

**PRESIDIO TRUST PUBLIC BOARD MEETING – December 8, 2009**

**NOTE: The following is the best transcript available of the public Board meeting of the Presidio Trust Board of Directors held on December 8, 2009. It is based upon an audio recording of the meeting.**

[Start of recorded material]

Nancy Bechtle: – 6:35, for the record. I would like to call the meeting of the Board to order. I would like to welcome everybody for coming. It's kind of a really cold – can you not hear me?

Nancy Bechtle: Now can you hear me?

Male Voice: Yes.

Nancy Bechtle: Okay. I'll try and stay closer to the mic. So far, the only thing that's happened is I called the meeting to order. I would like to welcome all of you here on this kind of cold and chilly evening. It is nice and warm in here. I think there's a fireplace around here someplace.

Male Voice: It's behind us.

Nancy Bechtle: It's behind us, yeah. So if we need to do that. Obviously it's kind of a calmer time for things going on at the Presidio, otherwise we would be having one of those huge meetings. But I'm very delighted that you are all here, and look forward to hearing any comments that you would like to make later.

I would like to introduce the people who are sitting at this table. First, I'll introduce the Board members – Bob Burke, Michael Shepherd, Nancy Conner, I'm Nancy Bechtle, Curtis Feeny. I would especially like to welcome John Reynolds, who is a brand new Board member, and we are thrilled to have him with us. He's spent many, many years in the Park Service, and brings some great wisdom to our Board. So welcome, John.

John Reynolds: Thank you. [Applause]

Nancy Bechtle: I'd like to welcome the staff who is here. Craig Middleton you all know, Mike Rothman and Karen Cook. I'm sorry?

Amy Marshall: My name is Amy Marshall. I'm the transportation engineer.

Nancy Bechtle: Amy, so nice to have you here. I just wasn't sure if you were sitting at the table there. That's great. This meeting is being recorded, as you all know. A transcript will be posted on the Presidio Trust Web site in probably pretty close time. At the end of this meeting, we will have time for public comment, as always. Please sign up for those who intend to comment publicly. I'm not sure where the cards are. Mollie? Okay, they're there.

The names of the speakers will be called in order of the sign-up. As usual, we'll name three names at a time to allow speakers time to get to the microphone. Each speaker is to say his or her name into the microphone before making comments, to assist in the accuracy

of the transcript. And each speaker will have three minutes to speak. Our timers will cue the speaker when there is one minute left, and the bell will ring when your time is up.

I would like to reiterate that we are going to be very strict on this. We don't want to have anybody imposing on everybody else's time. So at this point, I would like to call for approval of the minutes of September. Would somebody like to move approval?

Female Voice: [Unintelligible]

Male Voice: Second.

Nancy Bechtle: All those in favor?

All: Aye.

Nancy Bechtle: Opposed? As you can see on the agenda, there are minutes to be approved from the November meeting. We need to re-circulate those to the Board before we bring them for approval. The Executive Director's Report, please, Craig.

Craig Middleton: Thank you, Nancy. A couple of announcements I'd like to make, and then go over just a few issues. First of all, on the Main Parade design, we've scheduled an open house for people, very informal, to learn more about the evolution of the Main Parade design. That open house will be on Wednesday, December 16th. And there will

be two of them, one at 8:30 in the morning, and one at 6:30 at night in Building 103. Please come and see the latest on the Main Parade.

We've also scheduled a budget workshop. And I know at least you, Don, would love to come to that, because we talk a lot about the budget. But we've scheduled a budget workshop for January 20th, 6:30 in the evening at the Golden Gate Club. We'll look forward to really rolling up our sleeves and talking about the budget, tradeoffs, all that good stuff.

Also, [unintelligible] you've probably noticed, those of you who spend much time here, that there is a construction fence around Building 100, one of the Montgomery Street buildings. There's been a lease signed with the International Center to End Violence. This has been in development. We've been working on it for quite a long time. The group, the organization is called the Family Violence Prevention Fund. They've got quite an impressive program. They're rehabilitating that building. We're really happy to see one of the Montgomery Street barracks being rebuilt.

Many of you remember "War and Dissent." This was an exhibition here in the Officers' Club that was called "War and Dissent: The U.S. in the Philippines, 1898 to 1915." It was quite a good exhibition. In fact, it was so popular that the government of the Philippines asked that we bring it to the Philippines.

I just got an email from Randy Delehanty who's in the Philippines with the exhibition. They opened it this week. The director of the National Museum of the Philippines opened the exhibit, along with the foreign secretary. So it's really opened to wide acclaim there, and we're very proud of Randy and our Park Service friends who helped us out, and everybody else who worked so hard on that.

I wanted to announce that the Redmond Kernan Annual Lecture Series is happening this Saturday. That's going to be here in the Officers' Club, and it'll be a number of lectures all around the subject of the Japanese-American experience in World War II. I invite you all to come. It's free, and it should be very, very interesting.

On the funding front, Congress has appropriated \$23.2 million for the Presidio for this fiscal year. It's worth noting that the President's request was \$17.2 million. So this is \$6 million in addition to what the President requested. Obviously we're very pleased about that, and that money will help us in our investment into the Presidio.

A little word about the Fire Department. As you probably may know, we had a ten-year MOU, Memorandum of Understanding, with the National Park Service to provide fire and emergency services to the Presidio. That agreement expired at the end of September. Don't worry. We're still providing emergency and fire services to the Presidio through the Park Service. But we are in

conversations with the Park Service and with the San Francisco Fire Department to determine what is the best way to continue to provide those services here, both from a cost-effective perspective and also a fire safety perspective. We want to make sure that the place is safe, and we want to make sure that we're getting the services for the best cost we can. I do want to take a moment to thank the employees of the Presidio Fire Department who have been kind of waiting eagerly to find out what we're going to do on the Fire Department. They have been very patient, and I really do appreciate it.

I think you're probably all eager to hear some of the results of the traffic study that we did, the three-week traffic-calming study that involved a number of things, including the partial closure of Presidio Boulevard. So Amy is here tonight to talk about – we've gotten the initial results. She's going to go through those very briefly.

I would just like to say at the outset that we are not making any recommendation to the Board, and I don't expect the Board is planning to take any action in the near future to close the road or to do anything particular with regard to the results. This was a study. We wanted to take this three-week window at a time before we would start to see dislocations and disruptions related to the Doyle Drive construction project.

So we wanted to get a good study, good results. And I think we did. But that doesn't mean that we're going to just move right into a road closure or anything else. I think we'll consider that probably another year down the road, if at all. Amy, you want to go through what you have?

Amy Marshall: Sure. What I'd like to start by doing is describing the methodology that we used to gather the data, and then jump right in to the results, which we all have and are also in the handouts at the front table.

We essentially gathered two different kinds of data. We did machine traffic counts that measured the volume at various places that are illustrated by the blue bars on the first figure. We did that just before the study for a seven-day period just before we implemented all of the measures, and then again during the third week of the study. The idea is to let people settle into their different travel patterns, and then measure again after people have adjusted.

The other thing we looked at is cut-through patterns. For the purposes of this study, what we're considering cut-through traffic is anyone who enters one gate and then leaves another gate within a 15-minute period. It's possible that there are some park-based uses that occur during that timeframe, but for the most part these are people who are driving through the park to get from one place to another.

So we did a license plate survey to look at cut-through patterns in March of this year, and then we repeated the same study, the same methodology, same times and days of the week again during the third week of this study, and compared the March data to the October data.

Starting with Figure 1, you can see the various road closures and traffic-calming measures resulted in a pretty significant decrease in the total traffic on a daily basis through the Presidio gates. It's a little less than 20,000 fewer cars passing through all of the Presidio gates in aggregate both on the average weekday and on weekends. The results were pretty similar.

Figure 2 illustrates the same comparison – weekday daily traffic volumes in September just before the study began, and then in October during the third week of the study. You can see the most dramatic effect, as would be expected, at the Presidio Gate. You can also see a significant reduction at the Lombard Gate, which suggests that the reduction in cut-through traffic dramatically outweighed the number of park residents and employees that had to use the Lombard Gate because the Presidio Gate was less convenient.

Some other things that are worth noting. At the Arguello Gate, you can see there's only a modest increase in traffic through the Arguello Gate. Conditions on Arguello, the anecdotal data is a little different than what this might reflect, because there was a fair



amount of traffic entering the Presidio Gate, turning left onto West Pacific, and ending up on Arguello. So the traffic farther north on Arguello, the increase was probably a little bit higher.

We heard a lot about the increased traffic on West Pacific, but this data actually suggests that there is a decrease. Looking into that a little bit further, essentially what happened is there's a fair amount of cut-through traffic that currently enters the Arguello Gate and uses West Pacific and Presidio Boulevard to get to the Lombard Gate. So the reduction in that traffic was about 500 fewer cars per day in the eastbound direction. There was an increase in traffic in the westbound direction, people coming in the Presidio Gate and going down West Pacific. But the decrease in traffic going to the Lombard Gate outweighed the increase in westbound traffic.

The most significant increase was at Divisadero between Vallejo and Broadway. That's about a 24 percent increase in the daily traffic volume there. Looking at all of these locations in aggregate, the real message is that there's a significant amount of traffic that just went elsewhere to a place that we didn't measure. If you compare the reduction at the Presidio Gate to the increases at the Arguello Gate and Divisadero, there's obviously a lot of traffic that went somewhere else. Moving on to Figure 3 because we heard a lot about Divisadero – this is the graph that illustrates what the increase was throughout the day. The pattern is similar although the greatest increase in raw numbers was in the middle of the day.

Figure 4 is essentially the same information as in Figure 2 but looking at weekend patterns rather than weekday. And the patterns are very, very similar. The one thing worth noting here is that the Marina Gate and the 25th Avenue Gate was a slightly more pronounced reduction, part of that was because the Nike Women's Marathon was going through the park on Sunday when this data was gathered. So those two gates were closed until around 11am. So that's reflected here. Moving on to Figure 5, this is looking at –

Nancy Bechtle: Amy, I have a quick question. On Figure 4 on Divisadero between Sacramento and California what is it? It's huge.

Amy Marshall: Yeah, I should point that out. I apologize. There was some missing data, the machine counters malfunctioned a couple of times or they were vandalized. So looking at Divisadero between Sacramento and California we didn't have data for September. But if you look at Figure 2, to get an idea Sacramento and California is approximately where Divisadero stops being a north-south thoroughfare arterial roadway and becomes more of a residential roadway.

So we wanted to measure in two different locations to see if the increase that we saw between Vallejo and Broadway translated farther south. You can see that the increase is quite a bit less in far as Sacramento. So we suspect that that same pattern occurred on the weekend, but without the September data we can't be sure.

Figure 5 looks at the PM peak commute hour, primarily because this is the time of the day where we have the most historical data. You can see how traffic volumes have changed over the past several years since winter of 2000, over the past nine years essentially. You can see how traffic volumes at the Lombard Gate have decreased over time with the construction of the slip ramp, creating another access point to the park at Gorgas. Traffic volumes at many of the other gates have changed somewhat, but not a great deal.

Starting with Figure 6, rather than looking at overall traffic volumes, we're looking at the cut-through patterns and the traffic that's entering one gate and leaving another within 15 minutes. So the reduction in that traffic is pretty dramatic, about 11,000 cars, ten or 11 thousand cars. Similar results on weekdays and weekends.

To look at the cut-through traffic, we looked at two different time periods. We looked at a Thursday in the middle of the week to look at weekday conditions between 10 and 6. We chose this timeframe because that's what we looked at in March. We have results from another study from 1996 that looked at those same timeframes.

This is looking at the reduction in cut-through traffic by location. Obviously Presidio is the most dramatic reduction in cut-through traffic, but also a significant reduction at Lombard, and all of the gates really.

The closure of the one-way uphill section of Crissy Field Avenue likely contributes to part of the reduction at the Marina Gate and the Golden Gate Bridge Plaza Gate. That's a popular route to get through the park and bypass congestion on Doyle Drive in the afternoons.

Figure 8 is looking at the same information for weekend days. And again, the patterns are very, very similar.

Finally, Figure 9 looks at an aggregate, the reduction in pass-through traffic relative to total traffic through the Presidio gates on a daily basis. So you can see that the percentage of cut-through traffic went from about 50 percent to roughly cut in half to 24 percent.

Nancy Bechtle: Is that it?

Amy Marshall: So that's it. Any questions?

Nancy Bechtle: Well, it's going to be interesting to see what happens with all the data. Just kind of anecdotally, I think probably everybody in this room was affected to greater or lesser extent. And certainly it raised a whole lot of public opinion [unintelligible] in the press and people that you would run into on the street. The only thing that was good about it was it made the mayor very happy, because it took all the pressure off of him when he closed certain parts of Market Street. For that, I think we're grateful. Craig, back to you.

Craig Middleton: Yeah. There was an item that was in the Federal Register about a capital project approval; unspecified which capital project. I just wanted to clarify that we are not going to seek approval from the Board of a capital project tonight. The project that we had in mind for that – but it is just not ready to be brought up to the Board – involves the Montgomery Street Barrack. This is a project that would be rehabilitation of the Montgomery Street Barrack that would be included in our five-year plan, which I think has been distributed. We are in discussions with an organization called the Presidio School of Management. It's a current tenant of the Presidio. They offer an MBA in Sustainable Management. A wonderful tenant. They'd like to expand, and they're interested in the Montgomery Street Barrack. So we are in discussions with them. The Real Estate Committee and the Board have instructed staff to really outline the parameters of that agreement before we put money into the building. And we haven't gotten there yet. So that's why we're not going to bring it up tonight. But that's what we had in mind when we put that item in the Federal Register.

I should also say a little bit about the five-year plan, because that's been distributed today. We have a five-year plan, and had for a number of years. It is adjusted usually annually, sometimes a little bit more, but usually in consort with the budget, the annual budgeting process. As I mentioned earlier, we'll have a much more in-depth discussion about both the budget and the five-year – this is

a construction capital plan – on January 20th. So I look forward to seeing some of you there.

What it really is, it's not a pre-decisional document. It doesn't replace compliance. It's just a budgeting blueprint that helps us figure out how to organize ourselves in the next five years, and which projects we would like to consider over the next five years. They're listed on that document, a number of them. It also helps us figure out how will we fund projects, where will we get the money, and how we will apply it from year to year. That's really what the five-year plan is about. As I say, we'll talk more about that next month.

Some things to point out, though, in the five-year plan, as we're preparing for discussion next month. We hope, subject of course to the compliance processes that are going on currently, to devote some significant resources to the Main Post, particularly the historic rehabilitations that we all know are really important and need to happen. The buildings are not getting any better. They're beginning to deteriorate significantly. So you'll see in the five-year plan a number of projects related to that.

There is another significant project related to the environmental sustainability goals of the Presidio, and that is the development of a new clean water plant, something that we've been wanting to do for quite a long time. It's funded in the five-year plan.

And other things like completing the trails in [unintelligible] program. I know Greg is going to talk about that a little bit in a minute. Major rehabilitations of historic landscapes; major work on the forest to make sure that the declining forest doesn't decline further. All of these are in the five-year plan. There are lots of tradeoffs. There's lots of interesting information in there. So I urge you to look at it.

Also, in terms of funding sources, I mentioned the increased appropriations. I think it's worth noting in that context that the appropriations do end very soon – soon from our perspective. In fact, we are in the process of – in about six months – preparing our final presentation to the President for 2012, which will be our last year of annual appropriations. So for us, that feels like it's coming along pretty quick.

We'll see the appropriations becoming less and less of a factor in all of this. There's some funding coming from Doyle Drive for routine takings of buildings and mitigation measures that they have decided to fund, and we appreciate that. That helps us, clearly the borrowing. You can talk to Michael about this. The borrowing situation of the country is not particularly good right now.

We relied quite a bit on borrowing. It's called a financed lease transaction. It's a type of borrowing for our funding of the capital plan. And that we have changed the assumption to say that over the next five years we really don't think we'll be borrowing.

So all those things are in that five-year plan. We look forward to talking to you further about them. Are there any comments or questions from the Board? If so, we'll answer them. If not, I'll turn it back to you, Nancy.

Nancy Bechtle: Are there any questions from the Board? Okay. We are delighted to have our two main park partners here with us tonight. First, I would like to introduce Frank Dean, who is going to be telling us about the update on the Presidio Visitor Center, and the Interpretive Plan update. Frank, nice to have you here.

Frank Dean: Yes, thank you, Nancy. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. I wanted to talk about interpretation a little bit, and about the Visitor Center in particular, at the Presidio.

What we call "interpretation" in the Park Service, or "education" maybe more simply put, is telling stories. It's been a high priority for the Presidio even in the Army days when they had the Army Museum. As that transitioned, the Park Service in 1989 began to conduct informal interpretative programs in the Main Post in the Presidio.

In 1996, the Presidio Trust started doing that, as well – interpretive programs, house tours and special events. There's been some track record and progress in that arena, and there's been a lot of interest from the community, as well. A lot of neighborhood groups have



been asking about, “What are we going to do about interpretation? What are we going to do about a Visitor Center?”

To maybe give you a little more context, in the spring of 2000 there was a group of historical experts who met at the behest of the National Park Service and the Presidio Trust to identify the interpretive themes that should be discussed and presented in programming here at the Presidio. This was called the Story Symposium. It was a pretty interesting meeting and a lot of good things and ideas came out of it. That was followed by a strategy session that came up between the Trust and the Park Service. We made some headway on it. But unfortunately, we didn't finish the job. And clearly, we do need to finish that.

In the meanwhile, the Visitor Center that we had at Building 102 was closed for seismic retrofit. So we have some things that we made some headway, and then we hit a bump in the road there. So we need to do better.

I'm happy to report, though, tonight that more recently the Presidio Trust, and the Park Service and the Parks Conservancy met. And we've decided to go forward jointly in a planning effort to identify an interpretive program strategy, as well as identify a location for a Visitor Center at the Presidio. So we're pretty excited about that. [The third leg] of that would be the implementation strategy and funding strategy to make it all happen.

All this is consistent with the Presidio Trust legislation, which affords the Park Service the responsibility of conducting interpretation programming in collaboration with the Presidio Trust. So going forward jointly from here on out is consistent with that legislation.

Now the goal, ultimately, while ambitious, is to identify and actually hopefully open the new Visitor Center by 2013 when the new Presidio Parkway is reopened, Doyle Drive is reopened for business. That is our goal. We're going to put our shoulder to the wheel on focus on this in the next year, and really see how far we get.

We're pretty confident that working together, and pooling our resources and our talents of all three parties, we think we can make some good headway. We're excited about this opportunity to work with you all. We're going into this with an open mind, and no decisions have been made. All the options are there for us to consider. So with that, that's our [game]. That's our [plan].

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you, Frank. I think that is a very exciting project. I think everybody looks forward to hearing what the outcome will be.

Frank Dean: Great.

Nancy Conner: We certainly had heard a lot from the public about the need for this.

Frank Dean: Yes.

Nancy Conner: This is great to see it has come online. It's going to be really a blended project. It would be all three of you working together.

Frank Dean: Yes, that's the plan for now.

Nancy Conner: Different strengths.

Frank Dean: Yes.

Nancy Conner: And are you looking at a variety of locations, or are you focusing on –

Frank Dean: We are. I mean, I think the Main Post is going to be the primary focus. That seems to be where there's some consensus already that we should focus there. But nothing is off the table. There's different sites at the Presidio where we can do informal interpretation. There's some unique buildings throughout the Post that should be part of that mix, not necessarily open every day, but they could be visited periodically and opened for tours and programs.

Nancy Bechtle: Any other – yeah.

John Reynolds: Frank, thank you for this. I think it's really a good idea to evaluate where a Visitor Center should be in relationship to criteria that have

to do with how a visitor would come here and experience this place. So I really commend you and the Trust for doing this. I'd like to thank Craig for putting up some money to start this. I'd like to publicly say that I've said to you that I hope the Park Service can put up some money to come forward and not have the Trust have to fund everything in a joint project.

Frank Dean: We're going to have some [unintelligible], Michael Boland said. So we're in this together.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. Craig, do you have anything you'd like to add?

Craig Middleton: I just wanted to thank you, Frank. It's great to get this off the ground. We are going to put in \$200,000 just to get it started. I imagine it will ultimately cost more than that, so –

Frank Dean: Yes, [unintelligible].

Nancy Bechtle: Well, I think it's a great project.

Frank Dean: Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: It's going to be desperately needed here.

Frank Dean: Absolutely.

Nancy Bechtle: Yeah. Thank you.

Frank Dean: Okay. Well, thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Okay. Then we have Greg Moore, who is the Executive Director of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy. I hate to [think about it] – he's going to have the most wonderful announcement, I hope.

Greg Moore: We'll see. [Laughter] As I drove to the meeting this evening, I drove by the Presidio holiday tree that was lit last Friday, I believe. And I realized that the holiday season is the season of giving, so a report on philanthropy, I think, is timely.

It's really great to be here with all of you to think about how much people care about this national park that they will donate their time and their resources to make it a better place. Our role at the Parks Conservancy is to work as a philanthropic partner to the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service in helping connect people to these places, and encourage them to give their time and resources for their betterment and for their future.

And in that role, we are very honored to work with the Trust, and Craig and his great team, and with Frank and his great team, in connecting people's generosity with this landmark place.

Generosity at the Presidio is not a new thing. For almost 25 years now, the Bay Area has been contributing to the Presidio's betterment. Even in this building we can find generosity touching

the Presidio. The programs at the Presidio Archaeological Lab have been supported by private funding, philanthropic funds. The exhibits in this building were funded by private funds.

If you venture out in the landscape and begin to look around, you see the restoration of Crissy Field, the restoration of Tennessee Hollow, the restoration of Lobos Creek Valley, the restoration of the Presidio Bluffs, all these projects aided with philanthropic funds; as well as the rejuvenation of Rob Hill Campground, the development of the biking and hiking system, environmental and educational programs at the Crissy Field Center, and other programs within the Presidio.

I think at the holiday season we can count our good fortune that people have given so generously to the Presidio over time. The very first gift was in 1986, just to give it a little bit of context. That gift was \$72,700 from Evelyn and Water Haas Junior Fund. That gift was to look at how to improve Crissy Field. This was before the Presidio was closed as a post, and the Park Service just had the shoreline area. That was a great grant to get, not only because it got the job done then, but subsequently the Haas Junior Fund has contributed \$35 million on behalf of the Presidio – the lead gift to the Crissy Field restoration, and the lead gift to the Presidio Trails and Overlooks.

And as we look at it, in really a relatively short period of time, if you add up the giving that began in 1986 until now, it approaches

almost \$75 million of generosity on behalf of the Presidio. That's both a testament to the quality of the place and the quality of the community that those two things are coming together.

Now that I've brought you up to date on philanthropy, our role at the Conservancy, or our focus, is working on the Presidio Trails and Overlooks Plan. Some of you may remember that in April of 2007, the Evelyn and Walter Haas Junior Fund provided a \$16 million lead gift to the Conservancy to work directly with the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service in implementing the publicly approved Trails and Overlook Plan, and also to renovate the Rob Hill Campground.

The wonderful thing about that gift, of course, is the significance of the philanthropy. But more than that now, as you go out in the Presidio, you can see the amazing work that's been completed by the Trust and the Park Service to put that generosity to work.

The Trust has completed absolutely stunning trail projects. I'm sure many of you have taken advantage of them – completing the Presidio Promenade from the Lombard Gate up to the Golden Gate Bridge, improving Lovers Lane, building connector trails, implementing the Bay Area Ridge Trail; and now working on the Park Trail, which will connect the Richmond neighborhood, traversing across the Post down to Crissy Field.

So these trails are all beautifully designed by the Trust staff, very competently implemented by their Project Management Team. And it seems that almost every month there's a new trail and a ribbon-cutting occurring.

Also, there's been tremendous project progress with the Presidio Overlooks. There are now four scenic overlooks in the Presidio that have been funded by philanthropy – Inspiration Point, Immigrant Point, the Crissy Field Overlook, and more recently – in fact, just this last month – the National Cemetery Overlook.

On Veterans Day, on November 11th, the Cemetery Overlook was dedicated. If you haven't seen it, you have to. It's beautifully designed by the Presidio Trust staff, and it's dedicated to the service of American military personnel to our nation. Presidio Trust Board Member Bob Burke and his wife, Katherine, were the generous donors that made this overlook possible. Thank you, Bob, for that generosity. [Applause]

With four overlooks done, there's still four to go. The next overlook, the Lovers Creek Overlook, is under construction by the Trust, connecting to the Anza Trail. There are three other overlooks in the design phase, including the Golden Gate Overlook, which is on National Park land in Area A.

Next, the Rob Hill Campground is well underway, again, being restored, and managed, and designed and implemented by Presidio



Trust staff. And when completed, the campground will double its capacity, able to serve instead of two groups, four groups at a time. It will include new restrooms, an outdoor program pavilion, campfire circle and landscape improvements. The entire facility is designed to be accessible to people with disabilities.

The construction will be completed this March, so there will be some kind of ribbon-cutting, I'm sure. And it will be in time for the Camping at the Presidio Program to hit the ground running in the new campground. This is a program sponsored jointly by the Conservancy, the Trust, the Park Service and Bay Area Wilderness Training. It's a program funded by the Trust to give urban kids their first outdoor camping experience. It's a really great program with wonderful public reception.

Progress has also been made in raising funds for the restoration of El Polin Spring, a very significant cultural and natural site here at the Presidio. The Trust has contributed to that project by funding design and tree removals in some of the restoration planning. But the full vision of that project depends on philanthropic support coming in. To date, we've raised \$1.5 million to fund this project, and we have two pending requests totaling \$1.5 million. If funded, they would allow the project to proceed.

For all of that work – and that's really quite amazing out there – I'd like to just take a moment to acknowledge and thank Craig and his team for the incredible quality of their park design work, and their

very capable project management of these trails, overlooks and restoration campground improvements. It's really a thrill to see these things happening in the Presidio. Thank you, Craig.

Turning to our partnership with the National Park Service, since we completed the Crissy restoration with them almost ten years ago, we've been focusing on the Park Service side of the Trails Plan in Area A.

I've worked diligently with the National Park Service to provide the funding to complete the Battery to Bluffs Trail along the western shore of the Presidio below the road – I think one of the most beautiful trails in the Presidio – connecting to the Golden Gate Bridge, and also coming around the Golden Gate junction to bring the trails on the east side of the bridge connecting down to Crissy Field into the Presidio Promenade that the Trust has implemented.

So philanthropy has really moved into action here at the Presidio. The results are there for everybody to go discover. As these trails and overlooks are completed, it's amazing. The moment the construction fences go down, the public comes in. Some of the trails have 5,000 people per day on a weekend, so they really are serving the public well.

A challenge we had with the Evelyn and Walter Haas Junior Fund, it was a challenge grant. And that means that they will provide their money if we raise a certain amount of money. So they

provided a challenge grant to the Conservancy of \$7 million, which then would make their \$10 million gift available in installments for the Presidio trails.

It's been a little bit of a challenging year in the fundraising arena. The economy is not really the best. But I'm pleased to report that today the Conservancy received formal notification of a \$2.5 million gift from the S.D. Bechtel Junior Foundation that fulfills this challenge grant. So we now have met the \$7 million challenge grant. That means that the remaining funds of the Haas Fund are made available, will continue to flow to complete the trail work over the next two years. [Applause]

I'd like to add that any philanthropic success is never one person's success; it's the success of a community that cares about a place like the Presidio. It's the success of our organizations working together. Both the Park Service team who were part of helping make the case for this trail, and Craig and his team and Michael Boland did a beautiful job of introducing these donors to what the Presidio trails can mean, and why making a gift would be a really great philanthropic investment that they would be proud of.

The good thing about philanthropy, I think, is that everybody can participate. It's not all about big gifts. Anybody can give. Some people give grassroots gifts, and some people give of their time. So now is also a time to celebrate the philanthropy of volunteerism here at the Presidio. We've just gotten all the numbers in.

The volunteer program here is a combined program of the Trust, the Park Service and the Conservancy. And for the last year, ending September 30th, we see this incredible outpouring of volunteer time of people's own philanthropy in giving their effort to the park. 7,100 volunteers dedicated their time to the Presidio last year, contributing almost 60,000 hours of time. Over 320 groups were hosted here at the Presidio last year. That's almost one volunteer gathering per day. When you use nationally accepted benchmarks for the value of volunteer labor, the value of that time donated by people in the Bay area community is about \$1.2 million. So any of you out there who are volunteers, thank you very much. There's important work being done at the Presidio because of your attention.

Once again, at the holiday season, I think we can count our good fortunes, our good fortunes that so many people care about the Presidio, our good fortunes that they are generous with that care, and that things are happening that will be enjoyed for generations to come.

I'd like to thank the Presidio Trust, thank the Park Service, Craig, thank you, and thank the Bay Area community for your remarkable dedication to the Presidio, and for helping secure its best possible future as a national park. Thank you for having me.

Nancy Bechtle: Thanks, Greg. But don't leave yet. [Applause] Before you leave, Greg, are there any questions or statements?

Bob Burke: Nancy, Greg and Frank inspired me to just make two brief comments. Coming into this meeting, I didn't appreciate the importance of the format being that we would have somebody here representing the Park Service and the Conservancy. But it's a terrific reflection of the fact that the Presidio is a team effort.

In addition to those three organizations – Presidio Trust, Park Service and the Conservancy – earlier, I saw Robert Sindelar of the YMCA in the audience. There are other organizations, many organizations in the Presidio, both for-profit and not-for-profit, public and private, who contribute to what we do here. So it is a team effort.

I'm convinced that 99 percent of the people in the public don't know what is done by the Park Service, and what is done by the Presidio Trust, and what is done by the Conservancy, and what is done by other groups. And frankly, it doesn't matter. The point is the place is in a lot better condition today than it was when we took it over.

The second point I wanted to make is, Greg, you're the master of the soft sell. But to put a little finer point on the importance of philanthropy, the reality is – of which we're painfully aware – that

the Presidio cannot be developed in the way that we would all like to see it evolve without substantial sources of private money.

There's the misimpression that we're sitting on a gold mine here. And God knows it's a wonderful location with wonderful land and wonderful buildings. But it so happens the 800 or so buildings that we took over were all in disrepair, the roads were in disrepair, the infrastructure, the sewer system, you name it.

We have had to struggle mightily to get revenues up to a point where we can barely break even on just an operating basis. And we really have little or no capital to undertake the kind of building – gilding the lily that we would like to do. The really nice things you see, many of them are the result of private philanthropy, and not of the resources that we've been able to squeeze out of the property's hard assets.

It's not a struggle that we shrink from, but it's a constant struggle to find ways to do the trails and the other elements, many of which we have not yet been able to take on. With some frequency, people ask, "Why haven't you done this?" and, "Why haven't you done that?" But I don't think I need to remind people in today's atmosphere that we all have finite financial resources.

Before very long at all, as Craig commented, we're not going to have the money coming from Washington. And so we are up

against a demand to find added resources. Again, I can't thank you enough, Greg, and your organization for all you've done.

Greg Moore: It's an honor. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Yeah. It's true. The Conservancy, the staff, the Board, everybody – it's a pleasure. I know it firsthand. For the future, I hope that you will all consider going to the Trails Forever party that took place. My daughter and I co-chaired it last year. It was a great success. I would just suggest everybody who loves the park should be part of this wonderful party.

Male Voice: Thank you, Nancy.

Nancy Bechtle: Yes, please.

John Reynolds: [Unintelligible]

Nancy Bechtle: Yeah.

John Reynolds: Greg and fellow Board members here, I think there's one piece of the effect of philanthropy that you may not think about during often your philanthropy here in the Presidio. But in terms of the philanthropy that has resulted in high-quality ecological restoration, the philanthropy that's resulted in the highest quality of design standards, and the philanthropy that has produced a premier effort around the National Park system to try to figure out how to connect

all Americans to their national parks are models that are talked about all over the National Park system.

Your effect is far beyond what happens here on the ground. The nation appreciates it very, very much. I'm sure that you don't really often think about that, but your effect is huge because of what people here in San Francisco have accomplished, in the Trust and the Park Service and their design staff [crosstalk].

Greg Moore: Thank you, John, but the Bay Area has always been the leader for the rest of the nation. [Laughter] [Unintelligible]

Craig Middleton: Greg, I just wanted to say thank you to you, and also to your great team. Kathryn is here, Kathryn Morelli. Ben Harwood has just been fabulous on all of this. Of course, Doug Overman and Gwen Sobolewski and all of your people. So we love working with you, especially when you can bring news like this.

Greg Moore: Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: I hate to admit it [unintelligible] announcement is not us, I'm sorry to say.

[Crosstalk]

Greg Moore: All right. Thanks so much.



Nancy Bechtle: Okay. Thank you so much, Greg.

Greg Moore: Okay.

Nancy Bechtle: Okay. The update on the Main Post process, please. It's going to be Craig and Karen.

Craig Middleton: I just thought a meeting cannot go by of the Board without a short update on where we are on the compliance process. This is not intended to be a long session. I know we want to get to Doyle. But let me just tell you that we are still in the process, have been in the process since 2007, both the NEPA process and the NHPA process, National Historic Preservation Act process.

They're being undertaken in tandem. I think it's available on the table for anybody who wants to pick it up, is a matrix that shows how the two processes work in tandem, and how our process has been conducted going back to 2007, and how we expect it to move from here on out.

We're now in the National Historic Preservation Act consultation. It is a 106 consultation. It is ongoing, has been ongoing for some time. We're at the point at which we have put out a draft Programmatic Agreement. I think the date was November 17th. And that's out for comment by the signatory parties and the consulting parties, many of whom are represented here tonight. I see them here.

We look forward to having a series of meetings. I think some have occurred already this month. We're scheduling an all-hands meeting for sometime in mid-January, after which we hope to get comments back from the parties, and then use those comments toward developing another Programmatic Agreement that incorporates those comments.

Obviously, CAMP is no longer a possibility. I will say that through the consultation, we have also made a number of changes to the Main Post proposal and plans, and each of the projects that we've been discussing. We will not make any decisions until after the consultation is accomplished, and the NEPA SEIS process is also accomplished. That all happens over the next hopefully few months, and then we will come with a recommended decision.

I will say, though, that the Programmatic Agreement – I won't go into it now, but one of the key elements in it that I think will demonstrate some significant change is that the current Programmatic Agreement envisions a set of projects that together would result in less square footage than is envisioned in the Presidio Trust Management Plan – the PTMP, as we call it. It was passed in – was it 2004, Karen? I think so. PTMP.

Karen Cook: 2003.

Craig Middleton: 2003.

Karen Cook: 2002.

Craig Middleton: 2002? Okay. Karen, you'd know. Anyway, I thank everyone who's stuck with us during this process. It's arduous. I think it is resulting in some betterment in terms of what we see at the Main Post. And I think it's overall been a good process. Thank you to everyone, and we'll keep going.

Bob Burke: Craig, you mentioned earlier – I think you called it “open house” or something – there's going to be some other kind of discussion.  
[Unintelligible]

Craig Middleton: The question was about the open house. We're going to have a meeting on December 16th – two meetings, in fact, in one day – to talk about the Main Parade design, which has also evolved. Essentially, the design has evolved to replace what was considered to be hardscape on the Anza Esplanade, and much more landscape to treatment. I think we all look forward to talking with you about it.

Nancy Conner: That's just going to be on the Main Parade, not the Main Post, right?

Craig Middleton: Right, right.

Nancy Conner: Just for clarification, could I ask – the Programmatic Agreement is specific to the Main Post. It does not replace our Master Programmatic Agreement for [unintelligible].

Karen Cook: Yes. We have a Programmatic Agreement in place under the PTMP. Just as we're updating the PTMP, the Programmatic Agreement that we are discussing now involves the projects that are in the Main Post Update, and addresses how we'll resolve adverse effects that have been identified as part of those projects.

Craig Middleton: I might add too that the Programmatic Agreement lays out further process, so it isn't sort of the end all, particularly related to design review, as we move forward with any of the projects.

Nancy Bechtle: Any comments? With the approval of the Chairman of the Finance and Audit Committee, I'm actually going to change the order of the agenda that has been passed out. I understand that Lee Saage from Doyle Drive would like to move it up in the agenda. So can we have the report from Doyle Drive? [Unintelligible] sit over there.

Lee Saage: Actually, I sit up here.

Nancy Bechtle: You sit up there? Okay. So nice to have you here. Let me just do a short introduction. This, as I said, is Lee Saage, who is the Project Program Manager for Doyle Drive. I think everybody in this room is really riveted in what is going to be happening, because it will be affecting all of us. So with that, nice to have you here. Thank you.

Lee Saage: Well, thank you very much, Madame Chair, members of the Board, and members of the public. Again, my name is Lee Saage, and I've been with this project for about ten years. I can't tell you how happy I am to see it moving forward.

I have to say that the Presidio is about my favorite place on Earth. I was here in the Army back in the '80s. I spent probably more time on weekends in this building than have been good for me, usually up on the upper deck sipping tax-payer subsidized cocktails.

[Laughter] But as a former soldier and one who served here, I want to express my personal appreciation to the Presidio Trust, the National Park Service, the Conservancy, and all who have made this such a glorious and wonderful place. We who were part of what we believe is a great project are delighted and honored to be making what we believe is a strong contribution to continued improvement of the Presidio.

Bob Burke: Mr. Saage, if you could clarify something, I'm sure I'm not the only person in the room who doesn't know this. I saw your title in the agenda, but for whom do you work? [Laughter]

Lee Saage: Not the CIA. I work for a local – what's called "special district." It's the San Francisco County Transportation Authority. It's an organization that was established in the mid-80s. It's one of 17 counties within California that's a special transportation district primarily for executing two missions. One is the management of

sales tax revenues that are used for transportation projects in the state. We also serve as a county congestion management agency.

In this particular instance, with regard to Doyle Drive, we were a joint sponsor with the California Department of Transportation for the project because of its importance to the transportation system within the San Francisco area.

Before I begin I'll just introduce a couple of colleagues. Gene Gonzalo and David Yam are both with me from Caltrans. And Molly Graham is with us from the firm CirclePoint. Molly is in charge of arranging public outreach and communications for the project, and has been our principal point of contact in dealing with both the agencies and the public.

We'll move on. We'll cover these items tonight. Just a quick overview. Construction phasing and traffic, which, of course, is of great interest to a lot of folks during construction. We will look at specific road closures that are planned long-term, meaning just throughout the bulk of the construction period for the project. Mitigation activities that are included during construction, and then some specifics on our communication and outreach plan.

As I said, Doyle Drive was built back in 1936 as part of the Golden Gate Bridge Project, and in many ways sort of bifurcates the Presidio, separating Crissy Field from the Main Post area. The project undertaken to replace Doyle Drive began in 2000 with

initiation of the Environmental Impact Statement and Report process.

Nearing completion of that process, design work was begun on what would become the Presidio Parkway alternative. The Final Environmental Impact Statement and Report were completed in 2008. The project has actually been fast-track since then with major construction beginning literally now.

The current schedule will allow us to achieve seismic safety. That means that traffic will be taken off the existing facility and on a combination of portions of the new roadway and the detour in 2011. Major construction will be complete. The project will be substantially complete in 2013, and the final project completion in 2014. The difference is mostly completing the landscaping work.

Quick graphics just to give you some sense of what the new facility will look like. This is looking obviously an aerial view at the Main Post area, and up toward the Palace of Fine Arts to the upper right of the screen. That's existing conditions. The new facility, including the Main Post tunnel. This is another view, same location from the Palace of Fine Arts. Again, you can see the dramatic difference.

The facility is lowered [to grade], basically completely eliminating the visual intrusion that Doyle Drive constitutes now, and recreating connections from Crissy Field to the Main Post.

I've got some graphic simulations of certain elements of the new facility. This is looking at the interchange at Route 1, 101. My friends from Southern California laugh at what we are now calling the Intersection of Park Presidio and the Presidio Parkway.

[Laughter] [Unintelligible] Veterans Boulevard.

Look at the entrance to the Battery Tunnel in the upper left-hand portion of the slide, the graphic of the new design of the high viaduct, much lighter structure. It's going to dramatically open up the views through [Cavalry Hollow]. It picks up certain design keys from the Golden Gate Bridge to maintain that design consistency.

This is a view back toward the bridge, the Main Post tunnel and roadways exiting and going toward the entrances to the Presidio and to the City. This is a perspective looking mostly north. As you'll see to the left-hand portion, this is a new direct entry into the Presidio which not only serves the interest of the Presidio, but actually takes some traffic off of Richardson Boulevard coming into the City.

Construction is being handled in several phases. First phase basically leaves things as it is. So traffic will stay on the existing Doyle Drive. Two ramps, two local ramps that will be closed on the west side. Those ramps serve virtually exclusively local traffic that moves between the Richmond and the Sunset area, and Marina



and Cow Hollow. Very, very low traffic volume. The analysis we've done indicates that that traffic can quite easily be accommodated through the City grid system, although we are putting mechanisms in place on sort of a standby basis in the event there are difficulties because of that traffic diversion.

This will allow construction of the area that's in green. Basically half of the new Doyle Drive, Presidio Parkway facility to the south and the western part, and then a detour on the eastern part. The idea is once these two sections are completed, we'll be able to join them in the middle and take all of the traffic off of the existing Doyle Drive, put them on a combination of half the new facility and the detour, and then be able to remove all of Doyle Drive at one time.

That happens on a three-day weekend closure that'll occur in 2011. During that three-day weekend, traffic across the bridge will still be open, and we'll be able to use Veterans Boulevard Route 1. But we will be making a crossover connection between the new detour and half the facility that's being built in the west.

Bob Burke: At that point is when you judge the seismic safety to be achieved?

Lee Saage: Correct. At the conclusion of this phase, seismic safety is achieved, because we've got a new facility, and then the detour is basically at [break], so there's nothing near the break. Moving into Phase II, traffic is now operating on a combination of [path of facility] and

the detour in the east. Then in green you can see the construction of the balance of the Presidio Parkway. That will go until 2013.

Again, we'll have another one of those three-day closures. This one will move traffic off of the detour and put them on the permanent facility. At the completion of that three-day closure, the new facility will be opened, and traffic will be on the permanent Presidio Parkway.

There are a number of long-term road closures that affect the Presidio. I mentioned the two local ramps that connect Route 1 and Route 101. The approximate durations are shown in this graphic at the top. They're closed for about 18 months.

Also, Lincoln Boulevard will be closed during that time to facilitate construction. I've got a graphic in a moment that shows what the detour is. Later, once Lincoln is reopened, Halleck Street, as it crosses Doyle Drive, will be closed, along with Marshall, which is actually being permanently closed, and the slip ramp is being removed. This slip ramp was never intended to be a permanent facility. It was actually approved as a temporary facility pending construction of the Doyle Drive replacement.

Lincoln Boulevard detour is shown here. The closure is in red, and the detour is basically moving around and using Mason Street as a way of moving east and west.

Construction phase. Many of you have been through remodels of your home, so you know that it's going to be noticeable. We can't tell you that three years is going to go by, and a new facility will just magically appear. But we're going to do everything we can to make it as nonintrusive as we can.

In the interest of getting in and getting out, we are working long days. A typical construction period would be 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., five days a week; and then 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturday. We do anticipate limited Sunday work, and occasional night work. These would mostly be associated with activities that can't be interrupted. For example, when one begins a concrete pour, it has to be continuous in order to maintain the structural integrity of the concrete. And if one of those happens, if you need to start at a time when it requires some work on Sunday or night work, then we'll have to continue that.

This will all be coordinated well in advance with anyone who has any interest in it. We're working very closely literally on a daily basis with both the Park Service and the Presidio Trust on this project. We'll do everything we can to both keep communications flowing, and to make sure that people's lives are preserved with as much tranquility as we can.

Our contact specifications have been developed uniquely for this project to try to maintain as much peace as we can. There's an extensive traffic management plan that's in the process of being

developed. It's much more comprehensive, much more detailed than is typically done for a project like this. And it includes a lot of contingency plans to deal with things that may come up during the course of construction.

There's specific requirements concerning worker parking and worker access to facility to minimize the impacts that this traffic associated with construction workers will have. We're also restricting hours from material delivery and movement of construction vehicles during the course of construction. And also, designated haul routes within the facility to make sure these guys go where they're supposed to go. We particularly want to avoid disrupting residences and any commercial operations at the Presidio.

We've done an awful lot already to deal with the resource protection, particular biological resource protection, at the Presidio. We're working very hard to try to protect the trees. A number of them have been removed in preparation for the work that's coming up. We'll be coming back and putting a lot more in later on. And there will be an extensive dust control, air and water quality control program that is part of the project.

Traffic management and monitoring. I mentioned cultural resource protection. We've actually done an extensive 106 exercise for the project, including the [preparation] process for the few buildings that are going to have to be removed. We'll be doing detailed and

extensive noise and vibration monitoring. The entire corridor is going to be instrumented, and we'll be monitoring literally everything that happens out here, and monitoring it remotely.

One of the things that I think is probably just representative of what the Doyle Drive replacement project has been is our first – what was characterized as a construction contract. Contract I was for the collection of plants and seeds of native plants at the Presidio. And we've collected some 45,000 plants that are now being taken care of in the nursery.

As we build, and during the time of completion, we'll be coming back and replanting all of these. And they're not only plants that are native to the Presidio, and not only native to a specific location in the Presidio, but they're actually being coded by DNA so we know that it's exactly from that place where we're replanting it again.

One bit of interesting news I think many of you are aware of is that over the course of the last few weeks, we've discovered a plant that's believed to be an extremely rare plant called the Franciscan Manzanita. It was discovered – and it's been there for a long time, but it was shaded by another tree. When that tree was removed, there it was. It's a plant that hasn't existed in the wild since the 1940s. So this is a very exciting discovery. We and Caltrans are working very closely with federal and state resource agencies,

particularly National Wildlife Service, developing both short and long-range conservation and protection plans for this plant.

The plans are still in development. But what we expect is likely to happen is the plant is very likely to be moved to a safer location so it can be protected long-term. Its current location is one where it really is not safe. We think we found locations that can work better, and we're currently working through that now with all the interested agencies. We're [looking forward] to making sure that this rare plant receives the protection that it deserves.

The contractor haul routes, yards, and temporary construction easements are shown here. I won't go through this in detail, but they're kind of scattered throughout the quarter. One of the challenges we have is a very narrow corridor, an area that needs to be protected, and the need to try to maintain traffic moving throughout the corridor. That's presented quite a challenge. But in cooperation with officials of the Trust and the Park Service, I think we've come up with a plan that will work for us.

We have held, and continue to hold, a lot of meetings at the Presidio with the neighbors, residents and with the commercial interests.

This is sort of a list of those recently. The next public meeting is scheduled in February with neighbors in the area [unintelligible] structure. Of course, we're available anytime that anybody wants to meet, or to receive a briefing or update on the project.

There's contact information. We have a hotline; a very active, busy Web site. It's an interactive Web site. People can leave comments and get feedback. We also want to use this phone number and Web site during the construction process as a way that people can report anything that looks untoward – a construction vehicle is someplace it shouldn't be, or a dump truck is not properly covered, or just anything that somebody sees that they don't like, this is where they can report it. There is PresidioParkway.org on Twitter. So if any of you are really interested in following us on pretty much a minute-by-minute basis, you're encouraged to sign up for Twitter.

This is a quick animation of what the new facility will look like. Initially, it'll just pan over the existing facility. You'll see a bright light begin to show up on the right side of the screen. As the bright light moves from right to left, you'll see the old facility ahead of the light disappear, and the new facility begin to appear behind it.

You can see that happening now. I wish we could actually build it this quickly. [Laughter] But it does give you a sense of the change that will occur as the Presidio Parkway becomes a reality.

Nancy Bechtle: Wow, that's pretty cool.

Lee Saage: Yeah. Now it's sort of looping back and looking at some of the details. This is the interchange at 1, 101, [unintelligible] the Calvary Hollow. Now beginning to sort of swoop over the high viaduct, the entrance to the first tunnel, the Battery tunnel adjacent

to the National Cemetery. Islands in the background. Lots of trees; lots of green. Now we're coming out of the Battery tunnel under the parkway section between the two tunnels. You can see traffic entering the Main Post tunnel. There's traffic coming out of the Main Post tunnel, Halleck. This is a direct connector into the Presidio. And then the roadway connector onto Richardson. That concludes our presentation. We'd be happy to take any questions.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you very much. Lee said he was going to have to leave after this. First if there are questions from the Board, and then if there are any questions from our guests, the public, pertaining only to the Doyle Drive thing, we'd be happy to take them. Are there questions from the Board for Lee? Yeah, Bob.

Bob Burke: Does the new parkway increase the capacity to carry cars, or is it mostly safety and appearance?

Lee Saage: Mostly the latter. There's actually no capacity increase. That was, in fact, one of the design criteria, was to maintain the existing capacity. And there's really no need to. I mean, Doyle Drive is a mile and a half segment between a six-lane bridge on one end, and a city street on the other. So you don't even gain anything by increasing capacity.

Nancy Bechtle: Okay. Do you have one?



- Nancy Conner: The Manzanita was obviously a big surprise, not that you can anticipate surprises. But is 2013 pretty solid in terms of your estimation? Wasn't that the data [unintelligible]?
- Lee Saage: Pretty solid. You're right. The Manzanita was a surprise. We seem to have sort of a surprise a week on the project. If it's not one thing, it's something else. But we're blessed with a very skilled team, and we're blessed with what I think is a wonderful working relationship with our hosts here at the Presidio. So far, we have yet to find something we couldn't figure out a way to deal with. Of course, the biggest problem on this project is always money. And we're in pretty good shape there. So we think we should be okay.
- Nancy Conner: It's going to mean a lot for the Presidio. That's for sure.
- Nancy Bechtle: Michael.
- Michael Shepherd: First, I think it's an indication you must have people that are well-trained and capable onsite that when that tree was taken down, [unintelligible] Manzanita could be recognized and protected right away. Is that part of the team, or it was just good fortune?
- Lee Saage: No, it is. In fact, David Yam, whom I pointed out earlier, is sort of the guy in charge of protecting the Manzanita. That's his mission in life right now. He's very skilled. Although I will say we're getting a lot of help. National Wildlife Service is particularly excited. They have a lot of expertise. Of course, the Trust and the Park

Service both have arborists and biologists who are experts in this matter, as well.

Michael Shepherd: My actual question, if I may – I don't know if the three minutes applies, but –

Nancy Bechtle: It does to you too.

Michael Shepherd: Okay, I'll do my very best. We've looked at drafts and other drawings. It looked like the wall was higher on the south side in between the two tunnels. Will there be sort of a noise reduction aspect to that, as well? Obviously it's built in against the bluff there.

Lee Saage: Yeah. Well, it's a bluff. It exists. In fact, part of I think what's the charm of this design is that we can now see that bluff again. It's been there, and it's been hidden for 75 years.

This is an area, like so many things on this project, where a great deal of energy was invested in trying to come up with a design that met a whole bunch of goals. So the wall height was set in a way that not only served a good engineering purpose, but actually achieved study goals that were particularly important to designers from the Presidio Trust and from the National Park Service. It will have a significant quieting impact. If you look at what the noise footprint is from Doyle Drive now – and it's elevated – and we're putting all of it either at grade or inside a tunnel, it is going to

virtually disappear from a noise standpoint. I mean, we would be saving a lot of noise just by putting a new roadway in, because most of the noise that comes from a high-speed freeway now is because of real impact on concrete segments. Well, this is a new surface, so that's all gone. It's going to be very quiet. And then what noise there is will virtually be undetectable from the Main Post area.

Nancy Bechtle: Fantastic. Okay. Are there any comments – the three-minute rule applies here too – or questions for Lee regarding only Doyle Drive? State your name.

Patricia Vaughey: Patricia Vaughey, Marina-Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants. Talking about noise with their construction, it seems that they're doing noise related to the Trust and to the Presidio, but are there any noise tests number one, happening on Marina Boulevard, on Richardson and the other road areas as well?

One of the things I was very sad about is that not one person from the Conservative, from National Park, or you mentioned the neighbors in all of these presentations. And we matter. One of the things that I'm worried about – and they've heard it from me at the museum but I'd like you to hear about it. With a high viaduct you have pollutants that are dispersed because of the westerly winds. With a parkway, those pollutants are not dispersed. There's a high chance of Tennessee Hollow and some of the parts of the Presidio to be contaminated in the future.

Number two is a comment by Lee when he said that it will take more traffic off of Richardson Avenue take the lanes into Marina Boulevard. And my friends from Marina Boulevard, my clientele, it helps them. But my clientele that are on Broadway, Broderick, Baker, Divisadero, Scott and Pierce are going to get the brunt of it.

I want you to be well-aware that this is happening. You can see beautiful pictures and think they are wonderful but look further. And this goes to the traffic accounts you just heard a few moments ago, which [unintelligible] this, and Gorgas was not counted in several of those charts; Broderick was not counted; Baker was not counted. All of this interrelates with the neighbors as well as you. I want you to be well-aware that these issues are in place. My question about the high and low viaduct was not answered in the EIR. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Is there any comment that you want to make about the high viaduct?

Lee Saage: Sure. First of all, let me say "hi" to Patricia. She's a member of our Citizen's Advisory Committee, and has worked very hard to keep me honest throughout the preparation of the [unintelligible] document. We have taken into consideration noise impacts not only in the Presidio but throughout the neighborhood. But most of the construction takes place in the Presidio, so that's where most of the impacts are.

But the entire construction corridor is going to be monitored for noise. So we're working just as hard to try to avoid impacting neighbors in Cow Hollow and Marina as we are the Presidio.

The issue regarding contamination from the high viaduct, I think the principal issue there is somewhat [unintelligible]. There's a lead-based paint that was originally used for treating the existing high viaduct. The soil around it has been contaminated over the years mostly in the '50s, '60s and '70s with lead from vehicle exhaust. Well, neither of those are really an issue anymore. So there is going to be cleanup as part of this. But the new facility will have neither lead-based paint nor will be experiencing the kind of lead discharge from vehicle emissions that we have had in the past.

And the only thing I can say about traffic is this presentation wasn't intended to be a detailed discourse of traffic, but we have modeled every roadway in San Francisco literally. We have a pretty good idea of what's happening traffic-wise both during construction and with the final project. We're confident we're going to be able to manage traffic effectively. In fact, the new facility will not add any traffic to any roadway. Because of the net reduction in total traffic between Richardson and Marina, because of the diversion into the Presidio, both Marina and Richardson Boulevard will see a slight reduction in traffic when the project is completed.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. Next?

Brad Anderson: Hi, Brad Anderson. I'm under the impression that when you remove a tree from here, you must replace it with a tree of the same species. In the case of the eucalyptus, there's five you could choose from. Is it possible to replace it with a native California tree instead of putting a [unintelligible] eucalyptus family back [in that area]?

Lee Saage: Boy, I'm glad David Yam is here, because I don't know the answer to that.

David Yam: Well, yes, during that process, we're working very closely with the Trust arborists. Also, there's a host of other landscape architects and designers [unintelligible] master plan. You may have noticed even with the tree removals that have taken place so far really opens up some really interesting views that weren't there before. So a lot of that is going to be taking place. But getting back to the question does it have to be eucalyptus where eucalyptus is [unintelligible] to a native plant, I think, yes. In the mission of the Trust to go back to historic landscapes, native landscapes the emphasis will be on [unintelligible].

Brad Anderson: Fair enough.

Nancy Bechtle: Next.

Henrik Jones: Hi. I'm Henrik Jones. I'm fortunate to have lived next to the Presidio since 1991. I wanted to ask you with the Girard Avenue

exit, how much traffic do you expect to come off of Girard Avenue when it's opened in 2014?

Lee Saage: Frankly, I just don't remember the numbers offhand. I can tell you that the total volume that's expected to use – I'm trying to remember which is which – Girard, is that the connector to Marina, or is that Gorgas?

Henrik Jones: It's both, Marina and Presidio. It comes off –

Lee Saage: Okay. The total volume that's expected to use that extension up to Marina Boulevard is just a little less than it is now. So whatever the volume is today, you're going to see a bit of a reduction, but it's not going to be a dramatic reduction.

Henrik Jones: Then I guess to follow up that, these traffic studies said there would be 70,000 cars a day – that's what they measured – going through the different gates. I guess when you mentioned that one of the designs will be that there will be more traffic coming to the Presidio off of Richardson, I guess it would be helpful and useful to know what that number is. So if it's 70,000 in total today, what do you think Girard will add?

Lee Saage: Actually, it doesn't increase the total traffic. It's just providing a more efficient way for traffic to enter the Presidio that's coming from Marin County. The new facility will provide direct access as opposed to requiring traffic coming from Marin to first transit

Richardson Boulevard and then enter either at Lombard or one of the other gates.

Henrik Jones: But that traffic doesn't go into the Presidio. That traffic goes onto Lombard for the commuters. It's often going downtown. I think it would be very useful for everyone as they understand what's happening with the introduction of the first stoplight in the Presidio at the Girard Avenue exit –

I think for a later point, it would be very helpful for people to know how much traffic will come off of Girard Avenue into the Presidio, how much more additional traffic there will be in the Presidio. I think that traffic currently is not coming off of Richardson into the Presidio, because it can't. Physically impossible.

Lee Saage: Well, the Traffic Analysis in the Environmental Study provides all those details, and it's information readily available. We can certainly get it for you.

Nancy Bechtle: Okay.

Henrik Jones: Your study says it's going up at the Presidio gate from 1,000 cars an hour to 1,600 cars an hour.

Nancy Bechtle: I think maybe this discussion should take place in one of those meetings you have. Some more details there. Yes?



Neal Desai: Hello, Neal Desai, National Parks Conservation Association.  
Thank you, Lee, for that presentation. Could you and your team share with us the type of mitigation being proposed for the National Park Service, and Presidio Trust Museum and archeological collections? If that's possible now.

Lee Saage: I know we're planning to relocate the Archeological Lab. But other than that, that's the only impact I'm aware of that the project is causing, and therefore the only mitigation that we're providing for the archeological functions that are being performed by the Trust and the Park Service. Perhaps we can talk separately if there's something you're aware of that I'm not aware of. I'd be happy to chat with you about that.

Neal Desai: Yeah. That would be helpful. My understanding is that the collections are [separate] to have both of them receive appropriate, adequate mitigation would be good in this process.

Lee Saage: Okay.

Nancy Bechtle: Maybe you can continue [unintelligible]. There also has been [unintelligible] helped with the Conservancy, to move their center?

Lee Saage: Crissy Field Center?

Nancy Bechtle: Crissy Field Center.

Lee Saage: Yes. They have one of the most beautiful temporary facilities.

Nancy Bechtle: They do. It looks too good to be temporary. Okay. Thank you very much, Lee. Thank you all for your input. Okay. Curtis, please, the Finance and Audit Committee Report.

Curtis Feeny: Thank you, Chairman. Curtis Feeny, Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee. We heard from Lee that under the influence of government subsidy he felt the Presidio is the most beautiful, wonderful place on the planet. We certainly agree with that. Greg talked about the wonderful sense of place at the Presidio.

Then balancing those observations with what we heard from Craig about the 2013 deadline to be self-sufficient, and from Bob Burke about the importance of private subsidy to make the Presidio as great as it can be, it's within the context of these issues – how great a place it is, and what our fiscal challenges are – that the Finance and Audit Committee meet on a regular basis on behalf of the Board to really put the spotlight on, “Are we going to be able to be self-sufficient by the deadline that's been imposed by the Trust from its formation?”

So with that, I'll give the report on our November 13th Finance and Audit Committee meeting attended by myself and committee members Nancy Bechtle and Mike Shepherd. Primarily, this meeting was to review the financial audits of KPMG, our external auditor, and approve those for the benefit of the Trust.

We spent the preponderance of the meeting reviewing the '08 and '09 fiscal year audits, and then did approve those, which were submitted as clean by KPMG for the Finance and Audit Committee's approval, with the only sort of asterisk on that being that some of the Army plant equipment and fixtures back in the early, early days of the Presidio – we could find no records to establish book value on those, which was deemed nominal as far as impact.

With that, we then approved the minutes of the September 17th meeting, and also approved the KPMG report on performance and accountability, where they reviewed their process and how they look at the Presidio, both P&L and balance sheet reports that they review on behalf of the Trust.

The committee also reappointed the [unintelligible] CPAs to provide internal services for internal audit support, and then approved some minor wording changes for budget agreements to be taken up by the Board of Directors.

With that, we spent, as I said, quite a bit of time reviewing the fiscal year audit '09 numbers ending September 30th. Part of this was the good news that although with very tough economic conditions, we had a slight increase in total revenues to \$70 million from \$69 million, while total expenses remained relatively flat. So when we look around at the extreme economic conditions facing most

enterprises, we felt particularly blessed that this was a fairly flat year in terms of performance vis-à-vis others.

Then we reviewed construction completed during the previous year. I would highlight the Disney Museum. Everyone should take their time to go through that wonderful asset that's been added to the Presidio. It's truly fantastic. Also, as I mentioned were the Public Health Hospital and [unintelligible] Terrace, the barracks buildings, a lot of park access and park work, increase in shuttle activity, the Spire of Public Art Project, Lovers Lane, Presidio Promenade, and so on.

On the flipside, highlighted the unfunded liability of the remediation issues that still face the Presidio. This is taken extremely seriously by the Trust and the Board. We're not out of the woods quite yet on that. This is, again, one of those pressure points that your Trust and the Presidio has to deal with in terms of reaching long-term financial sustainability. Over the history of the Presidio, there were quite a bit of environmental issues that came about because of the various military and other uses of the Presidio. Those all have to be worked out, and we're on watch to do that. And we have some help from the appropriations. But those, again, go away here soon.

When we talked about the risks to the financials, that was one – the remediation issues. Potential construction issues around Doyle Drive. Right now, I think the construction costs are going in our

favor, but that can change with another five percent growth on China's economy taking away all of our commodities. So we're worried about construction costs going forward in our budgeting. Because of that, we have a fairly reasonable contingency line item in our 2010 fiscal year plan.

Finally, I would just mention that we sat down with KPMG and Louis Wong, without staff present. And the committee, as always, had a very nice interchange with our internal and external auditors about how did they feel the management team and the Trust in general are doing with regard to high standards of accountability on our financial statements. You can see the very positive report. They put it in the context of their national work that they do with other similar clients, and said that we stand very well with regard to that.

As the Chair of the Audit Committee, I'm always happy to hear the auditors say that they're very pleased with the quality of the work, and the quality of the teams that they work with. So with that, I'll take any questions from the Board.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. Mike?

Curtis Feeny: Michael or other committee members, please feel free to add.

Michael Shepherd: Perhaps with the special presentation about Doyle Drive, I found it also good that our auditors commented that we were prepared to

meet the special standards for reimbursement of expenses and other remediation from Caltrans and other funding sources.

Curtis Feeny: Excellent point.

Nancy Bechtle: Right, yeah.

Curtis Feeny: Excellent point. And I do think that if you saw that animation, I would suspect either Lucas Film or Disney, both Presidio Park tenants, did that animation. It's great.

Nancy Bechtle: Mike, do you have anything to add?

Mike Rotham: No. I think the Chair has covered the report very well. I'd be happy to assist with any questions.

Nancy Bechtle: Any questions?

Curtis Feeny: Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: I always like to quote Curtis, though, when he talks about the Presidio, and all the things that have happened in the past, and things that we're hoping to be in the future. He says, "We don't want this to be the best place in the country; we want the Presidio to be the best place in the planet." We're doing our best. Okay.

I think that ends all of our main topics. We will go straight into the public comment time. There still will be cards to sign up if you're interested. And again, to reiterate, please state who you are when you get up there. Actually, you will be called. I have the cards here. Three names will be called, and then each speaker has three minutes. And please stick to your three minutes.

I'm going to start with Amy Meyer, a former Board member, then Whitney Hall, then Mark Nagel. Good evening, Amy.

Amy Meyer: Thank you. Amy Meyer, former Board member. First of all, I want to thank you for the way this meeting has been set up. I really like what you've done here. It's more collegial. We feel more – I believe in the audience – a part of the discussion. You're not up onstage or something like that, and that works.

I wanted to bring up something from the Main Post process. We've been more and more, as we deal with the technical 106 paper, which is really a technical paper that is the Section 106 consultation. Section 106 is really something that is a tail on a dog. I better be careful of my metaphor.

Nancy Bechtle: Careful. Dogs are really [unintelligible]. [Laughter]

Amy Meyer: It's an appendage to a larger matter which is the Main Post Update itself. More and more, as we sit in meetings with Rob Thomson and Michael Boland, and sometimes we get to the larger

consultation, we have a problem because there are documents in this history, and people keep waving – last time it was a two-volume thing on the cultural landscape report that was done in 2002, and we all look at it and say, “We have questions, but we’ve not dealt with these items.”

I would like to suggest that we get into a different mode in one respect for the Main Post Update, and that’s to do something about discussing the underlying issues away from 106. Many of the historic issues have been dealt with, and people have been working on them for some time. But it’s basically a technical paper. And we keep running into the wall of, “Well, this isn’t the job of 106.” I would like to suggest something along the idea of a Main Post Update, sessions that also bring in members of the general public who are not interested in sitting through Section 106. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. Whitney.

Whitney Hall: Good evening. Thank you for this meeting. I certainly second Amy’s comment. I was particularly pleased with hearing Frank Dean’s report, the reception by the Board. For over ten years there have been those of us who’ve been itching for a decent Visitor Center of some sort for the public at the Presidio. The difficulties are many. A lot of bureaucracy in both sides. A lot of financial concerns in both sides. Perhaps some turf wars. I hope that the individual members, the individual directors of the Trust, will



personally keep an eye on this, and not let those same bureaucratic [unintelligible] jams develop again.

I didn't know what Amy was going to say. I'm going to try in the most simple way to give one view I think of what Amy was saying. Think of yourselves as the directors of a railroad. You have decided that you want to open a new market. That is your purpose. You're starting to develop your plans and get your Environmental Impact Reports and all that sort of thing, making your investment plans. Suddenly, that market changes and goes away. Do you continue to build the same railroad track to that destination, or do you stop and reevaluate, "What is this destination we're heading for now? Perhaps there's a better way to invest our time and energy." So what am I saying? Back to the railroad.

This paper that Craig referred to has a column on the National Environmental Policy Act, and one on the National Historic Preservation Act. Even this is too complicated for most people to spend time on and understand. Very simply, the National Environmental Policy Act sets forward procedures that all agencies must follow in order that your decisions are well-informed by the public.

It doesn't mean you have to accept those decisions, but you must create a procedure that they're well-informed by the public. Part of that is just like the railroad. You have to identify your objective. We're still working on a plan where the objective is to make Main

Post a cultural center with a nationally significant cultural facility, and to revitalize the Post with [unintelligible], so you can measure if you've arrived at that destination or not.

So the one rail of this track, the National Environmental Policy rail, really quit prior to a withdrawal of the art museum. There's been no revisions in thinking that we're aware of. I'm sure there has been. But the public is not aware of that. So we're sitting, as Amy said, at the 106 meeting dealing with individual structures – because that's what the 106 does – individual structures, and relation of one structure to another, looking at details, or how high this should be, and how many [there] should be broken into.

Nancy Bechtle: Okay, thank you.

Whitney Hall: You need to bring those two railroad tracks together and be sure you're going to the destination that you want to arrive at. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. We have Mark Nagel, correct?

Mark Nagel: Yeah, hi. Mark Nagel, Marina Community Association. I'd like to thank the Board for the revised format for this meeting. I think that it was particularly helpful and informative for the public, in contrast to the open-mic meetings that we've had in the past.

Over the past, say, two years, I know the members of this Board have heard a lot of negative critical comments from members of the public at these meetings. I'd like to start with just some words of appreciation, actually, for the staff of the Trust. Over the past few months since the CAMP proposal was withdrawn, the Trust has worked very hard with members of the public.

I have noticed that a lot of proposals that the Trust is putting forward do reflect some comments that the members of the public, as well as the National Park Service, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer have put forward. We do appreciate that. Members of the Trust have made themselves available to the public to explain the proposals and to hear our comments. So that is much appreciated.

I would like to turn now to an important issue, and that's the educational programming. I'd like to applaud the Trust, and the National Park Service, and the Conservancy for the announcement tonight of a collaboration on a Visitor Center. As members of the Board know, the public has expressed great interest over the past two years in historical programming. I think that by moving forward with a very serious first-rate program, the Presidio Trust will be able to get a lot of very positive participation from the public in Main Post planning. I look forward to working with the Presidio Trust on these programs. I would also encourage the Presidio Trust and the Park Service to the extent appropriate to include the public

in the programming planning process, so the public can have some input given the very high level of interest.

I'd like to raise a couple of issues of concern in the Main Post planning process. Just two items. Although there are various projects that are in very good shape and hitting the right direction, two of concern.

The first regards the planning for the Parade Ground. Right now, the Parade Ground is not part of the Main Post planning process. The Presidio Trust went through a planning review separately beginning, I believe, in 2007 at the last all-hands meeting of parties in August. The National Park Service, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and all the consulting parties requested that the Parade Ground be included, given its importance to the Main Post. I understand that the Presidio Trust reasonably wants to move forward, given that the process has concluded. However, there was a sense from the parties that, in fairness, they would like to be able to comment on the Main Parade Ground, given its importance to the Main Post.

The other item is more specific, concerning Buildings 40 and 41, these two barracks buildings out front here, the Officers' Club. The Presidio Trust is planning to demolish those buildings. Again, the NPS, and SHPO, and the consulting parties all have requested they stay in place. They may be unsightly, some. But they are part of

the Presidio's history, and excellent programming can be designed around them.

To conclude, I'd like to have just a word about the future. It's my understanding that tonight was the first time actually that the Park Service has been able to meet directly with the Board, is my understanding. I think that the process going forward could benefit from great collaboration between the Presidio Trust, and the Park Service, and the State Historic Preservation Officer. I'd encourage increased dialog going forward. Thank you very much.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you very much. Okay. The next two people are Paul Wermer, David Bancroft and Donald Green.

Paul Wermer: Good evening, directors. My name is Paul Wermer. I'm a member of the Pacific Heights Residents Association. I'd like to start by endorsing what Mr. Nagel said just previously about the importance of programming.

I would like to ask for your help on a particular issue, and that relates to traffic studies, and the integration of the Presidio's impacts on the City's impacts. The Presidio is not unique, an island off by itself. It interacts really strongly with the City in many ways. And one of the ways that it impacts is traffic.

I want to commend the work that the Trust has done in reaching out and talking to the community about the traffic study. But I'm

concerned that what I see and hear is highly quantitative data, and highly aggregated quantitative data. Traffic has two components. If you are on a commute street, the major component is quantitative. How many cars can I push through this distance per unit time? But we're not talking in much of the impact about commute. We're talking about impacts on residential areas. And there, qualitative factors are far more significant.

For example, in this Traffic-Calming Study Report, [unintelligible] discussion, description, assessment of such things is the backup that has been reported on Arguello, I believe it is, as part of the study, was not highlighted. The time distribution is touched on briefly, but is very, very significant, especially in residential neighborhoods.

I would encourage you, as directors of the operation, to ask the transportation people to engage more actively with groups such as NAPP to look at how to evaluate these more qualitative impacts, and how to make sense of them in a way that every one works. And that will have us all talking the same terms. We will be talking numbers when appropriate. We will be talking qualitative impacts when appropriate. And we'll understand how to work with them. Right now, we don't have that. And I think that's a barrier to really constructively moving forward. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you very much. David?

David Bancroft: Good evening. My name is David Bancroft. I'm appearing here for the group Save the Presidio. I want to endorse first many of the comments that have been made, many of the compliments. The Presidio is looking pretty good. I would like to add, in addition to the good comments about the rehabs and the overlooks, the programs and the exhibitions and the Disney Museum are just fabulous, fabulous undertakings by the Presidio.

I want to give you three suggestions to build on the goodwill. The first is with respect to your Board minutes. There's an issue here, I think, of some needed transparency. I want to read you the Board minutes from the meeting of June 30th. "Following a discussion of the Contemporary Art Museum at the Presidio (CAMP), the Board was joined by Don Fisher and Mary Murphy for further discussion of the issues in connection with the CAMP." And nothing further.

The Presidio Trust is, in a real way, a public agency. And I think that it's appropriate – I recognize the need for discreetness. I'm the secretary of a charity foundation, and I have some experience in drafting minutes. But really, that kind of a Board minute I don't think is informative in any way to the public. I want to read you the Board minutes from the meeting just before that.

"The Board discussed issues in connection with the draft Main Post Update to the Presidio Trust Management Plan, and the supplement to the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Main Post Update." I think we would like to know a little bit more

about what the Board meetings discuss, what the concerns are, and, of course, actions taken.

The second suggestion I have relates to the Freedom of Information Act. I went through some records the other day and saw that there had been a number of FOIA requests made, and also observed, as you know, that there is a memorandum from the Attorney General of the United States, which basically creates a strong presumption for a disclosure. In a couple of cases, we have had offers to disclose records that we have sought. But really, there's been a de facto denial, because we received from the Trust the imposition of fees, \$4,500. And my suggestion is is that you consider creating a small fund, perhaps \$25,000, that we could use on an experimental basis to subsidize some FOIA requests that are made from community organizations. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Donald Green: Good evening. I'm Donald Green. I've been here since, I guess, 1997. This is maybe my 18th meeting, along with Craig, and I guess Karen, over the last ten years or so. I have two or three specific items to mention. I'm also with the Laurel Heights Association, a member of the consulting group on 106.

I was delighted to see the Visitor Study. It's not called the Visitor Center Study; it's the Visitor Study. And Mr. Dean explained that this would be looking at interpretive programs; what the visitors



want when they get here. So I would encourage you to make sure that it includes interpretation and education of the public, and not just the use of that one facility.

Secondly, one of the issues is, I believe, that when visitors come, they ought to be able to enter one of the historic buildings, and get a sense of what it was like then, as we do when we visit Monticello, or when we visit Mount Vernon. You don't just look at it and walk away. You go in it.

I think the Montgomery Street Barracks were a very good example. It seems to me you should keep one or two of those – and there's only three left that aren't yet in the process of being contracted for private use – that you people facilitate the improvements for the \$15 million, but you put money in your own program to work with the Park Service to be used to recreate, for example, the barracks.

I was in the army some years back. I don't know how many other people have been in army barracks, but it's kind of fun. It's a little bit like the Fort Point Museum, the Fort Point place. I mean, to go in there is really history itself. I would encourage you to before you sign away leases for the next three buildings, let's finish the Interpretative Program, which will include what facilities do we need?

One or two other items. Other people have made a comment including the Main Parade project in the Programmatic Agreement.

I agree. My last point concerns the amount of parking space, and the amount of money you're going to start putting in this year to tear down asphalt and relocate parking places. It includes 300 parking spaces along the streets around the old Parade and the new Parade. That's an awful lot of cars to look at in an historic area.

Also, I think the study on transportation did not include a possible subsidized transit program that you people can provide with your PresidiGo Shuttle. It's not available on the weekends. It wouldn't cost you more than a couple hundred thousand dollars a year to provide half-hourly service downtown, the way you do during the week. That would reduce tremendously the demand for parking in the Presidio. I'm not sure you need the full 1,700 or 1,800 spaces.

The last item – I've made this before – I would urge you people to contract with an outside firm – transportation planners here in the City that have worked for you before – to review the demand estimate in your current analysis, because I don't think it properly weighs the negative impact of market prices on the demand for parking.

Lastly, the Transportation Plan should include Crissy Field. It should be the Trust area and the other area. Because once you start charging here, you don't charge there, and you have ability to go back and forth, [unintelligible] transportation plan for the park. So I would encourage you to do that before you start building new

buildings, and tearing up asphalt, and putting in new lots. Thank you very much.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. Gary Widman, Jay Watson and Neal Desai.

Gary Widman: Thank you. Gary Widman, President, Presidio Historical Association. I'm going to add my congratulations to the way you ran the meeting. Definitely a positive. Definitely a change. I think great good will come of it, to your benefit, as well as to ours.

I also should note that the Presidio Historical Association sent a note of congratulations to the Trust and to Mr. Burke for the effort that was completed on the Cemetery Overlook. That sets a good example for what could be done on history-related work in the future.

Most of all, I was pleased by your last statement, which is that we don't just want the best place in the country; we want the best place on the planet. The reason that that is so good, in my mind, is that that is a qualitative statement. That is not a quantitative statement. Your treatment of the Presidio up to this point has pretty much been carried out in quantitative terms – analyses of dollars, people, and so on. And it's led you to some success in most of the Presidio, but it's led you to great battles and barricades in the Main Post.

The Main Post is an extremely special place. I was particularly intrigued by the mention of what's being done to protect the single endangered species plant that had been discovered.

I can tell you from my prior experience in the Interior Department that National Historic Landmark Districts are considered to be the same status as endangered species of plants. They're the highest level of protection. You should be doing everything for a National Historic Landmark District that you would do for that plant, and a lot more, because there's so much more of it.

The good approach that we sensed tonight, I hope that's carried out. If you want this to continue, it's going to require that you work with the staff, because those of us who attend these meetings and deal with these issues see very different things than I suspect you see when we deal with these things day to day.

My suggestion actually is that you call a halt to the process, reorient, put those "best place in the planet" values in there, and then set out a process that will carry it out. As has been mentioned earlier, what we're doing now is simply renaming what's left of the old process, and we're going through the same thing with the same problems, the same objections. We have all the catalog of objections from the Park Service, from the State Historic Preservation Office, from the public. None of those are being answered by the present process. So I suggest that we stop, start over, and keep in mind that you want the best place on the planet.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Jay Watson: Members of the Trust and staff, thanks very much for the chance to say a few words. My name is Jay Watson. I'm the Regional Director of a national organization called the Student Conservation Association. It's a 52-year-old organization that's dedicated to youth leadership, conservation service and citizen stewardship. We place about 4,500 or so students a year around the country, both high school and college, in volunteer and internship positions.

One of our specific program models are locally recruited, paid high school conservation crews. We brought those to the Bay Area a couple years ago. We are now operating about eight of them mostly in parking. That's Rosie the Riveter in the East Bay, GGNRA, Point Rays, San Mateo County Parks.

We were really pleased to add one this past summer here at the Presidio. It was a six-person crew with two leaders, all from San Francisco. And we raised the money to provide that crew to the Presidio. It was about \$45,000 in private money, a small piece of that philanthropic gift that Greg Moore spoke to earlier.

They did trail work. They planted maybe about 1,000 native plants, removed a pile of invasive plants from throughout the Presidio. We're currently assessing within our office whether or not we can continue to raise the funds to bring that team to the Presidio. We're

in a lot of discussions with the Secretary of the Interior's Office, and he really has made a major initiative to ramp up youth engagement throughout all of the Department of the Interior.

So we're clearly making that assessment, and may very well approach the Trust staff with the idea of doing so on a cost-share basis. That's generally how we do things elsewhere in the country. But the Trust was a tremendous host to the crew this summer. They worked under the direction of primarily a fellow named Damian Raffa, I believe.

He went all the way through to the graduating ceremony. He was just enthusiastic and really cared about the kids we brought here. We very much appreciate his effort and all the other efforts that the Trust has engaged in. So we will be back in touch. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Craig Middleton: Thank you, Jay, for making that happen. Damian still talks about it. So we'll work together [unintelligible].

Jay Watson: Thank you.

Neal Desai: Hello. Neal Desai, National Parks Conservation Association. I want to endorse the work that Jay and the SCA does. It's fantastic stuff. I appreciate your support for that. I'd like to thank you really

for this format. It's been very information to me, and I imagine to many of the people here.

It's fantastic to see so many guests show up – the Park Service, Conservancy, the folks at Doyle Drive – to talk about their projects. It seems like a renewed spirit of collaboration. I'd like to encourage that as much as possible, as much as we can continue to make that a priority with not only yourselves, but interaction with the public, as well. It's a really fantastic format.

Specifically, the Visitor Center and the planning work being done there between your three entities – Greg, Frank and Craig – this is great. Let us know how we can support that as you folks move forward.

I'm just going to jump around in this agenda to fit what you folks were talking about. I didn't get the response in detail that I was looking for. But I think what we need to collectively focus on is that mitigation work for the archeological museum collections for not only the Presidio Trust but the Park Service are dealt with adequately, and the funds are received to make sure that they're moved [and properly stored], and then subsequently programmed.

Regarding the Main Post Update, I have to echo the comment that a lot of work has been done by the staff, and I imagine the Board as well, over the past couple of years to get to where we are now.

Nancy Bechtle: I'm sorry, Neal. Could you speak up a little bit? I can't hear very well. I mean, I can hear pretty well, but I can't hear you.

Neal Desai: [Unintelligible]. Yeah, okay. How about this? Better?

Nancy Bechtle: Yeah, thank you.

Neal Desai: A lot of work has been done. I'd like to acknowledge that. I think we're at a good place, again, of renewed collaboration. A lot of different entities are at the table. I have to say when I look at these next steps, I notice – this is specific, but it's also broad. I've read through the comments recently from the Park Service, from the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council.

I just don't see how we can get to these next steps as laid out here without some intermediary steps. There are a lot of documents that are outdated, a lot of plans and visions that not have yet to be translated to the public and consulting parties that reflect where we actually are. In short, it's confusing, but it's easily remedied.

To that end, I guess I'll have to end on this note. You folks have all received a notice from Earth Justice today re-iterating what we've been discussing for a few years with the Park Service and other agencies, as well. But the legislative mandate of new construction needs more attention. And it can easily be dealt with. But it needs to be acknowledged and respected. I'm happy to provide more information on that, but I feel like you folks have already been



briefed on that numerous times over the past couple of years.

Thank you for your time. I appreciate this meeting.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you. Thanks. Okay. Victor Meyerhoff, Henrik Jones and Bill Hudson.

Victor Meyerhoff: Good evening, Board members and Mr. Middleton. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I'd like to welcome Mr. Reynolds to the board. I'm Victor Meyerhoff, proprietor of the Presidio Bowling Center, and have been so for the past 14 years.

Once again, I'm here to persuade you to save bowling in the Presidio. Bowling has enjoyed a 98-year existence in the Presidio, and I can see no reason why it shouldn't remain here indefinitely. Our current location in Building 93 is seen by the Presidio Trust as inappropriate. This couldn't be farther from the truth. The Army had a very good reason for locating bowling at the Main Post, and the same reason it should remain here in its present location.

Based on square footage, the Bowling Center was, and still is, the most-used indoor recreation in the Presidio. Open 365 days a year, and 109 hours a week, we serve more than 75,000 customers per year. Our customer base ranges from 2 to 93 in age, and people from all over the world visit the center.

In November of 2008, "Bowlers Journal" magazine listed 95 bowling centers in the world to visit before you die. We were ranked number 26 in the world on that list. [Laughter]

[Unintelligible] public comment period, we submitted over 5,000 signatures petitioning our closure without plans to relocate the Bowling Center. Along with the petition, several letters and other items pleading to save the center were included. Currently, only 24 lanes of bowling remain in San Francisco. All were closed for basically the same reasons [you are] planning to close the current bowling center. Someone thought the space could be better used for something else. The only problem is that bowling takes a very specific footprint of a building to reside in. When a bowling center is removed, it is nearly impossible to relocate it. We are heading down the same path, and could ultimately doom bowling in San Francisco. The difference here is that you could actually listen to what the public wants and save bowling.

There are just about 1,500 acres in the Presidio, and we occupy a building of less than one-third of an acre, about one-fifth of one percent of the Presidio. So I ask this question: Why remove bowling from the Main Post in the near future? There is no anchor tenant to lease the space, and the list of other Main Post projects being considered is very lengthy. The difference is that most of these projects involve vacant buildings, or buildings where the tenants could be more easily relocated.

The Bowling Center is used and loved by the whole City. Since we're talking about a Main Post vision for 2030, why not wait until other projects are completed, and then if you still feel bowling has no place in the Main Post, move the center at that point in time?  
Thank you for your time.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Henrik Jones: Hi. I'd just like to thank the Presidio staff in the Presidio for the bold step of taking the traffic column study. The Girard Avenue exit will create its first stoplight within the Presidio. I think that is the fox in the henhouse. I think if there's one traffic light, there will probably be more. And it's important for the Presidio Trust and for all of us to look at ways to manage that traffic.

I think that although the traffic study may have generated some recent controversy, overall, the people who are sitting here, you all, are trying to maintain the Presidio as the best place in the world. I hope that you do many more studies to try to figure out the right way to manage traffic. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Bill Hudson: My name is Bill Hudson. I'm a neighbor of the Presidio. I want to echo Henrik's observations. Gratitude to the Trust for taking the steps to undertake the traffic study. This is the first time I think the Trust has seriously studied the question of cut-through traffic.

As we look at the future of the Presidio with ever more uses of attraction to visitors to the Presidio, it seems to me that removing some of the volume of that cut-through traffic is an important goal to make the Presidio more accessible to the new visitors that you are going to be enticing into the Presidio. I actually believe that the closure of Presidio Boulevard is an extreme step that need not be taken to really effectively address the cut-through traffic problem. There are intermediate measures that can be taken that I think at peak commute hours can dramatically reduce cut-through traffic.

I'm deeply concerned that the Girard Avenue exit, while it will serve the very excellent purpose of allowing immediate access into the Presidio for people that are truly visiting the Presidio, it will offer an enticing opportunity for Marin commuters to transit the Presidio to the Lombard or Presidio gates to avoid the congestion of Lombard Avenue and Richardson Boulevard.

I think that it's important that the Trust continue to look at this issue. I hope that they don't wait for that problem to present itself to start a six- to 12-month process to try and deal with it at that time. I really would hope that the Trust might take proactive steps today to work with the communities to implement restrictions, turning restrictions at the Girard-Lincoln intersection to avoid traffic turning into a major commute thoroughfare through the Presidio in the mornings and in the evenings.

Again, I note the comments in the report that suggest that we can wait to see if that problem arises to deal with it, but that may be too late a time to be doing that. So I urge the Trust to keep the effort up, dialoging with the neighboring communities, and pursuing some intermediate measures short of closing Presidio Boulevard. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you very much. We have Greg Scott, Patricia Vaughey and Lynne Newhouse Segal.

Greg Scott: Hi. I'm Greg Scott. I'm the President of Pacific Heights Residents Association, which [does] immediately [abut] the Presidio. Our mission as Pacific Heights Residents Association is to preserve and protect and maintain the residential character of the neighborhood. That is our main priority.

I'm here simply to reinforce our concerns that until Doyle Drive is complete, there not be major changes in road closures – closing the Presidio Gate for the Traffic-Calming Study, in our view, simply diverted traffic into other residential streets, and forced it into Cow Hollow and into the part of Pacific Heights that abuts Lyon Street, and the Arguello Gate for a lot of people who otherwise would have been coming and going from the Presidio Gate.

We think it's very important that we not close one gate, which is simply going to force a lot of that traffic onto residential streets and other parts of the City. We've got to take that into account as we

look at how we do manage the traffic, and how we do not just simply move the problem from one neighborhood to another.

It's not appropriate to burden the neighbors adjoining Lyon Street, Lombard and Arguello to keep traffic from going through the Presidio Gate. And we were very concerned that that not be made something permanent, and that we wait until Doyle Drive is complete before we would possibly be thinking about any other closures, which is what we were told.

[Unintelligible] together for district [unintelligible] meeting for District II, and we were told at that meeting by the representatives of the Traffic-Calming Study that there would be no further closures. We hope that indeed will be the case. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Patricia Vaughey: Patricia Vaughey. [Unintelligible] about the Presidio Trust, number one, is to make plans for things they don't have money on. Our association supported the Disney Museum because it was financed. Today, I spent three and a half hours discussing the Metro Theater on Union Street. It was our group that saved the Presidio Theater on Chestnut, that helped save the Marina Theater on Chestnut. And now the Metro.

Can they make it when they have a three screen commercial theater planned for the middle of the Presidio. This program that you have

may be on land that has significant historical significance. I will bring this up later. Number two is you didn't work with the neighbors. We have arts. We have culture too. And we want to share it with the people who come to the Presidio.

I firmly believe that there is another issue behind this theater renovation and expansion, and I would look seriously into what really is leading the charge on this. I'm not sure if it's [unintelligible] people. I think you better look at this extremely well before you move on it, and the location of it.

Number three, I disagree with you, Mr. Widman. I have an articulated bus now that changes gears in front of my house at 5:30 every morning. I don't think the MUNI plan has worked. But there's another issue coming up concerning MUNI changes, and it's the 43 Masonic. 43 Masonic stops at Lyon and Lombard every day and goes through the Presidio.

They want to change it, because they said first that the National Park Service wanted it, and that that the Trust wanted the 43 Masonic to be relocated into the transit hub. Well, 200 senior citizens who use that bus to go to the doctor. They cannot walk to Chestnut Street. They get on the bus. They get off at Divisadero. They get off at Pierce. It takes them two minutes to get across, but they have a place to go, a street where they can buy their products and have some socialization.

Why the Trust and the National Park Service are pushing the movement of this particular line just befuddles me. It's their connections to their doctors, to their food. And I think you should really consider what it is.

Now the traffic studies, real fast, asking people to really ask were not made according to instructions if this is what we want, but should we have it, to do the studies. Thank you.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you.

Lynne Segal: Hi. Lynne Newhouse Segal. I didn't expect to speak tonight, and I didn't expect to be last. It just worked on that way. I'm only speaking because I wanted to thank you, as I sat here and realized what a different atmosphere this is. I've been coming to your meetings. I've seen Board members come and go. I've seen Executive Directors come and go over the years. And this really feels like the beginning of you're working with the neighbors.

Hopefully your response on the traffic closures, and on the traffic study, and commitments that you've made to the neighbors about working with them, and about working with the Doyle Drive closure, and not making any further closures until after that's finished, until Doyle Drive construction is finished – it's all really a very, very good indication.



I love seeing the two Nancy's who are our neighbors right here. I know that you're not just ruling for us, but that you're our neighbors, and you're going to have to deal with the same changes that we are. So I thank you very, very much.

Nancy Bechtle: Thank you very much for those comments. Yes, we are your neighbors. And Lynne was the last speaker that we had.

I want to say something just kind of in general. It's been very educational, I think, for all the Board members to be sitting here. I like this format a lot better than the other ones. The only difficulties are going to be when we have 500 people who want to make comments. We're not going to be able to sit down here, because nobody's going to be able to see. So I don't know what's going to happen.

The other thing is is that I've heard some of the testimony tonight, people disagreeing with each other. I think that there is kind of a healthy debate. Not everybody is going to see things in the same way. There are many of us who've kind of been neighbors of the Presidio for our whole lives. We may see things different than you do. I think the important thing is for us to be listening to each other along the way.

Are there any comments from any Board members? Would someone like to move for adjournment?

Curtis Feeny: I move.

Nancy Bechtle: Is there a second?

Male Voice: [Unintelligible].

Nancy Bechtle: Okay. We have now adjourned at 8:59. So thank you all for coming. [Applause]

[End of recorded material]