

GATEWAY TRAFFIC

Table 2 summarizes changes in weekday PM peak hour gateway volumes in recent years. Construction of the Presidio Parkway has significantly affected traffic patterns within and near the Presidio, as reflected in the counts collected in September 2014. The ramps between Highway 1 and US 101 were closed from early 2010 to July 2015, resulting in an increase in volumes at the Golden Gate Bridge Plaza area. Direct access to the Presidio via the Girard Road interchange was opened in July 2015.

Although regional traffic volumes are typically greatest in the weekday peak commute hour, weekend peak hour traffic volumes are slightly greater than weekday peak hour volumes at some Presidio gates. This difference is most pronounced at the Golden Gate Bridge and popular routes through the Presidio to and from the Golden Gate Bridge. The PTMP EIS predicted a total weekday PM peak hour gate volume of 9,952 vehicles per hour at buildout, and anticipated the new Presidio Parkway interchange at Girard Road to accommodate approximately 9 percent of that peak hour volume. Peak hour gateway volumes in September 2014 were 7,012 vehicles per hour in the weekday PM peak hour and 7,362 vehicles per hour in the weekend peak hour, respectively.

INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

Five intersections were identified for study in the transportation analysis. These intersections are in close proximity to and on key access routes to the project site, and consequently are those that would be most affected by increased traffic traveling to and from the project site. The intersections are primarily a subset of intersections analyzed as part of the PTMP EIS and Main Post Update EIS. Other intersections previously studied as part of other environmental studies will continue to be monitored. The study intersections are:

1. Mason Street/Marina Boulevard/Lyon Street
2. Lincoln Boulevard/Graham Street
3. Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street
4. Lincoln Boulevard/Girard Road
5. Mason Street/Halleck Street

Turning movement counts were collected at one study intersection in September 2014 for the weekday afternoon peak-commute period and typical weekend peak period. Counts at this intersection were collected on March 29, 2015 for the peak weekend (i.e., unseasonably warm) peak period. Although
### 2 Presidio Gateways Traffic Volume Summary (Peak Hour Volumes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
<td>Vehicles per Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgas(^1)</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguello</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th/15th Avenue(^2)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Avenue</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG Bridge Plaza West</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG Bridge Plaza East</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,529</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,023</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,362</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015

\(^1\) The Gorgas Gate includes the slip ramp in the October 2005, January 2008 and March 2009 counts. The slip ramp was demolished prior to the September 2014 counts.

\(^2\) The 15th Avenue Gate accommodated both inbound and outbound traffic until the fall of 2010, when the 14th Avenue Gate opened for inbound traffic, since which time the 15th Avenue Gate accommodated outbound traffic only (cyclists excepted).
counts at this intersection helped determine the differences between weekday and weekend volumes and between typical weekend and peak weekend volumes, the current volumes at all study intersections are substantially affected by the Presidio Parkway project. Therefore, future projected turning movement volumes for the Lincoln Boulevard/Graham Street, Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street and Lincoln Boulevard/Girard Road intersections from the Main Post Update EIS were adjusted and used as the baseline for analysis of future conditions with the proposed project and alternatives.

The peak hour intersection operations analysis was conducted according to the methodology described in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The HCM methodology calculates the average delay experienced by a vehicle traveling through the intersection and assigns a corresponding level of service (LOS). An intersection operating at LOS D or better is generally considered to be operating acceptably. Levels of service E and F are generally considered unacceptable. At side street stop-controlled intersections, delay and LOS are calculated for each stop-controlled approach and operating conditions are reported for the worst approach. Levels of service for signalized intersections and all-way stop-controlled intersections are based on the weighted average delay per vehicle for all vehicles approaching the intersection.

Table 3 presents the existing delay per vehicle and LOS for the weekday PM peak hour, weekend peak hour and peak weekend peak hour for the intersection of Mason Street/Marina Boulevard/Lyon Street.

**PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICES**

Public transit systems serving the Presidio include Muni, PresidiGo shuttle service and Golden Gate Transit. These services provide access to other regional carriers such as BART, AC Transit, CalTrain, SamTrans and the regional ferry system.

**PresidiGo Shuttle (Downtown and Around the Park)**

The Trust implemented weekday downtown shuttle bus service (PresidiGo Downtown) for Presidio employees and residents in September 2005. Downtown service is now available to the public during midday hours and select runs in the afternoon commute period. Weekend Downtown service began in January 2014, and is open to the public. Ridership has continued to grow on the Downtown route, as illustrated in Figure 6. The PresidiGo Downtown route connects with the Around the Park routes (Crissy Field route and Presidio Hills route) at the Transit Center in the Main Post, and timed transfers allow users to travel to/from other parts of the Presidio with minimal delay. All PresidiGo service is free.

---

* At the time of data collection in the fall of 2014 and early 2015, Halleck Street was closed and Girard Road provided only local access to roadways in the Letterman district.
Muni

Muni recently implemented changes to the 43-Masonic route as identified in the Muni Forward initiative. Most notably, the changes include an extension of the route to the Transit Center within the project site. The 43-Masonic route operates between the Marina and the Excelsior, and now directly serves both the Letterman and Main Post districts. In conjunction with the route changes, Muni also increased frequency during the morning commute period from 10 minutes to 9 minutes and during the afternoon commute period from 12 minutes to 10 minutes.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES

The project site sits at the center of the Presidio on the border between the Main Post and Crissy Field (Area B) districts, and has been closed as part of the Presidio Parkway construction area for several years. The project will connect key pedestrian and bike routes in the Main Post and Crissy Field. The Presidio Promenade is a Class I multi-use path along the northern edge of the Main Post, and will connect directly to the project site. The portion of the Presidio Promenade between the San Francisco National Cemetery and the Golden Gate Bridge toll plaza was completed in 2008. The path will be connected to the Main Post after construction of the Presidio Parkway. It transitions to sidewalk and Class II bike lanes immediately east of the project site. The future Anza Esplanade runs north-south, extending south from the future Visitor Center in Building 210 and will provide key access to/from the project site to the rest of the Main Post and Arguello Boulevard. On the northern edge of the project site in Crissy Field, Mason Street currently has Class II striped bike lanes in both directions and a roadside Class I multi-use path on the north side. When reconstructed as part of the Presidio Parkway project, Halleck Street will have an uphill/southbound Class II bike lane and a Class III (shared) lane in the downhill/northbound direction. In addition to the paths provided within the project site itself, there will also be a continuous sidewalk

3 EXISTING (YEAR 2014) INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS (WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR AND WEEKEND PEAK HOUR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control Device</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekend Peak Hour</th>
<th>Peak Weekend Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mason Street / Marina Boulevard / Lyon Street</td>
<td>Signal / AWS</td>
<td>C 20</td>
<td>C 27</td>
<td>C 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2014
Notes: AWS = all-way stop control
LOS = level of service
sec/veh = seconds per vehicle
Average Daily Presidigo Ridership: Downtown Route

Avg. Weekday (Downtown)
Avg. Weekend (Downtown)
Linear (Avg. Weekday (Downtown))
along the west side of Halleck Street between Lincoln Boulevard and Mason Street. Lincoln Boulevard has sidewalks on both sides of the street and Class II striped bike lanes east of Graham Street.

**Would the proposed project or alternatives substantially increase traffic congestion or traffic volumes, or adversely affect traffic safety?**

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

In order to estimate the number of new vehicle trips that would be generated by each alternative, vehicle trip generation rates were developed for the different land use types for the buildings on the project site (restaurant, educational, retail, etc.) as well as the open space. Vehicle trips for each alternative were calculated for weekday PM peak hour, weekend peak hour and peak (i.e. unseasonably warm) weekend peak hour conditions. Estimates of weekday PM peak hour, weekend peak hour and peak weekend peak hour trips generated by the building uses in the proposed project and each of the alternatives are based on the methodology used in the cumulative analysis for the PTMP EIS, which, in turn, was based on trip generation information from standard data sources such as the San Francisco Planning Department Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines), the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). All of the travel characteristics included in this analysis reflect a moderate level of effectiveness of transportation demand management (TDM) measures associated with all three alternatives so as to not overestimate the effectiveness of TDM measures.

Trip generation estimates for the open space elements of each alternative were based on the calculated trip generation rate for Crissy Field (Area A). The trips associated with Crissy Field were based on existing vehicle counts at the Mason Street corridor entry and exit points (excluding pass-through trips) and the building uses in the Mason Street corridor. The difference between the observed vehicle counts and the building trip generation was determined to be total trips generated by the 107 acres of Crissy Field open space, and suggests a peak hour trip generation rate of 4.64, 6.25 and 6.78 vehicle trips per acre for weekday, weekend and peak weekend conditions, respectively. These rates were applied directly to Alternative 2, which had a similar proportion of usable outdoor space as Crissy Field (50 to 60 percent). Alternatives 1 and 3 have less usable outdoor space (24 percent and 43 percent, respectively), so the trip generation rates were adjusted accordingly. The resulting trip generation rates shown in Table 4 were developed to estimate the number of vehicle trips that would be generated by the project site.

Some trips will be internal to the Presidio; examples include trips by an employee who walks to a nearby restaurant for lunch, or lodging guests attending a wedding in the park, and these internal trips are more

---

10 A trip generation rate expresses the number of vehicle trips that would be generated by a unit of given land use type (e.g., restaurant).
4 PEAK HOUR VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekend Peak Hour</th>
<th>Peak Weekend Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parklands open space (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (thousand square feet)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (thousand square feet)</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (thousand square feet)</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>30.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Education (thousand square feet)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015

likely to be made by transit, walking, or bicycling than external trips. The mix of land uses within the park would also create “linked” trips. Linked trips are internal trips that are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination. For example, a Presidio employee who stops at the YMCA before traveling home would be a linked trip. The fact that some trips within the Presidio would be linked yields fewer trips than would occur otherwise. The vehicle trip generation rates shown in Table 4 reflect a moderate level of internal trips and linked trips. A complementary mix of uses could result in more internal and linked trips than assumed in this analysis.

The assumed geographic distribution of trips to/from the project site is as shown below:

- Marina Boulevard (i.e., Marina Gate): 40%
- US 101 East (via Girard Road): 30%
- Lombard Street/Presidio Boulevard: 5%
- Arguello Boulevard: 5%
- Highway 1 South: 5%
- Lincoln Boulevard to 25th Ave. Gate: 5%
- Golden Gate Bridge: 10%
Vehicle trip generation rates for each alternative reflect TDM measures to encourage transit, pedestrian and bicycle modes and discourage single-occupant vehicle travel. The TDM program consists of components that can be implemented to meet or exceed the intended traffic reductions. The TDM traffic reductions used in the PTMP EIS and Main Post Update EIS transportation analysis reflect the Trust’s minimum performance standards. Since traffic reductions are likely to exceed what has been incorporated here, the traffic forecasts can be considered somewhat conservative. Additional TDM program components would be instituted or existing TDM program elements would be intensified as necessary to achieve additional automobile trip reductions.

Table 5 presents the projected weekday PM peak hour, weekend peak hour and peak weekend peak hour vehicle trip generation estimates for each alternative. The number of vehicle trips would vary by alternative, depending on the amount of built space and usable open space. The number of weekday PM peak hour vehicle trips would range from approximately 233 under Alternative 1 to approximately 254 under Alternative 3. Alternative 1 would have the greatest percentage of native

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekend Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Weekend Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015
plantings and least amount of outdoor gathering space, and therefore would generate fewer vehicle trips. Alternative 2 would have the greatest amount of total outdoor space (lawns, paths, hardscape and terraces), but Alternative 3 would have more building space, resulting in a similar number of vehicle trips. The scheduling of events would require management strategies to minimize the impact on the transportation network. Because the uses on the site are complementary public-serving uses, visitors to the paths, overlooks and gathering spaces are also likely to enter the Visitor Center, the Transit Center or New Observation Post. Thus, the estimated total number of trips generated by each alternative is conservative, and the actual number of total trips may be lower. If all project trips were attributed to the Main Post, the number of trips generated by the Main Post district would increase 3 percent from what was evaluated in the Main Post Update EIS under Alternatives 2 and 3.

The new direct connection to the Presidio Parkway via Girard Road is expected to relieve some of the existing traffic congestion occurring at the Lombard Gate and accommodate growth in traffic volumes to/from the park. Halleck Street is being rebuilt as part of the Presidio Parkway project, and is expected to open in 2016. After the opening of Halleck Street, the Trust will periodically monitor traffic volumes at gates and key intersections during the weekday and weekend peak periods.

Based on the future projected traffic conditions, and the estimated traffic volumes for each of the alternatives, future traffic operating conditions were calculated for the study intersections for weekday PM peak hour, weekend peak hour and peak weekend peak hour conditions, as shown in Table 6. For unsignalized side street stop-controlled intersections, the level of service (LOS) and delay per vehicle are presented for the approach that would experience the worst delay. For all-way stop-controlled or signalized intersections, the overall intersection LOS and average delay per vehicle are presented. When forecasted intersection volumes exceed capacity substantially, the calculated intersection delay increases exponentially absent any mitigation to reduce volume or increase capacity. For these intersections, the forecasted delay is noted as greater than 50 seconds.

Traffic impacts at all of the study intersections could be mitigated to acceptable operating conditions of LOS D or better. In the Main Post Update ROD, signalization was identified as the mitigation measure for the Lincoln Boulevard/Graham Street and Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street intersections. Signalization would mitigate the operation of these intersections to LOS D or better with or without the additional traffic generated by the project, however any mitigation measures including signalization would be considered as a last resort. These study intersections are at the center of the Main Post district, and although the Trust has identified signalization as the mitigation measure as required by the NEPA, the Trust would only signalize these intersections in the long term and after review of the potential impact on historic resources. TDM measures such as more frequent and/or extensive PresidiGo service (particularly on weekends), modifications to parking fees or restrictions, and enhanced carpooling or vanpooling incentives would be considered and implemented before signalization. Other measures to reduce the total number of vehicle trips include measures to encourage more trip “linking” between uses in the
# Future Peak Hour Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Control Device</th>
<th>Mitigation Control Device</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS (sec/veh)</td>
<td>Unmitigated</td>
<td>Mitigated</td>
<td>Unmitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mason/Marina/Lyon</td>
<td>Signal/AWS</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mason/Halleck</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lincoln/Halleck</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lincoln/Graham</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lincoln/Girard</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekend Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mason/Marina/Lyon</td>
<td>Signal/AWS</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mason/Halleck</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lincoln/Halleck</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lincoln/Graham</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Lincoln/Girard</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Weekend Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mason/Marina/Lyon</td>
<td>Signal/AWS</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mason/Halleck</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lincoln/Halleck</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lincoln/Graham</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Lincoln/Girard</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015

Notes: AWS = all-way stop control  
SSS = side street stop control  
LOS = level of service  
sec/veh = seconds per vehicle  
n.a. = not applicable  
**Bold** type indicates unacceptable operating conditions (LOS E or LOS F).
parklands project or other nearby uses. The traffic analysis assumes a modest amount of trip linking between various uses. Encouraging linked vehicle trips between compatible uses (e.g., between Visitor Center and restaurants or between restaurants and Main Post lodging) would reduce the total number of vehicle trips to/from the Presidio.

**ALTERNATIVE 1 – PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Alternative 1 would generate 233 weekday PM peak hour vehicle trips, 301 weekend peak hour vehicle trips and 304 peak weekend peak hour vehicle trips. As shown in Table 6, of the five studied intersections, the minor approach to the Lincoln/Halleck intersection would operate at unacceptable levels (LOS E or F) during the weekday PM peak hour, three intersections would operate unacceptably in the typical weekend peak hour, and four intersections would operate unacceptably during the peak hour of a peak weekend.

The Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street intersection is stop-controlled on the Halleck Street approach, and the Halleck Street approach is the approach that would experience unacceptable delay. Vehicle trips leaving the project site would have the option of using the all-way stop-controlled intersection of Lincoln Boulevard/Graham Street intersection, which is expected to operate better than the Halleck Street approach to the Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street intersection. The Lincoln Boulevard/Halleck Street intersection was not expected to operate at an unacceptable level of service in the PTMP EIS. In the PTMP EIS, Lincoln Boulevard was assumed to have two lanes in each direction, reflecting the geometric modifications originally described in the 1994 NPS General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA). Class II bike lanes were added to this section of Lincoln Boulevard several years ago, and in the analysis for the Main Post Update EIS and this analysis, the future lane configuration is assumed to be the same as it is currently. Recommended transportation mitigation measures listed at the beginning of this chapter would improve the operation of the study intersections to LOS D or better.

**ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY**

Alternative 2 would generate 249 weekday PM peak hour vehicle trips, 320 weekend peak hour vehicle trips and 327 peak weekend peak hour vehicle trips. As shown in Table 6, of the five studied intersections, three intersections would operate at unacceptable levels (LOS E or F) under Alternative 2 during the typical weekend peak hour, and four would operate at LOS E or F during the peak weekend peak hour. The Mason Street/Halleck Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS F under typical weekend conditions if traffic volumes are not reduced through TDM measures. Recommended transportation mitigation measures listed at the beginning of this chapter would improve the operation of the study intersections to LOS D or better.
ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS

Alternative 3 is estimated to generate 254 weekday PM peak hour vehicle trips, 321 weekend peak hour trips and 328 peak weekend peak hour trips, similar to Alternative 2. In the weekday PM peak hour, weekend peak hour and peak weekend peak hour, Alternative 3 would result in unacceptable service levels (LOS E or F) at the same number of intersections as Alternative 2. Recommended transportation mitigation measures listed at the beginning of this chapter would improve the operation of the study intersections to LOS D or better.

Would the proposed project or alternatives adversely affect traffic safety for pedestrians and bicyclists?

ALL ALTERNATIVES

Bicycle access and pedestrian circulation within the Main Post were reviewed as part of the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan (Trust and NPS 2003). Key trails connecting to the project site include the Presidio Promenade and future Anza Esplanade. The trails within the new parklands would substantially improve pedestrian and bicycle connections between Crissy Field and the Main Post, making walking and bicycling safer and more viable modes of travel.

Implementation of the proposed project or alternatives would result in an increase in pedestrian and bicycle activity within and near the project site and on adjacent streets. The increase in pedestrian and bicycle activity would generally be accommodated within the existing and planned surrounding pedestrian and bicycle network, and the trails within the project site would provide key connections to the surrounding network. Proposed major paths and path nodes would be appropriately sized and configured to accommodate expected volumes. The anticipated mix of pedestrians and could be accommodated, even on peak days. Secondary paths would experience much lower volumes and only need to be wide enough to support comfortable visitor travel with the ability for visitor groups to pass each other in the same or opposite directions. A width of 6 feet or more would ensure that an acceptable level of service is maintained on the secondary paths.

Providing bicycle and pedestrian amenities such as shelters, benches, water fountains, secure bicycle racks, route lighting, and other facilities throughout the Presidio, as called for by PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure TR-9 Pedestrian/Bicycle Amenities, combined with the new connections within the project site, and bikeway and trail improvements outlined in the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan, would provide a pedestrian and bicycle network that would adequately accommodate pedestrians and bicycles without creating hazards, barriers, or access restrictions for pedestrians and bicyclists.
**Would the proposed project or alternatives adversely affect public transit services?**

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

All alternatives would generate additional transit trips for several Bay Area transit providers and would most affect the transit providers that directly serve the Main Post (Muni and the Presidio's shuttle, PresidiGo), with Alternative 3 generating the greatest number of additional transit trips. Ridership on PresidiGo weekday peak period Downtown service is near capacity today during peak months, and additional capacity will be needed to keep pace with increasing demand. Weekend PresidiGo Downtown service currently has available capacity. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) informed several Muni service changes being implemented as part of the Muni Forward program. The change with the greatest impact to the alternatives is the route changes to the 43-Masonic route, which includes connecting directly to the Transit Center in the Main Post and extending the route terminus from Chestnut Street/Fillmore Street intersection to Fort Mason (Marina Boulevard/Laguna Street intersection). The Muni Forward improvements also include increased frequency on the 43-Masonic route from every 10 to every 9 minutes in the morning commute period and from every 12 to every 10 minutes in the afternoon commute period. The increased frequency will help accommodate additional transit riders generated by the proposed project or alternatives.

Mitigation measures called for in the PTMP ROD, including PresidiGo service, supporting increased frequency on Muni lines (TR-10 Support Increased Muni Frequencies), and monitoring of Golden Gate Transit routes and coordination with Golden Gate Transit (TR-25 Transit Service Monitoring Program), would reduce the impacts on transit service.

**Would construction-related traffic conflict with local and regional traffic?**

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

Because construction vehicle trips traveling to and from the project site would be dispersed, the vehicle trips on other regional roadways would not be substantial and would generally fall within the normal fluctuations of traffic. The reduction in construction traffic associated with the upcoming completion of the Presidio Parkway would be substantially greater than the increase associated with the parklands project, so the total volume of construction traffic in the park would be less than it is today. Construction activities would include import of soil, grading, construction of paths, planting, building rehabilitation and new construction, utility upgrades, and other infrastructure enhancements. Construction vehicles would include trucks hauling construction debris and delivering construction materials and supplies, as well as construction worker vehicles. The volume of construction vehicles traveling to and from the project site would vary, depending on the specific construction activity and the schedules of the various building elements of each of the alternatives. Construction vehicles would generally enter the Presidio...
via the new US101 interchange on Girard Road. Truck traffic would comply with city truck restrictions on nearby streets (e.g., Marina Boulevard and Lyon Street). Construction management as called for in the PTMP ROD (Mitigation Measure TR-26 Construction Traffic Management Plan) would adequately mitigate impacts due to construction traffic.

CONCLUSION

All alternatives would contribute to anticipated unacceptable operating conditions at study intersections, particularly on weekends. Signalization would mitigate the operation of the study intersections to LOS D or better with or without the additional traffic generated by the alternatives. Signalization would be considered in the long term subject to further review of the potential impact on historic resources. Recently expanded MUNI bus service, improved pedestrian and bicycle connections included in the proposed project, and TDM measures such as more frequent and/or extensive PresidiGo service would encourage and accommodate the use of non-automobile modes, and reduce traffic congestion at all study intersections to acceptable levels. Management of events and programs would minimize traffic congestion on peak days.

PARKING

Parking occupancy information has been collected on a recurring basis in the Crissy Field (Area B) and Main Post districts over the past decade. Table 7 provides a summary of recently collected data within approximately a ½- to ¾-mile (10-15 minute walk) of the project site. The greatest weekday occupancy of parking in the Main Post generally occurs early to mid-afternoon. On weekends, parking utilization in the Main Post varies considerably depending on the schedule of outdoor events (e.g., Sunday Picnics with food truck vendors). At Crissy Field, parking conditions are more likely to vary with weather conditions. Over 70 percent of the planned building square footage in the Main Post is currently occupied, and approximately 45 percent of the planned building square footage is currently occupied in the Crissy Field (Area B) district. Parking utilization will increase with increased occupancy of buildings in these districts.

Parking management strategies to manage parking supplies and reduce demand have primarily included parking fees in recent years, with time restrictions in a small number of locations. As the number and various types of visitor destinations increases, short-term parking demand will increase, and the relative proportion of long-term (i.e., employee) parking demand will decrease. Parking management strategies will be adapted accordingly to make the most efficient use of available parking supplies, introducing time limits near visitor destinations to encourage turnover of spaces and differential pricing to shift long-term parking demand to less proximate parking areas. These parking management policies will be coordinated with other transportation programs to create a coherent, effective approach to accommodating, but discouraging automobile use and promoting more sustainable means of travel.

Parking supply is not considered to be a significant environmental impact under the NEPA. As a result of parking shortfalls, individuals who would prefer to drive may use alternate means of transportation because the perceived convenience of driving is lessened by a shortage of parking. This shortage is not considered significant because it implements Trust transportation demand management policies intended to reduce park-wide traffic congestion, and air quality, noise and safety impacts caused by congestion. The Trust, however, does acknowledge that parking conditions are of interest to the public and decision-makers, and therefore provides the following parking analysis for informational purposes only.
Would the parking demand associated with the proposed project and alternatives be accommodated within the proposed supply?

ALL ALTERNATIVES

Parking demand for all alternatives primarily consists of short-term demand by visitors and a small amount of long-term parking by employees. Different land uses experience peak parking demand on different days of the week. Alternative 1 includes some office use and consequently has a parking demand on weekdays similar to weekends. Alternatives 2 and 3 include visitor-oriented uses and would have greater parking demand on weekends than weekdays. The parking demand associated with large weekend special events would need to be managed to ensure adequate parking supply in the Main Post district. Alternative 2 would have the greatest amount of usable outdoor space, but Alternative 3 would have the greatest amount of built space. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate similar weekday and weekend parking demand.

The project site is on the border between the Main Post and Crissy Field (Area B) districts, and motorists are expected to park in both districts. Several of the anticipated future changes in the parking supply in the Crissy Field (Area B) district would be associated with completion of the Presidio Parkway and return of associated construction support space to the park. The parking lot east of the Commissary (Building 610) would be expanded by approximately 66 spaces, the lot near the east Mason Street warehouses would be built to provide approximately 210 spaces, the temporary parking lot within the Quartermaster Reach site would be removed, and a 45-space parking lot would be added immediately east of Building 640. Anticipated changes in long-term parking supply in the Main Post include a reduction in spaces associated with the Anza Esplanade and expansion of the parking lot near Building 387.
Table 8 presents a summary of parking demand, as compared to supply, for each alternative. Alternative 1 would have the least parking demand, and Alternatives 2 and 3 would have similar parking demand, on both weekdays and weekends. Parking demand on weekends varies in both the Main Post and Crissy Field. In the Main Post, the size and number of events is the primary variable in parking demand. At Crissy Field, there is little variability in the parking demand generated by building uses in Area B, but weather conditions and programming create more variability in the parking demand in Area A.

As required by PTMP EIS Mitigation Measure TR-22 TDM Program Monitoring, the Trust has implemented a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce automobile usage by all tenants, occupants and visitors. If TDM goals are not being reached, the Trust would implement more aggressive strategies or intensify components of the existing program, such as requiring tenant participation in more TDM program elements and/or providing more frequent and/or extensive shuttle service.

All alternatives would have adequate parking supply to accommodate demand on weekdays and typical weekends. On peak weekends when there are outdoor events in the Main Post and increased demand at Crissy Field, overall parking demand would exceed supply, resulting in a small deficit in the combined Crissy Field and Main Post districts. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-21 Presidio-Wide Parking Management as identified in the PTMP ROD would manage parking conditions to minimize parking impacts. In addition, increasing parking supply in key areas to meet demand would minimize the negative effects of motorists circulating in search of available parking. Any added parking supply would be located to be shared between various uses and maximize efficiency.

Under all alternatives, outdoor events would be scheduled and coordinated based on parking availability, and events would be sized and capped at 1,200 persons to ensure that supply meets expected demand. Events requiring large amounts of parking would not be scheduled concurrently with other events or Presidio peak parking demand periods. On days in which events occur at both the Main Parade and within the project site lawns, during peak arrival periods, adjacent roadways could become congested and vehicles could be parked in areas not designated for parking, including adjacent road shoulders and fields. In addition, due to the increased amount of interpretive elements throughout the project site, the length of stay for leisure visitors could be extended. As required by PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure TR-24 Special Event Parking Management, the Trust would coordinate events with other park event venues (indoor and outdoor) so that combined parking demand would not exceed parking supply. A multi-pronged approach to parking management for peak activity periods would be implemented, including:

- promoting transit (e.g., MUNI or PresidiGo), taxi service, and walking and biking;
- event-specific shuttle bus service;
- valet parking;

Alternative 1 would provide the largest number of parking spaces on the project site (124), but would generate the least demand of the three alternatives. Alternative 2 would provide approximately 87 spaces on the project site. Alternative 3 has comparable outdoor space as Alternative 2, but has more built space. Parking demand would be greater than with Alternatives 1 or 2, but onsite parking supply (53) would be less than other alternatives. Under all alternatives, there would be adequate parking at the Main Post and Crissy Field to accommodate the additional parking on weekdays and typical weekends.
## Comparison of Parking Demand and Supply by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alternative 1 (number of parking spaces)</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (number of parking spaces)</th>
<th>Alternative 3 (number of parking spaces)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Demand</strong></td>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Post (excluding project site)</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crissy Field (Area B, excluding project site)</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crissy Field (Area A)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply</strong></td>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Post (excluding project site)</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crissy Field (Area B, excluding project site)</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crissy Field (Area A)</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS/DEFICIT</strong></td>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crissy Field (Area A)</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS/DEFICIT - Percent</strong></td>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crissy Field (Area A)</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015

Note: Parking demand and supply for Main Post excludes Infantry Terrace residential neighborhood. Parking demand and supply for Crissy Field (Area A) includes East Beach and West Bluff parking areas.
supplementing PresidiGo Around the Park and Downtown route capacities and frequencies;

• shuttle service to/from any underutilized parking areas in other parts of the Presidio;

• providing temporary signs to route vehicles to overflow parking areas; and

• establishing differential pricing and/or time limits for parking adjacent to the project site.

CONCLUSION

None of the alternatives would significantly impact the availability of parking in the Crissy Field or Main Post districts. On most days, parking management and other TDM measures would accommodate parking demand while also encouraging use of non-automobile modes. Management of events and programs would minimize impacts on peak days.

VISITATION

CRISSY FIELD

Crissy Field (Area A), located directly north of the project site, features 100 acres of a unique, landscaped and restored natural coastal environment within the Presidio, offering exceptional recreation and learning opportunities to a wide range of visitors. Crissy Field includes a 22-acre restored tidal marsh and dunes, the scenic Crissy Field Promenade/Bay Trail, the Crissy Field Center, seating areas, a restored historic airfield, a beach, a fishing pier (Torpedo Wharf) and a Class 1 bike path. The Crissy Field Promenade is a segment of the Bay Trail and generally follows the northern edge of Crissy Field. East Beach, located east of the tidal marsh area, consists of several picnic areas, parking and restroom facilities. East Beach is also a popular launching site for windsurfers, kiteboarders and nonmotorized watercraft users such as kayakers. The Crissy Field Center, temporarily located in Building 1199 at the east end of East Beach, hosts numerous environmental education and leadership programs for children and families. West Bluff Picnic Area, located at the northwest end of Crissy Field, consists of several picnic areas, parking, restroom facilities, and food and beverage facilities. The Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary headquarters is located on Crissy Field West. Facilities include the Ocean Climate Center, Visitor Center and classrooms. Crissy Field has more visitors than it was originally designed to accommodate. Access is difficult on weekends when there is exceptional weather and special events. However, on most existing weekdays and weekends, there is zero to minor crowding (NPS 2012).

The NPS manages all special events at Crissy Field (Area A) under Title 16, U.S. Code and Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, 2.50. Policy guidance for management of special event activities is provided in NPS Policies, Director’s Order 53 Special Park Uses, and the GGNRA Superintendent’s Compendium (updated annually). Special use permits are issued in accordance with the Crissy Field Plan EA (Jones &
Stokes 1996), which designates the area for “a variety of active recreational uses.” The decision to issue or deny a permit for a special park use flows from the appropriate compliance under the NEPA and other applicable laws. Permits are denied if special events would result in significant conflict with other existing uses or program activities.

Within Crissy Field (Area B), the Trust requires appropriate permit conditions for organized events and schedule/coordinate such events with the NPS to minimize visitor use impacts and ensure that park resources are protected (PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure CO-7 Special Events).

**MAIN POST**

The Main Post, which forms the southern edge of the project area, is the “heart of the Presidio”, historically serving as the social and administrative center of the post. Today, the Main Post is a center for public programs from films to festivals, with destinations and amenities that help visitors experience, understand and enjoy the park. The 4.5-acre Main Parade, recently restored as a green open space sloping from the center of the Main Post towards the project site, hosts informal gatherings and everyday activities as well as organized public events. The Visitor Center, which provides maps, brochures and suggested activities, temporarily operates in Building 36 while planning for its new, permanent location in Building 210 within the project site. The Officers’ Club in Building 50 features exhibits, programs and cultural events including live music and dance, talks, films, family activities and educational offerings. Other public places include the 22-suite Inn at the Presidio, the Walt Disney Family Museum, the Museum of the Society of California Pioneers, the Golden Gate Club, the Presidio Bowling Center, the Transit Center, the Archaeology Lab, and several restaurants and cafés.

**NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS**

Visitors to the project site are currently confronted by a fenced-off area containing a large-scale construction site. The Presidio Parkway tunnel tops are clearly in view and separate the Presidio’s Main Post from Crissy Field. Except for the Transit Center, visitor amenities such as landscaping, plantings and lawns, paths, vista points, gathering spaces, lighting and power are not yet evident. Despite the temporary degraded visual condition of the site, passers-by noticing the unobstructed views and proximity to the waterfront can readily imagine the visitor opportunities and potential afforded by the parklands project.

**VISITATION MEASURES**

Both the NPS and the Trust manage the levels of use visiting the Presidio to help control issues associated with crowding and traffic and reduce conflicts between activities that share facilities and areas. Management actions and protection measures are coordinated to control visitation to ensure that safe conditions are maintained and appropriate uses of the park can be enjoyed by visitors. Such measures include managing distribution of visitors and controlling crowding, implementing visitor safety
measures, limiting visitor access to sensitive areas, restricting parking and vehicle access, and/or closures when capacity is reached.

**Would the proposed project or the alternatives adversely affect the existing visitor experiences and uses of the park?**

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

**Project Site Visitation Capacity**

The proposed project and alternatives include an allocation of open landscape areas, for visitor rest, recreation and group gathering, and to support programs or events. When no outdoor programs or events are being held, visitor demand for these areas would be relatively low; especially in light of the abundance of similar type areas at Crissy Field and the Main Post. The estimated maximum number of visitors (people at one time) that would be onsite for each alternative, including visitors in buildings and public circulation areas, along with the estimated average length of stay, is provided in Table 9.

For special events, excessive congestion could occur if demand exceeds the project site capacity. Thus, outdoor events would be limited to those that do not exceed the site capacity. The types of events envisioned for the project site are those that are relatively small to moderate in scale. The Trust would cap events on the project site at 1,200 persons to ensure that comfortable visitation conditions are always maintained (Orca Consulting LLC 2015). The Trust’s event approval process required by PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure CO-7 Special Events would ensure that the recommended levels would not be exceeded.

Each alternative also includes an allocation of food service, retail and restroom capacity. These capacities would be planned to meet the expected visitor demand levels as closely as possible, especially for restrooms. For retail and food service facilities, whenever wait lines form, queue areas would be implemented. It is not anticipated that wait lines would grow to long lengths, as visitors would opt for other dining and retail locations rather than waiting in line. On peak days, food and retail carts and trucks could also be implemented to minimize wait lines and take advantage of the unsatisfied visitor demand.

**Visitation Demand at Crissy Field**

There would be more visitors from Crissy Field that would reroute their visit through the new parklands than there would be new parklands visitors that go to Crissy Field, so the net impact would be a slight reduction in visitor demand for Crissy Field activities (i.e., Crissy Field visitors that opt to spend more time at the project site and less time at Crissy Field). Pedestrian/bicyclist traffic volumes for Crissy Field would increase slightly, due to the path connections enabling cross-traffic between Crissy Field and the Main Post, but there would be a shift in traffic patterns from Crissy Field’s main Promenade to the connector paths, which should be a beneficial impact, as the crowded Promenade would be alleviated,
and other lower-use Crissy Field paths would be activated. Therefore, a slight reduction in Crissy Field PAOT’s and slight increase in pedestrian/bicyclist traffic volumes (but improved traffic distribution) is expected. On days with large events with viewing areas on Crissy Field, such as Fleet Week, it is likely that some visitors would park at the project site and other Main Post lots and walk through the new parklands to Crissy Field for event viewing. On these days, there would be an increase in Crissy Field pedestrian traffic and use.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

This alternative would feature a mostly natural landscape with limited programming. Visitors would be drawn to the site to reflect and be inspired, to immerse themselves in a more natural environment, and discover and explore the larger setting. The project site would be largely undifferentiated and would not support gathering areas for performances and activities, picnics and cultural events. Key visitor amenities would include pathways, native plantings, modest interpretative exhibits/signage, and small areas to picnic, sit and enjoy the views. The primary north-south paths would provide access from the Main Post to Crissy Field while the more meandering east-west paths would allow visitors to stroll. The lack of amenities, such as seating, lighting, shade/shelter or places to store belongings would only likely attract visitors to the Presidio who are already familiar with the park. Visitor activities would include solitary walks or meeting in small groups to appreciate the views along the bluff top. Building 211 would be designated for office use and would not support public use for programs or provide shelter from the elements. The Crissy Field Center would not be expanded with new Field Station and Classroom buildings to serve the general public and to provide needed spaces for the growing environmental education and leadership programs for under-served youth. Because the outdoor Learning Landscape would not be included, opportunities for education would be limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>People at One Time (PAOT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Stay (hours)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Stay (hours)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Stay (hours)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ORCA Consulting LLC 2015
An estimated 1,427 people at one time would visit the project site on a peak weekday, and 1,641 on a peak weekend day (ORCA Consulting LLC 2015). Individuals participating in nearby uses or experiences that would like to use other park areas would appreciate the improved connectivity between the upland and lowland areas of the Presidio brought about by the project, as would those seeking solitude and natural quiet. However, the lack of amenities and services would not likely introduce new-to-the-park users to the project site, or result in a markedly improved visitor experience. Many visitors to the Main Post or Crissy Field would be unaware of the proposed changes. There would be little increase in visitor understanding of the significance of the Presidio due to improved programs, exhibits, information, media and other educational experiences. Those visitors who prefer a wider range of activities and more support services to facilitate their visit may be disappointed.

Depending on location of optimum viewpoints along pathways, and due to the absence of established overlooks, some crowding could occur along portions of the pathway when groups stop for photos or orientation. In congested areas, some visitors may step off the established paths and on to delicate land and vegetation. Wayfinding and identification signs would encourage group gathering at established gathering areas only. Gathering areas at the north and south entrances would facilitate group orientation prior to and after traversing the project site pathways. Local tour operators would be provided guidance on stopping points, areas to avoid, and overall rules for visitation at the project site.

Pathway entrances to the north and south could experience bottlenecks during arrival and departure surges for events at Main Post and Crissy Field. For peak arrival and departure surges, personnel and/or volunteers would be placed at critical parklands entrance points to encourage visitors to use all available entrances and pathways (improved demand distribution). Additional, temporary wayfinding would be in place for peak events (e.g., major concerts at Main Post, Fleet Week viewing at Crissy Field, etc.).

Educational gatherings would be limited to the three planned gathering areas to avoid creating congestion.

As this alternative does not include additional restroom, food service and retail spaces, during peak periods, insufficient availability of key visitor services could result in overcrowding at existing facilities such as the Transit Café and restrooms. For peak periods, temporary supplemental services would be provided and placed in locations which would not obstruct visitor flow. Temporary services would include portable restrooms, food and retail carts and/or kiosks, and supplemental waste receptacles.

**ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY**

Compared to Alternative 1, this alternative would provide a more diverse landscape consisting of lawns, gardens, meadows and native plantings throughout the project site. Participatory spaces would be provided for assembly, education, tours, learning and interaction. Lawn areas in and around Buildings 210 and 211 and at the Eastern Promontory would allow visitors to gather. Medium-sized special events
and community programs would be held. Multiple activities in areas on the bluff top could happen simultaneously, and several paths down the embankment would allow visitors to be immersed in the native plantings. A highly visible and centrally located gathering area would be provided at the Central Promontory. Building 211 (Observation Post) would function as a program and special events facility. Similar to Alternative 1, the Crissy Field Center would not be expanded with new buildings. While the outdoor Learning Landscape would not be constructed, a large lawn area in the center of the native plantings could provide more programmed amenities than Alternative 1.

A peak weekday would be expected to attract 2,153 visitors at one time to the project site, whereas a peak weekend day would attract 3,984 visitors at one time (ORCA Consulting LLC 2015). New user groups, including people of all ages from diverse audiences and ethnic communities, would be attracted to the site for performances, cultural events, and picnics. Places for people of all ages would be available to play games such as lawn bowling or bocce ball or climb stumps, ladders and rope bridges, or to experience fog, sound, wind and other weather patterns. The large plaza around the Visitor Center would inform visitors and inspire them to visit other park destinations. Some visitors who prefer a contemplative experience may feel that programs and gatherings are in conflict with a desirable park experience while others might like the range and types of spaces and activities provided.

Similar to Alternative 1, some crowding could occur along portions of the pathways when groups stop for photos or orientation. Wayfinding and identification signs would encourage group gathering at established gathering areas only. Gathering areas at the north and south entrances would facilitate group orientation prior to and after traversing the pathways. Local tour operators would be provided guidance on stopping points, areas to avoid, and overall rules for visitation at the project site.

Also as in Alternative 1, certain pathway entrances to the north and south could experience bottlenecks during arrival and departure surges for events at Main Post and Crissy Field. For peak arrival and departure surges, personnel and/or volunteers would be placed at critical entrance points to improve demand distribution. Additional, temporary wayfinding would be in place for peak events.

For special event activity on the lawn areas, pathways directly feeding these areas would periodically experience arrival and departure surges. Lawn area feeder pathways would be appropriately sized to avoid creating congestion.

Building 211 would provide additional restroom capacity, and would be subject to availability for general visitor use depending upon planned programming within these two spaces. If these facilities are not available to the general public during peak visitation periods, crowding at existing public restroom facilities on the project site could occur. During peak periods, insufficient availability of key visitor services such as food services and restrooms could result in overcrowding at existing facilities such as the Transit Café, and upkeep of these spaces at peak operation could be difficult to perform. For peak periods, temporary supplemental services would be provided and placed in proximity to the existing Transit Café,
or in adjacent outdoor spaces which would not obstruct visitor flow. Temporary services would include portable restrooms, food and retail carts and/or kiosks, and supplemental waste receptacles.

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS**

Compared to Alternative 1, Alternative 3 would provide more visitation opportunities and encourage greater participation by the local and regional population, including those that are not traditional park visitors. The setting would serve as a place offering a greater variety of outdoor educational and interpretative experiences, including more onsite interpretive materials and programs. Gathering and programmable spaces of varying size and character would be provided to support a diversity of experiences, including small intimate seating areas (for individuals and small groups), spaces for family picnics and touring groups, and spaces for community programs. The range of spaces would welcome the most diverse audience of participants to experience the new parklands while providing connections to the many adjacent park resources. The new parklands would function as a main trailhead to the rest of the Presidio trail network. Visitors would be able to reference the centrally located Visitor Center plaza (the Zocalo) as a meeting place and encourage them to visit other park destinations. The New Observation Post would function as a program and event facility that also provides visitors shelter from the weather.

The military history and legacy of service that defines the Presidio would be highlighted by interpretive features, including a compass rose depicting the expeditions and deployments from the Presidio at the Central Overlook. Interpretive elements might make the Presidio more relevant to new visitors by connecting them to the multi-cultural heritage and extensive history of the park.

The gathering areas at the Central Overlook and adjacent terraced seating on the embankment would provide panoramic views over the bay. One or more paths down the embankment would be wide enough to allow bicycle and pedestrian use and enable visitors to be immersed in the natural landscape along the embankment. The Learning Landscape would provide an outdoor place-based environmental learning experience that focuses on the natural and cultural history of the site including unstructured play. The adjacent Crissy Field Center would be expanded with a new Classroom building to provide needed space for continuing the environmental learning program for under-served youth and a public Field Station, which would serve as an orientation and meeting place for drop-in visitors to the Learning Landscape.

Among the alternatives, Alternative 3 would provide the greatest amount of infrastructure to support visitors. An expected 1,857 people at one time would visit on a peak weekday, and 2,749 on a peak weekend day (ORCA Consulting LLC 2015). Visitors would enjoy quintessential National Park experiences such as a fire circle and terraced seating for ranger-led talks. Those focused on simply appreciating the setting would benefit from the enhanced scenic viewing through the removal of Building 211, replaced by the New Observation Post on the eastern edge of the project site, and the addition of the new overlooks.
Visitor amenities including restrooms at the New Observation Post and the Field Station, adequate seating, lighting, shade/shelter, and places to store belongings would likely appeal to a wider audience of visitors and would also likely encourage an increased stay time and repeat visitation. Those expressing interest in having more onsite interpretive materials and programs, or for engaging diverse audiences would value the many opportunities for first-hand learning brought about by this alternative. Some of the local visitors who frequent the park on a regular basis, particularly those seeking solitude and quiet, may not find places for gathering and programs appealing. They might find solace, however, in the ample trail opportunities afforded by the alternative, which would provide a tranquil park experience. Providing trails received strong support from all potential user groups during scoping.

Alternative 3 provides the most generous pathway sizing on the south end of the project site, enabling more comfortable flow to and from the Main Parade during events. However, pathway entrances to the south that lack similar sizing could experience bottlenecks during arrival and departure surges during major events. As in all alternatives, for peak arrival and departure surges, personnel and/or volunteers would be placed at critical parklands entrance points to encourage visitors to use all available entrances and pathways (improved demand distribution). Additional, temporary wayfinding would be in place for peak events.

Similar to the other alternatives, during peak periods, insufficient availability of key visitor services such as food services and restrooms could create overcrowding at existing facilities such as the Transit Café, and upkeep of these spaces at peak operation could be difficult to perform. Supplemental, temporary food services and portable restrooms would be provided in proximity to the café, or in adjacent outdoor spaces.

**CONCLUSION**

All alternatives would allow visitors to begin using a new area within the park. Each would improve connectivity to and between adjacent areas in the park, facilitate the visitor experience, and increase opportunities for visitor understanding of the Presidio to a different degree. The diversity of the audience and the number of participants would depend upon the range of activities, settings and services offered. From an operations perspective, Alternatives 1 and 3 would provide the least risk of impact to park resources, as compared to Alternative 2, due to a) less relative demand due to less programing (Alternative 1) or b) greater amount of infrastructure to support heightened demand levels (Alternative 3). Current frequent users of the park may not appreciate the increase in the number of new visitors attracted to the project area or the additional opportunities for recreation, education, inspiration and enjoyment offered. Site designs would ensure that visitor use impacts are minimized. Management actions would be available to ensure that park resources are protected.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

The 14-acre project site is located within the Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark District (NHLD). The project site sits at the nexus of historic development on the former military post, between waterfront and uplands, industrial and ceremonial spaces, utilitarian and recreational uses. The area that is now Crissy Field once consisted of an extensive tidal marsh at the base of the bluffs. A seasonal creek drained the plateau on which the Main Post now sits, flowing northeast into the marsh near where present-day building 603 now stands. This ecologically rich area provided bountiful resources for the Ohlone people of the area, who were called Yelamu in the northern peninsula. With the arrival of the Spanish in 1776, the transformation of the area by non-Native hands began, first with the establishment of the adobe fort to the south, and later by large-scale earth moving activities under the U.S. Army. The development of the Main Post after the American takeover in 1846 followed the original Spanish geometry and orientation toward the bay. By 1870, a roadway (the future Lincoln Boulevard) had traversed the northern end of the project site, marking what would soon become the northern limit of the Main Parade. The Army populated the area between the road and the edge of the bluff with stables and other utilitarian structures. The creek was filled by 1895, thereby creating the Main Parade and an expanded stables area. In 1900, the Guardhouse (today’s Building 210) was completed, echoing the style and material of the nearby Montgomery Street Barracks, and exerting a more permanent presence on the bluff than the earlier frontier-style stables buildings.

In the early 20th century, the U.S. Army began filling the bayfront slough, enabling the relocation of the stables and other back-of-house functions from the upper bluff to the lower waterfront. The 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition brought sweeping change to Crissy Field, completing the fill effort and constructing a vast, temporary “city” of exhibit halls, as well as a racetrack. The onset of World War I cut the exposition short, and its buildings were replaced with a large cantonment of barracks. Infrastructure, including a rail line along Mason Street and associated warehouses, connected the Presidio to Fort Mason and the Port of San Francisco during this time. The waterfront barracks were removed as the airfield functions extended to the east beginning in 1921, but Crissy Field closed as an active airfield in 1936 due to treacherous flying conditions and advances in military aviation. By 1941, the Mid-Crissy area largely consisted of a densely-built collection of motor pool, storage and warehouse buildings (including today’s Building 603), many of which remained until the 1980s. On the Main Post, the fire station (the first facility of its kind on a U.S Army post) was constructed in 1917, and by World War II the area adjacent to it was populated by wood frame barracks.

The northern Main Post’s present-day use as a transit hub, parking and services area largely dates to the late 1960s, when the booming civilian population working on-post necessitated dining options for non-service people, and transit infrastructure for commuters. The present-day organization of the Mid-Crissy area largely dates to 1989, when the remaining motor pool buildings were removed, and the Commissary (Building 610, now Sports Basement) and associated parking were constructed. Today,
vestiges of each of these episodes remain within the project site boundaries, creating an enormous opportunity for engaging park visitors, interpretation and revitalization.

NHLD CONTRIBUTORS WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE

Building 603 is the only NHLD-contributing building within the project site include Buildings 210, 603, and 201. Additionally, the parklands project would be visible from approximately 11 historic buildings and sites which contribute to the NHLD. Although the NHLD and these nearby contributing resources as a whole retain integrity as historic properties, the project site has been substantially altered as a result of construction of the Presidio Parkway.

CURRENT INTEGRITY OF THE PROJECT SITE

Construction of the Presidio Parkway substantially changed the historic character of the majority of the project site, with the demolition of the NHLD contributing roadway, buildings and other contributing resources, construction of twin tunnels and re-creation of the former bluff which historically separated the Main Post with Crissy Field, and relocation of NHLD contributing Building 201 (located at the eastern edge of the project site). The Presidio Parkway also removed 49,500 square feet of non-historic built space (former Buildings 605 and 606/Public Storage facility, built 1972) that was directly adjacent to the west and south of Building 603. As such, the project site has considerably reduced levels of integrity when compared to other portions of the NHLD.

Building 603, which will be rehabilitated by the parklands project to serve as an expanded Crissy Field Center, was rehabilitated for the same purpose by the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy in 2001 with a finding of “no adverse effect.” Character defining features of the building’s interior and exterior have been identified in the draft New Presidio Parklands Project Supplemental Design Guidelines (Trust 2015b) (Attachment 4), which contains direction about retaining them in the currently anticipated rehabilitation. The integrity of the project site around Building 603 is substantially altered from the end of the period of significance. All structures from this formerly densely-built site have been removed by either the U.S. Army or the Presidio Parkway, with the exception of (Old) Mason Street to the north.

11 Building 201 (built 1896) is currently listed as a contributing resource to the NHLD, and in 2016 will be moved by the Presidio Parkway project from its present, temporary storage location to its permanent position on Halleck Street; however, the Presidio Parkway project has moved the building, removed its lower level, and will soon rehabilitate the remaining structure. The Presidio Parkway project carries a commitment to re-evaluate the building’s contributing status following its rehabilitation. Building 201 will not be directly affected by the New Presidio Parklands project.
Would the proposed project or the alternatives directly or indirectly affect contributing features of the Presidio NHLD?

The project area, or Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the parklands project (undertaking) extends well beyond the limits of the 14-acre project site and includes three PTMP planning districts [the Main Post, Crissy Field (Area B) and Letterman] and Crissy Field (Area A) that overlap or are visually connected to the project site. The following discussion also refers to various sub-areas and resources within the APE, which could be potentially affected (directly or indirectly) by the undertaking. The APE and sub-areas have been the subject of a number of guidelines and treatment recommendations prepared by the Trust and others, including the supplemental design guidelines, which will be finalized as part of the parklands project. In general, maintaining consistency with the guidelines and other applicable planning documents would avoid adverse effects to historic resources. The APE and sub-areas are shown in Figure 7.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Building rehabilitation, stabilization, and maintenance that would occur under this alternative would protect the overall status of the NHLD. As Building 211 would be retained in its current location, its retention would continue to impede historically significant northerly views from the Main Parade. No new construction would occur in the vicinity of Building 603; instead, open space and views would be emphasized rather than the historically densely built setting. The historic structure (Building 603) would be returned to service as the Crissy Field Center with the same level of programming and uses as existed prior to construction of the Presidio Parkway project. Landscape rehabilitation and retention of historic roadways on the edges of the project site would be generally beneficial. Large areas of predominantly native plantings on the northern end of the bluff top would be incompatible with the historic landscape character of the Main Post, which consists of lawns, gardens and ornamental plantings. The addition of trees above and inland of the tunnels could also limit bay views to the northwest from portions of the Main Post. Through conformance with the supplemental design guidelines, this potential adverse effect would be minimized.

ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY

This alternative would be consistent with the Doyle Drive Historic Property Treatment Plan for the Built Environment, and would be consistent with the Doyle Drive Architectural Criteria, the intention of which is to minimize and/or mitigate adverse effects of the Presidio Parkway project to the integrity of the NHLD. As with Alternative 1, Building 211, retained in its current location, would continue to impede historically significant northerly views from the Main Parade. No new construction would occur in the vicinity of Building 603, which would emphasize open space and views rather than the historically densely built setting. Building 603 would, like Alternative 1, be returned to service as the Crissy Field Center with...
the same level of programming and uses as existed prior to the Presidio Parkway project. Compared to Alternative 1, the planted character of the project site would be characterized by three distinct zones: lawns, gardens and meadows on the bluff top; native plantings on the bluff face; and a combination of the two zones at the Crissy Field level. This differentiation is generally more compatible with the historic planted character of the three areas than that proposed under Alternative 1, however the large areas of lawn west of Building 603 are incompatible with a site that was historically either bayfront marsh of a light-industrial “working waterfront.” Through conformance with supplemental design guidelines, this potential adverse effect would be minimized.

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS**

Implementation of this alternative would have no direct adverse effect on the NHLD. Similar to the other alternatives, the project site is visible from approximately 11 historic buildings and sites which contribute to the NHLD, this alternative could indirectly affect them as a result of the change to their historic setting. These include historic buildings on the northerly end of the Main Post, to either side of the Main Parade, as well as those along Lincoln Boulevard and Halleck Street. Rehabilitation of Building 603 to serve an expanded Crissy Field Center program would directly affect the historic building and new construction to support the expanded program could indirectly affect the resource. The potential for direct and indirect effects is addressed under each project feature.

**Removal and Replacement of Building 211**

Under this alternative, Building 211 (Observation Post, built 1968) would be demolished and replaced with the New Observation Post of similar size, at a nearby location. Removal of Building 211 would have no adverse effect to the NHLD as it is a non-contributor to the NHLD. Its removal would reopen historically significant northerly views from the Main Parade and adjacent historic buildings. To avoid indirectly affecting any NHLD contributors in the vicinity of Building 211, the New Observation Post would be constructed out of the viewshed of the Main Parade, to the north of non-historic Building 215. New construction would conform to the supplemental design guidelines. Specifically the new construction would:

- not exceed an average height of 68.61 feet above sea level, which is the peak of the roof of adjacent Building 215; the highest point of new construction would not exceed 80.85 feet above sea level, which is the ridgeline of nearby Building 210;
- be organized on the site according to patterns of historic development in the area (e.g., perpendicular to Lincoln Boulevard and/or parallel with Graham Street);
- sited to the north and/or east of existing buildings so as to be minimally visible from the historic core of the Main Post.
- maintain a set back from the bluff edge to avoid obstructing views from Crissy Field;
• screen the non-historic parking area between Building 220 and Graham Street from the Main Post bluff landscape area to the west through the use of new buildings and/or landscaping;
• serve as a replacement for non-historic Building 211 in order to re-establish views north from the foot of the Main Parade and the rear of Building 210;
• not exceed 9,294 square feet of total new construction in the Main Post Bluff Sub-District (the size of existing Building 211);
• consider breaking new buildings into smaller volumes in order to disperse their mass;
• not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and differentiate the new work from the old, and be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the Main Post bluff’s historic resources; and
• adhere to the appropriate building materials and color palettes identified in the Main Post Bluff Subarea Design Guidelines (Trust 2011) and treatment recommendations in the Main Post Bluff Subarea of the Main Post Cultural Landscape Report (Trust 2012).

Rehabilitation and Expansion of Building 603
Under this alternative, the Crissy Field Center (Building 603, built 1939) would be rehabilitated and new educational/program facilities would be constructed to the south of Building 603 to house event and visitor serving space for the Crissy Field Center programs and additional classrooms. Rehabilitation of Building 603 would conform to the supplemental design guidelines and applicable treatment recommendations, and would not substantially alter the design or materials of the building. The design of the expansion of Building 603 is currently envisioned as two buildings (Field Station and Classroom building). The expansion would be constructed to conform to the supplemental design guidelines. Specifically the new construction would:
• maintain a 70-foot setback from Mason Street so that the west elevation of the historic building is not obscured;
• not exceed 34 feet above sea level (the height of the new Main Post bluff elevation); the average height of the roof of the new structure(s) would not exceed 29.5 feet above sea level (the bottom of 2nd floor window openings on the south elevations of Building 603);
• favor permeable and open facades that allow for strong connections between interior uses and street life and/or exterior spaces;
• break new buildings into smaller volumes in order to disperse their mass over this once-densely built site;
• not exceed 5,800 square feet in any single building adjacent to Building 603 (half the size of the building); and would not exceed 7,500 square feet of total new construction within the Youth Campus;
• concentrate new deck elements, as needed, on the south side of the building, except where to provide universal access to the building’s elevated first floor plate;

• incorporate flood control measures into the construction of the building to help minimize damage from flooding; and/or design new construction that is temporary in nature, or can be easily repaired or replaced in the event of damage due to flooding; and

• adhere to the identified Building 603 character defining features and treatment recommendations, as well as the list of appropriate building materials and color palettes identified for the Mid-Crissy Area Design Guidelines (Trust 2011); and

• place compatible new structures in the vicinity of Building 603, which was historically part of a more densely built setting than it is today.

Circulation Features and the Overlooks

• The Anza Esplanade would be extended to connect the Main Post to the Central Overlook, a central viewing and gathering point, while establishing a rectilinear northward extension of the sightlines down Anza Street, allowing continuous views and direct pedestrian access from the Main Parade on the south, to the Learning Landscape and Building 603 along Mason Street on the north, and to Crissy Field further north.

• The rectilinear orientation of the Anza Esplanade would reference the axial arrangement of roads and buildings surrounding the Main Post, without directly mimicking these elements.

• The Central Overlook, a central viewing and gathering point, would provide direct visual connections to the larger landscape, including Crissy Field, as well as the San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge in the distance, while lending a strong sense of place and a reminder of the Presidio’s historic connection with the San Francisco Bay.

• At the center point of the overlook, a two-dimensional (i.e., flat), interpretive element in the landscape design dedicated to telling the story of the military at the Presidio and service of individuals to their country is being considered.

• The Anza Esplanade and Central Overlook would maintain the setting and feeling of the Main Post and the Mid-Crissy areas, and support fulfillment of the historic preservation criteria provided in the Doyle Drive Architectural Criteria Report (Caltrans 2008).

• The Bluff Walk would constitute the main east-west pedestrian connection along the new bluff edge, and include pedestrian connections from the Main Post down to the Learning Landscape and Building 603. A series of viewing terraces would line the edge of the bluff and be oriented directly on axis with the Golden Gate Bridge and Alcatraz, consistent with direction from existing guidelines.

• The Bluff Walk would be a pedestrian circulation feature that complements the re-created bluff that once separated the upper and lower posts, while providing a direct pedestrian throughway across the
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northern edge of the Main Post, and connections to Mason Street and Crissy Field beyond, as existed prior to the construction of Doyle Drive in 1937.

- The viewing terraces would provide direct visual connections to the larger landscape lending a strong sense of place and a reminder of the Presidio’s historic connection to the San Francisco Bay. Although the proposed Anza Esplanade and three overlooks, as well as the Bluff Walk, would be new landscape elements visible from the northern edge of the Main Post and Crissy Field, these walkways would be relatively flat, two-dimensional linear objects placed on the ground plane of the new landscape, and would enhance, rather than obstruct, views from adjacent resources.

Zocalo

The new Zocalo would function as a main social and multi-functional arrival and gathering plaza between the Transit Center (Building 215) and the Visitor Center (Building 210). The landscaped pedestrian plaza would replace the non-historic paved parking lot that currently exists in the same location, and would retain the cluster of mature Monterey cypress trees as a focal point of the plaza. Retention of mature trees while removing non-historic hardscape materials and reactivating this autodominated space with a multi-functional pedestrian plaza would maintain the setting and feeling of the Main Post that existed during the majority of the period of significance.

Landscape and Hardscape

The rehabilitation treatment under the parklands project would seek to reestablish elements of the area’s natural character, in addition to structures and amenities supporting its newly-envisioned environmental education program. The character of this new landscape would be compatible with the setting and feeling of adjacent natural areas, and all new features would be small-scale and subordinate to existing historic resources (Building 603, Mason Street).

- As under Alternative 2, the planted areas are designed to complement and differentiate between the landscape character of Crissy Field, the bluff face and the Main Post. Unlike Alternative 2, the preferred alternative limits the amount of new lawn proposed for the Crissy Field area, which is more in keeping with the historic character of the area.

- These new park elements would be consistent with the wider landscape character of the Main Post and Mid-Crissy areas, and support fulfillment of the historic preservation criteria provided in the Doyle Drive BETP and Architectural Criteria Report (Caltrans 2008).

CONCLUSION

None of the alternatives would have a direct or indirect adverse effect on the NHLD. Alternative 3 would result in a visible change to the landscape when viewed from contributing resources in the project area, due primarily to new construction (New Observation Post), building rehabilitation and expansion (Building 603) and key project elements (Anza Esplanade Extension, overlooks, Zocalo and Bluff Walk). However,
conformance with applicable design guidelines and planning documents would ensure that the design and construction of the New Observation Post and Crissy Field Center expansion are consistent with the Secretary’s Standards, resulting in a new structure or structures that are compatible with the character defining features of the NHLD and its contributing resources, including the setting and feeling of the NHLD in the project area. The key project elements would be compatible with established design criteria and would therefore enhance the qualities and characteristics of the project area and the NHLD as a whole.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Contributing archaeological areas of the NHLD were predicted through the use of historic maps and documentary evidence as part of the 1993 NHL Update (NPS 1993). Subsequent archival research, GIS modeling and excavation have provided additional information about predicted areas of the NHLD. In certain cases, subsurface archaeological testing and other excavation efforts have confirmed the presence of the predicted resources and enabled the Trust and NPS to characterize archaeological areas of the NHLD. The Quartermaster Complex, Quartermaster Dump and Stream Ravine Dump archaeological areas, all of which contribute to the NHLD, are within or directly adjacent to the project site. Additionally, a portion of the project site is considered to be sensitive for prehistoric archaeological deposits (Figure 8).

QUARTERMASTER COMPLEX ARCHAEOLOGICAL AREA (1860s-1910s)

The Quartermaster Complex archaeological area is predicted based on historic maps and historical documentary evidence. The complex was located at the north end of the Main Post and consisted of a series of buildings and structures such as stables, a bakery, blacksmiths, shops and storehouses. A total of 21 buildings and structures were part of the complex. Most of the buildings were removed prior to 1915 but a few remained in use through World War I. The footprint of the Quartermaster Complex lies under Buildings 210, 218, 220, 211 and 215 and a series of parking lots. Archaeological remains associated with the Quartermaster Complex could be expected to include privies, trash pits, dumps or sheet refuse deposits, stone or brick foundations from former buildings, and features associated with an open work space or yard.

QUARTERMASTER DUMP ARCHAEOLOGICAL AREA (1880s-1910s)

The Quartermaster’s Dump archaeological area is known to contain archaeological deposits based on previous archaeological investigations. The area consists of a series of landfills dispersed over acres of the bayfront landscape of the Presidio. The Quartermaster Dump was a late 19th century garbage dump where refuse from the post was deposited into the bayshore marsh. Previously, trash disposal on the post had occurred close to the site of its production in privies. Beginning in the 1890s, garbage disposal at the Presidio began to occur in a more consolidated fashion into the communal dump maintained by the

“The Trust shall take all reasonable measures to protect archaeological sites and features identified inside the Presidio National Historic Landmark District.” – Presidio Trust Programmatic Agreement
Quartermaster Corps. Discrete dumping in the marshlands had occurred earlier and may be represented at the basal layers of the site. By the turn of the 20th century, a garbage cremator was located near the Quartermaster Dump, along Halleck Street along the Presidio Wharf. Combustible garbage was burned while noncombustible materials such as tin cans, stable waste and ashes were disposed of in the marsh. The Quartermaster Dump archaeological deposits were eventually capped by additional fill brought in for the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition.

STREAM RAVINE DUMP ARCHAEOLOGICAL AREA (1770s-1890s)

The Stream Ravine Dump archaeological area is predicted based on the presence of a stream ravine that bisected the current Main Parade. Given trash disposal practices of the 19th century, it is likely that trash was deposited in the stream ravine to be washed away, thus preventing trash buildup on the post. Additionally, the Stream Ravine Dump area would have been an attractive and convenient location for domestic work such as washing clothes and preparing food. The location of the Stream Ravine Dump area is predicted from historic maps that depict the course of the stream ravine before it was filled by the Army in 1893. The stream was likely used throughout the life of the fort by the Spanish, Mexican and American occupants until it was filled in 1893.

PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

The Presidio of San Francisco is within the traditional territory of the Ohlone, a Penutian-speaking group that anthropologist hypothesize migrated into the San Francisco Bay region from the Central Valley. The exact timing of this migration is not known, but estimates range from around 1000 B.C. to 500 A.D. (Levy 1978). Two archaeological sites, CA-SFR-6/26 and CA-SFR-126, have been within the project area. It is thought that CA-SFR-129 (ca. 1300-1780s A.D.) may represent the ethnohistorically-known village of Petlenuc, which is associated with the Yelamu local tribe that inhabited the northern end of the San Francisco peninsula at Spanish arrival (Milliken 1995). CA-SFR-6 appears to be an earlier phase of Native Californian occupation (ca. 750 - 1350 A.D.) located very close to CA-SFR-129 and also on the bayshore estuary. The lower bluff of the project site is within an area that has been designated sensitive for precontact archaeological deposits, given the proximity to CA-SFR-6/26 and CA-SFR-129 and a similar bayshore environment. The tops of any archaeological deposits are predicted to be covered by substantial historic fill that was placed either as trash or as hydraulic fill in preparation for the Panama Pacific Exposition (PPIE) in 1915.
Would the proposed project or alternatives affect known or predicted archaeological sites or features?

ALL ALTERNATIVES

The proposed project and alternatives have been designed to avoid adverse effects to known and predicted archaeological areas of the NHLD. Archaeological oversight would be built into all design and construction phases to ensure that the archaeological deposits associated with either the Quartermaster Complex, Quartermaster Dump, Stream Ravine Dump or the pre-contact occupation of the area are preserved in place and to provide a plan of action in the event of an inadvertent discovery. An Archaeological Management Assessment (AMA) (Jones 2015) has been prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the Presidio Trust Programmatic Agreement (PTPA). An Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) and, if necessary, an Archaeological Identification Plan (AIP) would be prepared to guide implementation of the proposed project.

Quartermaster Complex

The Quartermaster Complex is expected to be a series of shallowly buried building elements (foundations) and associated trash deposits. Previous archaeological testing of the unpaved areas did not locate intact archaeological deposits that could be securely associated with the Quartermaster Complex (Jones and Stokes 2002). Pavement over a large portion of the area prevents archaeological identification testing prior to construction. Therefore, archaeological identification testing and monitoring of ground disturbance would be employed during construction to ensure the avoidance of adverse effects. Archaeological features that retain integrity or contribute to the significance of the Quartermaster Complex archaeological area would be identified, documented and preserved in place during construction. If testing identifies archaeological features with integrity that contribute to the significance of the Quartermaster Complex, new construction would be designed to avoid these features.

Quartermaster Dump

The Quartermaster Dump archaeological area is expected to be a very dense deposit of trash buried below at least 3 feet of fill (Blind and Barnaal 2008 and adjacent archaeological investigations). Under Alternative 3, the rehabilitation and expansion of Building 603 and the adjacent Learning Landscape are at least partially within the Quartermaster Dump archaeological area. In order to avoid adverse effects to this deposit, design efforts to date have focused on keeping required project elements within the upper 3 feet below current ground surface and/or using imported fill to raise grades across the site. If during the schematic phase, it is decided that deeper elements are required, archaeological identification testing will determine if archaeological deposits are present. If archaeological deposits that contribute to the Quartermaster Dump archaeological area are identified, the proposed project would be redesigned.
to avoid these resources. Archaeological monitoring would be conducted during construction to ensure that any archaeological deposits that are inadvertently discovered are documented and treated appropriately.

**Stream Ravine Dump**
All alternatives call for new landscaping west of Building 210 over the Stream Ravine Dump archaeological area. Any archaeological deposits associated with the Stream Ravine Dump are expected to be buried at depth (5+ feet below current ground surface) and would not be affected by the proposed project (Blind and Barnaal 2008). If project plans change to include substantial excavation, additional archaeological consultation would be built into the design. Archaeological monitoring would be conducted during construction to ensure that any archaeological deposits that are inadvertently discovered are documented and treated appropriately.

**Pre-Contact Sensitivity**
Project elements north of the slope embankment are considered to be sensitive for pre-contact archaeological deposits. Archaeological deposits associated with the pre-contact occupation of the Presidio are expected to be buried below historic soils brought in to fill the marshlands. Archaeological testing (Jones and Stokes 2002; GANDA 2013) and geoarchaeological modeling for the Doyle Drive Project (GANDA 2013) suggest that the potential to locate pre-contact deposits is low and that any deposits with physical integrity would likely be deeply buried. Archaeological monitoring would be required during construction to ensure that any pre-contact archaeological deposits that are inadvertently discovered are documented and treated appropriately.

**CONCLUSION**
None of the alternatives would likely adversely affect any known or predicted archaeological properties in the project area. Archaeological resources would be protected by adhering to procedures outlined in the PTPA. Archaeological monitoring of ground disturbing activities during construction would ensure that there are no adverse effects to known or predicted archaeological areas or any deposits that are inadvertently discovered during construction. An Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) would guide this monitoring once design is complete and before construction commences. The AMP specifies the location, frequency and duration of required archaeological monitoring and the steps to ensure appropriate treatment of any resources discovered during construction. Archaeological Treatment Plans for individual sites and the AMP prepared for previously unknown sites would ensure that any discoveries are handled in accordance with all stipulations of the PTPA.
VISUAL RESOURCES

VISUAL SETTING

The project site is situated along the coastal terrace bluff, amidst two distinctive landscape types. The Presidio’s open and expansive coastal plain is the defining characteristic of the landscape to the north of the site. The historic Main Post and surrounding wooded hillsides form the project area’s southern landscape. The project site extends along the coastal bluff between Crissy Field Marsh to the north and the Main Post to the south.

Northern Coastal Plain

Defining features of the northern coastal plain are the restored marsh and surrounding coastal scrub vegetation, the open lawns of Crissy Field and East Beach picnic area, and the broad sandy beach and open waters of San Francisco Bay. The Presidio’s coastal plain is mostly free of vertical structures and tall vegetation, providing for panoramic views of the San Francisco Bay shoreline and landmarks. Structures within the coastal plain are primarily confined to locations south of and oriented towards Mason Street (e.g., former air hangers, warehouses and administrative buildings to the west and warehouse buildings to the east). Building 610 is also located along Mason Street, immediately adjacent to the project site’s northwestern border. Building 610 is a non-historic post-World War II building that is oriented toward an adjacent parking lot rather than to Mason Street. Most of the structures along Mason Street are unified by their white walls and red roofs, a color scheme that is represented throughout the Presidio’s structural landscape.

Main Post and Southern Hills

Defining features of the project area’s southern landscape include the Main Post’s highly ordered layout of streets, buildings, parking lots, and manicured open spaces, backed by contrasting steeply-sloping wooded hillsides. The Main Post is organized on a northeast/southwest grid that frames central rectilinear lawns or parade grounds. The largest of these open spaces is the Main Parade that extends through the center of the Main Post, sloping gently to the northeast towards San Francisco Bay. Buildings are arranged in linear clusters, following the northeast/southwest grid, and form a consistent built edge along the parade grounds. Eight of the Presidio’s nine most prevalent architectural styles are represented in the Main Post. While the structures represent styles popular during the various periods of military post construction, the Main Post buildings are unified by the military’s basic and straightforward approach to construction and design (Trust 2010a). They tend towards formal symmetry, avoid excessive ornamentation, and are generally consistent with the bulk, heights, masses, and color schemes (red and white) that comprise the Presidio’s historic landscape (Trust 2010a).
Project Site

The project site is bisected by a segment of the Presidio Parkway, which includes two 1,035-foot-long cut-and-cover tunnels extending from Halleck Street in the east to Building 106 in the west. The portion of the project site through which the tunnels and adjacent construction areas pass is currently enclosed in 4- to 6-foot tall chain-link construction fence, the majority of which includes red privacy slats that screen this portion of the project site, and is closed to public access. Ornamental street trees line the south side of Mason Street and contrast with the low lying coastal scrub vegetation characteristic of the restored Crissy Field Marsh to the north.

Notable structural elements within the project site include Building 603 along its northern border, as well as Buildings 201, 210, 211 and 215 along its southern border. While Building 603 is isolated along the project site’s northern border, its height, bulk, mass and color scheme (white walls and red roof) are visually consistent with most other structures along Mason Street to the east and west, and Main Post to the south. Building orientations within the project site’s southern border break from the formal geometric organization of the adjacent Main Post. These buildings are similarly diverse in architectural style, but remain unified with their counterparts to the south through consistent heights, bulks, masses and color schemes (white walls and red roofs).

IMPORTANT VIEWS

Views of the project site from selected important viewpoints are shown in Figure 9. These viewpoints were chosen because they are representative of many potential viewpoints in the project area that were considered for this analysis. Potential changes to the visual character of the setting and important views would be most apparent from the selected viewpoints. The views from other nearby public spaces (e.g., Torpedo Wharf, Crissy Field, Golden Gate Promenade) were either similar to those represented, or were obstructed by intervening vegetation or structures. Similarly, the views from more distant public spaces (e.g., Crissy Field Overlook, Golden Gate Bridge) featured a project site indistinct from and subordinate to other development along Mason Street, the Presidio’s interior, and the densely developed city beyond. The project site is not visible from Inspiration Point Overlook. As shown in the figure and discussed below, two representative viewpoints were selected for this analysis.

View From Main Parade Facing Northeast

Views to the northeast from the Main Parade include the broad, gently sloping and neatly manicured lawn of the Main Post parade grounds. The Presidio Parkway perimeter fencing and newly-constructed tunnel tops are visible along the nearfield horizon and are most apparent as viewed from the north portion of the Main Parade. Vertical structures of the Main Post frame the grounds and parking area to the east and west, but to the north they open up to sweeping views of the San Francisco Bay and silhouettes of rugged Marin ridgelines that dominate the horizon. The easternmost extent of these views is partially obscured by the project site’s Buildings 603, 210, 211, 215, and 201. The mainly passive users
IMPORTANT VIEWPOINTS
of the Main Parade (e.g., picnickers, small event attendees) could be somewhat sensitive to project area landscape changes from this viewpoint.

**View From Bay Trail/Mason Street Facing Southeast**

Views of the project site from the Bay Trail along Mason Street are partially obstructed by Building 610 and the ornamental street trees lining the south side of Mason Street. From this vantage point, the sparsely vegetated right-of-way and Building 610 parking lot islands are prominent in the foreground. Between the parking lot’s mature trees and light posts, the northernmost Presidio Parkway tunnel is visible. The exposed form and mass of the tunnels creates a distinct horizontal divide between the foreground and background landscapes. The partially obscured white walls and red roofs of Buildings 211 and 201 are visible beyond the tunnel tops. These buildings are dominant structural elements of the horizon. A small fringe of the San Francisco skyline is visible on the distant horizon, but is subordinate to the project site’s structures. The mainly active users of the Bay Trail/Mason Street (e.g., walkers, runners, bicyclists, motorists) would have low to moderate sensitivity to project site landscape changes from this viewpoint; their views would be fleeting as they pass the project site.

**Would the proposed project any of the alternatives degrade the visual character of the setting, be incompatible with the existing natural or structural elements of the setting, or obstruct important views?**

**ALTERNATIVE 1 – PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Under Alternative 1, the coastal terrace bluff would be recreated to the north of the Presidio Parkway tunnels. In keeping with the bluff’s natural transverse gradient, the steepest slopes would be along the project site’s western edge and descend gradually towards the east. Building 201 would be returned to the site of the original building. Upon completion of construction, the project site would consist of a largely undifferentiated landscape planted with predominantly native vegetation. Several pedestrian connections would be provided between the Main Post and Crissy Field, two of which would extend the formal northeast-southwest corridors that frame the Main Parade and parking lot (Anza Esplanade and Montgomery Street) through the project site to Mason Street.

**View From Main Parade Facing Northeast**

Viewed from the Main Parade, the visual character of the project site would continue to be defined by the consistent built edge of Main Post buildings to the west, a diversity of architectural styles unified by a consistent red and white color scheme, and a neatly-manicured and gently-sloping Main Parade that gives way to views of the San Francisco Bay and Marin County hillsides beyond. Under Alternative 1, Building 211 would remain and continue to block views of the bay and distant hillsides to the east. Users of the Main Post would observe a landscape transition from the lawns of the Main Parade at the project...
site's southern boundary to predominantly native plantings along the tunnel tops. The finished grade of the project site west of Buildings 210 and 211 would be increased from the existing tunnel tops height by at least four feet, the expected minimum depth of soil to support native plantings. The design would also include several new trees and shrubs. The increased elevation of the finished grade would raise the near-field horizon, thereby removing from view a small band of the San Francisco Bay. The addition of trees above and inland of the tunnels could also limit bay views to the northwest from portions of the Main Post. Through conformance with the supplemental design guidelines (Attachment 4), this potential adverse impact would be minimized. The overall effect on visual resources as viewed from the Main Parade would be beneficial.

**View From Bay Trail/Mason Street Facing Southeast**

Viewed from the Bay Trail along Mason Street, the visual character of the project site would continue to be influenced by Crissy Field Marsh to the north and Mason Street buildings to the south. The recreated bluff would evoke the form of the historic bluff between the Main Post and Crissy Field, providing a more naturalistic complement to the restored Crissy Field Marsh to the north. Alternative 1 would improve the visual character of the project site by covering exposed tunnels and revegetating staging areas. The removal of ornamental street trees and addition of low-lying native plantings throughout the project site would allow for clearer views of the project site and enhance visual connectivity among Mason Street buildings. These landscape changes would be compatible with the existing natural and structural character of the setting. The shift in Building 201 to its permanent location west of Halleck Street could make the structure appear more prominent on the nearfield horizon. Nevertheless, because the building's style, massing, and coloring are consistent with other buildings in the Main Post and along Mason Street, this move would not degrade or be incompatible with the existing visual setting. The relocated Building 201 and existing Building 211 would appear as breaks in an otherwise mostly continuous tree line along the southern far-field horizon; although, views of the building may be partially screened by landscaping proposed for areas to the northwest of these structures. Neither building would block any existing important views. The effect of Alternative 1 on visual resources as viewed from the Bay Trail/Mason Street would be beneficial.

**ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY**

Under Alternative 2, the physical form of the recreated bluff would be as described for Alternative 1, and Building 201 would be returned to its permanent location. Upon completion of construction, the project site would consist of a more diverse landscape comprised primarily of gardens, lawns, and more formalized areas (e.g., plaza and promontory) for visitors to gather compared with Alternative 1. The extent of native plantings would be reduced relative to Alternative 1, and generally limited to the bluff and coastal plain portions of the project site. Trees would be more dispersed under this alternative. As with Alternative 1, pedestrian pathways between the Main Post and Crissy Field would be numerous and include an extension of the Anza Esplanade through to Mason Street, but would be more varied.
and include opportunities for viewing the bay from designated overlooks and interacting with the park through interpretive features.

**View From Main Parade Facing Northeast**

As with Alternative 1, when viewed from the Main Parade, the visual character of the project site would remain intact, and continue to be defined by the Main Post’s building orientations, diverse architectural styles with uniform colors, manicured lawns, and bay views beyond. Building 211 would continue to obstruct views of the bay and distant hillsides to the east. However, rather than appearing as native plantings, the project site would have a more unique identity which would be established through greater diversity in the height, color, and texture of vegetation; clearer delineations among landscaped and non-landscaped areas; and greater variation in the widths and directions of access pathways than under Alternative 1. Relative to Alternative 1, the visual character of the project site would be improved. While the character of the project site would be more distinct under Alternative 2, its transition to a more differentiated landscape would be more gradual relative to Alternative 1, and would complement the existing setting’s natural and structural elements. As with Alternative 1, the project site’s finished grade over the tunnel tops would encroach upon nearfield bay views. However, with fewer trees proposed for bluff top and inland areas under Alternative 2, the horizontal encroachment would not be as noticeable and expansive blue-water views would remain. Through conformance with the supplemental design guidelines (Attachment 4), this potential adverse impact would be minimized. The overall effect on visual resources as viewed from the Main Parade would be beneficial.

**View From Bay Trail/Mason Street Facing Southeast**

Similar to Alternative 1, when viewed from the Bay Trail along Mason Street, Crissy Field Marsh, Mason Street Buildings, and the recreated bluff would remain the defining elements of the project site under Alternative 2. The native plantings of varied heights along Mason Street would also provide a naturalistic complement to the restored Crissy Field Marsh to the north. Compared to Alternative 1, the addition of lawns, terraces and gathering areas, and greater pedestrian connectivity would give the project site a more distinctive and complex appearance. Under Alternative 2, the composition of lawns, native plantings, sinuous pedestrian pathways, and varied topography would be compatible with the existing natural and physical elements of the project site’s setting; one or more of these elements is represented in Crissy Field, Crissy Field Marsh, and East Beach picnic area. With greater variation in vegetation heights, the visual connectivity among Mason Street Buildings and through the project site to the buildings and vegetation of the Main Post may not be as strong under Alternative 2. With the addition of lawn on the coastal plain and fewer bluff top trees under this alternative, the relocated Building 201 and existing Building 211 would feature more prominently in views to the south from the Bay Trail/Mason Street than under Alternative 1. However, for the reasons described for Alternative 1, these changes would not degrade the visual character of the setting, be incompatible with its natural or physical
elements, nor would the buildings block important views. The effect of Alternative 2 on visual resources as viewed from the Bay Trail/Mason Street would be beneficial.

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS**

Under Alternative 3, the physical form of the recreated bluff would be as described for Alternative 1, and Building 201 would be moved to its permanent location. However, unlike Alternative 1, Building 211 would be removed and a similarly sized structure (New Observation Post) would be added to the bluff top terrace portion of the project site (inland of the tunnels). In addition, two new structures (the Field Station and the Classroom building) would be added to the coastal plain portion of the project site (inland of Mason Street). Upon completion of construction, the project site would consist of a more diverse landscape comprised primarily of gardens, lawns, dunes and the Learning Landscape. The extent of native plantings would be reduced relative to Alternative 1, but greater than Alternative 2, and generally limited to the bluff and lower portion of the project site. Pedestrian access would favor more sinuous pathways over the more direct linear pathways representative of the Main Post, as reflected in Alternative 1.

**View From Main Parade Facing Northeast**

As with Alternative 1, when viewed from the Main Parade, the visual character of the project site would remain intact and continue to be defined by the Main Post’s building orientations, diverse architectural styles with uniform colors, manicured lawns and bay views beyond. However, as illustrated in Figure 10, the project site would have a more unique identity than under Alternative 1, which would be established through greater diversity in the height, color, and texture of vegetation; clearer delineations among landscape types; and greater variation in the widths and directions of access pathways. While the character of the project site would be more distinct under Alternative 3, its transition to a more differentiated landscape would be similar to that of Alternative 1, with gardens and meadows softening the transition to the less formal native bluff top plantings. The New Observation Post would be similar in size to the existing Observation Post and would not be conspicuous, if even visible, from the Main Parade. Given the design of the new structure would be required to follow the supplemental design guidelines, these landscape changes would be compatible with the existing setting’s natural and structural elements. As with Alternative 1, the project site’s finished grade over the tunnel tops would encroach upon nearfield bay views. However, with no trees proposed west of Building 210 and with removal of Building 211, this horizontal encroachment would not be noticeable and the range of views from the Main Parade to the west would be improved relative to Alternatives 1 and 2. The removal of Building 211 would similarly improve opportunities to view the bay and distant hillsides to the east; the New Observation Post would not obstruct these views. The impact of Alternative 3 on visual resources as viewed from the Main Parade would be beneficial.
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View From Bay Trail/Mason Street Facing Southeast

Similar to Alternative 1, when viewed from the Bay Trail along Mason Street, Crissy Field Marsh, Mason Street Buildings, and the recreated bluff would remain the defining elements of the project site under Alternative 3. Relative to Alternative 1, the dune vegetation proposed for the portion of the project site along Mason Street would be more consistent with the heights, colors, textures of the dune scrub vegetation associated with the restored Crissy Field Marsh to the north. Compared to Alternative 1, the dune vegetation, learning landscape, and gathering areas would give the project site a more distinctive and complex appearance. The pedestrian pathways (namely the bluff-face stairs connecting the Western Overlook to the Learning Landscape) would be more prominent than under Alternative 1. As shown in Figure 11, new structural elements within and adjacent to the Learning Landscape, including the Field Station and new Classroom building, would be partially screened by the dune vegetation of the Learning Landscape, and would be subordinate in height and mass to nearby existing structures. The topographic relief within the Learning Landscape would further screen these buildings from view as shown in Figure 12. While the proposed buildings would be newer than their historic Mason Street and Main Post counterparts, their designs would be required to conform to the supplemental design guidelines. And so while the Alternative 3 landscape would include more and newer development than under Alternative 1, the proposed landscape changes would generally be in keeping with the existing natural and physical elements of the coastal plain setting. As with Alternative 1, the absence of tall vegetation would allow for stronger visual connectivity among Mason Street buildings and through the project site to the buildings and vegetation of the Main Post. In contrast to Alternative 1, the removal of Building 211 would improve views from Mason Street towards the Main Post, removing a visual break in an otherwise mostly continuous tree line along the southern far-field horizon. In the absence of vegetative screening under Alternative 3, this break in the far-field horizon would remain with the moved Building 201. As the proposed new vertical structures would be smaller than and set back behind Building 603, these structures would not result in the obstruction of important views relative to Alternative 1. The effect of Alternative 3 on visual resources as viewed from the Bay Trail/Mason Street would be beneficial.

CONCLUSION

Under all alternatives, the visual character of the project site would be maintained and improved through covering of the exposed tunnels, revegetating staging areas, and recreating the bluff. Proposed developments under Alternatives 1 and 2 would be limited to landscape design changes, and would generally be compatible with the existing natural and structural elements of the setting. Given their relatively small bulks, heights, and masses, and through adherence to established design guidelines, the new structures proposed under Alternative 3 would also be compatible with the natural and structural elements of the setting. Landscape modifications under Alternatives 1 and 2, namely the planting of new trees along the project site’s southwestern edge could block bay views from the Main Parade. The absence of tall vegetation and removal of Building 211 in Alternative 3 would have a beneficial effect on bay views, relative to Alternative 1.
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**LIGHT AND GLARE**

The starry night sky and natural darkness are important components of the Presidio. The park is one of the remaining harbors of darkness in San Francisco and provides a rare opportunity for the public to experience this diminishing resource in an urban area. Crissy Field’s natural lightscape is critical for nighttime scenery and for maintaining nocturnal habitat. Many wildlife species found at Crissy Field rely on natural patterns of light and dark for navigation, to cue behaviors or hide from predators.

The project site’s nighttime lightscape environment is generally dark now that nighttime lighting for construction of the Presidio Parkway is no longer required, with considerable lighting influence from sources beyond the project site, including the Golden Gate Bridge and the San Francisco skyline. In the project area, detectable sources of lighting include Main Post building security and street lighting, and the headlights of vehicles traveling along Lincoln Boulevard and Mason Street. Sources of nighttime lighting within the project site are generally limited to parking lot, building entry and interior lighting.

The PTMP addresses the protection of the nighttime environment in the park, and seeks to minimize the intrusion of light in natural areas to protect wildlife. The Trust’s Standard Measures for Lighting direct Trust staff to manage and preserve the natural night sky by:

1. Using light only where needed;
2. Using light only when it is needed;
3. Using the minimum amount of light necessary;
4. Using minimal-impact lighting techniques; and
5. Employing energy conservation measures.

Application of these guiding principles to the parklands project is especially important to prevent the disturbance of ecological processes and degradation of scenic values of the future Quartermaster Reach located directly east of the project site and the nearby Crissy Field Marsh.

**Would the proposed project or the alternatives create light pollution?**

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

Exterior lighting associated with the alternatives is not anticipated to greatly alter the baseline lighting environment of the project area. The Mid-Crissy Design Guidelines (Presidio Trust 2011b) that apply to the project site would require exterior lighting be designed to minimize light pollution. Code-required lights would be installed where egress, accessibility, and personal safety are principal concerns. Tall
pole lights would only be used where area safety and task lighting is required, such as along Mason Street and in parking lots, as project conditions warrant. Lighting would be path-level and limited to the primary circulation spaces, primary gathering spaces and site edges and entrances. Under Alternative 3, path-level lighting would be energy efficient luminaires and LED lighting focused around primary spaces:

- Anza Esplanade
- The Zocalo
- Youth Center (secure zone), and
- Bluff Pedestrian Ramps and Stairs

And secondary pathways and spaces:

- East-west diagonal path connecting Building 106 to the Zocalo
- The Cliff Walk
- The Overlooks, and
- A primary pathway in the Learning Landscape

All lights would be high efficiency, low glare, downcast and shielded fixtures per the current California Building Energy Efficiency Standards California and LEED V2.2 guidelines for new lighting (for which dark sky preservation is a rewarded achievement). No uplighting or event searchlights would be permitted. The Trust would review both the interior and exterior lighting designs to ensure consistency with PTMP policies regarding light and with guiding principles set forth in the Trust's Standard Measures for Lighting. Best lighting practices would be reviewed, including use of backlight, uplight and glare (BUG) ratings and photometric analyses, to avoid light trespass into adjacent natural areas.

**CONCLUSION**

New lighting associated with the proposed project or alternatives would be consistent with PTMP lighting policies and the Trust’s guiding principles for lighting. Through evaluation of lighting techniques and lighting technology, the personal safety of visitors would be addressed while avoiding the adverse impacts of light pollution, including those on the Presidio's night sky or adjacent natural areas.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Presidio supports a diverse array of natural communities as well as plant and animal species within the larger urban landscape of the City of San Francisco. Coastal salt marsh, arroyo willow riparian forest, coast live oak woodland, serpentine scrub, dune scrub, wetlands, and historic forests of Monterey cypress (*Hesperocyparis macrocarpa*) and blue gum eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*), among other communities, persist within the Presidio's open space. Common and special-status plant and animal species also are documented in these specialized environments. The natural communities within the project area include the restored Crissy Field Marsh and associated native plant communities of coastal salt marsh and dune scrub located across Mason Street to the north, and the Tennessee Hollow Creek corridor with riparian and coastal scrub communities located across Halleck Street to the east of the project site. The project site is located within a designed, landscaped area of the Presidio, or areas recently disturbed during construction of the Presidio Parkway. Native vegetation and wildlife associated with the natural communities within Crissy Field Marsh and Tennessee Hollow are more diverse than the managed communities of the project site.

VEGETATION COMMUNITIES AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

While the greater Presidio contains approximately 171 acres of remnant or restored native plant communities, none occur within the project site. The entire project site falls within the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) Landscape Vegetation Zones (VMP Figure 3, page 21). Vegetation within the project site is limited to exotic landscaping and a small stand of Monterey cypress trees. While such environments offer limited habitat value, they still provide cover, foraging and nesting habitat for a variety of bird species, as well as amphibians, reptiles and small mammals, especially those that are tolerant of disturbance and human presence.

Landscaped Vegetation

The southern portion of the project site is landscaped with a variety of ornamental trees, shrubs and maintained non-native grass lawns supplemented with some native species. Marina strawberry tree (*Arbutus marina*), crimson bottlebrush tree (*Callistemon citrinus*), Canary Island date palm tree (*Phoenix canariensis*), Kusamaki tree (*Podocarpus macrophyllus*) and a few pines (*Pinus* spp.) occur in this area, among shrubs of Australian cheesewood (*Pittosporum undulatum*), Japanese cheesewood (*Pittosporum tobira*), manzanita (Manzanita sp.) and hebe azure (*Hebe speciosa*), and with an understory of star jasmine (*Trachelospermum jasminoides*), rock rose (*Cistus salviifolius*) and native beach strawberry (*Fragaria chiloensis*).

Birds commonly found in such areas include non-native English sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) and European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), as well as birds native to the area such as American robin (*Turdus migratorius*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*), Brewer’s blackbird.*
(Euphagus cyanocephalus), western scrub jay (Aphelocoma californica), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), American crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos), common raven (Corvus corax), California towhee (Meliozone crissalis), northern mockingbird (Mimus polyglottos), bushtit (Psaltriparus minimus) and Anna’s hummingbird (Calypte anna). White-crowned sparrows (Zonotrichia leucophrys) are fairly prolific throughout the Presidio and may also occur in the project site.

Reptiles using this type of habitat may include native species such as western terrestrial garter snake (Thamnophis elegans) and western fence lizard (Sceloporus occidentalis). Amphibians commonly found in this type of habitat include California slender salamander (Batrachoseps attenuatus), yellow-eyed ensatina salamander (Ensatina eschscholtzii xanthoptica), and the arboreal salamander (Aneides lugubris). Mammals typically associated with such landscaped areas include striped skunk (Mephitis mephitis), raccoon (Procyon lotor), Virginia opossum (Didelphis virginiana), as well as Botta’s pocket gopher (Thomomys bottae) and other small rodents. Coyotes (Canis latrans) are routinely sighted in the Presidio and could appear within the project site on a transient basis.

**Monterey Cypress Forest**

A small forest stand consisting of five Monterey cypress (Hesperocyparis macrocarpa) trees, native to California but not native to the San Francisco area, occurs west of the Transit Center (Building 215) within the project site. The Monterey cypress trees may host a variety of bird and bat species that nest or roost in the bark and branches of the mature trees. Avian species common to cypress forest include native species such as American robin, chestnut-backed chickadee (Poecile rufescens), pygmy nuthatch (Sitta pygmaea), red-breasted nuthatch (Sitta canadensis), brown creeper (Certhia americana), downy woodpecker (Picoides pubescens), purple finch (Haemorhous purpureus) and tree swallow (Tachycineta bicolor). Raptors common to the Presidio such as red-shouldered hawk (Buteo lineatus) and red-tailed hawk may nest in the upper branches. Tree-roosting bats that might occur in the Monterey cypress forest include western red bat (Lasiurus borealis), Mexican free-tailed bat (Tadarida brasiliensis) and little brown myotis (Myotis lucifugus). Amphibians commonly found in this type of habitat include California slender salamander (Batrachoseps attenuatus), yellow-eyed ensatina salamander (Ensatina eschscholtzii xanthoptica) and the arboreal salamander (Aneides lugubris).

**Coastal Salt Marsh**

Across Mason Street from the project site, Crissy Field Marsh is a restored 18-acre tidal salt marsh with fringe vegetation dominated by native pickleweed (Salicornia pacifica), saltgrass (Distichlis spicata), alkali heath (Frankenia salina), fleshy jaumea (Jaumea carnosa) and marsh gumplant (Grindelia stricta var. angustifolia) with California sea lavender (Limonium californicum), salt marsh sand spurrey (Spergularia marina) and salt marsh dodder (Cuscuta pacifica var. pacifica). The open water and mudflats of the marsh provide valuable foraging and roosting areas for both resident and migratory birds. Common species that frequent the mudflats or fringe vegetation of the marsh include great blue heron (Ardea herodias), great egret (Ardea alba), snowy egret (Egretta thula), yellow legs (Tringa spp.), long-billed curlew
(Numenius americanus), whimbrel (Numenius phaeopus), western sandpiper (Calidris mauri), western gull (Larus occidentalis), ring-billed gull (Larus delawarensis) and California gull. Common loon (Gavia immer), Caspian tern (Hydroprogne caspia), double-crested cormorant (Phalacrocorax auritus), brown pelican (Pelecanus occidentalis), ruddy duck (Oxyura jamaicensis), scaup (Aythya spp.), bufflehead (Bucephala albeola), pied-billed grebe (Podilymbus podiceps), eared grebe (Podiceps nigricollis) and aechmophorus grebes (Aechmophorus spp.) among many others are seasonally present. The marsh is also frequented by a variety of fish species including but not limited to leopard shark (Triakis semifasciata), threespine stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus), and a variety of gobies (Gobiidae).

**Dune Scrub**

Just above the salt marsh plants, sandy soils support native foredune vegetation comprised of beach strawberry (Fragaria chiloensis), sand verbena (Abronia spp.), beach evening primrose (Camissoniopsis cheiranthifolia), dune knotweed (Polygonum paronychia) and beach morning-glory (Calystegia soldanella). Larger woodier plants that occur upland of the low-growing dune species include coyote bush (Baccharis pilularis), dune bush lupine (Lupinus chamissonis), lizard tail (Eriophyllum staechadifolium), coast buckwheat (Eriogonum latifolium), California coffee berry (Frangula californica) California sage (Artemisia californica) and sticky monkey (Mimulus aurantiacus). Dune scrub supports northern alligator lizard (Elgaria coerulea), southern alligator lizard (Elgaria multicaudata), western fence lizard (Sceloporus occidentalis) and gopher snakes (Pituophis catenifer); small rodents such as deer mouse (Peromyscus maniculatus), vagrant shrew (Sorex vagrans) and California vole (Microtus californicus); and a variety of birds including white-crowned sparrow, song sparrow (Melospiza melodia), Bewick’s wren (Thryomanes bewickii), fox sparrow (Passerella iliaca), California towhee, common bushtit and house finch.

**Arroyo Willow Riparian Scrub**

The Tennessee Hollow Creek is currently contained within a 72-inch pipe connected to the south eastern portion of Crissy Field Marsh. However, the topography of the natural drainage corridor remains and is densely vegetated with native arroyo willow (Salix lasiolepis) and a combination of native California blackberry (Rubus ursinus) and non-native Himalayan blackberry (Rubus armeniacus). Arroyo willow stands also occur in the upland areas of Crissy Field Marsh near the west end. Arroyo willow riparian scrub provides foraging opportunities and cover a variety of mammals such as common raccoon (Procyon lotor) and Virginia opossum as well as for resident and migratory birds, including many species already discussed in addition to San Francisco common yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas sinuous), lesser goldfinch (Spinus psaltria), American goldfinch (Spinus tristis), ruby-crowned kinglet (Regulus calendula), green heron (Butorides virescens), western kingbird (Tyrannus verticalis) and warbling vireo (Vireo gilvus). The creek also supports threespine stickleback fish (Gasterosteus aculeatus).

---

12 Note: does not include the federally-listed tide water goby (Eucyclogobius newberryi).
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

Special-status species, their status, their habitat requirements, plant blooming periods, and the potential for each species to occur within the project area and the project site are provided in Attachment 5. Many of the species occur in the restored natural communities of the project area and do not occur within the project site boundaries.

No special-status plants occur within the project site due to the highly managed nature of the current vegetation communities (e.g., manicured lawns and exotic landscaping) and otherwise developed or highly disturbed areas. No special-status plants that occur in the greater project area will be disturbed by the project in ways that might compromise their survival.

Only the olive-sided flycatcher (considered a species of special concern by CDFW), other resident and migratory birds, and special-status bats have a moderate potential to occur within the project area and could be affected either directly or indirectly by the project.

Olive-Sided Flycatcher

The olive-sided flycatcher (Contopus cooperi) is often observed during the breeding season singing fairly continuously throughout the day from a perch on the highest branch of a tree. Olive-sided flycatchers breed in the Presidio and will build a cup nest in the outer branches of a mature tree, conifer trees preferred. The Monterey cypress and taller landscaped trees of the project site provide suitable habitat for this species.

Resident and Migratory Birds

The San Francisco Peninsula is an important migratory stopover for birds along the Pacific Flyway (one of the four major migratory routes in North America). Raptors, songbirds, shorebirds and waterfowl stopover in the Presidio during their fall and spring migrations as its diverse natural communities offer suitable and attractive habitat for birds to forage and rest along this migration route. Several resident and migratory birds could nest within or adjacent to the project site in trees, shrubs and buildings. Several raptors are known to nest in the Presidio’s mature trees, including red-tailed hawk, red shouldered hawk, American kestrel (Falco sparverius), Cooper’s hawk (Accipiter cooperii) and great horned owl (Bubo virginianus). The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code protect raptors and most native migratory birds and breeding birds.

Special-Status Bats

Special status bats potentially occurring within the project site and project area include the western red bat (Lasiurus blossevillii), hoary bat (Lasiurus cinereus) and Yuma myotis (Myotis yumanensis). Suitable roosting habitat for these bats includes tree foliage, underneath the exfoliating bark of trees, tree cavities, and for the Yuma myotis, open spaces within buildings. Each of these species has been
documented during surveys of the Presidio and were more commonly encountered near areas with open water for foraging insects (Krauel 2009). Bats could be present seasonally in any of the buildings at the project site, or in tree foliage, in tree cavities, or under the loose, peeling bark of trees within the project area.

**WETLANDS AND OTHER WATERS OF THE U.S.**

While wetlands and other waters of the U.S. occur within the Presidio, none are present within the project site.

*Would the proposed project or any of the alternatives adversely affect any sensitive habitat community, or special-status species or its habitat?*

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

The new parklands would affect areas that are already developed, landscaped, or previously disturbed by the Presidio Parkway project. Following completion of the Presidio Parkway and prior to implementation of the alternatives, disturbed areas of the project site would be vulnerable to colonization by non-native or invasive plant species. Disturbed areas would be treated with broadcast seed mixture and mulch or a hydroseed mixture approved by the Trust immediately following construction; however, formal revegetation or restoration of the project site would be phased over several years. Over this time, such undesirable weedy vegetation may become well established. Additionally, seeds of non-native or invasive plants could be introduced to the project site on visitor clothing or vehicles during this interim period and on equipment or machinery during construction. The Trust would employ strategies identified in VMP Mitigation Measure NP-1 *Invasive Exotic Plant Species*, which would prevent the spread of non-native or invasive vegetation in the project site. With implementation of these measures, potential effects related to the spread of non-native and invasive plants would be minor and adverse.

Proposed construction activities would generally have short-term minor impacts on biological resources given the marginal habitat value associated with the project site’s existing conditions and minimal indirect disturbance to biological resources in adjacent areas, such as Crissy Field Marsh. In the long term, the parklands project would be beneficial to biological resources in the project area, regardless of the selected alternative, all of which provide for revegetation or restoration of recently disturbed areas. All alternatives would establish the appropriate native vegetation or the appropriate ornamental

---

13 No special-status plants or sensitive natural communities, including jurisdictional wetlands, occur within the project area. As a result, the project would have no effect on these resources. Therefore, these items are not discussed further.

14 All revegetation would be completed in accordance with the Vegetation Management Plan (Trust and NPS 2001) and standard NPS and Trust restoration practices such as using locally native plant material, protecting and restoring soil conditions, irrigating, and controlling aggressive non-native species (Doyle Drive EIS/R, pages 3-234 and K-8).
vegetation in proposed landscaped areas, each providing foraging opportunity and cover to wildlife and contributing to the overall vegetated landscape of the Presidio. The Vegetation Management Plan prescribes plant lists for landscaped areas that consider a species’ historical use in the Presidio, long term maintenance needs, and invasive tendencies. Designed landscapes are planted with species appropriate to the Presidio based on historical record, reference sites for community composition, and site conditions. Native plants are propagated from Presidio stock within the native plant nursery to protect locally distinct genetic types.

Throughout construction of the Presidio Parkway, avian response to project-related noise was monitored in the Presidio on a quarterly basis according to the Doyle Drive BMP (Measure 3.6.1), which resulted in 21 monitoring events between November 2009 and May 2015. Based upon monitoring reports from this period, no long-term behavioral disturbance associated with the Presidio Parkway project noise environment was observed at either the Crissy Field Marsh or forested monitoring locations along the construction corridor. Short-term discrete noise response, such as flushing to the sound of an engine backfire, were infrequent. Give the lack of observed adverse effects of construction noise on Presidio birds, continued monitoring of avian response to parklands project-related noise was determined unnecessary.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – PTMP UPDATE ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative 1, resident and migratory birds that nest in the project area could be disturbed by project construction activities such as removal of existing vegetation, ground disturbance, an elevated noise environment, and increased human presence. Any of these activities in the vicinity of an active bird nest could cause nest abandonment by an adult or direct take of a nest, eggs, or nestlings. Under this alternative, the Trust would undertake pre-construction nesting bird surveys performed per PTMP Mitigation Measure NR-9 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, which would identify active nests in the project area and that could be affected by construction and establish protective measures around nests to facilitate nest success.

Common and special-status bat species of the Presidio could roost in mature trees, such as the Monterey cypress near Building 215, and in vacant or underused buildings of the project site, such as Building 201. Disturbance to buildings or vegetation occupied by roosting bats could cause adverse impacts during periods of inactivity when bats are most vulnerable. These periods include maternity roosting season (May 1 – September 15) or winter torpor (October 15 – February 28); although, winter hibernation is less common in San Francisco’s mild climate. Disturbance to maternity roosts could cause female bats to abandon pups or could result in direct mortality of special-status bats at maternity roosts and disturbance to a hibernation roost could take adult bats. The Trust would implement pre-construction surveys for bat roosts per PTMP Mitigation Measure NR-9 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, which would identify in-use roosts sites in the project area that could be affected by construction and establish avoidance measures to protect roosts or determine appropriate methods for roost relocation.
Short-term impacts on other resident wildlife could include some direct loss of small or less mobile species common to the Presidio, such as small mammals, reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates. However, this alternative would generally offer long term benefits to such wildlife by revegetating areas disturbed by the Presidio Parkway project and increasing the total area of available habitat within the Presidio. The Trust would revegetate 7.7 acres of the project site with predominantly native plants of a coastal scrub or dune scrub community, consistent with vegetation natural to the adjacent bluffs and surrounding Crissy Field Marsh. Consistency between the vegetation communities in revegetated areas of the project site with that of adjacent naturalistic environments would provide more continuous wildlife habitat that could support greater population and diversity of species. Native plant communities tend to support local, specialized invertebrate, avian and mammal pollinators, and are more viable communities to host rare or special-status plants; expanding these communities within the project site would provide opportunities for establishment of new populations of these species. The Trust would monitor and maintain restored areas of native vegetation per the management actions for landscape vegetation in the VMP.

**ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY ALTERNATIVE**

Under Alternative 2, the potential effects on biological resources would generally be the same as described under Alternative 1. Similarly, under this alternative, the Trust would undertake the identified PTMP BMP measures. Relative to Alternative 1, the extent of native vegetation would be reduced (by 4.2 acres) and more fragmented among landscaped areas. Integrating amenities into the project design, such as a group fire pit, interpretive features and formalized gathering areas, would enrich the visitor experience and result in an overall greater public presence. In congested areas, visitors could step off the established paths and trample areas planted with, or colonized by native vegetation. Visitors could also challenge unencumbered uses by local wildlife that could otherwise occupy areas of the project site vegetated with native plantings. Fragmented, designed landscapes with less native plant cover, generally offer less habitat value to local wildlife and less opportunity for natural, contiguous ecosystems to establish between the project site and adjacent areas. Thus, the intended diverse visitor appeal of this alternative’s key elements, coupled with reduced extent and continuity of native vegetation, would provide fewer benefits to local biological resources relative to Alternative 1. Management actions such as signage, protective fencing, and generous pathway sizing as described in the Visitation section and consistent with PTMP Mitigation Measure NR-5 *Wildlife and Native Plant Communities* would protect local wildlife and native plant cover within the project site and project area.
ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS

Under Alternative 3, the potential effects on biological resources would generally be the same as described under Alternative 1. Similarly, under this alternative, the Trust would undertake the identified PTMP BMP measures. Relative to Alternative 1, the extent of native vegetation would be reduced (by 3.4 acres) and more fragmented among landscaped areas. The sequence of vegetation plantings under Alternative 3 from dune to woodlands would mimic the natural progression of communities found elsewhere in the Presidio. However, increased visitor presence, more pedestrian pathways bisecting planting areas, and presence of specialized use areas along the northern and southern edges could deter wildlife use along the fringes of the various habitats types closest to public areas. Nevertheless, similar to existing densely vegetated but accessible areas throughout the Presidio, areas of native vegetation through the interior of the project site, particularly the band of coastal bluff scrub gardens\(^15\) and the perennial grassland meadow, could become a viable supportive environment for both native wildlife and plants over time if left to naturally grow and evolve.

Under Alternative 3, any birds nesting or bats roosting in the vicinity of Building 211 during demolition and subsequent construction of the new buildings would be minimized through the Trust’s implementation of the pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures described for these species under Alternative 1. Design features of the new buildings such as large windows or transparent walls, and additional lighting integrated into the new buildings and visitor amenities would increase potential adverse effects on local wildlife, such as birds and bats, relative to Alternative 1. Such effects could include collision fatality or injury, and disorientation associated with excessive light pollution.

Glass surfaces used to provide more natural lighting or to take advantage of views from the project site that are likely to be incorporated into new construction could result in increased bird collisions. Daytime collisions occur most often when birds fail to recognize window glass as a barrier. Collisions could be induced by night lighting of the building, which can be especially problematic for migrating songbirds since many are nocturnal migrants (Ogden, 1996). In addition, while exterior lighting associated with this alternative is not anticipated to greatly alter the baseline lighting environment of the project area (see Light and Glare), new lighting could contribute to adverse nighttime lighting effects on local or migratory wildlife. The Mid-Crissy Design Guidelines (Trust 2011b) would require exterior lighting to be designed to minimize light pollution and new building elements to incorporate bird-safe design standards that would apply to the new buildings and any interpretive features of the site. In addition, the Trust would pursue best bird-safe building practices such as those included in the City of San Francisco’s Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings (San Francisco Planning Department 2011) and Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings Design Guide (SFPD 2012) to reduce collisions and minimize the potential for adverse nighttime lighting effects on local or migratory wildlife. The San Francisco design standards provide guidance regarding

\(^{15}\) The gardens proposed for Alternative 3 would use 21st century sustainable horticultural practices to increase their ability to support wildlife, pollinators and other beneficial insects.

It is estimated that between 365 and 988 million songbirds are killed annually in North America due to collisions with buildings and other structures (Loss et al. 2014). Collisions are currently recognized as one of the leading causes of bird population declines worldwide (Brown et al. 2007).
CONCLUSION

There would be no effects on special-status plants or sensitive natural communities, including jurisdictional wetlands, as none occur within the project area. The Trust would implement measures identified in the PTMP ROD and VMP to avoid or minimize temporary adverse effects related to the spread of non-native and invasive plant species, resident and migratory birds, roosting bats, and other resident wildlife species during construction. The project site’s wildlife habitat value would increase through native plantings in the designed landscape. The addition of buildings and new sources of lighting would increase the potential for adverse effects on resident and migratory birds. However, these potential effects would be minimized by implementing bird-safe treatments included in the Mid-Crissy Design Guidelines and City of San Francisco’s standards and guidelines for bird-safe buildings.

WATER RESOURCES

WATER SUPPLY

The Trust operates a facility that treats water from Lobos Creek to provide potable water to the Presidio under permit from the California State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water Programs. Supplemental water is purchased from the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) as needed. Since 2012, CCSF has provided approximately 22 percent of the total water consumed at the park, and the remainder was provided by Lobos Creek. During this period, use of CCSF water ranged from 0 gallons per day in the winter and spring to 1 million gallons per day (mgd) at the peak of the dry season.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), the CCSF department that provides water to San Francisco and surrounding communities, estimates that the current retail demand for water from its system is between 80 and 81 mgd (SFPUC 2011). The SFPUC identifies the Presidio as an “in-city customer/non-residential” and therefore historical water use and projected water demands of Area B are included in its Urban Water Management Plan (SFPUC 2005). These projections are based on the CCSF Planning Department’s Land Use Allocation 2002 (CCSF 2003), which takes into account projected future development within the Presidio. Because the Trust is a retail customer, the purchase and use of water from the SFPUC is subject to its water shortage regulations, including mandatory water rationing programs and rate structures adopted during drought conditions.

The Trust is committed to reducing the demand for off-site potable water resources by conserving water. In response to the current drought, the Trust has implemented several water reducing measures...
including reducing lawns where appropriate and employing a 3-tiered system for managing turf areas which regulates irrigation based on public use and visibility. As shown in Table 10, these measures have resulted in an 18 percent reduction in overall water usage and a 34 percent reduction in purchases from SFPUC, when compared to an average of the prior three years.

10 TOTAL WATER DEMAND COMPARISON
(JANUARY-AUGUST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2012-2014 (Average)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Percent Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobos Creek</td>
<td>183.9</td>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243.4</td>
<td>198.8</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015
Units: million gallons

To further reduce impacts to potable supplies, the Trust has committed to implementing water recycling in the northern and eastern sections of the park (PTMP, page 55). The recycled water treatment plant, which will produce approximately 0.5 mgd, will be constructed once funding has been secured. The Trust has also been identified as a customer of the SFPUC’s Westside Recycled Water Project, which will provide recycled water to the Presidio Golf Course, National Cemetery and Public Health District. The SFPUC expects to begin providing service in early 2019.

WATER QUALITY

The project site drains to San Francisco Bay. The west portion of the project site drains through Outfall F to Crissy Field Marsh, which outlets to the San Francisco Bay and the east portion of the project site drains through Outfall D to Crissy Field Marsh before discharging into San Francisco Bay. Following completion of the Presidio Parkway, stormwater in the east portion of the project site will make its way through the new Quartermaster Reach before discharging into San Francisco Bay. The Presidio Parkway project is subject to the design criteria set forth by the project’s construction documents and will be documented in a turnover conditions agreement. The Presidio Parkway project is committed to maintaining similar hydrologic conditions to those that existed prior to tunnel construction.

The proximity of the project site to Crissy Field Marsh and the San Francisco Bay make erosion and sedimentation control practices critical. The Trust has implemented and is operating under the Presidio of San Francisco Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) (Dames & Moore 1994), which includes a detailed Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that outlines erosion prevention and sedimentation control measures used to avoid contamination of storm drains and surface water resources. Structural
and operational stormwater pollution prevention measures, referred to as best management practices (BMPs), are developed and employed to reduce stormwater runoff volumes, protect water quality and meet water quality standards.

The PTMP EIS estimates the amount of net new construction (i.e. new construction less demolition) in the Presidio to determine changes in permeable surfaces and thus stormwater runoff (pages 335 through 341). The assessment did not account for the decrease in impervious surfaces and reduction in volume of stormwater runoff that would occur associated with conversion of the project site from pavement to more permeable materials. Nevertheless, the analysis determined that no additional demands or impacts on the district's stormwater systems are anticipated. PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure UT-7 Stormwater Reduction would require that infrastructure improvements be installed prior to new construction to minimize stormwater runoff and comply with existing water quality standards, regulatory requirements and the SMP.

Would the proposed project or alternatives increase demands on potable water supplies?

Table 11 compares current water usage with PTMP projections and presents changes in water demand resulting from the proposed project and alternatives. Irrigation demands were developed using the methodology included in the State's recently adopted Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (California Department of Water Resources 2015). The ordinance promotes efficient landscapes in new developments and retrofitted landscape, and calls for increasing water efficiency standards through more efficient irrigation systems, recycled water usage, onsite stormwater capture, and by limiting the portion of landscapes that can be covered in turf.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – PRESIDIO TRUST MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Implementation of this alternative would not change the Presidio’s water demands. The alternative includes approximately one acre of lawns and less than one acre of gardens. Irrigation demands resulting from these areas are taken into account in the PTMP projections. No new construction is included so there would be no changes to domestic demands. The alternative includes approximately 7.7 acres of predominately native plantings, which would not need irrigation beyond an initial establishment period. Therefore, there would be no long-term impact on water demands.

ALTERNATIVE 2 – PRESIDIO PARKWAY

Similar to Alternative 1, this alternative proposes no new construction so there would be no changes to domestic demands. This alternative also includes 4.2 acres of lawn and garden areas and 3.5 acres of predominately native plantings. While the native plantings would not increase water demands beyond initial establishment, the 4.2 acres of lawn and garden areas represent new irrigated areas. The change
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represents a 1.0 percent increase in annual consumption and 1.2 percent increase in peak month demand when compared to current Presidio-wide demands. The combination of current demands with projected increases from this alternative are well below PTMP projections.

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (PROPOSED PROJECT) – NEW PRESIDIO PARKLANDS**

This alternative proposes approximately 7,500 square feet of net new construction within the Crissy Field and Main Post districts. Water demands resulting from this construction are taken into account in the PTMP projections. This alternative also includes approximately 4.3 acres of predominately native plantings that would not need irrigation beyond an establishment period and would have no bearing on Presidio-wide water demands, similar to the other alternatives. This alternative also includes 3.8 acres of new irrigated areas consisting of approximately 1.3 acres of lawn area and 2.5 acres of other plantings. The change represents a 1.2 percent increase in annual consumption and 1.3 percent increase in peak month demand when compared to current demands. Similar to Alternative 2, the combination of current demands with projected increases from this alternative are well below PTMP projections.

To reduce water demands, the Trust would design, construct and maintain landscapes proposed within each of the alternatives in accordance with PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure UT-1 *Demand Management* which requires implementation of BMPs. BMPs include designing and constructing landscapes and irrigation systems to meet Trust irrigation guidelines, which include specific requirements for efficient and

### TABLE 11: WATER DEMAND SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Domestic Demand</th>
<th>Irrigation Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily</td>
<td>Average Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTMP</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current (Average of 2012-2014)</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presidio Trust 2015
Units: Million Gallons per Day
Off Peak: Average demand from November through April
Alternative analysis represents changes from PTMP projections.
effective water application, and accepting recycled water for irrigation when available. The proposed project would conform with the Trust irrigation guidelines, meet the provisions of the State’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, and achieve Trust sustainability goals.

*Would the proposed project or alternatives inhibit surface water drainage, alter the landscape topography, or lead to increased runoff or erosion?*

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

Impervious surfaces, including buildings, hardscapes and parking lots, within the 14-acre project site would range from about 1.9 acres under Alternative 1 (covering 14 percent of the project site) to 5.6 acres under Alternative 3 (covering 40 percent of the project site). Alternative 2 would have 3.9 acres of impervious surfaces (covering 28 percent of the project site). The Trust would limit impervious surfaces to the extent feasible. Proposed stormwater management strategies would mitigate any impacts from flows during storm events. The required SWPPP would control sediment in project site runoff during construction.

**Storm Drainage**

All alternatives would comply with applicable federal, state and local stormwater codes, including the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, Section 438 (EISA 438) and water quantity requirements equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.2. EISA 438 requires the parklands project to use site planning, design, construction and maintenance strategies to maintain or restore, to the maximum extent technically feasible, the predevelopment hydrology with regard to the temperature, rate, volume and duration of flow. LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.2 requires the parklands project to capture and treat the rainfall from a design storm of 0.75 inch using BMPs, and complete a SWPPP.

In compliance with PTMP ROD Mitigation Measure UT-7 Stormwater Reduction, the stormwater management system would rely on low-impact development techniques to the maximum extent feasible. BMPs would be integrated into the landscape and grading design plans to minimize runoff and to increase on-site rainwater retention. In general, stormwater would be directed into the landscaped areas where it would migrate vertically through four feet of well-drained soil media. Below the four-foot layer, heavily compacted soil would most likely limit infiltration opportunities. As such, a subsurface drainage collection system would be installed. This could come in the form of a layer of aggregate that houses perforated pipes with a geotextile fabric in between the soil and aggregate. Alternatively, the use of a flat, perforated pipe system that can reside directly in the soil or within a thinner layer of aggregate would be explored in order to minimize the depth needed for drainage solutions and maximize the planting soil depth.
In order to comply with EISA 438 in the upper area of the project site, stormwater runoff from a 1.32-inch rainfall event would be retained and managed onsite through a combination of infiltration, evaporation and onsite reuse. Due to the low-lying nature of the northern portion of the project site, strategies to comply with EISA 438 in this area would be evaluated during schematic design. The drainage system would be independent of the Presidio Parkway drainage system with minimal water, if any, making its way into the highway drainage system. Subsurface drainage improvements would also be located in the embankment, terracing down the slope, to the flat area below. The subsurface drainage system would be collected into hard-lined pipes and routed to the retention system. The retention system would require an overflow pipe connection to the Trust-owned drainage system. A surface drainage system consisting of area drains and catch basins would collect runoff from large storm events as well as overflow from smaller events. This system would tie into the Trust-owned drainage system. The parklands project would also upgrade a section of the trunk lines leading to Outfall F from 24- to 36-inches (Magnusson Klemencic Associates 2015).

Parking Lots

New parking lots could contribute a number of substances, such as trash, suspended solids, hydrocarbons, oil and grease, and heavy metals that could enter receiving waters through stormwater runoff or non-stormwater discharges. Runoff would be directed from parking lots to pervious areas for retention/detention and infiltration. The Trust would also follow protocols including using good housekeeping practices, following appropriate cleaning BMPs, and training employees to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from parking areas.

Lawn and Landscaped Areas

Stormwater runoff from landscaped areas would be minimized by maximizing groundwater infiltration and stormwater drainage at the project site. A thorough site grading and drainage plan utilizing appropriate design measures would be implemented. Groundwater percolation would also be promoted through soil decompaction and permeable ground cover materials. Plants with low irrigation requirements (for example, native or drought tolerant species) and that minimize or eliminate the use of fertilizer or pesticides to sustain growth would be selected. Only plant materials adapted to the project site’s microclimate would be installed. Wood chips would be used in planter areas without ground cover to minimize sediment in runoff.

Irrigation water provided to landscaped areas may result in excess irrigation water and pollutants, such as pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, being conveyed into the storm drain system. Project plan designs would include application methods of irrigation water that minimize runoff of excess irrigation water into the stormwater conveyance system.
In addition, the Trust’s Roads and Grounds Integrated Pest Management Program (IPM)\textsuperscript{16} would be implemented at the project site to minimize pesticide drift, runoff and groundwater contamination. All herbicides and pesticides proposed for use would be rapidly biodegradable, approved in advance by the Trust IPM Coordinator, and applied according to manufacturer’s label recommendations and in conformance to all applicable laws and regulations.

CONCLUSION

Water demand for the proposed project represents approximately 1.0 percent of the Presidio’s total annual consumption. Landscapes would be planned, designed, installed, managed and maintained to promote the conservation and efficient use of water and to prevent the waste of this valuable resource. Water irrigation systems would allow for the future use of recycled water. Stormwater management practices would be integrated into the landscape and grading design plans to minimize runoff and to increase on-site rainwater retention. Multiple best management practices would be used to control erosion and prevent sediment from entering Crissy Field Marsh and the San Francisco Bay.

\textsuperscript{16} IPM is an ecosystem-based strategy that focuses on long-term prevention of pests and their damage through a combination of techniques such as biological control, habitat manipulation, modification of cultural practices, and use of resistant plant varieties. Pesticides are used only after monitoring indicates they are needed, according to established guidelines, and treatments are made with the goal of removing only the target organism. Pest control materials are selected and applied in a manner that minimizes risks to human health, beneficial and non-target organisms, and the environment. The Trust’s Roads and Grounds IPM Program (2002c) is on file and available for review at the Presidio Trust.
It is now well established that rising global atmospheric greenhouse gas (GHG) emission concentrations are significantly affecting the Earth's climate. However, according to the Council on Environmental Quality, climate change is a particularly complex challenge given its global nature and inherent interrelationships among its sources, causation, mechanisms of action and impacts. Broadly stated, the effects of climate change observed to date and projected to occur in the future include more frequent and intense heat waves, more severe wildfires, degraded air quality, more heavy downpours and flooding, increased drought, more intense storms, harm to water resources, harm to wildlife and ecosystems, and greater sea-level rise. State agencies such as the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) expect no less than 31 inches and perhaps as much as 69 inches of sea-level rise on the West Coast by 2100 (BCDC 1968 as amended October 2011). The lower site areas along Mason Street are at risk of increased frequency and severity of inundation due to tides, tsunami and sea-level rise. Areas below elevation 14.0 (which includes Mason Street and all of the existing flat areas between Mason Street and the new embankment) could either be flooded (if not elevated) or have access curtailed by flooding along Mason Street (Moffatt & Nichol 2013).

The Doyle Drive EIS/R noted Caltrans’ approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change through its Climate Action Program at the State level but did not evaluate the impacts associated with an increase in GHG emissions levels for the Presidio Parkway project (Section 4.4.1 Climate Change, page 4-14.).

The Trust is taking an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction and climate change. In its Strategy 2020 (Trust 2015c), the Trust defined its focus for the next five years, including operating the Presidio’s infrastructure using sustainable practices (Steward the Presidio, page 11). It intends to accomplish this through the following means among others:

- Meeting or exceeding California and/or federal standards for efficiency related to energy, waste, and waste generation\(^7\)
- Monitoring and reducing the Presidio’s carbon footprint
- Promoting water self-sufficiency with conservation, reclamation, planting choices, and other techniques

\(^7\) On March 19, 2015, President Obama signed Executive Order 13693 (http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-25/pdf/2015-07016.pdf). Mr. Obama’s directive orders federal agencies over the next decade to cut their emissions by an average of 40 percent compared with their levels in 2008, and to increase their use of electricity from renewable sources by 30 percent.
The Trust’s draft Climate Action Agenda (2015d) reviews how climate change is affecting parks, and proposes a baseline for the Presidio’s carbon footprint. It then suggests a number of initiatives, from resource and energy conservation to education and programming, which can be implemented for the Presidio to become a model of sound environmental stewardship. The report is a first step in the development of a Climate Action Team and the articulation of quantitative, tangible goals that will prepare the park for climate change. Also outlined are strategic goals to mitigate the effects of climate change, increase climate change education, and implement sustainability best practices. These goals include protecting the historical and ecological structure of the park through increased resilience planning, participating in the reduction of atmospheric carbon, and strengthening landscape productivity.

Would the proposed project or any of the alternatives be inconsistent with Trust sustainability and climate preparedness priorities or contribute to climate change through GHG emissions?

ALL ALTERNATIVES

All alternatives being considered would achieve the goals of the Climate Action Agenda by adopting the following strategies as part of the parklands project:

- Optimize the assets of the site, such as access, views, orientation, sunlight, connectivity, programming and adjacency.

- Introduce natural areas within the designed landscape to promote biodiversity and habitat for birds, butterflies and other species.

- Follow LEED building standards for new construction and building rehabilitation within the site, and analyze the energy efficiency of new buildings to assess if they meet their goals.

- Incorporate climate-resilient design into rehabilitation of existing buildings and the design of new buildings within the site.

- Ensure the design of new buildings at Crissy Field meet International Building Code performance objectives for construction and modifications of buildings within flood hazard areas (see FEMA 2007).18

- Use energy efficient light fixtures in buildings and outdoors.

---

18 The IBC also references ASCE 24 which provides code-directed performance measures and standards for structural design and construction.
• Develop renewable on-site generation where appropriate.

• Install irrigation systems to anticipate recycled water availability.

• Limit irrigated turf to programmatic spaces, scaled to particular types of experience and activity.

• Landscape other areas not expected to be actively used except as a visual resource with local native plants and climate-adapted non-natives species that can tolerate the anticipated range of temperatures, rainfall patterns, and potential inundation from sea level rise.

• Avoid invasive plants and utilize integrated pest management with least toxic methods as the first course of action.

• Consider how the Learning Landscape could serve as a flooding buffer for the Crissy Field Center.

• Create absorbent landscapes and utilize onsite stormwater management.

• Showcase 21st century sustainable maintenance practices following Bay-Friendly Landscape Coalition (Bay-Friendly Landscaping & Gardening Coalition 2013) or similar Presidio-specific guidelines.

• Meet the State’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (California Department of Water Resources 2015) water efficiency standards for new and retrofitted landscapes through more efficient irrigation systems, greywater usage, onsite storm water capture, and by limiting the portion of landscapes that can be covered in turf.

• Source materials locally to the extent possible and use natural or synthetic materials that are salvaged, renewable and/or recyclable.

• Provide indoor and outdoor waste management receptacles, including separate containers for recyclable and compostable materials at all bin stations.

• Use materials that minimize heat gain in the summer (without reflective glare) and heat loss in the winter.

• Use energy efficient and low emissions construction equipment that meet and exceed EPA Tier 4 emission standards.

• Use proactive park design as an opportunity for public education on climate change; explain anticipated changes and how the park is planned for long term viability. Make climate change real, immediate, and relevant for people by raising awareness, illustrating the importance of reducing GHGs, and demonstrating a sound environmental stewardship ethic for this issue.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES
CONCLUSION

Adoption of site-specific strategies to further the goals of the Trust’s Climate Action Agenda would anticipate changes at the project site and surrounding areas that may result from climate change, improve environmental conditions and provide benefits. Incorporating sustainability considerations into resilience planning would also help prepare for and adapt to the effects of climate change.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

The new parklands are located within the Presidio, which was a military installation until 1994. Due to its military past and the age of the facilities, a number of hazardous materials sites were investigated within the park. Within the project site, north of the proposed embankment, a cleanup site known as the Commissary/PX Study Area historically contained a number of structures that constituted the Presidio Consolidated Motor Pool. Throughout 2000, the Trust conducted a series of investigations to identify and delineate the source of petroleum in the groundwater seeps at Crissy Field. Interim source removal activities, including the excavation of petroleum-affected soils, were conducted to address the groundwater seep contamination. During 2002 and 2003, two additional investigations were conducted to delineate petroleum contamination in this area. Four sub-areas within the Commissary/PX Study Area associated with potential hazardous materials releases were included in a Final Remedial Action Plan (Final RAP) (MACTEC 2007). Cleanup of the Commissary/PX Study Area was conducted under the oversight of both the Water Board and DTSC. The Trust’s Revised Final Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was approved by the Water Board in 2006 and the Final RAP was approved by the DTSC in 2008. The cleanup work was completed in multiple phases and corrective actions consisted of the following: excavation and removal of impacted soils, cover in place of impacted soils, and land use controls. A Land Use Control (LUC) zone was established to prohibit unrestricted use of the Commissary/PX LUC Area and maintain a cover over areas with residual contamination in soil following remedial actions completed at the site in 2008 (AMEC Geomatrix 2008, 2009). Restrictions within the LUC zone include:

- Use for construction of new facilities for housing or the operation of schools, hospitals, playgrounds, and day care centers is prohibited without further remediation.
- Workers potentially exposed to soils will follow the site-specific Health and Safety Plan, have the appropriate level of health and safety training, and use the appropriate level of personal protective equipment specified in a Health and Safety Plan.

The LUC is an element of the 2012 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement and associated O&M Plan between the Trust, National Park Service and the DTSC, and outlines restrictions on future land uses and requirements for soil disturbing activities. A copy of the current LUC is available for review at the Presidio Trust.
• All soils excavated will be managed and/or disposed in accordance with Presidio policies and procedures and applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

• Use as a saltwater ecological habitat area or ecological special status habitat area is prohibited.

• Soil will remain covered with concrete, buildings, landscaping, or another appropriate barrier (e.g., a minimum of 24 inches of fill, or 6 inches of fill and an engineered barrier layer) in landscaped areas.

The Doyle Drive EIS/R envisioned the excavation, testing and off-site disposal of soil removed from the Main Post tunnel as it coincides with the Commissary/PX LUC area. Since then, DTSC has approved the proposed soil import to the LUC that will be used as backfill around the Main Post tunnel.

**Would the proposed project or any of the alternatives involve handling of hazardous substances?**

**ALL ALTERNATIVES**

Existing barriers to soils within the LUC zone such as pavement, buildings, and landscaping would be maintained to the extent possible to prevent direct physical access with underlying soils that contain residual contaminants of concern. Site-specific land use restrictions within the Commissary/PX LUC zone would be conformed with or further remediation would be undertaken in consultation with the Water Board and DTSC to allow currently restricted land uses, for example, playgrounds and expansion of saltwater ecological habitat areas or special status habitat areas within the Learning Landscape area. If, as a result of the parklands project, soil is excavated within the LUC zone, sufficient soil would be removed such that a LUC is no longer required (clean closed), or soil would be consolidated and capped such that it does not pose a risk to human health or the environment based on the planned land use. Documenting site conditions and estimating human health and environmental risk could require additional site characterization activities such as soil sampling and the preparation of risk assessments. Required additional remedial measures would be identified based on the estimated risks, and the measures preferred by the parklands project would be approved by the appropriate regulatory agency. Additionally, any soil imported to the LUC area would need to be approved as chemically acceptable. In all cases, where the LUC remains, the Trust would continue its obligations to monitor soil disturbing activities and prepare annual reports documenting those activities to the DTSC.

**CONCLUSION**

Implementation of new site uses and soil disturbing construction in the Commissary/PX Land Use Control area as part of the parklands project would be subject to regulatory approval of planned land use changes and remedial actions (as required) in advance of construction. Should the land use include ecologic habitat and facilities considered sensitive uses, additional remediation to remove and/or cap
contaminated soil would ensure protection of human health and the environment. For areas where the LUC would remain in effect, the Trust would continue annual monitoring and reporting to the DTSC.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Trust found the following projects relevant to the cumulative impact analysis because they have a bearing on the effects of the proposed project and alternatives:

- Current use of Building 50 (Presidio Officers’ Club) as a recently transformed cultural center (Trust): The Officers’ Club features exhibits about the Presidio’s history, a destination restaurant, free public programs including live music and dance, talks, films, and family activities, and event and education spaces.

- Future use of Buildings 1182-1188 (Mason Street warehouses) as a sporting goods store and recreational program center (Sports Basement) (Trust): The store will promote healthy lifestyles and enjoyment of the park by selling athletic gear and apparel, offering free fitness classes, facilitating group workouts, and hosting educational and cultural events.

- Future use of Building 210 as the Visitor Center to serve as an interpretive/orientation portal between the historic Presidio and New Presidio Parklands/Crissy Field (Trust/NPS): Visitors with a short amount of time will be able to quickly find the tools and resources necessary to identify and go to specific destinations. Others will encounter interpretive storytelling devices (including interpretive retail products) to help inspire and guide their travels.

- Future use of Building 610 (former Commissary) building as a museum or cultural center as foreseen in the PTMP (Trust): Multiple activities have been contemplated for the site. Responses have included exhibition spaces for permanent and changing exhibitions; indoor and outdoor activities; educational programs and activities; access to Crissy Field, the bay shoreline and Presidio trails; food service; theater and performance space; large, visible green areas; and sculpture and art.

- Future restoration of Quartermaster Reach (Trust): An approximately 850-foot length of stream, currently running through a subsurface culvert that ultimately discharges to Crissy Field Marsh at the northern-most (lowest) end of the Tennessee Hollow watershed near the Presidio Parkway, will be “daylighted” in order to restore (create) wetland habitat.

- Potential repairs and improvements to Crissy Field (“Crissy Refresh”) (NPS): While still speculative and under development, this could include repair and rehabilitation, additional capital upgrades, and potential changes to facilitate program enhancements.
Potential long-term use of Building 1199 (temporary Crissy Field Center) for as-yet-undefined park-related and public uses (NPS): Suggested uses include reuse or repurpose for East Beach; lease for income; kayak, bike and other recreational equipment rentals; food service or event rental; and outpost for Crissy Field Center (Building 603).

Future long-term use of the Palace of Fine Arts building (City of San Francisco): Proposals recently submitted include: an arts space, destination market hall and a holistic wellness pavilion (Arcadium SF); an athletic club and public recreational facility (Bay Club); multi-use playing fields, along with a small cafe and community events space (Bladium Sports and Fitness Club); exhibition pavilions, an international cuisines pavilion and an arts technology (Center for Global Arts and Cultures); a conference center and events facility (Maybeck Center); a San Francisco arts, crafts, community and hospitality center (Equity Community Builders), and an interactive and educational museum, destination restaurant, retail and café kiosks, and theater (San Francisco Museum at the Palace Consortium).

TRANSPORTATION

The transportation analysis considers the identified cumulative projects, as well as occupancy of remaining vacant buildings in the Main Post and Crissy Field districts. Under cumulative conditions, Alternatives 2 and 3 would increase the total number of peak hour vehicle trips in the combined Crissy Field (Area B) and Main Post districts by approximately 2 percent on both weekdays and 5 weekends. Any improvements to Crissy Field associated with Crissy Refresh would be coordinated with the parklands project to ensure safe and logical trail connections. Identified intersection improvements and implementation of the Trust’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program, including parking fees and PresidiGo shuttle service to encourage the use of alternative modes such as transit, walking, cycling and carpooling, would minimize the impacts of traffic generated by uses throughout the Presidio below significant levels.

PARKING

The parking analysis considers the cumulative projects and increased demand from the Presidio Officers’ Club, Mason Street Warehouses, Building 610, and future occupancy of other buildings in the Main Post and Crissy Field districts. The parking analysis also considers the reduction in parking supply associated with the Presidio Parkway project. There would generally be sufficient parking in the Main Post district and the Crissy Field district to accommodate demand from the cumulative projects, but due to seasonal variation in park visitation, parking demand is expected to exceed supply in some areas on peak weekend days. Visitors who choose to drive to the park on those days would have difficulty parking. The

For more information, see http://sfrecpark.org/about/partnership-opportunities/palace-of-fine-arts-request-for-concept-proposals/palace-of-fine-arts-proposals/.
provision of park-wide TDM measures (e.g., parking time restrictions and/or fees) identified in the PTMP that encourage the use of alternative modes would serve to reduce the expected parking shortfall. Implementation of park-wide parking management (as recommended in PTMP EIS Mitigation Measure TR-21 Presidio-Wide Parking Management) would reduce the impacts of fee parking throughout the park.

**VISITATION**

Rehabilitation, expansion and upgrades to facilities resulting from the cumulative projects would expand visitor opportunities and access to park resources, and engage a wider audience in the following ways:

- The New Presidio Parklands would welcome visitors with spectacular views, food and amenities, free public events, pathways and vistas points, and spaces where people could gather.

- The updated Presidio Officers’ Club attracts visitors reflecting the diversity of the Bay Area with exhibits and programs that help establish a deep understanding of the Presidio’s role in shaping California and the nation.

- The Visitor Center would include interpretive elements to augment (and differentiate from) the Officers’ Club. Visitors’ experiences would be enhanced by providing them with needed information, orientation and services.

- Sports Basement will reuse the Mason Street warehouses for activities compatible with Crissy Field’s open space and recreational opportunities, and allow the community and visitors to enjoy the park and appreciate its resources.

- However the program is developed and whatever its ultimate focus, a cultural institution at the Commissary site would be a resource for the community and a national and international draw. Programmatic offerings would be provided that are fresh and vital, that connect to broader themes, and that stimulate imagination and creativity. Cross-disciplinary programming would advance knowledge that has broad and lasting relevance. Changing exhibitions would engage repeat visitors.

- Quartermaster Reach will increase recreational and educational use of the restored 9.5-acre natural habitat area. Completion of the pedestrian trail from Lincoln Avenue to Mason Street would provide another direct connection from the park’s uplands to Crissy Field and the bayfront.

- Crissy Refresh could provide additional programming to mid-Crissy to allow for a greater dispersion of visitors throughout Crissy Field, helping to alleviate congestion in East and West Crissy. Potential circulation changes could reduce visitor conflicts arising from the heavy use of bicyclists and pedestrians.
Reuse of the Crissy Field Center at East Beach site would allow the NPS and/or Conservancy to maintain access to the natural and cultural resources of the park, especially the outdoor areas of Crissy Field, in community-based environmental programs that serve youths, schools and community organizations, while being minimally intrusive on existing activities at Crissy Field.

Leasing of the Palace of Fine Arts Building would give Presidio visitors the option to connect with the Palace. Meaningful public access to the Palace while offering a desired use would enhance the visitor experience in the larger community.

Together, cumulative projects would contribute to the Presidio’s ongoing transformation into a welcoming destination that provides meaningful experiences for visitors from around the world. When there is good weather and special events are taking place resulting in more crowded conditions, demand might exceed visitor amenities offered, even with application of visitation measures. Visitor satisfaction and experience would likely decrease, and some visitors who would normally visit the Main Post or Crissy Field may not want to visit the areas. The amount of visitation displacement that would occur is not specifically known, and is likely to vary based on visitors’ expectations of crowding levels from weekdays to peak weekends. Visitors would likely be displaced to other recreational areas within the park or other nearby city or GGNRA sites where similar visitor experiences are available. However, on most weekdays and weekends, conditions are expected to be busy with only minor crowding. Adjacent areas may witness slightly more crowded conditions than typically experienced currently during special events. Related issues, such as parking and access problems would arise, but the new parklands project’s incremental contribution to cumulative conditions would be small.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The cumulative projects would have no direct and indirect effects within the project area, especially when added to the aggregate effects of past individual projects and the overall level of change within the NHLD. The rehabilitation of Crissy Field (completed in 2001) removed 32 historic buildings to restore earlier historic and natural features and to introduce parking for recreational activities. The construction of the Letterman Digital Arts Center (completed in 2005) replaced non-historic buildings and a large parking lot with compatibly designed new buildings and landscape. The replacement of Doyle Drive (which began construction in 2009) is in the final stages of replacing the historic elevated roadway with a new parkway, which included the removal of historic buildings and streets, and the reconfiguration of the historic Main Post bluff to accommodate the parkway.21 All three of these projects have had or will have impacts on the NHLD due to removal of contributing resources and the introduction of new buildings.

21 The proposed project or its alternatives would in part minimize and mitigate the adverse effects of the Presidio Parkway project on the NHLD by designing a new park to evoke the form of the historic bluff between the Main Parade and Crissy Field, and maximizing physical and visual connectivity.
The magnitude of impacts of the cumulative projects are limited and would have no relationship to the impacts of these past projects, as the projects would:

- replace non-historic buildings with new buildings of a similar or smaller scale (future use of Building 610 as a museum or cultural center, long term use of Building 1199),
- rehabilitate buildings for compatible new uses requiring minimal alteration of the character-defining materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships of the buildings and their settings (Building 50/Officers’ Club cultural center, Mason Street Warehouses sporting goods store, Building 210 Visitor Center, long-term use of the Palace of Fine Arts), and
- execute landscape improvements that are consistent with pre-existing guidance developed explicitly to avoid adverse effects to historic resources (restoration of Quartermaster Reach, Crissy Refresh).

The proposed project’s finding of effect in Attachment 2 confirms that the proposed project or its alternatives would minimize and/or partially mitigate the present effects of a much larger project (replacement of Doyle Drive), adhere to applicable planning and design guidelines, and maintain the integrity of the NHLD. The cumulative projects would have primarily beneficial effects similar in scope to the parklands project that would not reach a point of significance.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Ground-disturbing activities associated with cumulative projects, including future use of the Commissary, could adversely affect archaeological sites. The cumulative projects could also adversely affect unknown sites that may be identified through future research or an unanticipated discovery. Archaeological review would be required before undertaking or permitting ground-disturbing activities. Any ground-disturbing activities that may affect known or predicted archaeological sites would be evaluated and subject to a range of requirements including, but not limited to, avoidance of the sites, monitoring, coring or trenching, and testing and/or data recovery. All artifacts found would be cataloged, appropriately treated, and properly stored or displayed according to applicable federal standards and the Trust’s Archaeological Collections Management Policy. These requirements would help avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects.

---

22 Implementation of relevant design guidelines would further ensure that new construction is compatible with the historic district, minimizing impacts on the historic scene.
VISUAL RESOURCES

Potential future restoration, and facility rehabilitation, expansions, and improvements associated with the cumulative projects would enhance visual resources and opportunities to enjoy views within and around the project area. Restoration of the Quartermaster Reach would transform the presently denuded lands east of and adjacent to the project site into one of a more naturalistic character that would further complement the aesthetic of the restored Crissy Field Marsh and appear as an extension of the revegetated project site. Restoration projects envisioned as part of Crissy Refresh would similarly increase this naturalistic aesthetic. In addition, Crissy Refresh facility upgrades and program enhancements would indirectly increase bay viewing opportunities by making Crissy Field more accessible and enjoyable to park visitors. Each of these cumulative projects is part of a larger transformation of the San Francisco waterfront into a more visually interesting, accessible and engaging environment. The incremental effects on visual resources resulting from cumulative projects would advance the Trust’s and NPS’ interests and objectives of preserving and enhancing the visual resources and viewing opportunities throughout the Presidio and along the bay shoreline.

LIGHT AND GLARE

The cumulative projects would reduce the amount of light to be more suitable for the intentional natural darkness of the Presidio. Lighting for all projects would be designed to strike a balance between the darkness of nature and the minimum lighting necessary for the human activities occurring at night. The large and mostly inefficient light sources at the Commissary site would be replaced by new lighting methods that provide a better park experience with no environmental damage to the adjacent Crissy Field Marsh. Both the replacement lighting at the Commissary site and the new lighting at the Mason Street warehouses would adhere to the Trust’s guiding principles for lighting. The Crissy Field Center at East Beach would be guided by NPS Management Policies to ensure the light emanating from the facility is minimized (NPS 2006).

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

In general, the effects of cumulative projects on biological resources in the project area would be beneficial. Restoration of the Quartermaster Reach would provide more open water habitat for aquatic species, greater foraging opportunities for wildlife, an expanded corridor for wildlife movement, and improved water quality, among other benefits. Similarly, habitat restoration and enhancement projects undertaken as part of Crissy Refresh would contribute to the overall transformation of Crissy Field to a more naturalistic environment and provide increased wildlife habitat value and opportunity for native plant community expansion. These projects, in addition the parklands project, would enhance and expand the vegetative landscape of the Presidio and increase the extent of available habitat within the

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES
Presidio for occupation by local wildlife and reintroduction and establishment of special-status or rare plant populations. The projects would allow for the reconnection of open space between the Crissy Field and the Main Post that would facilitate animal movement between various habitats types within the Presidio.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

Cumulative projects, in combination with additional activities that further reduce the potential occurrence of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants within and adjacent to the project area, would contribute to the cleanup of waste sites from when the Presidio was a U.S. Army post and support overall the environmental remediation program at the Presidio. The Trust’s comprehensive environmental cleanup to date has included:

- closure of approximately 576 underground and aboveground fuel tanks;
- removing approximately 11 miles of former fuel distribution piping;
- removing lead-based paint contaminated soil from the drip-lines of approximately 700 buildings and structures;
- removing over 350,000 tons of soil and debris from multiple landfill sites where the Army disposed of municipal waste and construction debris, in order to restore native habitat and construct recreational improvements; and
- capping waste fill sites that cannot effectively be removed in a manner protective of human health and the environment, and that allows future development.

Thus, the cumulative impact of cleanup activities at and near the project area would be considered beneficial insofar as it would help accomplish the Trust’s goal of reducing risk of exposure to hazardous substances to levels that are protective of human health and the environment.
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