



NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS FOR PRESIDIO PLANNING

3819 Divisadero Street, #1, San Francisco, California 94123

415-474-2466 hulka@earthlink.net

Cow Hollow Association

Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association

Lake Street Residents Association

Laurel Heights Improvement Association

Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association

Marina Community Association

Pacific Heights Residents Association

Planning Association for the Richmond

Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors

Presidio Terrace Association

Sea Cliff Properties Association

West Presidio Neighborhood Association

15 February 2010

Mr. Craig Middleton, Executive Director
Presidio Trust

RE: NAPP comments on the Draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the Main Post Update (MPU) to the Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP).

Dear Craig,

Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning (NAPP) is pleased to be included in this Section 106 Consultation for the first time in our history, but regret that the time between the last Resolution Phase Meeting (Jan. 26) and the deadline for these comments (Feb. 15, 2010) was inadequate for us to take a formal vote of our member groups. As the combined voice for more than 10 neighborhood groups, we needed a minimum of 30 days to provide you with the comprehensive and detailed comments that are fully vetted, as our bylaws require.

NAPP is pleased to point out, however, that three of our member groups are also Consulting Parties: (Cow Hollow Association (CHA); Laurel Heights Improvement Association (LHIA); and Marina Community Association (MCA). Each is submitting more detailed comments on behalf of their own groups. In addition, NAPP endorses the comments submitted by the National Park Service (NPS).

The following is intended to summarize NAPP's key concerns:

1. The National Park Service should be a full Signatory Party to the PA with the same role and rights as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for all the reasons set forth in the CHA comment letter.
2. The Consulting Parties, Concurring Parties and the public should be permitted to trigger an ACHP review. These parties should be allowed to review project plans and schematic drawings.
3. In transitioning to a national park, the Presidio Trust should commit to the use and development of its historic resources on an equal basis, if not as a first priority, to the development of non-historic properties.
4. The duration of the PA should be limited to five years.
5. NAPP urges the Trust to include the Main Parade Ground in the PA. That the Trust conducted a review process of the MPG in advance of the PA is a weak rationalization for excluding the development of this vital resource from the PA.
6. Realistic standards that respect the past should be applied consistently to the various projects in the PA.

a. **El Presidio.** NAPP assumes that the demolition of Buildings 40 and 41 is no longer a consideration. Absent another site within the Main Post, we urge the Trust not to remove

them from their current site and instead retain them as part of the rich history of the site.

b. **The Lodge.** This project continues to be the square peg in the round hole, except instead of square it apparently involves 10 or more long, rectangular structures massed tightly together on the east side of the Main Parade. The historic justification for the location of the project does not appear to be credible.

c. **The Head of the Main Parade.** NAPP is relieved that the scale of the use of this site will be limited to the existing structures. While the bowling alley is not historic, it represents a social aspect of military life, and it should either be retained as-is or relocated elsewhere in the Presidio.

d. **The Presidio Chapel.** NAPP urges that the restrictions placed on the chapel new construction be consistent with those imposed on the Disney Museum and the Presidio Theater, both of which have been permitted to add substantial additions that are functionally aligned with the historic structure.

e. **Montgomery Street Barracks.** NAPP urges that at least a significant portion of one or more of the barracks be used to present the Presidio's history to the public. The history of the Presidio needs to be told and be experienced through a comprehensive presentation of exhibits and interpretation beyond just the heritage center and the visitors' center.

7. A comprehensive Transportation and Parking Plan should be an integral component of the PA, as opposed to relying on an out of date plan or postponing the development of a comprehensive plan until after committing to major projects.

The parking plan presented to the public in 2005 and approved by the Trust in 2007 is far different from what was proposed in the February 2009 Main Post Update, and then further revised in Appendix H of the November 2009 Draft MPU-PA. While NAPP has participated in the SEIS process, further participation and review are called for due to the continuing change in content and likely phasing of scheduled demolitions and construction of new street parking, surface lots and possibly underground garages. By including a comprehensive Transportation Plan (with pedestrian circulation patterns considered also) for consultation under Section II C, NAPP would be assured of informative exchanges between the Trust, federal and state agencies, concerned public interest and neighborhood groups, which we believe have proven to be beneficial for the Park.

We understand that the changing nature of the current and planned use of buildings, the Main Parade and Anza Esplanade at the Main Post have differing impacts on the number of visitors and employees to expect. The transportation models used in the past in PTMP and updated to some degree in subsequent MPU/SEIS are inadequate and further review is necessary. For example, the previous efforts did not consider use of remote or satellite parking areas on the edges of the Park as an alternative to providing parking spaces for 2000 vehicles in the Main Post. We believe this should be seriously evaluated,

NAPP also understands that the Trust and NPS are in agreement that parking changes in the Trust Area B will have significant impacts on NPS Area A. Policies for the two areas must be developed in tandem to provide the best service to visitors at both areas. We urge the Trust and the NPS to work together now to coordinate policies and to determine jointly where the best locations for new parking areas would be, and how shuttle service might be used.

We understand the current budget and construction plan calls for removing the asphalt parking lot at the Main Parade Ground, for the purpose of greening those seven acres for a park-like setting. To replace the lost parking spaces, the plan calls for removing Herbst Hall and converting a large area there to parking, as well as completing the area behind the Montgomery St Barracks.

However, we are not convinced that increasing parking in front of the Child Development Center

and Adult Care Center is good for the people using those facilities. The number of cars entering and using the area would increase from 35 or so to 235, a very significant increase. If that can be avoided and parking found elsewhere, it would better serve the uses of those two centers. Also, if parking could be found elsewhere, including areas outside the Main Post, in combination with shuttle services, Herbst Hall could be retained as a facility that continues to serve community needs, instead of destroying a functional building.

We are also concerned about the plan to add parking on both sides of Montgomery Street, in front of the newly landscaped frontage. First, it is the primary route for vehicles traveling in all directions. To line the street with two files of parked cars does not seem a good solution. This will be one of the areas of greatest pedestrian use for visitors to the museums, theater, chapel, visitor center and interpretive programs in the Barrack buildings. To the extent Montgomery Street can be free of traffic and parking, the area will look better aesthetically, and provide a calmer and more historic view of the heart of the Presidio.

NAPP is concerned about the amount and location of traffic and parking in the Main Post. We believe other areas can be utilized to relieve the pressure at the Main Post, e.g., Fort Scott, Crissy Field, Letterman garage, near the entrance to the Golden Gate Bridge, and other parking areas within the Park. We strongly urge the Trust to engage outside consultants to prepare a comprehensive Transportation Plan that would take into consideration existing building use and related employee and visitor data, would seek the best locations throughout the Park for replacing parking spaces removed from the Main Parade, and determine the likely level of expected demand both in Area A and B over the long run.

8. Plans for the Heritage Center should be more fully integrated into the MPU and where appropriate, into the consultation process. Even though no adverse effect on Building 50 is anticipated, the more clarity and public information available on this major Main Post component, the better.

Cordially,

Judith Hulka
President
Neighborhood Associations
For Presidio Planning