

# CRISSY FIELD CENTENNIAL REPAIR, PRESIDIO

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

PEPC Project ID: 63094

Documents:

Categorical Exclusion Documentation (72088)

Schematic Design (72089)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,08,2016 22:17:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I take strong issue regarding the assessment that the impact to Visitor Use and Experience-Recreation Resources is non-significant. The board sailing community has voiced strong concern to those pushing this project that the proposed layout will have a strong negative impact on our ability to rig our equipment and access the beach. As currently configured, there is ample parking and grass rigging area on the west end of the parking lot (the only part of the lot directly adjacent to the beach.) This current configuration was the result of years of working with the NPS and other stakeholders in the late 1990's to develop a layout that worked for board sailors as well as other stakeholders. That process was codified as part of an EIR that is a binding legal document for this location.

The proposed layout will reduce that parking by half and force the sailing community further away from the beach into a large asphalt parking lot.

I find it hard to believe that a project that was conceived in February has only two months later decided that it is categorically excluded from any Environment Impact Studies. There are viable alternatives to this layout that would address maintenance concerns while maintaining the current shoreline access to recreational users. I would strongly recommend that those alternatives be looked and assessed with the same level of attention as this radical reconfiguration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 12:02:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,

The plans for redesigning the parking and recreational areas at East Beach Crissy Field do not at all seem to fall under the category of 'deferred maintenance', but rather a complete redesign. This redesign will have very large negative impacts on the group of park users who need to access the water with windsurfing, kiting, and paddling gear.

I understand the need to create paved parking spaces, but there is a huge need for many more spaces in the far west portion of the park. You have created a lot of parking spaces, but they are far, far to the east of the current parking areas, and they do not provide safe access, let alone really any practical access to the water.

I believe the redesign of the parking as you put forth will cause a great amount of congestion and problems in the west end of the park, and it is completely unnecessary. Please create more parking on the west end with plenty of adjacent grass for gear so that the longtime windsurfing, kiting, and paddling uses can continue.

Thank you,

Dianne Younger Rosse

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 12:23:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have already provided a comment in opposition to this project but would like to add that we would typically see multiple design alternatives in a process like this. That process would allow review and assessment of the pros and cons of each scheme. What I see is a single design riddled with flaws that will adversely affect many of the current users of this park. I would strongly recommend developing multiple alternatives as a vehicle to build consensus towards a path forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 12:25:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would also like to add that under the heading of "plan process" on this site, there is no information. Is this the final design? Will there be any public hearings? What is the timeline of this project? The public is being kept in the dark.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 17:17:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I can download the document but not open it. How may I obtain a hard copy?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,10,2016 11:24:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Greg and I am writing to you to strongly protest the plan for re-structuring the parking area of Crissy Field near and around the bathrooms at the east beach as well as the parking area just east of the bathrooms.

As a windsurfer and frequent user of this area, along with many of my fellow windsurfer/kiter companions,

the current/existing arrangement works quite well. There has never been any problems regarding enough parking etc.

for all who use Crissy Field (including non-windsurfer/kiters).

Instead, the effort should be placed on a better maintenance plan to keep the grass areas healthier.

This would make much more sense and would be a considerably easier/less costly process. The grass

areas

near the bathrooms and especially east of the bathroom "patch" are in need of care and have been quite neglected, resulting in the current state of mostly sand/gravel/dirt where there was once lawn/grass.

This entire area has been largely catered to the windsurfing/kiting community. It works quite well as is-it simply needs more maintenance.

The new plan would be costly and would have a negative impact on our community. I see no benefits at all.

The current layout lends itself quite well to a very friendly and social atmosphere as well as being very efficient in our community.

The new plan would greatly hinder this.

I will continue to fight against this new plan and will encourage people to do the same.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Greg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 7 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,10,2016 15:41:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS made a few revisions to there east beach parking and promenade redesign after the two meet and greet informational meetings at the east beach parking lot and a private meeting with the SFBA, the changes were some more parking and a better turn around west of the bathrooms. This is an improvement, but the entire plan has many flaws.

On the weekends, you will really be hampered to find easy access parking for windsurfing and kite-boarding.

The park service is trying to fast track this, the history of the original EIR is that San Francisco board sailors are original stake holders and east beach including the parking was to give sailors easy access to the beach. This money is meant for differed maintenance, not a redesign. This token 15 day comments period is disingenuous. Any redesign should require a full EIR. The NPS may be in violation of the CZMA and NEPA, plus any changes require BCDC approval.

Paved area to increase by 50 percent. Turf planting for parking not thriving". Completely untrue...the back grass areas, where they have actually put in the slightest effort to water and aerate, are totally healthy. That gets a ton of parking volume too. The middle square to the east is a wasteland...but it's been ignored for at least a few years. Maybe put in a slight effort to maintain what you have? Not a shock that if you leave something to die, it dies...

"Inefficient parking layout...weekend needs". Very disingenuous. There are literally only about 6-8 days per YEAR when the place is totally full. Just the big holiday weekends. Rest of the year can be busy, but there is always room no matter what time you arrive. Who cares if the parking is "casual", as they say, if it's not \*full\*?

Just imagine carrying your rig across 30 feet of promenade as apposed to the current 20 feet, with all the people and bicycles. The NPS says it will move congestion along, I say it will create more congestion.

All those preferred parking spots to on the west side of the parking lot will be in competition with picnickers and dog walkers. All the other parking is for tourist whom do not know better.

It is not going to be easy to get your gear setup and carry it to a lawn area if you have to park in the main parking lot squeezed together. Not to mention numerous trips back and forth to your car.

there is an agenda playing out here, to make this more people centrist, and anti car, the east beach was designed for multiple recreational use.

The drawing regarding the east limit of the beach is not correct. It doesn't correctly display the fenced off rip-rap dunes that extend further to the west, visible in the Google Earth photo.

The drawing appears to show the beach extending so far east that it would be accessible to most of the huge paved area which goes all the way to the existing Crissy Center. That eastern half of parking area would not be directly accessible to the beach.

They NPS needs to rethink the design of the parking at the east end of the lot. The way it is currently proposed, it is going to feel like a huge asphalt parking lot in front of a Target. Maybe they could convert the middle aisle into grass that could be used for rigging but also to make that area feel a little less "mean"

The NPS should use the money to fix the sewer line, maintain and fix the east beach bathrooms. Fix the drainage of the promenade, keeping it at it's current 20 foot width. And restore and maintain the current parking lawns and parking configuration.

Concerns about speeding in the parking lot can be fixed with speed bumps and stop signs at the intersections in the parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,10,2016 19:14:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed reconfiguration of Crissy Field and parking must be delayed to include ample public input. Allowing only 15 days for users of Crissy Field to organize and provide comments sends a the wrong message, that the NPS intends to exclude the public from commenting and providing full and complete feedback on the redesign.

As a frequent user of Crissy Field more than 200 days last year. The changes the NPS is proposing to make will make the area more tourist friendly by increasing the size of the promenade and paved parking. But that is not what the frequent users want. The promenade is adequate, part of the problem currently is the benches and people sitting on the benches take up 6-8 feet of the current promenade. Rather than increasing the size of the promenade the benches should be moved back to allow for full utilization of the current 20ft promenade. At times the promenade is full with dogs, bikers and walkers, so moving the benches back to allow full utilization of the 20ft promenade will be more than adequate.

The proposed parking lot is overkill and will make Crissy Field feel like a Target in the suburbs.

This project must be delayed to allow for a full EIR to take place and allow full and complete public input. It should be in the NPS interest to engage the entire public to ensure that National Park which is the taxpayers after all is designed according to their use. The attempt by the NPS to speed up the project and

exempt the project from full public review is wrong and against the principles of the country we live in.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,11,2016 12:35:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TO: NPS Staff

I am glad to see a comprehensive approach, as opposed to piecemeal, being proposed. Periodic improvements are necessary to accommodate the growing number of visitors. The project appears to be a reasonable balance between human and environmental use dynamics. Although.....

Two concerning considerations are?

1. Adequate sea level rise ADAPTATION design for the lifespan?
2. Adequate swale filtration for the increase in automobile by-products carried by storm water activity?

Congratulations on the anniversary fundraising challenge!

Respectfully

Ron Maykel  
Pacifica,CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 10    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,11,2016 13:25:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I welcome the opportunity to add my insight to the process. Thank you for the outreach. I am a regular user of crissy field- coming there almost 200x a year for the past 15 year to windsurf, kiteboard and spent time with my family on the beach. It is practically my living room. Your design changes seem like a great improvement to whats already there but I do have some concerns with the massive amounts of pavement proposed for parking at the eastern side of east beach. To me it seems like another giant Wall Mart or Cosco parking lot with no regard to the existing site. I'd hope some of the center rows could be reserved for more open green space or at least use a greener product- like turf paving vs that of asphalt. I understand this comes with additional cost but I come to the beach to get away from parking lots!

I welcome the expanded grass areas by the restroom to the promenade but question the logic after 6 years of drought. Non watering of the existing green areas led to much of the under performance of the site. How will this be maintained in the future? I also wonder how you might be able to reuse the water from the (now turned off) shower to add in irrigation of the site but realize this is beyond the scope of the proposed project.

This brings me to my main point which is the categorical exemption of the scope of the project vs that of a more normal environmental review process. It seems you are forcing a major design change to the area where the board sailors use the most. Back in the 90's, the designers of this place worked with many stakeholders (including the windsurfing community) to develop a consensus plan that was amenable to everyone. That process was very deliberate and thoughtful and the current design is codified by an

environmental document that includes legal protections.

I wonder how a more basic maintenance of the site over the years would not have led to its decline. I hope you could learn from this lessons and not propose massive design changes but work periodically to maintain the site more regularly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 11    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,11,2016 17:56:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

These are major changes to the Chrissy Field area and will have significant impacts on local character and use patterns, not to mention the impact of all the extra paving. The informal lots can be kept up with a small amount of effort and we don't need to pave such a huge swath of land. The definitely should require an EIR and the short comment period is a farce. Please extend the comment period and pursue an EIR as you should. It seems like the EIR process is being short-cut as the redesign planners know that it would not hold up to scrutiny.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,12,2016 10:39:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

I am against a categorical exclusion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,12,2016 15:09:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

I am against a categorical exclusion, this makes no sense.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 14    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,13,2016 11:01:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 15    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,14,2016 09:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR.

You are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.  
I am against a categorical exclusion.

Hello,

The National Park Service / GGNRA was awarded centennial deferred maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust. These funds should be used for deferred maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign.

The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out as detailed in the original EIR of 1996. There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I am a regular user of Crissy Field East Beach and I the current configuration works well. Certainly there is no need to increase the amount of fully paved parking area. That would reduce the natural character of this beautiful area. If anything, some of the current parking area should be replaced with permeable pavers.

The park service has been negligent in its maintenance of the grassy areas. Why aren't these areas properly maintained as is?

The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet. I want less paved and more grass like it already is.

Spend the 5 million on improving the promenade without widening it. Perhaps better seating and some lane markings for peds and bicycles. Fix the bathrooms and sewer line. Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow traffic down.

Please, no additional paving! Paving and cars are OBSOLETE. We should be building and investing in infrastructure for PEOPLE, not cars.

thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 16    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service:

I object to the proposed redraw of East Beach parking based on the following:

1. Categorical Exemption being used to bypass regular environmental process claims no impact on recreational use. This is not true. East Beach Windsurf and Kitesurf communities have been trying to work with the Park Service to document the loss of 75 spaces at the only available windsurf and kite surf access dramatically affects recreational use especially during the weekends.
2. The windsurf and kite surf communities were (San Francisco Board Sailing Association) worked in partnership with the Park on the planning of the current East Beach parking plan. The results were useable for these communities as well as general public. Reduction of 75 spaces in this critical remaining area greatly reduces recreational access for these communities.
3. Moving all the parking to an area with no space, and no grass, takes the one final place that the Park has clustered windsurfing and kitesurfing activists and prohibits them from accessing areas to rig and prepare their kites and sails.

While we understand there are reasons the Park must spend funds this year, please register my opposition to this plan and add a request for a more considered process including the communities who helped develop the current East Beach plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 17    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 11:25:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is wrong to bypass the systematic review of the plans. When Crissy field was first redesigned, the SFBA was heavily involved in the design of the current parking lot along with the other key stakeholders, and it continues to be. Years of meetings and consensus building went into this process. We didn't get everything we wanted, but we got a place that has worked well for us over the last 15 years. If you intend to redesign this place, you cannot short circuit this process. Two weeks is not enough time to allow for public comment. Removing 75 parking places and moving them to a paved lot will certainly have an effect on recreation use. This is a redesign and not a refurbishment, so you must consult with everyone involved. Failing to do this makes your department look very underhanded and shady. The money is given for refurbishment- not redesign. There are many refurbishments needed at Crissy Field including the bathrooms and showers which are in a horrible state. Sarah Cox

---

**Correspondence ID:** 18    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,16,2016 12:31:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service:

I object to the proposed redraw of East Beach parking based on the following:

1. Categorical Exemption being used to bypass regular environmental process claims no impact on recreational use. This is not true. East Beach Windsurf and Kitesurf communities have been trying to work with the Park Service to document the loss of 75 spaces at the only available windsurf and kite surf access dramatically affects recreational use especially during the weekends.
2. The windsurf and kite surf communities (San Francisco Board Sailing Association) worked in partnership with the Park on the planning of the current East Beach parking plan. The results were useable for these communities as well as general public. Reduction of 75 spaces in this critical remaining area greatly reduces recreational access for these communities.
3. Moving all the parking to an area with no space, and no grass, takes the one final place that the Park has clustered windsurfing and kitesurfing activists and prohibits them from accessing areas to rig and prepare their kites and sails.

While we understand there are reasons the Park must spend funds this year, please register my opposition to this plan and add a request for a more considered process including the communities who helped develop the current East Beach plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 19    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,16,2016 12:54:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A categorical exemption that claims no impact on recreational use is not true. This impacts our recreational use by eliminating existing parking spots (75) in the western part of the parking lot. The western parking area is crucial. This should not be a redesign without going through the appropriate process. Many of the claims in the document are not true and are highlighting non-existent problems and do not address actual problems, such as not maintaining current grass areas. Do NOT railroad us by redesigning our park without allowing for input to the process from recreational users. A categorical exemption allows for interests of users to be disregarded and our precious resource be redesigned at the whim of the NPS. Please refurbish the promenade into a more barefoot friendly surface, renovate the bathrooms, and maintain the grass of the current footprint as the money was intended.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 20    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088



**Received:** Apr,16,2016 14:57:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm opposed to a categorical exclusion to an EIR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 21    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 15:02:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a massive parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

There is NO WAY this will / should / can pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as dicondra repens which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

There is NO WAY this will pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA. This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a massive parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

I hope you will coordinate with the San Francisco Boardsailing Association to develop a mutually acceptable plan so that the plan can move forward expeditiously without a massive amount of wasted funds on all sides.

Susan Samols

---

**Correspondence ID:** 22    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 15:27:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I do not think that the current Crissy Field reconfiguration project should qualify for a categorical exclusion from an EIR. Some parts of the project, such as the resurfacing of the promenade, are clearly maintenance and are necessary. However, the complete reconfiguration of the parking lot, including paving over most of the eastern portion, is a huge change and does in fact impact the area in a big way. There are many statements in the document I find misleading and disturbing, however I would like to comment on two main points.

The document states the existing turf parking is too difficult to maintain and seems to allude to the drought as the problem because now it cannot be watered. However, the some of the turf areas were never really maintained or allowed to thrive. The areas that were watered and maintained (in the back of the park) do just fine with parking and use. Creating huge swaths of asphalt in this beautiful area is not at all the original intent and should not be fast tracked just because it is convenient.

The document states that recreational use will not be impacted by the redesign of the parking lot, but that is certainly not true. The west side of the park is heavily used by boardsailors, paddlers, and other water sports users. It is critical, not just convenient, that we have access to the water on the west side of the park, as this is the only reasonably safe area to launch. The design currently eliminates much parking on that end of the park, which will cause congestion and intense competition for parking with picnickers and other users of the park. In order for the design not to impact water users in a significant negative way, it must include more parking with more adjacent grassy areas for rigging and staging. This design is going to cause trouble between different users and will absolutely impede access to the water and create safety issues for watersport users.

Thank you,

Dianne Younger Rosse

---

**Correspondence ID:** 23    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 09:42:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There is NO WAY this will pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA. This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a massive parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 24    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 11:27:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There should be an environmental impact study. This is a major reconfiguration of a federal park close to the bay. The project increases pavement areas and adds drainage swale which is either going to be a tripping hazard or result in more ugly safety fencing around a mall style parking lot. The handicapped and water users will lose frontage parking. Pedestrian traffic to the water will be more congested during peak periods. Widening the promenade without bike lanes and speed bumps will create more random behavior by tourists, much like the waterfront at Fishermans wharf. Resurfacing and crowning the bike path is a worthy project, but there are more important maintenance issues that building a paved parking lot.

The estuary creek meanders through the beach and creates a standing water problem every year. The creek should have a permanent engineered canal lined with stone that will empty efficiently into the bay. The bathrooms should be repaired and upgraded. The showers have been shut off for a year. A desalinator powered by wind is well within the capabilities of the park and would be a great demonstration project. The public walks were limited in providing information and taking statements from concerned park users.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 25    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 14:42:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been going to Crissy Field for 20 years to run, picnic, windsurf, kiteboard and stand up paddle board.

The proposed redesign of the parking at Crissy field flies directly in the face of all of the work the SF Board Sailing Association did to continued recreational water use for those of us with windsurfing, kiteboarding and paddle boards.

We need MORE parking spaces on the west side of the parking lot - not less. That is why these parking spots are the first to fill up on any busy day. Taking away parking and access in these areas does a huge disservice to a large community that has very little water access in the first place due to the need for precise wind directions, speeds and safe access.

Please do not move forward with this plan until the entire community has a chance to provide input and make this work for all of us.

Rebecca  
415.378.3395

---

**Correspondence ID:** 26    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 18:05:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Resurface Crissy Field Promenade and Reconfigure East Beach Parking Area

project needs a full EIR. How can NPS say that this proposed project and redesign of the park will not have any significant impact? Please conduct a full EIR before continuing with this project. I am against a categorical exclusion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 27    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 19:55:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The current Exclusion Plan for re-configuration of the Crissy Field parking area is ill-advised, rushed, flawed, and based on incorrect statements, premises and facts.

The current Exclusion Plan appears to have been carefully crafted to try to avoid the proper reviews by lumping all users, use cases, and the entire Crissy Field parking area together as one, thereby hiding the fact that real changes in the use, type of use, and impact to users are being proposed.

The current Exclusion Plan is being put forward with undue haste. The short comment period provided for the Exclusion Plan is an example of the hurried and flawed process. The proposed changes to the parking area amount to a re-design of the parking area and certainly do not correspond to the stated purpose for use of funds provided to cover maintenance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 28    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** The plans do a good job of remedying current problem areas. Given climate change and the drought, it's time to consider a longer horizon plan to extend the marsh westward and eliminate some of the overly big airfield.

Richard Tilles

Sent from my iPad

---

**Correspondence ID:** 29    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 17:29:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board has adopted a Total Maximum Daily Load for Crissy Field Beach to address exceedances of water quality objectives for bacteria. One way to reduce bacteria inputs to the beach water is to reduce stormwater runoff that drains to the beach. In my reading of your plans, it appears the improvements will slow the discharge of runoff by routing it through swales. The design specifications were not found, but we would expect that runoff from smaller storms could be completely treated by the swales. We support improvements in number and capacity of stormwater treatment units. We also suggest a serious effort to increase pet waste bag stations and public education on keeping pet waste off the entire beach area. Please let me know if you would like more information about the role of GGNRA in implementing the bacteria TMDL for Crissy Field Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 30    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 18:53:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to voice my concern over the proposed "re-design" of the Crissy Field parking area. My primary CONCERN is the significant reduction in parking, combined with increased distance from proposed parking to the grassy areas used by both the Windsurf and Kitesurf communities on a regular basis.

I am a windsurfer for the past 32 years. I moved to San Francisco in 2009 from the East Coast because of my passion for Windsurfing. During the "season" from March to September, I am often at Crissy Field 4 days a week in the late afternoons to Windsurf.

Crissy Field provides a WORLD CLASS windsurfing launch, and supports a vibrant, enthusiastic group of men and women who enjoy both windsurf and kitesurfing from this location.

Our combined passion for the Wind and Water conditions will not change. Your layout will cause Windsurfers and Kitesurfers to be carrying their greater distances from the parking areas to the beach, causing increased traffic and chaos in the area.

What is the "GOAL" of the money being spent? The location is beautiful and functional already. Please consider the voices and concerns of the Windsurf and Kitesurf community.

Regards,

- James

---

**Correspondence ID:** 31    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,19,2016 09:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

I am against a categorical exclusion.

This looks like much more than differed maintenance with increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet.

Please do not rush this through with a 15 day comment period.

I beg of you to use the proper procedures and propose a better design.

I have confidence that you can and will choose to do the right thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 32    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,19,2016 13:35:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Are you seriously removing 75 parking spaces from Crissy Field lot? The traffic at this location is already incredibly intense, removing these spots achieves very little, and hurts the local community who enjoys the space. We have local users of the park that are present at this location every single day. Please do not go around the normal process to "upgrade" this site without consulting the local opinion. Losing any parking, let alone 75 spots is nothing but a terrible idea.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 33    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,19,2016 23:05:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am responding to problems I see with the Schematic Design of the Crissy Field resurfacing.

First off, my background is that I am an Orthopedic Surgeon who grew up in the Bay Area. I spent much of my youth sailing dinghies and windsurfers at the City Front. My first job was with a surf shop just up the street from Crissy Field. I have a busy orthopedic practice in San Francisco and commonly come down to Crissy Field to decompress after a weeks work.

I knew Crissy Field when it was a concrete lot with a few government buildings. When the current park design was planned, I got to see the public process in action. A mentor of mine, Dr. Paul Heineken was instrumental in some of the features of the current design. It was fascinating to hear him talk about how various features of the park provided numerous options to the various user groups that frequent the park. I don't think even he conceived of how great a success this urban wetland has become!

The current layout of the East Beach Parking involves large areas of grass parking that unfortunately due to drought, and deferred maintenance has become a blight, which I believe is what is prompting the current redesign.

The solution does nothing but make this eyesore permanent by paving over it with asphalt. This has all of the beauty and functionality of a strip mall parking lot.

Remember that the reason for using grass as a parking surface in the initial design was to allow for multiple uses of this very precious waterfront space. During holiday weekends, and high use days, the grass surface serves to provide parking. But on weeknights when the lot is less than 25% capacity, the grass parking area becomes a soccer field, a race track for RC cars, a place for workouts for fitness groups, among other uses. Paving the space means that it becomes a very efficient parking area, but not much more.

I would support the using of pavers or a grid to help support the turf and prevent excessive wear that is causing problems with the current design but feel that the plan as proposed should not be accepted without further public review. Remember how valuable this space is. Don't squander it by turning it into a "parking lot".

With best regards, Dr. Nicholas H. Mast

---

**Correspondence ID:** 34 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,19,2016 23:08:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance' plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a

grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as dicondra repens which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

There is NO WAY this will pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA. This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a massive parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 35    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 02:27:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

As an avid kiter and windsurfer I'm against this categorical exclusion.

This area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA and we used it for a very long time as windsurfing recreational area

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

We need some grassy area and not huge paved parking lot.

With best regards,  
Dmytro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 36    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 12:41:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,  
you the National Park Service GGNRA were awarded centennial differed maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust, great.  
Use it for differed maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign.  
The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996.  
There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.  
I like the current configuration. The park service has been negligent in it's maintenance of the grassy areas, I wonder if on purpose to help along someones agenda on their view of how crissy field east beach parking is supposed to look.  
The grassy/dirt casual parking is wonderful, people/families park and pick-nick right by there car. I love it that there is lawn available were ever you park.  
The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.  
Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet.  
I want less paved and more grass like it already is.  
Spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade with out widening it, this will only cause congestion of people loitering, it will not help move the flow of people, and bicycles.Fix the bathrooms and sewer line.  
Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow it down.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 37 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 13:15:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against a categorical exclusion. Grassy/dirt casual parking is wonderful, people/families park and pick-nick right by there car. I love it that there is lawn available were ever you park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 38 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 13:44:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ok, I get it that you have these matching Federal funds that you need to spend but the end of the year but THAT IS NO EXCUSE to jam a crappy plan into place. Have you ever tried to get in and out of the parking lot at Crissy on a weekend? How is the new design accommodating the traffic patterns? Your new design is classic: pave paradise and put up a parking lot. That's such a shame. Why not have a thoughtful redesign that incorporates feedback from ALL the stakeholders at Crissy? This design is an insult to all windsurfers and kitesurfers. You are basically making their lives miserable by massively reducing the softer areas for rigging sails and kites with very nearby parking. And you are not doing a proper environmental review. Don't you think such an important location so intertwined with nature deserves a proper environmental design review? The use of Crissy has massively increased over the years since the improvements have been put in place. Now your response to increased usage is to pave more and create a mall-like parking lot. Shame. You should step back, look at the situation holistically and incorporate the input from all stakeholders. The fact that Crissy is so successful as a recreation destination is great. The fact that you've got some funding to make improvements is great. The fact that you are jamming a crappy design down everyone's throats at the last minute with no input from all stakeholders is a tragedy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 39 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 18:30:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** One part of this document claims no impact on recreational use, which is just not true as it clearly impacts use of the area by windsurfers/kitesurfers..

There are two main flaws with the plan is as follows:

1. There is a net loss of 75 spaces on the west side of the lot. It is the area directly adjacent to the beach and where most of windsurfers/kitesurefrs park. With the removal of those 75 spaces, this area will be in very high demand by our community as well as dog walkers and picnickers. On the weekend, it will be very hard to park here.
2. The loss of 75 spaces is made up with a huge Walmart like parking lot at the east end of the lot. Aside from the unfriendly nature of this large parking lot, there is very little grass here. Windsurfer/kitesurfer are going to be shlepping their gear back and forth across a busy parking lot to get to grass and eventually the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 40    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 18:33:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am against the Categorical Exclusion. Please conduct a full environmental study and issue an environmental impact report. How can you say that this proposed project and redesign of the park will not have any significant impact?  
You are changing the layout of the park without need. Please explore the effects of the proposed changes before the start of the proposed changes. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 41    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 18:42:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

The National Park Service GGNRA were awarded centennial differed maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust, great. Use it for differed maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign. The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996. There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I like the current configuration. The park service has been negligent in it's maintenance of the grassy areas, I wonder if on purpose to help along someones agenda on their view of how crissy field east beach parking is supposed to look. The grassy/dirt casual parking is wonderful, people/families park and pick-nick right by there car. I love it that there is lawn available were ever you park. The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc. Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet.

I want less paved and more grass like it already is. Spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade with out widening it, this will only cause congestion of people loitering, it will not help move the flow of people, and bicycles.Fix the bathrooms and sewer line. Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow it down.

Thank you for you kind attention and consideration of my letter,

David Nelson.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 42    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 18:51:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please consider the kiteboard users and their ease of parking, access to rigging area and launch area, and safety.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 43    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 19:03:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DATE: April 20, 2016  
TO: National Park Service  
RE: Proposed Categorical Exclusion for Crissy Field Redesign

The current plan constitutes a major redesign of the Crissy Field/ East Beach Area, and it breaks the long-standing Commitments made to the Public when the Park was originally approved in 1996. The proposed public access, public use areas, traffic circulation and parking are all significantly modified compared to previously approved environmental mitigations (see Environmental Assessment approved by the National Park Service (NPS) on October 2, 1996; copy available on the NPS website; see "Additional Commitments" section of the Environmental Assessment on pages 25-27, especially items 2 and 10 and the Conclusion).

The current process has not adequately engaged the public, and the Categorical Exemption runs counter to both the spirit and content of the environmental documents that were approved in 1996 as part of a collaborative design approach with the NPS.

NPS needs to engage more deeply in the public review and approval process, and take into consideration the commitments made previously to the local community.

The proposed Categorical Exclusion for the pending redesign does not meet the minimum legal requirements.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 44    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

I am against a categorical exclusion.

National Park Service - PEPC - Categorical Exclusion Documentation -Submit Comments

NPS PEPC - Categorical Exclusion Documentation

parkplanning.nps.gov

stnad by.

Good sample letter to the park service.

Hello,

you the National Park Service GGNRA were awarded centennial differed maintenance money with

matching funds from the Haas Family trust, great.

Use it for differed maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign.

The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996.

There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I like the current configuration. The park service has been negligent in it's maintenance of the grassy areas, I wonder if on purpose to help along someones agenda on their view of how crissy field east beach parking is supposed to look.

The grassy/dirt casual parking is wonderful, people/families park and pick-nick right by there car. I love it that there is lawn available were ever you park.

The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet.

I want less paved and more grass like it already is.

Spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade with out widening it, this will only cause congestion of people loitering, it will not help move the flow of people, and bicycles. Fix the bathrooms and sewer line.

Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow it

down. <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/comment...cumentID=72089>

National Park Service - PEPC - Schematic Design - Submit Comments

NPS PEPC - Schematic Design

[parkplanning.nps.gov](http://parkplanning.nps.gov)

And some more talking points. stand by

I will go over what you have sent.

Here are some example talking points from the Sailors perspective.

The NPS made a few revisions to there east beach parking and promenade redesign after the two meet and greet informational meetings at the east beach parking lot and a private meeting with the SFBA, the changes were some more parking and a better turn around west of the bathrooms. This is an improvement, but the entire plan has many flaws. On the weekends, you will really be hampered to find easy access parking for windsurfing and kite-boarding. The park service is trying to fast track this, the history of the original EIR is that San Francisco board sailors are original stake holders and east beach including the parking was to give sailors easy access to the beach. This money is meant for differed maintenance, not a redesign. This token 15 day comments period is disingenuous. Any redesign should require a full EIR. The NPS may be in violation of the CZMA and NEPA, plus any changes require BCDC approval. Paved area to increase by 50 percent. Turf planting for parking not thriving". Completely untrue...the back grass areas, where they have actually put in the slightest effort to water and aerate, are totally healthy. That gets a ton of parking volume too. The middle square to the east is a wasteland...but it's been ignored for at least a few years. Maybe put in a slight effort to maintain what you have? Not a shock that if you leave something to die, it dies...

"Inefficient parking layout...weekend needs". Very disingenuous. There are literally only about 6-8 days per YEAR when the place is totally full. Just the big holiday weekends. Rest of the year can be busy, but there is always room no matter what time you arrive. Who cares if the parking is "casual", as they say, if it's not \*full\*? Just imagine carrying your rig across 30 feet of promenade as apposed to the current 20 feet, with all the people and bicycles. The NPS says it will move congestion along, I say it will create more congestion.

All those preferred parking spots to on the west side of the parking lot will be in competition with pic-nickers and dog walkers. All the other parking is for tourist whom do not know better. It is not going to be easy to get your gear setup and carry it to a lawn area if you have to park in the main parking lot squeezed together. Not to mention numerous trips back and forth to your car. There is an agenda playing out here, to make this more people centrist, and anti car, the east beach was designed for multiple recreational use.

The drawing regarding the east limit of the beach is not correct. It doesn't correctly display the fenced off rip-rap dunes that extend further to the west, visible in the Google Earth photo.

The drawing appears to show the beach extending so far east that it would be accessible to most of the huge paved area which goes all the way to the existing Crissy Center. That eastern half of parking area would not be directly accessible to the beach.

They NPS needs to rethink the design of the parking at the east end of the lot. The way it is currently proposed, it is going to feel like a huge asphalt parking lot in front of a Target. Maybe they could convert the middle aisle into grass that could be used for rigging but also to make that area feel a little less "mean"

The NPS should use the money to fix the sewer line, maintain and fix the east beach bathrooms. Fix the drainage of the promenade, keeping it at it's current 20 foot width. And restore and maintain the current parking lawns and parking configuration.

Concerns about speeding in the parking lot can be fixed with speed bumps and stop signs at the intersections in the parking lot.  
thank you"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 45    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 19:50:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

I am against a categorical exclusion.

National Park Service - PEPC - Categorical Exclusion Documentation -Submit Comments

NPS PEPC - Categorical Exclusion Documentation

parkplanning.nps.gov

stnad by.

Good sample letter to the park service.

Hello,

you the National Park Service GGNRA were awarded centennial differed maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust, great.

Use it for differed maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign.

The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996.

There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I like the current configuration. The park service has been negligent in it's maintenance of the grassy areas, I wonder if on purpose to help along someones agenda on their view of how crissy field east beach parking is supposed to look.

The grassy/dirt casual parking is wonderful, people/families park and pick-nick right by there car. I love it that there is lawn available were ever you park.

The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet.

I want less paved and more grass like it already is.

Spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade with out widening it, this will only cause congestion of people loitering, it will not help move the flow of people, and bicycles.Fix the bathrooms and sewer line.

Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow it

down.<https://parkplanning.nps.gov/comment...cumentID=72089>

National Park Service - PEPC - Schematic Design -Submit Comments

NPS PEPC - Schematic Design

[parkplanning.nps.gov](http://parkplanning.nps.gov)

And some more talking points stand by

I will go over what you have sent.

Here are some example talking points from the Sailors perspective.

The NPS made a few revisions to their east beach parking and promenade redesign after the two meet and greet informational meetings at the east beach parking lot and a private meeting with the SFBA, the changes were some more parking and a better turn around west of the bathrooms. This is an improvement, but the entire plan has many flaws. On the weekends, you will really be hampered to find easy access parking for windsurfing and kite-boarding. The park service is trying to fast track this, the history of the original EIR is that San Francisco board sailors are original stake holders and east beach including the parking was to give sailors easy access to the beach. This money is meant for deferred maintenance, not a redesign. This token 15 day comments period is disingenuous. Any redesign should require a full EIR. The NPS may be in violation of the CZMA and NEPA, plus any changes require BCDC approval. Paved area to increase by 50 percent. Turf planting for parking not thriving". Completely untrue...the back grass areas, where they have actually put in the slightest effort to water and aerate, are totally healthy. That gets a ton of parking volume too. The middle square to the east is a wasteland...but it's been ignored for at least a few years. Maybe put in a slight effort to maintain what you have? Not a shock that if you leave something to die, it dies...

"Inefficient parking layout...weekend needs". Very disingenuous. There are literally only about 6-8 days per YEAR when the place is totally full. Just the big holiday weekends. Rest of the year can be busy, but there is always room no matter what time you arrive. Who cares if the parking is "casual", as they say, if it's not \*full\*? Just imagine carrying your rig across 30 feet of promenade as apposed to the current 20 feet, with all the people and bicycles. The NPS says it will move congestion along, I say it will create more congestion.

All those preferred parking spots to on the west side of the parking lot will be in competition with pic-nickers and dog walkers. All the other parking is for tourist whom do not know better. It is not going to be easy to get your gear setup and carry it to a lawn area if you have to park in the main parking lot squeezed together. Not to mention numerous trips back and forth to your car. There is an agenda playing out here, to make this more people centrist, and anti car, the east beach was designed for multiple recreational use.

The drawing regarding the east limit of the beach is not correct. It doesn't correctly display the fenced off rip-rap dunes that extend further to the west, visible in the Google Earth photo.

The drawing appears to show the beach extending so far east that it would be accessible to most of the huge paved area which goes all the way to the existing Crissy Center. That eastern half of parking area would not be directly accessible to the beach.

They NPS needs to rethink the design of the parking at the east end of the lot. The way it is currently proposed, it is going to feel like a huge asphalt parking lot in front of a Target. Maybe they could convert the middle aisle into grass that could be used for rigging but also to make that area feel a little less "mean"

The NPS should use the money to fix the sewer line, maintain and fix the east beach bathrooms. Fix the drainage of the promenade, keeping it at it's current 20 foot width. And restore and maintain the current parking lawns and parking configuration.

Concerns about speeding in the parking lot can be fixed with speed bumps and stop signs at the intersections in the parking lot.  
thank you"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 46    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 21:04:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam:

Please keep Chrissy Field open as a world-class launch and landing location for kitesurfers. Thank you for your consideration. We care about this decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 47    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 21:31:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed "deferred maintenance" plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field.

Crissy field was intended to be a park and recreation area. I visit the area annually and fore kitesurfing and this plan destroys the ability to do so in the future. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade.

The proposal is unacceptable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 48    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 21:49:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm opposed to the proposed changes to the Crissy Field's East Beach parking lot.

The two main flaws with the plan are as follows:

1. There is a net loss of 75 spaces on the west side of the lot. It is the area directly adjacent to the beach and where most of us park. With the removal of those 75 spaces, this area will be in very high demand by our community as well as dog walkers and picnickers. I don't really see a problem during the week but on the weekend, it will be very hard to park here.
2. The loss of 75 spaces is made up with a huge Walmart like parking lot at the east end of the lot. Aside from the unfriendly nature of this large parking lot, there is very little grass here. If you are unlucky enough to show up late on the weekend, you are going to be shlepping your gear back and forth across a busy parking lot to get to grass and eventually the beach. In a nutshell, this sucks and is unacceptable.

Please respect the preferences of the park's most frequent users. There are not many other places where we can go to practice our favorite sport: kiteboarding

---

**Correspondence ID:** 49    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,21,2016 10:51:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

the National Park Service GGNRA was awarded centennial differed maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust.

The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996, and I disagree with the new redesign plans.

There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I appreciate the grassy/dirt casual parking and it services the current and anticipated needs of the public as well as boardsailors/kiteboarders.

The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

I would propose spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade without widening it, not increasing the parking, and perhaps getting the public showers going again instead of rushing to spend money on an ill thought out redesign.

Sincerely,

Robert Li

---

**Correspondence ID:** 50    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 11:23:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I wanted to comment on the proposed redesign of Crissy Field. I believe the the current parking and traffic flow is works given usual traffic patterns and that overflow parking on the grass is sufficient for special events and holidays.

I implore you to have a longer public discussion period before any new design is approved.

Regards,

Kevin Growney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 51    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 14:01:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid Kite-foiler, and beach goer, I object to this plan - - the beach access will be reduced causing a lot more congestion with board sailors dragging gear across busy traffic/parking areas - this plan also short circuits both critical environmental review and also working with the active and supportive community that cares for this space/resource. Please reject and significantly amend to accomodate key constituencies!

Many thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 52    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 18:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am pretty sure the scope of this project is beyond the authority of this group

without full EIR approval. This needs a full EIR you are violating key aspects of the original 1996 EIR.

I am against a categorical exclusion.

Why would you want to fastrack such a critical piece of real estate? Any effort to do so will result in an investigation that will reveal any untoward motivations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 53 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 13:08:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think this needs a full EIR as it does not match the reasoning for a categorical exclusion. Personally I would like to see more funds applied towards maintenance of existing facilities instead of wasting money on a redesign.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 54 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 14:50:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** How can the NEPA compliance for the repairs qualify as a Categorical Exclusion? NPS plans to reconfigure the park. That is not a repair. Conduct a full environmental review and issue a report indicating the impact of the proposed project. I am against a Categorical Exclusion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 55 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 15:49:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a windsurfer and user of Crissy Field, the proposed changes are not conducive to my use of the area. In particular, the proposed parking changes will cause windsurfers to park far from the launch area when crowded which is typical on weekends. Please take the input of the SFBA (San Francisco Boardsailing Association) into account before making changes. Thank You, Jonathan Hahn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 56 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 16:29:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS's request for a categorical exemption repeatedly relies on the assertion that the current Crissy parking area only holds 400 cars and there will be no net loss of parking. The parking area was originally designed to accommodate 500 cars, and in peak times holds significantly more than 400, contrary to the NPS's repeated assertions. (I understand the NPS is relying on parking counts conducted for them. As a regular user of Crissy Field I know that those counts are not accurate and are significantly underreporting the car count at peak times.) The current proposal calls for far more than maintenance, and represents a significant change to the parking lot configuration. The proposed changes will likely exacerbate overcrowded parking conditions on the weekend and worsen the traffic flow, while limiting access to regular users. While a redesign of the parking lot may be in order in the future, it should not be rushed through without full public participation and full consideration of the impact of proposed changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 57 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72088

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter



**Correspondence:** April 22, 2016

Ms. Christine Lehnertz  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Attn: Crissy Field Promenade and East Beach Parking Repairs  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Subject: Comments on the recently proposed Crissy Field Centennial Repair Project's preliminary design drawings and draft environmental review documents

Dear Ms. Lehnertz:

Crissy Field East Beach is an internationally renowned, world class boardsailing site for both windsurfing and kiteboarding. The San Francisco Boardsailing Association (SFBA) is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1986 to protect & enhance boardsailing access and to promote safety and related education in the San Francisco Bay Area, and the establishment of Crissy Field as a permanent boardsailing site was our first focus.

SFBA has been a GGNRA park-partner since 1986, the same year that Mr. Brian O'Neill (who became one of the longest tenured superintendents in the National Park Service) took charge. For the next fourteen years SFBA participated fully in every step of planning and design for Crissy East Beach as we know it today. Both during construction and since completion in 2001, SFBA has contributed over \$50,000 for enhancements (including western beach assess, public web cams and dog-wash station) and has provided volunteers for major initiatives whenever needed, including the major beach rubble removal and sand replenishment efforts when the tidal basin inlet/outlet eroded the beach to the point of extreme risk to anyone entering the water.

Over the last fifteen years SFBA has worked closely with both GGNRA and the GGNPC on the details of East Beach maintenance, modifications and additions, such as the addition of the picnic areas at the west end of East Beach and establishment of the Temporary Crissy field Center FROG buildings which are sited at the east end, currently displacing approximately 100 turf parking spots. More recently, since 2012 SFBA has worked closely with GGNPC staff on details of the "Crissy Refresh" project, which was supposed to have 'repaired' the wear and tear resulting from the America's Cup events in 2013 and has yet to be implemented.

Throughout the thirty years described above and the strong relationships built with leadership and staff at GGNRA and GGNPC, never once has SFBA questioned or needed to question proposed project agendas or NEPA compliance. Thus one can imagine our surprise when your March 2016 Centennial Repair Project proposal hit the streets with 1) no advanced notice and 2) an agenda to essentially turn much of the East Beach area into a pavement parking lot.

Additionally, while one can empathize with the desire to use a gift and grant worth \$5 Million for repair, the proposal as we see it is a complete redesign of the "use" of Crissy Field East Beach by the elimination of much of the western end pervious parking/rigging-friendly surfaces and replacement with pavement. With this in mind it is completely unrealistic to expect that a design process which took years to complete initially can be replicated with only three weeks of project introduction followed by a fourteen day comment period.

The findings in the June 1996 Crissy Field Plan Environmental Assessment state that: "Staff and designers will also work with representatives of the San Francisco Boardsailing Association on these and other details of the east beach area." True to your word, GGNRA and GGNPC representatives met with SFBA representatives in late March and early April 2016 and provided us the opportunity to:

1. Demonstrate why the western end of Crissy East Beach is so important to boardsailors for parking/rigging and launching,
2. Explain why the eastern end holds little value because of the hardened shoreline, and
3. Review, discuss and explain why the initial and current proposals are a net loss of parking/rigging (and thus access) for the boardsailing community.

SFBA appreciates the dialogue and opportunity we've had to-date to enhance the proposal by including western end vehicle circulation and reducing the overall 'take' of upwind (western end) parking/rigging-friendly surfaces; however, as the proposal stands today this area would still lose over 75 spaces. This is a significant impact which should be addressed in an Environmental Assessment (EA) at a minimum for the following reasons - This is a significant component of the parking area upwind and adjacent to the beach and adjacent to the picnic areas; they are the areas that will be in the highest demand by multiple user groups and fill up first on busy weekends. Boardsailing is an equipment intensive sport, requiring rigging-friendly surfaces adjacent to one's vehicle, and thus these are the areas that are the only practical locations for parking/rigging.

The eastern half of the turf parking area would be replaced by a single large asphalt parking lot, similar to what you would find at a shopping center. This lot would be devoid of adjacency to grass and would be impractical for boardsailing parking/rigging. Likewise, the southern portion of existing parking/rigging will be reduced substantially, essentially eliminating much of the rigging-friendly grass surface. These are also significant impacts which should be addressed by more intensive review during an EA.

Our following comments focus on those components of the "Recommended Categorical Exclusion -- DRAFT" document (CE Document) which we find to be inaccurate, misleading and/or missing, and we hereby request that the CE Document be revised to reflect the following concerns:

Cover Page: Categorical Exclusion (CE) Justifications

C.8. -- Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity or appearance.

Concern: Please list and provide direct examples of those minor structures and facilities which are proposed to be replaced with little or no change in location, capacity or appearance. Your 2015 NPS NEPA Handbook gives examples, surely you can, too!

Concern: If this justification is applied across the board to the proposed action, then the proposed design is actually a change of location of parking, capacity of parking, and appearance of the entire parking area!

C. 18. -- Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

Concern: Please list and provide direct examples of those minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas. Your 2015 NPS NEPA Handbook provides guidance such that an example of a 'small improved parking lot' would be a "small-scale development of new parking spaces adjacent to existing parking areas". Somehow the addition of 53,225 ft<sup>2</sup> of pavement

and 189 paved parking spaces does not equate to 'small'! Please explain.

C.9. -- Repair, resurfacing, striping, installation of traffic control devices, repair/replacement of guardrails, etc. on existing roads.

Concern: Please explain why this category is not used. If you used this as CE justification for a component of your 'Centennial Repair Project', such as new striping, installation of speed bumps for traffic control, repair of existing pavement or resurfacing of the turf parking with pavement, you will find in your guidance that this CE applies to road maintenance, rehabilitation, repaving, and reconstruction on existing roads within the existing road prism. It is suggested that this applicable CE justification would disqualify your proposed project from a CE. Please explain.

C. 16. -- Landscaping and landscape maintenance in previously disturbed or developed areas.

Concern: The terms 'repair' and 'redesign/reconfiguration' have distinctly different meanings. If NPS were to reconsider the propriety of its approach to spending \$2.5 Million in 'Repair Grant funds' on its proposed "Redesign/Reconfiguration" of Crissy East Beach, and instead keep and honor its word from 2012 and spend the funds on actual repair by implementing its overdue "Crissy Refresh" project, it could use all of the above CE justifications with full integrity and clear conscience, and likely public support, and begin 'Repair/Refresh' construction in late 2016.

Section B -Background:

The first sentence of the second paragraph begins with "Crissy stormwater Field"....

Concern: Please clarify!

Reference is made that the East Beach Parking Area is reaching the end of its useful life and is now in fair to poor condition due to heavy public use, popularity and years of degradation.

Concern: Be honest about all the causes of the degradation -- including lack of watering and annual reseeded, as was the norm for the first 10 plus years when it functioned well! Additionally, it is a stretch to say that the area is at the end of its useful life. For the most part, the restroom turf area is in decent condition; however, the lack of water and annual maintenance on two of the grassy areas in particular has left them vulnerable to the winds and thus almost devoid of any soil in the western turf panel. Addressing the condition of the turf and perhaps restricting parking to a strip around the perimeter of these turf areas could provide a path forward that would reduce maintenance and maintain the current layout.

Additionally, this section references an inefficient layout.

Concern: What is specifically inefficient about this layout? The busy weekend of 4/16/2016 and 4/17/2016 saw abnormally warm temperatures on both days. There were many vehicles but people found ways to park in tandem, ask their neighbors if they could slide their car over, and overall found creative ways to add capacity. Our experience is that on the handful of days where the lot is used at close to capacity, users generally find ways to make it work with little to no conflict.

Section C. Purpose, Need and Objectives

## Purpose and Need:

Crissy East Beach is one of the few water-contact-recreation access points on San Francisco Bay, it is not a Promenade Parking lot.

Concern: The turf areas are not overflow parking; they were designed and constructed as a daily recreational asset for boardsailing and other water access sport vehicle parking and equipment assembly.

It is important to note here that from the beginning, the majority of Crissy Field East Beach was designed as a recreational area with a pervious, parking/rigging-friendly surface; it was not intended to be or designed to be just a parking Lot! Throughout the document, 'turf panels' and 'informal turf parking areas' are referred to as "overflow turf lawn panels"; this couldn't be further from the truth. All of the turf parking was meant to be daily parking/rigging and parking/recreation surfaces, not overflow or special event parking. Please correct these mis-statements.

The second paragraph of this section states, "The purpose and need of this project are to address critical repairs and deferred maintenance." We take no issue with this statement and applaud the NPS for securing funding to address repairs and deferred maintenance.

Concern: However, this does not necessitate a radical redesign of the parking area. This section references improving visitor experience and safety. It is unclear how the redesign relates to these particular issues; please clarify!

This section references "changed conditions" but does not describe in any detail what these changed conditions are. This section references a need to improve safety but there are no statistics provided to indicate that there are pressing safety issues that need to be addressed. Please clarify!

As regular users of this area, we have not seen much in the way of unsafe conditions here. Folks walk around there area without issue. Occasionally, there are drivers who do not respect the discretion needed in a parking lot. We would be fully supportive of traffic calming measures such as speed bumps to slow vehicular speeds in this area.

This section indicates that the soLution to the stated "purpose and need" will require a need to "eliminate areas of disrepair"; "provide for another 10-15 year lifespan"; "improve visitor experience and safety"; and "decrease future maintenance requirements." Reference is made to the tripping hazards of the grass areas. Is there any documentation of this "tripping hazard"? This one item is mentioned repeatedly throughout this document but is unsubstantiated with any empirical evidence that this is in fact true or problematic. Please clarify!

Is the current proposed plan the only means to achieve the purpose and need and its associated sub-goals? We have seen only one plan that was minimally modified to address some of our concerns. We have proposed several alternate approaches that would address both the purpose and need as well as the other desires listed here without completely reconfiguring the entire parking area. Have these been seriously considered as a means to address deferred maintenance without eliminating the wonderful character of this place? Are there options to address the deferred maintenance without adding other non-related design items such as widening the promenade? This section ends with a statement that the goal is to "continue to support diverse recreational uses, including boardsailing and picnicking." What has been designed thus far would not support boardsailing and would represent a significant degradation of our access to the bay. Please clarify!

Objectives:

#### Parking Area Improvements

Improve visitor experience and address safety and wayfinding concerns

Concern: Please clarify safety and wayfinding concerns!

Accommodate parking for 400 cars, which remains the same as the current parking count and the current condition.

Concern: Crissy East Beach was planned and designed to accommodate 500 parking spaces; at present the Temporary Crissy Field Center located at the east end blocks approximately 100 of those spaces. What are the plans for removing the Temporary Center once Doyle Drive is completed in 2016? It is our position that no redesign or reconfiguration of the area be conducted without including the fate and future of the Temporary Center. Please clarify!

Improve drainage at East Beach and treat runoff from the parking lot before entering drains.

Concern: By paving over 53,225 ft<sup>2</sup> of presently pervious surfaces, stormwater runoff increases significantly. As in most things, when solving a problem one creates a new problem, which in this case may well be an increase in standing water in the swales and thus mosquito breeding and infestation. With the concerns of the new mosquito-borne viruses, please address this concern!

Limit use of turf parking to reduce the amount of area to be maintained for informal parking and allow lawn areas to thrive

Concern: Please explain how this will be accomplished and where!

Make parking layout more efficient.

Concern: By forcing more and more boardsailing vehicles into the large paved parking lot, moving equipment from the vehicle to a grass rigging location may likely result in safety challenges; and safety issues for those in the way during high winds and equipment movement.

#### Section D-Development of Proposal (Pre-Proposal Scoping)

This section references a process of developing and reviewing alternatives; however the public has only seen one option. Minor modifications were made to this one option.

Concern: People (boardsailors or otherwise) love the current layout and support addressing the deferred maintenance but not the redesign. This should be included.

#### Section E - Proposed Action

The project team has developed a proposal to repair the Crissy field Promenade and East Beach Parking Area.

Item 1- Replacement of the promenade material and repair of damage.

Concern: We take no issue with the proposed repairs to the promenade, however we believe that widening the promenade from 20 to 30 feet in the East Beach area will exacerbate boardsailing crossing issues and it ultimately will not resolve congestion for those using it.

Item 2- Reconfiguration of the East Beach Parking

Concern: We take serious issue with the proposed reconfiguration of East Beach parking, and the fact that it is also referred to as repair. Since when are redesign/reconfiguration and repair/replace of like kind the same activity. They are not. Please address!

The current proposal does not address the needs of the boardsailing community and is a violation of both the letter and spirit of prior environmental review processes. Those prior agreements need to be respected and rushing this design forward will serve to both erode the quality of the East Beach Area as well as the mutual trust between stakeholders and GGNRA going forward. The original design supported 500 parking spaces. The Temporary Crissy field Center displaced space for approximately 100 of those cars. The proposed design would result in the further reduction of 75 spaces in the western half of the area and elimination of grass areas to rig in the eastern half. SFBA has offered several alternatives that would maintain the current configuration and address issues of maintenance, safety, and stormwater. These alternatives need to be pursued further!

Additionally, the parking closest to the water was intended 1) to assist those who are less mobile to be able to enjoy the Bay from the comfort and warmth of their vehicle, and 2) to enable all users to monitor and enjoy the visual experience of boardsailing from the needed warmth of a vehicle. Anyone who thinks that a bench alone at the promenade's edge will suffice has not spent much time at Crissy field! Please address! We would also like to know what the ADA community thinks. Also, we assume that in the third paragraph it was supposed to read 'ADA standards', vice ABA!

Item 3- Enhance planted buffer between Promenade and East Beach Parking

Concern: The planted buffer between the promenade and East Beach Parking has absolutely nothing to do with the purpose and need of this project. We would agree that there might be some visual benefit to this but it is clear that blowing sand has been a problem in this area. Windy days in the spring and summer result in large clouds of blowing sand out of the west. Even more problematic are the handful of days in the fall and winter when the wind blows directly on shore from the north. Sand is blown directly from the beach and deposited into the grass. No matter what type of grass you plant here, the zone will be subject to that deposition of sand. In the spirit of reducing the need for maintenance, we recommend keeping the small buffer but replacing the grass with some sort of native hedge. You would gain some type of screening and avoid a larger grass area regularly filling up with sand. The widened planted buffer and widened promenade that have been proposed create serious limitations to parking area solutions and need to be reconsidered as irrelevant to the purpose and need of this project.

We are also concerned with the plans for stormwater collection and treatment in the planted buffer, and again with the potential increase in standing water in the swales and thus mosquito breeding and infestation.

Section F-There is no section F. During this accelerated and rushed process, has this document been fully proofread and vetted prior to public comment?

### Section G - Land Management Plan

The proposed action claims to be consistent with the Presidio General Management Plan (GMPA 1994.) An excerpt from this document specifically calls for "Boardsailors will use the offshore waters at the east end of the promenade and access to the beach will be provided for them with nearby parking and rigging areas."

Concern: The proposed project will erode the quality of both the access and nearby parking and rigging areas. We have attempted on multiple occasions to communicate the specific needs related to pursuit of our recreational activity. Boardsailing gear is bulky. Many of us carry multiple boards, sails, masts, fins, etc. It is imperative that sufficient space be provided to allow for parking adjacent to grass area to rig our gear. Running back and forth across a large asphalt lot is both impractical and potentially unsafe. Additionally, sailing at the mouth of the SF Bay has certain inherent risks. The strong winds and tides can potentially be dangerous to sailors. Gear breakage, sudden decrease of wind, and other unforeseen factors can potentially put individuals on the bay in danger. As such, our entire community collectively looks out for each other. Annual safety meetings at the St. Francis Yacht Club and continual outreach to and coordination with the US Coast Guard are part of our mission. However, the ability to visually see those in distress from the parking area has been a critical factor in maintaining a proud history of safety at this area. Both the requirements of parking adjacent to grass and ability to visually view the conditions on the bay were important criteria that were addressed during the initial design and build out of this parking area over 15 years ago.

### Section H-Impact Assessment (Item 3-NPS Screening Form)

Resource Effects to Consider: There are issues in this section that are unclear or are inconsistent with statements in other parts of this document.

#### 1. Human Health and Safety:

Concern: This document claims that the improvements to the parking area are intended to improve visitor safety but it is unclear how that is met. As previously stated, our observation is that the current parking lot is indeed an extremely safe place. Are there any statistics that support the belief that the current area is unsafe? Anecdotally, our observation is that the current layout has proved to be extremely safe with few to no incidents over the last 15 years. Interestingly enough, this section declares that the impact to public safety would be non-significant. We would agree with this finding. The proposed action would not change the level of safety. Please clarify this contradiction with previous statements about project goals and efforts.

#### 2. Visitor Use and Experience - Recreation Resources:

Concern: This document claims that improvements to the parking area will improve visitor experience. It is unclear how that would be true. For the vast majority of users (the 325 cars stuck in a large asphalt parking lot) the arrival experience of coming to Crissy field will not be improved but rather degraded; what ever happened to encouraging discovery, to making choices about where to park your first time, or

the first time you realize that parking into the wind will prevent you from ripping your car door off? For board sailors stuck in this large asphalt lot, the visitor experience will be awful. To assert that the impact is non-significant is disingenuous.

### 3. Water Quality

Concerns: The proposed action goes to great lengths to develop swales to catch stormwater runoff of a large asphalt parking lot that would replace the pervious turf that currently exists. The impact is listed as non-significant. Wouldn't maintaining a layout that addresses stormwater runoff adequately via more pervious paving and more turf be a more cost effective solution than the expense of such a major redesign?

### 4. Sea Level Rise - Climate Change

Concern: Why is this section listed as non-significant? Section B specifically indicates that this project will address climate change. In what way does it do so? Section C-Objectives cites the need of an increased planted buffer zone between the promenade and parking to allow buffer from potential storm surge overwash. Are there any documented occurrences of this? Most of us have observed Crissy over the years during large storms, king tides, and even the tsunami from Japan a few years ago and have never seen the water anywhere close to overrunning the beach.

### Park Specific Environmental Screening Questions

Item 3: Introduce non-historic elements into a historic setting, structure or environment.

Concern: The answer should be YES., the introduction of 53,225 ft<sup>2</sup> of non-historic pavement into what is and was green turf. The East Beach Parking Area is not just an existing parking lot, it is a sophisticated recreational surface planned, designed and constructed to accommodate the assembly of fragile, high-performance boardsailing and sailing equipment and daily vehicle access and parking.

Items 6 and 12: Creating a public safety or health hazard

Concern: There will likely be greater congestion in the central parking lot and unsafe to be unloading and carrying gear and rigs and boards from the parking lot amongst moving vehicles to the friendly grass surfaces.

Items 11 and 13: Affect current or planned visitor services, recreational resources, access or available parking? Change or impede accessibility?

Concern: This project will eliminate 189 existing boardsailing parking spaces with immediately adjacent rigging-friendly surfaces, which is a significant impediment to accessibility!

Item 16: Alter scenic features, viewsheds, be visually intrusive or add to a degraded visual condition?

Concern: This proposal would negatively impact scenic features and understates the visual impact of a large asphalt parking lot as minimal. It references the precedent setting use of asphalt in a parking lot but



neglects to address the unique quality of this specific location in a national park adjacent to the San Francisco Bay. The current layout is not a parking lot but rather a recreational surface and parking area. What has been proposed is more analogous to what you would see next to a shopping mall and not in the crown jewel of a national park.

Additionally, this project essentially eliminates the existing ADA compatible water viewshed from frontrow parking. And because it is cold and damp here most of the year, it also eliminates the ability for Boardsailing safety monitors to watch for those in trouble from the warmth and safety of a vehicle.

## Issues and Concerns

### Public Access and Visitor Experience:

Concern: The document references the "highly regarded board sailing area" in the existing conditions and then claims "visitor access and activities will remain unchanged with the implementation of the project" that will "temporary inconvenience visitors." As already stated in this letter, the proposed action will significantly change access for board sailors to park, rig, and launch at Crissy Field. The inconvenience, particularly on the weekend, will not be temporary but permanent, and it will make the East Beach unworkable for many of us as a viable boardsailing option.

Beyond the specific impacts to boardsailing, this section talks about East Beach as a parking lot that serves the beach, promenade, and other areas when in reality the recreational parking/rigging AREA is in many cases a destination in-and-of itself. People enjoying the outdoors while picnicking or setting up volleyball on the informal turf is how the space is used. The place is a social gathering space as currently designed and this configurations works well for the vast majority of visitors. The end of this section claims that visitor experience would be enhanced by additional lawn areas when in reality the proposed action reduces the area of lawn/turf by over 52,000 square feet.

### Traffic and Parking:

Concern: At the end of the existing conditions section, this document references the turf area at the south portion of the parking area. "This area is open with no indication of individual parking spaces; users park at will. Typically parking in this area is oriented in the same direction as the paved parking abutting it." We would agree with this observation, which contradicts much of the document's assertions that informal turf parking is somehow inefficient or confusing to users! Despite the lack of designated stalls or structured parking, most people seem to naturally park efficiently in these areas just like they would on a structured lot. Boardsailors, especially, tend to work together to accommodate one another.

### Public Safety:

Concern: There is no rationale that defining pedestrian walkways, drive aisles, and parking spaces would reduce conflicts between user groups; on the contrary, drivers tend to become more disturbed when an adjacent vehicle hogs more than one space or does not park straight within his or her parking lot pavement stripes. As mentioned earlier, this item has absolutely nothing to do with stated purpose and need and attempts to "solve" a problem that SFBA believes currently does not exist at East Beach.

### In Closing:

While SFBA appreciates the magnificent task remaining before you in the implementation of a Crissy field Centennial Repair Project, we are also of the position that any reduction in existing parking levels at

the western end of East Beach would be a diminution of public coastal access and recreation. As a result, SFBA strongly encourages either a more formal Crissy East Beach Reconfiguration planning process and an Environmental Assessment of the options, or more preferably a recommitment to repairing, 'refreshing' and perhaps slightly improving our existing configuration to reduce some of the existing maintenance and operational challenges.

True to the belief that human beings are only fully human when they play, given the intense work ethic of people in the Bay Area and the very little, precious time we have to get out on the water after work and on weekends, SFBA is more committed than ever to working together with GGNRA and the GGNPC in a fast-track effort to put the shine back-on Crissy Field East Beach. If you have any questions or would like further clarification regarding our comments, please let us know.

Sincerely,

[signed]

William Robberson, P.E.  
Board President  
San Francisco Boardsailing Association  
BillRobberson@stba.org

[signed]

Chris Apicella  
Crissy Field Site Steward  
San Francisco Boardsailing Association  
Capicella@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 58    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72088  
**Received:** Apr,25,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Nancy B. Ream  
3385 Clay Street  
San Francisco, California 94118

April 20, 2016

GGNRA  
Attn: East Beach Promenade and Parking Repairs  
Building 201  
Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Hello;

Thanks to all involved in the "refreshing Crissy Field Project".

Currently the surface of the promenade shows the wear of great use. After rains, puddles almost fill the walkway in some areas making passage a matter of leaps and jumps. Bikes too often dominate any dry

path. Widening will help these problems.

The Crissy Promenade has one of the most beautiful views in the city, yet currently automobiles have priority placement in the lot that faces the Bay. The new design of grassy areas is welcoming and useful; and parking is not far away.

Sincerely yours,  
Nancy Ream

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,08,2016 21:40:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a regular user of Crissy Field, I was excited at the prospect of newly available funds to refresh and address deferred maintenance of Crissy Field. I am an avid windsurfer and on many summer days, you can find me down at Crissy enjoying the easy access to the beach and grassy areas to rig my equipment near my vehicle. I have been dismayed at the lack of maintenance of the lawns in the last several years and was hoping funds would be used to enhance and reinforce those areas. I have been trying really hard to be supportive of this process but with this comment, I would like to voice my strong opposition to what has been proposed. My concerns are as follows:

- 1) The proposed plan ignores the needs of the most frequent users of Crissy Field. As currently proposed, the plan would eliminate almost half the parking at the western end of Crissy Field. The East Beach and parking area are not parallel to each other but are rather offset. The western end of the parking lot is adjacent to the beach and the east end is not. The west end is where people who want to access the beach want to park. On busy weekends, it will be very difficult to park here with limited parking.
- 2) Parallel to this redesign is a plan to eliminate off leash dog walking at the East Beach and limit off leash to the portion of the beach west of the bridge. Again, this will put added pressure on parking at the west end of the lot.
- 3) Windsurfers who show up at busy times will be forced to park at the east end of the lot and walk through a busy vehicular area to get to the beach with their gear. This is going to be a dangerous and less than optimal situation.
- 4) There were many stakeholders who, in good faith, took part in a design process in the late 1990's that lasted several years to develop a layout that worked for everyone. We all made sacrifices to achieve something that was acceptable to all parties. This process has been rushed with minimal public input and a complete rejection of the formal agreements that were put into place back then.
- 5) The existing EIR approvals for Crissy Field called for 500 parking spaces. The current plan is only 400 spaces.
- 6) It is apparent that there are voices within this process that are not willing to compromise. A desire for a 30ft wide promenade; a grass buffer between parking and the promenade; the sacred boundaries of artificial wetlands and dunes; etc prevent real productive discussion about a configuration that might work well for all.

I would strongly recommend that the NPS pursue a more modest plan to refresh Crissy rather than a wholesale redesign, especially given the constraints of time. As currently proposed, this layout will be the death knell of windsurfing and kitesurfing on the weekends. The opposition of this plan is building as we

speaking and there are many who will use all legal avenues to prevent this from happening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,08,2016 21:46:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The improvements at Crissy Field will add to the parking pressure that now exist. Please consider leaving front row parking instead of adding the grassy areas in front of the current restrooms.

Also, the Park Service does not do a decent job of maintaining the current grass in that area. Why would the Park Service want to add more grass that will not be maintained. The drought conditions will determine the success of the new design. It seems like a high risk proposition that also makes public use more difficult.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,08,2016 22:01:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly agree with the proposed changes to the East Beach Parking Lot on the last page of the pdf. In particular, the removal of the parking spaces between the restroom area and the promenade will give better access to windsurfers (myself included) and kites who use that area to rig/launch; we won't have to worry about dodging cars while carrying our equipment to the beach. It would also make the area around the restroom less crowded, since as of now it is difficult to find room to rig on windy days when everyone comes out. Converting the reinforced turf areas into paved parking is also a very welcome addition, since it more than makes up for the removal of the spaces in front of the restrooms (and is more visually appealing than dirt and mud). My only complaint is that the entrance and exit to the lot are quite narrow, and create traffic jams on Mason when there are a lot of visitors. There also should be better signage that the access points to the lot are both one-way, as I frequently see visitors driving the wrong way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,09,2016 00:00:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This all looks fine. Thanks to all who contributed. My one specific comment is a request to maintain electric vehicle charging in the parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,09,2016 00:01:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposal overall seems to have good intentions, but I have a major issue with your plan to pave over almost all of the grass parking. Your proposal gives two specific reasons for doing this - - neither one is accurate, unfortunately:

1. "Reinforced turf planting for parking not thriving". This is very disingenuous. Currently there are several different sections of grass parking that are very healthy and thriving. These are the sections that I have seen (very minimally) watered and aerated in recent years. For example, the back lawn that is south of the bathrooms. Meanwhile, the middle square area to the east (where the 6/7/8 is marked on your PDF) has become a sandy wasteland. This area has not been watered or maintained in any way for years, just

left to be abused. It's been proven that just putting in the slightest effort to maintain the grass will keep it thriving even with heavy parking. The back lawn (the healthy one) has WAY more parking volume than the dustbowl to the east, yet it still thrives. Giving this as a reason to pave the whole place is really, really lazy.

2. "Inefficient parking layout...weekend needs". This is also very disingenuous. There are literally only about 6-8 days per YEAR when the parking at Crissy is totally full. Memorial Day, July 4, Labor Day, Fleet Week. That is it. The rest of the year, even warm sunny weekends, there is always room. Sure, the parking is sometimes not "organized", but it's also not \*full\*, so why does that matter? If you are concerned about those 4 big weekends, then just staff the place on those days to make sure the parking is lined up (this is already done during Fleet Week). For you to say that casual parking is preventing regular weekend needs from being met is absolutely false.

A big part of what makes Crissy Field such a special places is that there are large grassy areas where you can park and be with your friends. This proposal totally eliminates that, and turns it into one giant paved parking lot. There is no reason to fix something that isn't broken - - spend your money to simply maintain what you already have rather than this huge "redesign" that is going to ruin Crissy as we know it. It's really sad that this proposal was put together by people that clearly do not spend much time down there. If they did, they would realize how inaccurate their "problems" with the current parking are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,09,2016 09:21:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am responding to the proposed changes for Crissy Field, San Francisco. After reviewing the proposed plan, It has become apparent that a few changes could be made to enhance the plan. As an avid kite surfer who uses Crissy Field on a regular basis, here are my notes:

1. I like the change to add lawn near the promenade. As long as it is just grass and not plantings. This seems to maintain some sports usage at the site. If this becomes plantings, then you negate the effective multi use aspect that just grass provides for rigging gear and keeping a safe area for such activities.
2. I suggest removing the parking created on the east side of the restroom square. If anything, use grass pavers as that area has a variety of multi use from picnicking, sports, and other family activities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 7    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,09,2016 11:17:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Let me start this off by saying how much I love Crissy Field. It is my home away from home and I care deeply about it's fate.

This proposal bothers me on a number of levels:

1. It puts further restrictions on parking when use of the park is at an all time high;
2. If you want to reduce the number of cars at Crissy Field, then you have to limit the number of Events at the beach!

3. As a windsurfer I am deeply concerned about having to walk my gear through a crowded parking lot, and then a promenade teeming with tourists, dog walkers and cyclists; this could be a dangerous endeavor and I fear reflect poorly on advocates for the new design.

4. It's my understanding that the SFBA worked closely will all parties on the current Crissy Field - I hope that you will give serious consideration to the SFBA and their concerns.

Best regards,  
Crissy Field Lover

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 11:20:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First of all I would like to ask what the guidelines and purpose of this makeover to the east beach parking and rigging area.

Why are you doing this change and what are the goals.

I've been windsurfing at Crissy Field on a weekly basis since 1991 and I've witnessed all the changes that have taken place there.

As I said back in 1998, why can't they leave well enough alone. But that's not how progress works so let's make some real progress here for once. Windsurfers and now kitesurfers and paddlers have and do use this area on a regular basis. Rumor has it that the GGNRA wants to accommodate those groups as a priority. We'd like to see you put your money where your mouth is. Why don't you listen to our needs. They are quite simple actually.

We need grassy rigging area and a place to park pretty much where we rig. What that translates to is that all the grassy areas that we can rig our gear on should have a perimeter of back in parallel parking at those exact locations. Your schematic does shoe some of this but you have taken some grassy rigging area away to provide parking. Instead you should leave the grass alone and create parking where the existing driving lanes are and therefor move the driveways out a bit.

We also need to maximize the number of parking spots adjacent to rigging areas/grassy areas and it doesn't look that way in you proposed plan.

There are only a handful of days where the parking lot is full for the usual annual events. On the other hand, everyday of the year Windsurfers, kitesurfer and paddlers use our areas to enjoy this playground of ours. Dog walkers and pedestrians are easily accommodated but our group does have special needs and we want to be proud of our little playground and what your organization will provide for us. Please listen and address our needs.

There is so much to say here but I will spare you the agony. Just know that the windsurfing community is very concerned and we hope that our concerns will be heard. Feel free to contact me asap for more details as I have a clear channel to all the important people in our community that can really help make this project the best ever.

Here is a link to our group discussion if you're curious about what we're talking about.  
<http://www.iwindsurf.com/forums/viewtopic.php?t=31136>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 17:28:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for intent to improve Crissy Field. A thanks as well to the Haas family for the donation. With that said the current plan was not developed in an a manner that is congruent with how the park is used. The plan needs to be revisited after including the groups that actually use the park. In previous development efforts promises were made that all changes would be reviewed together as a community. This was not the case with this current set of changes. Given the iconic nature of the park its important that the development reflects the community in which it lives. Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 10 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 18:37:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for intent to improve Crissy Field. A thanks as well to the Haas family for the donation. The current plan was not developed in a manner that is congruent with how the park is used.

The plan needs to be revisited after including the groups that actually use the park. In previous development efforts promises were made that all changes would be reviewed together as a community. This was not the case with this current set of changes. Given the iconic nature of the park it's important that the development reflects the community in which it lives. Access to the water for board sports is so important to so many.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 11 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,09,2016 20:43:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Re; Resurface Crissy Field Promenade and Reconfigure East Beach Parking Area, Presidio

The promenade does need crowning, proper drainage, and resurfacing. There is frequent standing water on the walkway.

The parking lot reconfiguration and widening of the promenade is unnecessary, probably illegal, and a disservice to the daily users of the park. Board sailers and kites will have to carry their gear from a multi row parking stall arrangement to a rigging area, by the restrooms and then thread a wider promenade that promotes random behavior by tourists. There should be separate lanes for bikes. The choke point at the end of the planned widened section is going to be a problem with dog walkers, pedestrians and bikes merging.

Real grass does not do well close to the water without constant care. We have seen grass well inland at east beach die off with neglect.

The money would be better spent repairing the ongoing bathroom sewer problems, aligning the outflow of the estuary so it doesn't create a stagnant pond in the middle of the beach annually, and filling in the sand up to the seawall, where hazards exist at the first step onto the beach.

I was present at one of the Park Services walk throughs at Crissy Field.

My impression was that this remodeling of east beach was a way to spend lots of money without thinking too much about what the outcome is for the people who use and support the beach every day.

Thank you.

PS: You can turn the showers back on anytime too!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,10,2016 08:40:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello. I appreciate the efforts being made to redesign Crissy field. However it is my understanding that inclusion of feedback by all groups who use Crissy field has not happened and this is concerning.

I am a frequent user of the park for wind related activities and do not believe the proposed design takes into consideration such activities. As such it seems that access to the park for such activities will be significantly hampered by the new redesign compared to the current design. It is my understanding that groups who represent wind related activities are similarly not in favor of the proposed design.

I respectfully request that the voices of all users and groups who use the park have a chance to be heard.

Thank you,

Taylor Gautier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,10,2016 10:04:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I really appreciate that changes are planned to be made to crissy field, but could we get some windsurfers and kitesurfers input on the new plans. My friends and I go kite there several times every week and the proposed changes will make everyones rigging situation much more inconvenient. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 14    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,10,2016 10:11:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Consider the enhancement of habitat values in the planning. Decrease non-native lawn species and manage instead for local plant species appropriate to the area (soils, etc.). Reduce water use (including "Brown is the new Green" messaging, if necessary). Also, as a parent, I feel uncomfortable letting my two young children walk around and play in this area because of all of the off-leash dogs running out of control. I have no reason to trust strange dogs around my kids, and dog owners and professional dog walkers never seem to get this. I usually have to carry my kids on the trails here or keep them in their stroller because of the out of control, off-leash dogs. Sadly, most of the time we just avoid the area altogether. Improve posting of dog regulations and improve enforcement of dog regulations. I also frequently see people running off-leash dogs through the posted sensitive bird habitats near here. Improve signage and enforcement of those regulations too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 15    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089



**Received:** Apr,10,2016 11:09:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

The NPS made a few revisions to there east beach parking and promenade redesign after the two meet and greet informational meetings at the east beach parking lot and a private meeting with the SFBA, the changes were some more parking and a better turn around west of the bathrooms. This is an improvement, but the entire plan has many flaws.

On the weekends, you will really be hampered to find easy access parking for windsurfing and kite-boarding.

The park service is trying to fast track this, the history of the original EIR is that San Francisco board sailors are original stake holders and east beach including the parking was to give sailors easy access to the beach. This money is meant for differed maintenance, not a redesign. This token 15 day comments period is disingenuous. Any redesign should require a full EIR. The NPS may be in violation of the CZMA and NEPA, plus any changes require BCDC approval.

Paved area to increase by 50 percent. Turf planting for parking not thriving". Completely untrue...the back grass areas, where they have actually put in the slightest effort to water and aerate, are totally healthy. That gets a ton of parking volume too. The middle square to the east is a wasteland...but it's been ignored for at least a few years. Maybe put in a slight effort to maintain what you have? Not a shock that if you leave something to die, it dies...

"Inefficient parking layout...weekend needs". Very disingenuous. There are literally only about 6-8 days per YEAR when the place is totally full. Just the big holiday weekends. Rest of the year can be busy, but there is always room no matter what time you arrive. Who cares if the parking is "casual", as they say, if it's not \*full\*?

Just imagine carrying your rig across 30 feet of promenade as apposed to the current 20 feet, with all the people and bicycles. The NPS says it will move congestion along, I say it will create more congestion.

All those preferred parking spots to on the west side of the parking lot will be in competition with picnickers and dog walkers. All the other parking is for tourist whom do not know better.

It is not going to be easy to get your gear setup and carry it to a lawn area if you have to park in the main parking lot squeezed together. Not to mention numerous trips back and forth to your car.

there is an agenda playing out here, to make this more people centrist, and anti car, the east beach was designed for multiple recreational use.

The drawing regarding the east limit of the beach is not correct. It doesn't correctly display the fenced off rip-rap dunes that extend further to the west, visible in the Google Earth photo.

The drawing appears to show the beach extending so far east that it would be accessible to most of the huge paved area which goes all the way to the existing Crissy Center. That eastern half of parking area would not be directly accessible to the beach.

They NPS needs to rethink the design of the parking at the east end of the lot. The way it is currently proposed, it is going to feel like a huge asphalt parking lot in front of a Target. Maybe they could convert the middle aisle into grass that could be used for rigging but also to make that area feel a little less "mean"

The NPS should use the money to fix the sewer line, maintain and fix the east beach bathrooms. Fix the drainage of the promenade, keeping it at it's current 20 foot width. And restore and maintain the current parking lawns and parking configuration.

Concerns about speeding in the parking lot can be fixed with speed bumps and stop signs at the intersections in the parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 16    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,10,2016 16:51:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a 73 year old wind surfer. I have been happily sailing at Crissy Field for over 30 years along with countless other sailors. The proposed reconfiguration makes it impossible for me to rig my gear next to my vehicle, as I have been doing for thirty years because it pushes parking away from the rigging area and beach. It also substantially reduces the parking and rigging area at the west end of the lot which is the part adjacent to the beach and launch area, an area that is always in high demand by not only sailors but everyone else using the beach. The picnic area added there a few years ago further reduces the available area. Moreover, the upcoming ban on off-leash dogs on the East Beach will cause dog owners to want to park as far west as possible to get closer to the designated off-leash area. It will be very hard to park here on the weekends. The reconfiguration purports to make up for the loss of parking at the west end of the lot with a huge asphalt lot at the east end. Aside from turning what is now a natural area into ugly asphalt, many of us who will be forced to park there will be trudging our bulky gear through a busy parking lot to get to the rigging area, something that is clearly unsafe for everyone. The proposed reconfiguration seems to be an attempt to ruin an arrangement that has worked quite well for everyone for many years in order to satisfy some special,interest's idea of political correctness, e.g., "a car free National Park experience," even though Crissy Field is an urban park long enjoyed by many people from outside the immediate urban area. Our sailing community spent many years going through a design process with lots of other groups back in the 1990's. The current design was codified in the current Environmental Impact Statement. For the NPS to make such substantial changes without going through a similar process is partisan, unfair to most users of Crissy Field, and sure to be contested in the courts.

Crissy Field is one of a very few West Coast wind surfing and kite sailing venues. It has hosted many national contests. The proposed reconfiguration is going to basically snuff out its use by wind surfers and kite sailors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 17    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,10,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed reconfiguration of Crissy Field and parking must be delayed to include ample public input. Allowing only 15 days for users of Crissy Field to organize and provide comments sends a the wrong message, that the NPS intends to exclude the public from commenting and providing full and complete feedback on the redesign.

As a frequent user of Crissy Field more than 200 days last year. The changes the NPS is proposing to make will make the area more tourist friendly by increasing the size of the promenade and paved parking. But that is not what the frequent users want. The promenade is adequate, part of the problem currently is the benches and people sitting on the benches take up 6-8 feet of the current promenade. Rather than increasing the size of the promenade the benches should be moved back to allow for full utilization of the current 20ft promenade. At times the promenade is full with dogs, bikers and walkers, so moving the

benches back to allow full utilization of the 20ft promenade will be more than adequate.

The proposed parking lot is overkill and will make Crissy Field feel like a Target in the suburbs. The current parking situation is adequate on all but July 4th or when very large events are taking place. What needs to happen is watering of the grass parking lots, improved drainage and wintertime closing off of the grass parking lots. Closing off of the grass parking lots will allow the grass time to develop and grow. At least for the past five years the main grass parking lots have been completely unwatered, that is why the grass is dead. If the NPS watered, aerated the soil, closed the grass lots during the winter low use season the grass would be fantastic as it was 5-10 years ago. I for one would much rather see grass rather than concrete that cannot absorb the rainwater in the winter. By the NPS increasing the pavement by more than 50% i will create pooling of rainwater in the winter, San Francisco has by paying residents to take out concrete in backyards and driveways to absorb more water. The NPS project to increase the parking using paved lots is completely the opposite direction we need to be going. I agree there are speeding problems, I have seen kids almost get hit and car accidents. Part of the problems is the crazy design of traffic flow without any use of stop signs. Stop signs must be used when the main arteries going in and out cross with the parking areas.

This project must be delayed to allow for a full EIR to take place and allow full and complete public input. It should be in the NPS interest to engage the entire public to ensure that National Park which is the taxpayers after all is designed according to their use. The attempt by the NPS to speed up the project and exempt the project from full public review is wrong and against the principles of the country we live in. I agree Crissy Field does need improvements and I am happy that the Haas family is willing to help improve the park, but I think they would be extremely disappointed to know that the attempts the NPS is going to by not collecting input from the users of the park. NPS consultants in Washington DC do not know what we want or need in our only urban National Park in the US. The NPS must fully engage with the San Francisco public users. As a stand up paddle boarder and windsurfer I love Crissy Field, it is nature at its best. There is nothing I love more than coming to Crissy by car or bike after a long day of work to enjoy, relax and exercise. I hope to enjoy this park for many generations to come with my family.

Tim Thole

---

**Correspondence ID:** 18    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,10,2016 20:40:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a native and long-time resident of San Francisco, and a windsurfer and kitesurfer at Crissy Field since 1999, the park at the East Beach of Crissy Field is an extremely important part of my life in San Francisco. I use the park, beach, promenade and parking lot well over 120 days per year.

I generally support the resurfacing and reconfiguring of the parking lot, a widening of the promenade, and the removal of all cars and drive areas north of the bathrooms, however, I feel the proposed design drawing has significant problems and must be not be allowed to proceed. The proposed drawings show too much densely-packed, paved parking lot east of the bathrooms, with not enough grass area near the cars. There is also continued parking on the grass, which I think has been shown to be impractical. Further, the proposed design will cause significant disruption to use of the beach by the windsurfing and kitesurfing community.

It is my understanding that this proposed plan is being fast-tracked, and that there was insufficient consultation with the board sailing community (stakeholders in the original planning of the East Beach park 20 years ago). I believe it is wrong to fast-track this re-design, without allowing input from

important stakeholders.

I have seen a competing drawing prepared by the architect Chris Apocella, which I think is much better design. Apocella's plan retains the same number of parking spaces, but distributes them to areas of the park (and with better layout) that are more appropriate for all park users, such as runners, dog walkers, picnickers, beach-using families, as well as the boardsailing community.

I urge a full review process, that involves much more input from stakeholders.

Thank you,  
Greg McKenney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 19    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,10,2016 20:53:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am disappointed by the new schematics for Crissy Field parking. The current parking places seem adequate for most days, but on sunny weekends, there is definitely not enough parking. Why does there have to be a major remapping of the parking? Why, instead of grass, can't you just decomposed granite, or some other water permeable substance that doesn't have to be replanted (like the turf does) and would let rainwater run back into the ground water?

The proposed plan puts everyone farther from the beach- -what about handicapped users of the beach and promenade? I am about to have a second knee replacement, and although the distance created by the new plantings may not seem like a long way to you, I can testify that every yard makes a difference.

It seems to me that you are making unnecessary changes that are NOT for the better, and the short time span on this comment period does not give the public adequate time to give their opinions.

The Park Service has done lots of good things in the Presidio, but this and the proposed changes to dog walking are not among them.

Sincerely,  
Mary Gregory

---

**Correspondence ID:** 20    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,11,2016 17:58:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not pave over more of Chrissy Field and instead come up with a design to improve and restore the informal areas. A huge paved lot would be a tragedy for such a scenic and natural area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 21    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,12,2016 06:27:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not agree w/ the NPS revisions to the east beach parking and promenade redesign.

"Inefficient parking layout...weekend needs". Very disingenuous. There are literally only about 6-8 days

per YEAR when the place is totally full. Just the big holiday weekends. Rest of the year can be busy, but there is always room no matter what time you arrive. Who cares if the parking is "casual", as they say, if it's not \*full\*? Just imagine carrying your rig across 30 feet of promenade as apposed to the current 20 feet, with all the people and bicycles. The NPS says it will move congestion along, I say it will create more congestion.

All those preferred parking spots to on the west side of the parking lot will be in competition with pic-nickers and dog walkers. All the other parking is for tourist whom do not know better. It is not going to be easy to get your gear setup and carry it to a lawn area if you have to park in the main parking lot squeezed together. Not to mention numerous trips back and forth to your car. There is an agenda playing out here, to make this more people centrist, and anti car, the east beach was designed for multiple recreational use.

The drawing regarding the east limit of the beach is not correct. It doesn't correctly display the fenced off rip-rap dunes that extend further to the west, visible in the Google Earth photo.

The drawing appears to show the beach extending so far east that it would be accessible to most of the huge paved area which goes all the way to the existing Crissy Center. That eastern half of parking area would not be directly accessible to the beach.

They NPS needs to rethink the design of the parking at the east end of the lot. The way it is currently proposed, it is going to feel like a huge asphalt parking lot in front of a Target. Maybe they could convert the middle aisle into grass that could be used for rigging but also to make that area feel a little less "mean".

The NPS should use the money to fix the sewer line, maintain and fix the east beach bathrooms. Fix the drainage of the promenade, keeping it at it's current 20 foot width. And restore and maintain the current parking lawns and parking configuration.

Concerns about speeding in the parking lot can be fixed with speed bumps and stop signs at the intersections in the parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 22    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,12,2016 10:26:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, you the National Park Service GGNRA were awarded centennial differed maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust, great.

Use it for differed maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign.

The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996.

There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I like the current configuration. The park service has been negligent in is maintenance of the grassy areas, I wonder if on purpose to help along someones agenda on their view of how crissy field east beach parking is supposed to look.

The grassy/dirt casual parking is wonderful, people/families park and pick-nick right by there car. I love it that there is lawn available were ever you park.

The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet.  
I want less paved and more grass like it already is.

Spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade with out widening it, this will only cause congestion of people loitering, it will not help move the flow of people, and bicycles.

Fix the bathrooms and sewer line. Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow it down.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 23    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,12,2016 10:57:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a consistent user of the East Beach area of Crissy Field since 1983. There has been a sizable community of water sports enthusiasts utilizing the unique aspect of open access to a beach exposed to the wind coming in from the Golden Gate. The combination of wind, tide, and beach do not exist anywhere else in the State of California.

As a result, the community of water sports users, primarily windsurfers and kiteboarders, but also including stand up paddleboards and sailors, will continue to access the Bay from this spot. It is true that there are many other users of this area that did not exist prior to the park service improving the area, but the water sports community has been there in force prior to the handover of the area from the military to the park service, and, due to the unique nature of the conditions, this community will continue to be active at the East Beach.

My concern with the new layout is that you will be funneling kiteboarding to the East side of the beach, where there is the highest chance of conflict with other beach users. There is no question that kiteboarders and windsurfers have the most gear to transport from the car to the beach. They will be looking for the shortest route to do so. With the new parking layout, that puts them on the east side of the beach, where we have seen the most other users of the beach congregate. This will lead to more potential conflict, as a kiter uses a fair amount of the beach to launch and land a kite. Focusing these groups to use the same area of beach is not a good idea.

My suggestion would be to create more parking, close to the beach, to the west of the existing bathrooms, thus encouraging kites to use the west area of the beach by the pipe. This will do much to lead to an area that will be safer for all users of the beach. If you folks had just a bit of foresight, or visited the beach on a windy spring or summer afternoon....which is about every day....the use of the beach and potential conflict will become clear. To avoid doing so means you placed the safety of the public at a lower concern than increasing concrete parking, which seems to be contrary to your purpose.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 24    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,13,2016 17:58:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The scheme to repave the promenade at Crissy Field fails to deal in anyway with the existing unsafe conditions caused by the congestion of pedestrian and bicycle users. The extreme increase

of bicycle traffic often rented by tourists does not mix well with other park users.

There needs to be a physical separation of bicycle riders and other users. The "others" include walkers, runners, families with children and baby strollers, dog walkers, etc.

Suggested solution, (1) install styles or gates at key entrance points to the promenade. (2) Require bicycles to be walked, not ridden, in the most highly congested areas, such as the East Beach parking lot beach front promenade. (3) Install signs at key points which direct bicycle riders, to an alternative, to the formal bike lanes along Mason Street. Signs in the East Beach area for riders heading West toward the Bridge. Signs aimed at riders returning from the Bridge, Fort Point, the pier, the Warming Hut, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 25    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,13,2016 19:15:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 1. Use the opportunity to remove hazardous exposed concrete, debris and asphalt where kids play at the west end of the east beach.  
2. Provide proper path connection for bikes from the eastern overflow parking area to marina green

---

**Correspondence ID:** 26    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,14,2016 09:58:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,  
The National Park Service / GGNRA was awarded centennial deferred maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust. These funds should be used for deferred maintenance, not for an ill thought out redesign.  
The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out as detailed in the original EIR of 1996. There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.  
I am a regular user of Crissy Field East Beach and I the current configuration works well. Certainly there is no need to increase the amount of fully paved parking area. That would reduce the natural character of this beautiful area. If anything, some of the current parking area should be replaced with permeable pavers.

The park service has been negligent in its maintenance of the grassy areas. Why aren't these areas properly maintained as is?

The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

Your plan will increase paved parking from 95,975 square feet to 140,010 square feet. I want less paved and more grass like it already is.

Spend the 5 million on improving the promenade without widening it. Perhaps better seating and some lane markings for peds and bicycles. Fix the bathrooms and sewer line. Rejuvenate the lawns, put in some speed bumps, and a couple stop signs to slow traffic down.

Please, no additional paving! Paving and cars are OBSOLETE. We should be building and investing in infrastructure for PEOPLE, not cars.

thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 27    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 11:06:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If you take away all the parking from the Westside of Crissy, residents who use the water will not have any direct access to the water. The parking lots as planned have no beach access as they are in front of the rocks. It is not a good place for swimmers and boarders to launch, which makes it more dangerous. We residents need to have parking spaces and grass on the west side, where the boarders launch and the children play in the groin and beach.

Furthermore, the money is supposed to be for a refurbishment, not a redesign. The bathrooms are not in a good state and should be refurbished. Also the grass needs to be watered. Perhaps a coin operated shower could replace the closed shower. There are many things that need to be fixed at Crissy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 28    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 11:14:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

I strongly oppose the schematic design. As proposed, it severely impacts our windsurfing and kitesurfing community that regularly uses the western span of the parking lot to access the waters at Crissy Field. We need to keep the western end of the parking lot access for several key reasons:

1. Our equipment is heavy as we carry 20-25lbs of gear in windy conditions from the parking lot to water's edge.
2. In windsurfing/kiting, you want to start as upwind (furthest west) as possible as there is no where to come in downwind if the wind dies off or if there is a strong flood tide. This is a critical safety issue for our water recreation users.
3. Following our windsurf/kiting sessions, we rinse our gear at the bathroom buildings in the western section of the parking area.

Your design would severely limit (remove 75 parking spaces in the western section of the lot) the parking access for windsurfing and kitesurfing. The proposed eastern lot has no adjacent grass, so on a crowded day, windsurfers and kite surfers would have to carry heavy amounts of gear a long way only to reach the eastern most section of the beach, which is not where we set up or access the water.

I propose that you simply re-sod the existing grass areas and install superior drainage to help maintain the grass areas adjacent to existing parking spots. If the California draught is of concern, I propose you install synthetic turf with drainage in the grass areas that currently have degraded due to lack of water and maintenance.

The windsurfing and kitesurfing community has been highly involved (through the San Francisco Boardsailing Association) in the improvements at Crissy Field East Beach in the original plans in the late 90s. Please do not move forward with this plan without considering the input of this extremely active community and daily users of Crissy Field East Beach.

San Francisco is a world class windsurfing and kitesurfing locale, hosting many world championship races and events. This community thrives at this site and needs critical access to parking spaces in the western section of the East Beach area.



Sincerely,  
Jane Cormier  
Co-Owner/Boardsports California  
local windsurfing/kitesurfing/stand up paddle shop/school

---

**Correspondence ID:** 29    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 12:31:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service:

I object to the proposed redraw of East Beach parking based on the following:

1. Categorical Exemption being used to bypass regular environmental process claims no impact on recreational use. This is not true. East Beach Windsurf and Kitesurf communities have been trying to work with the Park Service to document the loss of 75 spaces at the only available windsurf and kite surf access dramatically affects recreational use especially during the weekends.
2. The windsurf and kite surf communities (San Francisco Board Sailing Association) worked in partnership with the Park on the planning of the current East Beach parking plan. The results were useable for these communities as well as general public. Reduction of 75 spaces in this critical remaining area greatly reduces recreational access for these communities.
3. Moving all the parking to an area with no space, and no grass, takes the one final place that the Park has clustered windsurfing and kitesurfing activists and prohibits them from accessing areas to rig and prepare their kites and sails.

While we understand there are reasons the Park must spend funds this year, please register my opposition to this plan and add a request for a more considered process including the communities who helped develop the current East Beach plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 30    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 12:36:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like you to note my intense objection to the redesign of the East Beach and Crissy Field Area. As a member of the windsurfing community for more than 20 years, this plan is completely unacceptable and reduces access to recreation activities tremendously for windsurfers, kitesurfers and other beach goers. The original plan, which went through many iterations and incorporated input from recreational users, including the SF Boardsailing Association, should not be discarded without a true process to redesign it. My understanding of the intent of the refurbishing is to repair the current elements of the previous designed and approved plan, not to redesign important aspects of our access.

Eliminating the 75 parking spots along the promenade reduces recreational use for windsurfers, kitesurfers and others by limiting direct access to our beach. Rigging our equipment in the western part of the parking lot on grass near our cars is important to protect the integrity of the gear and our access to the water. Asphalt scratches sails and boards. If grass is maintained properly (which it hasn't been) it is much more forgiving. Many people and families with young children also enjoy the direct access to the beach from those front spaces. Being able to park in the western part of the parking lot is also important to access the water, the picnic areas that you expanded without notice and the promenade. Parking in a big asphalt parking lot in the eastern part of the lot is definitely not allowing people to experience the current feeling of being in a national recreation area.

Please limit the refurbishing to renovating the bathrooms, and resurfacing and fixing the existing

promenade into a surface without small rocks that hurt bare feet when you walk on it. When I am at the beach with small children, they are unable to walk on the current surface that you put down. It looks like the planned resurface is not any smoother and doesn't eliminate this problem.

Just one note, one of the reasons that the parking can be challenging is that park officials schedule many weekend events that bring people to park and then leave the area. This should also not be allowed. The promenade doesn't need to be widened. Please do NOT redesign our precious park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 31 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,16,2016 14:03:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service:

I object to the proposed redraw of East Beach parking based on the following:

1. Categorical Exemption being used to bypass regular environmental process claims no impact on recreational use. This is not true. East Beach Windsurf and Kitesurf communities have been trying to work with the Park Service to document the loss of 75 spaces at the only available windsurf and kite surf access dramatically affects recreational use especially during the weekends.
2. The windsurf and kite surf communities (San Francisco Board Sailing Association) worked in partnership with the Park on the planning of the current East Beach parking plan. The results were usable for these communities as well as general public. Reduction of 75 spaces in this critical remaining area greatly reduces recreational access for these communities.
3. Moving all the parking to an area with no space, and no grass, takes the one final place that the Park has clustered windsurfing and kitesurfing activists and prohibits them from accessing areas to rig and prepare their kites and sails.

While we understand there are reasons the Park must spend funds this year, please register my opposition to this plan and add a request for a more considered process including the communities who helped develop the current East Beach plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 32 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,16,2016 14:54:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm opposed to Crissy field east parking lot redesign. I like it the way it is. Use the money for maintenance only. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 33 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,16,2016 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance' plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The

available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as diondra repens which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. It does not require mowing. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

There is NO WAY this will pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA. This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a MASSIVE parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

I hope you will coordinate with the San Francisco Boardsailing Association to develop a mutually acceptable plan so that the plan can move forward expeditiously without a massive amount of wasted funds on all sides.

Susan Samols

---

**Correspondence ID:** 34    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,16,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance' plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The

needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as *dicondra repens* which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. It does not require mowing. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

There is NO WAY this will pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA. This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a MASSIVE parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

I hope you will coordinate with the San Francisco Boardsailing Association to develop a mutually acceptable plan so that the plan can move forward expeditiously without a massive amount of wasted funds on all sides.

Susan Samols

---

**Correspondence ID:** 35    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,16,2016 18:42:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a windsurfer that approves of the current plan. I write anonymously because I do not want to jeopardize my standing in the windsurfing community. There are a small number of us who are working through the iWindsurf forums to try and derail the project for reasons that seem petty and selfish to me. I believe that the current plan strikes a nice balance for all users, improves the quality of the site, and maintains access for us windsurfers. Please do not believe that the few vocally opposed windsurfers speak on behalf of all windsurfers - they do not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 36    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,17,2016 09:41:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance" plan for the

East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as *dicondra repens* which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 37    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 18:54:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Widening the promenade from 20 feet to 30 feet at East Beach will only increase bike and foot traffic, therefore, making it more difficult to cross the promenade to gain access to the beach, not only for beach goers, but also for board sailors. Furthermore, creating this widened path and later reducing it by 10 feet creates a choke point and congestion. Resurface it, but keep it 20 feet wide. Eliminating parking along the promenade takes away the access for the elderly and handicapped, who enjoy sitting in their car or sitting on the nearby benches to take in the sights of the beach and the beautiful Golden Gate bay view. Keep the parking lot "as is". Post signs, repaint stripes and directional arrows, and install speed bumps and stop signs. Keep the park a park. Don't create more pavement. What happened to "brown is the new green"? Keep the parking grounds available for the professional dog walkers west of the bathrooms under the trees. Keep the lawn area surrounding the bathrooms green and keep the parking area immediately surrounding the bathrooms for the board sailors. They need to park next to a grassy area and to have access to their vehicle for their equipment. Fix the bathrooms! There is always one toilet that does not function. Repair the sewage line and the water lines. Line the estuary from the walking bridge to the bay with boulders on the east side and excavate the beach so there is no longer a pond that is created during storm and monthly extreme high tides. Stagnant water breeds mosquitoes and zika. Excavate the beach with more sand along the existing promenade concrete sea wall. Use the grant

money for maintenance and repair, not to reconfigure the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 38    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,17,2016 19:48:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current plan for Crissy Field parking doesn't make any sense. The current proposed parking plan caters for heavy parking use on just a handful of days per year that the parking area is full. It makes no sense to pave over almost the entire parking area for just a few days of heavy use per year. The proposed parking area plan is a fundamental change in the way this area is being used, and that is not maintenance but an architectural re-design.

The current reasons given for the proposed changes to the parking area also make no sense. Proper maintenance has not been provided for the parking area. Grassy areas have been allowed to die and no thought given to proper maintenance of what is there already. Grassy areas that have been maintained, for example by the bathrooms and in front of the Crissy Field Center, have thrived.

Paving Crissy Field over, year-by-year, and a little at a time is not the answer to any problem. More care should be taken in the proposed plan. More input from users should be solicited and factored into the plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 39    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 13:10:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to support the proposed plan as is. Please do not miss this opportunity for matching funds which will provide improvements and repairs to these heavily used and increasingly popular recreation areas. I am a neighbor who walks the promenade regularly and find the trails degraded from heavy use, allowing water to collect after rains. I am also offended by careless dog owners who allow their pets to defecate in the grassy strips immediately adjacent to the parking zone near East Beach. It directly affects my enjoyment of the park.

I am aware that the dog groups have organized to block any work at Crissy Field. They have unfairly mobilized support from across the country from those who do not ever use our park. We must speak for the much, much larger number of visitors and locals who value the experience of walking along our waterfront and enjoying it's spectacular scenery and natural resource treasures. This particular part of our Presidio will become even more popular with completion of the Presidio Parklands project. Crissy Field continues to be a treasured public gift, with major donations from the generous Haas family. Please continue to steward this incredible gift for future generations.

Ideally, I would like to see:

1. East Beach parking area and its hard landscape should be thoughtfully designed to not encourage dog waste in areas between parking and the beach/trails or in picnic areas.
2. I prefer restricting bike riders to the paved area on Mason Street, to allow a more enjoyable pedestrian experience on the promenade and to prevent further degradation of the compacted trail. Once the project has been completed, a study/test of this option would be appreciated.
3. Enforcement of the new Dog Management Rules
4. Park staff presence, and temporary, movable signage with ongoing current information to update visitors on changes to the landscape, including behavior that is appropriate in this park, including park dispatch contact numbers.

Thank you for continuing to be leaders and holding our park to a higher standard.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 40    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 18:42:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On behalf of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition I am writing to convey our support for reconfiguring the East Beach parking area of Crissy Field, as this can provide an important connection for people on bicycles to reach the promenade. The design is a great improvement from the current state of the parking area, however there could be additional space for bicycles along the one or both of the roads that connect Old Mason Road to the promenade, through the parking area. That would allow people on bicycles to safely reach the promenade to bicycle along the water, providing another connection for the Bay Trail. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 41    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 19:14:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The schematic design for Crissy Field maintenance is flawed and biased against handicapped users and water sports enthusiasts. The plan also goes beyond any reasonable definition of maintenance. Adding remote paved parking, creating drainage swales which will have to be fenced off and widening the promenade is reconfiguration requiring an environmental study. We don't need more paved parking or an extra wide concourse with choke points at each end. The daily users of the beach need parking close to the water. Handicapped persons enjoy a rare venue of being able to see beachgoers and sailing sports from their cars. Crissy Field is a world class sailing destination, and as natural a beach as you will find within city limits, not a Coney Island or Fishermans Wharf style venue. It is a small and precious asset to the Park service. I don't think anyone wants to degrade the experience of the beach users, but there is a limit to how many people can comfortably occupy the park. On hot weekends the park approaches that limit and it seems that this plan addresses the few peak visitor periods to the detriment of daily users.

We do need a crowned and properly draining promenade with bike lane signage and speed bumps at the cross traffic points.

We do need to get the bathrooms fixed and the showers turned back on.

The money for maintenance could well be spent engineering a proper outflow for the estuary pond.

Storms and high tides create a standing pool of stagnant water on the beach annually.

In general, I am in favor of more grass and erosion control, and less pavement.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed reconfiguration of Crissy Field East Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 42    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 21:59:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am one of thousands of San Franciscans who regularly take advantage of the wonderful urban access to the bay provided by Crissy Field to windsurf, kitesurf, paddleboard, and engage in other water sports. The San Francisco Bay is widely regarded as one of the top locations in the world for such activities, and the Crissy Field east beach area is the critical access point to the bay for many of us.

The lengthy and careful design process for the current layout of the east beach area carefully considered these recreational needs, and the resulting plan has been extremely successful. While the new proposed

plan has some encouraging improvements, it also would negatively impact recreational use of Crissy Field for water sports without some important changes.

First, to acknowledge improvements in the proposed plan:

- The existing reinforced turf parking areas have not worked, and replacing these dirt areas with an improved parking area makes sense
- Turning the area between the bathrooms/showers and the promenade into grass would create more space for rigging sails and preparing gear while also providing direct access to the water without requiring people to navigate narrow spaces between cars and to cross through traffic. Note this is only true as long as the plan is maintained as currently shown with grass lawn in this area. If it is changed to the bio-swale used elsewhere in the plan along the promenade, the area cannot be used effectively.
- Adding double car width no parking hatched areas along the southern edge of the western half of the parking area will enable recreational users to rig gear on the southern section of grass and to walk with their gear to the beach. A continuous row of parking spaces would effectively render this grass area unusable. Given that it is used regularly on weekends when there are many people at east beach, it is important to maintain this grass area as usable.

However, the current proposed redesign would also have a number of negative impacts on recreational use which would outweigh the benefits, including:

- 1) Although the total number of parking spaces at east beach would be kept consistent, the number of spaces in the west end of the parking lot closest to the grass rigging area for sails and other watersports equipment will be significantly reduced, with new spaces added in a large paved lot further east. With the proposed design, recreational watersports users will likely find themselves having to park far away from the rigging area, to unload gear into driving lanes in the parking lot, and to carry boards and other large gear through the parking lot to the grass. This will create traffic issues, safety issues, and crime issues (with cars left temporarily open), and it will negatively impact the recreational use of the east beach area.
- 2) The number of parking spaces with direct access to the grass lawn rigging areas next to the bathroom and in the area south of it will be significantly reduced. The practical realities of needing to move watersports gear from cars to grass without leaving it on asphalt which could damage bulky and fragile gear will again result in recreational users having to walk across parking lot areas with their gear, with a variety of negative consequences per above. Additionally, recreational watersports users of the east beach area who can't get parking close to the rigging area will likely end up parking along the southeast margin of the parking lot to be able to rig sails and prepare their gear close to their cars, which will result in them walking all the way through the north-south driving lanes of the parking lot with fully rigged gear to access the beach, creating more traffic and safety issues.
- 3) Years of experience with the current layout suggests that traffic flow with the new proposed layout will result in most visitors who do not find parking in the rows closest to the beach in the middle section of the parking area continuing to the west where they will fill up all of the parking in the west end of east beach long before utilizing much of the new parking at the east end. This will reduce the amount of available parking with access to the grass lawn, and a likely high volume of traffic flowing through the one entrance/exit to the western part of the parking area will increase traffic and safety issues.
- 4) The smaller lawn in the westernmost section of the parking lot doesn't have any exit paths in the proposed design that are large enough to carry gear through, which means it will not be usable for



watersports purposes.

These negative impacts on recreational use are substantial, and I urge the park service to engage with recreational users of east beach such as the San Francisco Boardsailing Association to solicit additional feedback and to collaborate in a new east beach design that will better met the needs of recreational users.

Finally, I have a few suggestions for things that could be improved in the proposed design to reduce negative recreational impacts, especially if the park service doesnt engage with the community to consider a broader range of design options:

- 1) Add parking along the western margin of the main lawn area to increase the amount of parking with direct access to the lawn
- 2) Add parking along the westernmost edge of the east beach area to increase the amount of parking in the western half of the area
- 3) Create an exit path out of the small lawn in the west section of the parking lot, even if just a double car width no parking zone on the northern side of the lawn, to enable people to walk between the lawn and the beach with their gear
- 4) Break up the parking lot on the eastern half of the east beach parking area by putting in grass strips that are 100-150% o the length of parking stalls in the area currently designated for 5 foot drainage channels, and extend these the full length of those rows instead of stopping them 3 stalls short as in the current design. These would make the larger parking area more aesthetically attractive, and would also significantly increase the amount of usable lawn area immediately adjacent to parking stalls for rigging and preparing gear, while also acting as alleys for people to get through the parking lot with their gear without having to walk in traffic lanes
- 5) Consider changes to the traffic circulation patterns or signage to encourage or require drivers entering the east beach area to circle through the east side of the parking area so that they are more likely to park there and not to immediately head to the western side of the parking area closer to the bridge. Among other things, breaking up the linear east-west drive path along the southern edge of the current design might motivate more people to stay on the east side and utilize the new parking more effectively.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. I hope you will seriously consider these points as well as the feedback from the broader community of recreational users of the east beach area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 43    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,18,2016 22:29:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your plan to remove 75 of the parking spots between the current rest rooms and the beach will severely hamper recreational use by the windsurfing and kite surfing community in the SF Bay Area. These activities require close proximity to boards, sails, masts, kites, etc, during setup, which are kept in the practitioner's vehicles. After setup the windsurf or kitesurfing gear must be carried to the water, so minimizing the distance between the parking space and the water is very important, as the gear is heavy and difficult to manouver, particularly in windy conditions. Please reconsider your plan!

/Anders

---

**Correspondence ID:** 44    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 22:38:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a sailor, and in line with the perspective of the Chrissy Field Yacht Club.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 45    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,18,2016 23:22:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The existing East Beach Parking Area is a worn out, dated design, lacking in functionality and imagination. Parked vehicles should not be lined up at the edge of the beachfront, extending across the entire length of the East Beach. In sharp contrast, the proposed design is simple, brilliant and both aesthetically and environmentally appropriate for the site. The goals of all eight of the issues listed on the "existing conditions" page are spot on. Thank you GGNRA, the Conservancy and CMG for a great plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 46    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,19,2016 12:34:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was vice chair of the GGNRA Advisory Commission that made recommendations to the park about the design of this portion of Crissy Field. As with any well-used site of this kind, over the years it has received a lot of wear and tear. Also, as the field trip I participated in with GGNRA and Conservancy staff showed, there are small faults in the original design that have become apparent over time.

The renewal and rehabilitation of this site, is a fitting part of the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service. Crissy Field has at least a million visitors a year and the structural wearing down that has occurred over 15 years has to be fixed. Also it is necessary to widen this part of the Promenade where there are a great many visitors and the potential for conflicts caused by crowding.

The faults in the original design have to do with how too many visitors who picnic or play on the grass are separated from the beach. The rehabilitation provides better connection and places more parking behind the grassy areas.

If it would be helpful to board sailors, a couple of 5 minute parking spaces could be marked for them to unload their gear nearer to the beach before going to a long-term parking space.

This project is a fine-tuned adjustment that will provide much pleasure to visitors to this important area of the Presidio.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 47    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,19,2016 13:38:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

My comments are directed at the East Beach Parking portion of this plan. If the goal of the proposed plan is to better the experience of residents and visitors to Crissy Field I'm disappointed by the proposal to

insert more asphalt.

Crissy Field is a wonderful natural amenity. We are lucky to have it. Accommodating the public's enjoyment of this amenity is important. This is why I agree with many of the proposed improvements in this schematic design.

However, there is a point at which improvements to accommodate the public dilute the very beauty that the public is there to enjoy. In my opinion a large, paved parking lot crosses this threshold.

We have talented, creative designers in this town. Is there not a solution that highlights the fragility of this natural landscape and our desire to be stewards rather than acquiesce to the convenience of the automobile?

Respectfully,  
Peter Cornue

---

**Correspondence ID:** 48    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,19,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am responding to problems I see with the Schematic Design of the Crissy Field resurfacing.

First off, my background is that I am an Orthopedic Surgeon who grew up in the Bay Area. I spent much of my youth sailing dinghies and windsurfers at the City Front. My first job was with a surf shop just up the street from Crissy Field. I have a busy orthopedic practice in San Francisco and commonly come down to Crissy Field to decompress after a weeks work.

I knew Crissy Field when it was a concrete lot with a few government buildings. When the current park design was planned, I got to see the public process in action. A mentor of mine, Dr. Paul Heineken was instrumental in some of the features of the current design. It was fascinating to hear him talk about how various features of the park provided numerous options to the various user groups that frequent the park. I don't think even he conceived of how great a success this urban wetland has become!

The current layout of the East Beach Parking involves large areas of grass parking that unfortunately due to drought, and deferred maintenance has become a blight, which I believe is what is prompting the current redesign.

The solution does nothing but make this eyesore permanent by paving over it with asphalt. This has all of the beauty and functionality of a strip mall parking lot.

Remember that the reason for using grass as a parking surface in the initial design was to allow for multiple uses of this very precious waterfront space. During holiday weekends, and high use days, the grass surface serves to provide parking. But on weeknights when the lot is less than 25% capacity, the grass parking area becomes a soccer field, a race track for RC cars, a place for workouts for fitness groups, among other uses. Paving the space means that it becomes a very efficient parking area, but not much more.

I would support the using of pavers or a grid to help support the turf and prevent excessive wear that is

causing problems with the current design but feel that the plan as proposed should not be accepted with out further public review. Remember how valuable this space is. Don't squander it by turning it into a "parking lot".

With best regards,  
Dr. Nicholas H. Mast

---

**Correspondence ID:** 49    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DATE: April 20, 2016  
TO: National Parks Service (NPS)  
RE: Public Comments on the NPS plan for Crissy Field/ East Beach Area.

I am not in favor of what has been proposed. Seasonal Grass Parking Areas have all been eliminated. Now there is not enough parking adjacent to grass, particularly in the large asphalt lot proposed for the east end of the lot.

Recommendations:

1. Install usable grass areas in the center of the large paved parking lots. Lawn should be wide enough for picnics, rigging windsurf gear and for breaking up the mass of new pavement.
2. Add walking Paths through Parking Lots to the Beach. Avoid pedestrian conflicts with driveways and cars. Walking Paths need to be 15 to 20 feet wide to accommodate all users.
3. Keep the vehicle circulation pattern that goes around the grass lot on the west side of the plan. It's good as shown.
4. Stripe all parking stalls on the west side of the plan.
5. Do not include any compact parking spaces.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 50    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 12:40:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance' plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The

proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as *dicondra repens* which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 51    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 12:59:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Good morning NPS Team Representatives,

While generally supportive of the concept of repairing the highly used Crissy Field area and utilizing funds which have been allocated for such scope of work, the current schematic design needs further revision. I do not support the design as proposed.

Seasonal grass parking areas have all been eliminated. Now there is not enough parking adjacent to grass, particularly in the large asphalt lot proposed for the east end of the lot.

Recommendations:

1. Install usable grass areas in the center of the large paved parking lots. Lawn should be wide enough (no less than 15 feet and preferably 20-25 feet) for picnics, rigging windsurf gear and for breaking up the mass of new pavement.
2. Add walking paths through parking lots to the beach. Avoid pedestrian conflicts with driveways and cars. Walking paths need to be at least 15 feet wide, and preferably 20 feet wide to accommodate all users.
3. Please retain the vehicle circulation pattern that goes around the grass lot on the west side of the plan.
4. Stripe all parking stalls on the west side of the plan.
5. Do not include any compact parking spaces.

Very truly yours,

John D. Newman  
Attorney at Law

---

**Correspondence ID:** 52    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 13:33:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been utilizing Crissy field for 30 years. Long before there were hoards of people enjoying Crissy Field for all manner of activities, there was a group of hardy windsurfers who braved dusty, rocky open areas sort of like the wild west west in order to park, rig, and windsurf. It was a pleasant improvement when the area was spruced up with grass, proper toilets, and showers. But now, some of the oldest and most loyal users of Crissy Field are getting the **SHORT END OF THE PLANNING STICK**. In your proposed diagram, you are creating a nightmare for windsurfers. You are moving most of the parking to the East end of the parking lot where there is no accessible grass for rigging. You clearly did **NOT** get any input from the windsurfing community when coming up with this design. We need to be able to park on or near grass with our cars to rig our gear. The design shows a bunch of shrubbery on the north side of the lot and as well as massively reducing the number of parking spaces with easy access to grass. I'm really bummed that the home of world class windsurfing and kitesurfing conditions is getting **NO** respect. Your design assumes everyone is equally happy to park anywhere. This simply isn't the case. A dog walker can easily use your "walmart-style" parking lot but a windsurfing or kitesurfer needs easy access to his or her vehicle during the rigging process **AND** needs to rig on the grass or other soft surface.

Do you guys really not care that this is world class water sports location? Do you have no desire to acknowledge this community of die hard wind sports enthusiasts and their needs?

I am so saddened that the plan didn't take our needs into account. What can I do help you meet your needs to make improvements while also accommodating one of the key constituent user groups of Crissy field?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 53    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One part of this document claims no impact on recreational use, which is just not true as it clearly impacts use of the area by windsurfers/kitesurfers..

There are two main flaws with the plan, as follows:

1. There is a net loss of 75 spaces on the west side of the lot. It is the area directly adjacent to the beach and where most of windsurfers/kitesurfers park. With the removal of those 75 spaces, this area will be in very high demand by our community as well as dog walkers and picnickers. On the weekend, it will be very hard to park here.

2. The loss of 75 spaces is made up with a huge Walmart like parking lot at the east end of the lot. Aside from the unfriendly nature of this large parking lot, there is very little grass here. Windsurfer/kitesurfer are going to be schlepping their gear back and forth across a busy parking lot to get to grass and eventually the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 54    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 19:15:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance' plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as dicondra repens which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 55 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 19:20:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My daughter brings me to east beach. I am handicapped. Please do not remove the parking places along the promenade. It is a hardship for me if I am not close to the water to see that beautiful view. I use a walker and find it hard to get out of the car. Being able to park and watch the activities at the beach from my car is one of my few pleasures in life. You are making it worse by creating a "round about drop off area" that eliminates parking along the promenade. The parking lot is not broken, so don't try to fix it. It does not require a reconfiguration. Please use the grant money to do maintenance on the existing park. Do not eliminate parking spaces that bring joy to seniors. Your day will come and then maybe you will consider seniors and handicapped.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 56 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,20,2016 21:36:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave the parking lot alone. The proximity to the beach allows easier access for moms with kids, kite surfers and picnickers. We eat our lunch at CF most days. My 82 year old Dad loves the view. He is handicapped and can enjoy the view without exiting the car. I fear, moving the lot,

will be more exclusive than inclusive for many people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 57    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,20,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm opposed to the proposed changes to the Crissy Field's East Beach parking lot.

The two main flaws with the plan are as follows:

1. There is a net loss of 75 spaces on the west side of the lot. It is the area directly adjacent to the beach and where most of us park. With the removal of those 75 spaces, this area will be in very high demand by our community as well as dog walkers and picnickers. I don't really see a problem during the week but on the weekend, it will be very hard to park here.
2. The loss of 75 spaces is made up with a huge Walmart like parking lot at the east end of the lot. Aside from the unfriendly nature of this large parking lot, there is very little grass here. If you are unlucky enough to show up late on the weekend, you are going to be schlepping your gear back and forth across a busy parking lot to get to grass and eventually the beach. In a nutshell, this sucks and is unacceptable.

Please respect the preferences of the park's most frequent users. There are not many other places where we can go to practice our favorite sport: kiteboarding

---

**Correspondence ID:** 58    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,  
the National Park Service GGNRA was awarded centennial deferred maintenance money with matching funds from the Haas Family trust.  
The current configuration of the parking lot is well thought out in the original EIR of 1996, and I disagree with the new redesign plans.  
There are legally binding covenants in this EIR that the current park management seem to be overlooking in a rush to use this money in 2016.

I appreciate the grassy/dirt casual parking and it services the current and anticipated needs of the public as well as boardsailors/kiteboarders.  
The east beach parking is only full about 8 days a year on holidays, etc.

I would propose spend the 5 million on fixing the promenade without widening it, not increasing the parking, and perhaps getting the public showers going again instead of rushing to spend money on an ill thought out redesign.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 59    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 12:57:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What a wonderful opportunity to "refresh" the much beloved Crissy Field and its immediate environs. As a long-term San Francisco resident, Crissy Field has been a very significant part



of my life and I frequently walk the promenade. The Park Service has offered a timely, much-needed, and well-designed updating of this important site. As a national park near a dense urban area, the NPS has successfully walked a fine line in meeting the needs of multiple users while respecting both the natural and cultural legacy of this iconic place. Thank you! JoAnn McAllister

---

**Correspondence ID:** 60    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 14:00:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid Kite-foiler, and beach goer, I object to this plan - - the beach access will be reduced causing a lot more congestion with board sailors dragging gear across busy traffic/parking areas - this plan also short circuits both critical environmental review and also working with the active and supportive community that cares for this space/resource. Please reject and significantly amend to accommodate key constituencies!

Many thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 61    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 16:07:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am one of those people who might be guilty of loving Crissy Field to death. I've been walking the Promenade since it was built, and I find my day is improved any time I've been able to spend time there. My little dog and I are at Crissy Field 2 or 3 times a week.

In the past I would be out in the elements regardless of the fog, wind, or drizzle. But I'm now 75 years old and find that when it's inclement weather, it's more enjoyable to just sit in my car and watch the boats on the water, the wave action, and those who are out kite sailing. I'm usually fortunate to find parking in the row closest to the Promenade and have an uninterrupted view of the activities.

My request is that although the parking will be moved back, that the reconfiguration will not limit the view of the beach and the Promenade, that it still allows someone sitting in the car on a cold day to continue to feel a part of the beauty and the fun of being at the beach.

I'm so grateful for Crissy Field, and also for all the hard work that has gone into making it what it is. I remember that when I was a very small child my brother was stationed at Crissy Field during the War and I remember our picking him up when he had a few days of leave. Crissy Field is very important to me.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 62    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 16:56:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NPS/GGNRA proposed plans to repair and rehabilitate one of the most heavily visited and used recreational areas in San Francisco, at Crissy Field. As the Crissy Field area is not 15 years old and is visited by millions every year, this portion of GGNRA is due for refreshing, repairs and rehabilitation.

I support the resurfacing of the all important promenade, repairing the paths, and improving the drainage capabilities to the Marsh and all the proposed recreational changes that will improve the visitor

experience ce.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 63    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,21,2016 19:39:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sample letter

I am saddened and disturbed by the proposed "deferred maintenance' plan for the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The plan takes literally the lyrics "PAVED PARADISE AND PUT UP A PARKING LOT"

In fact this area of Crissy field was never intended for the sole purpose of parking. It was intended to be part of Crissy FIELD, a PARK, a RECREATION AREA, and a SOCIAL GATHERING SITE. The proposed plan suggests that the architects have limited knowledge of the area and how it is used.

This area is a WORLD class windsurfing and kiting site and is used for international events. The proposed site, obliterates much of the green area which is essential for rigging and equipment. The available green site proposed is completely inadequate and will also be in high demand by picnickers. The needs of windsurfers and kitesurfers have been completely ignored. One must park ADJACENT to a grassy area in order to have access to one's vehicle for the equipment. The proposed plan is incompatible with the original mission statement and intended use design for the area and suggests that the area is solely there as parking for the promenade. This could not be further from the truth.

It is unfortunate that the original dune grass proposed for the area did not work out. There are other types of flora that could be considered such as dicondra repens which is drought and coastal tolerate, can handle heavy traffic and also will grow in sand or hard surface. The lack of maintenance of the area over the years has been appalling but not as appalling as the current proposal. Maintenance of the existing lawns is also an option. Drought has been cited as a reason not to do this however drought has not stopped the proposal of extensive lawn in the presidio overpass plan. Thus maintenance of the existing lawns should remain an option.

This proposal is UNACCEPTABLE and unless you work for greater compromise with the communities and especially the windsurfers and kitesurfers that utilize the area then you can be guaranteed significant pressure both from a community outpouring and legal angle to prevent this project from moving forward.

There is NO WAY this will pass from a legal perspective with an exclusion for a NEPA. This is MAJOR CONSTRUCTION of a massive parking lot in an area that was previously an open space / multi functional area.

FALSE C.8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

FALSE C.18. Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 64    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 14:21:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Senior Plea:

I am a handicapped senior and enjoy east beach. If you move ahead with this new design for parking, it will make things worse for those of us that have special needs. Being able to park the car right near the beach enables me to get out with my walker and walk directly on the promenade to the benches. With your new plan, it will make it more difficult for me to get to the benches. Life is hard enough for us with a disability, so please don't make it harder. Keep the existing parking as it is now. Keep ALL the parking spaces along the promenade for those to enjoy the view from their car or the benches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 65 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 14:29:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't change the existing east beach parking. I am a disabled senior and have trouble walking. You will make it worse for me, as well as others, to have to walk a greater distance to sit on a bench. I look forward to my time at the beach. Please take into consideration how hard it is for people like me to get around. I hope never have to find out how hard it is being handicapped. Please conduct a full EIR to determine the impact of this project.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 66 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 14:39:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Do not widen the promenade. It will only increase bike traffic and make it unsafe for little children and seniors. Do not remove the existing benches. Add more along the promenade. They serve the purpose of rest and public well being. The benches provide a place to watch the water sports activities, people, dogs, and to look at the bay views. Maintain what is there now. Don't change it. Use the grant money to do much needed maintenance. Do not change the park! It's not broken... don't fix it. Maintain it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 67 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 15:49:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a windsurfer and user of Crissy Field, the proposed changes are not conducive to my use of the area. In particular, the proposed parking changes will cause windsurfers to park far from the launch area when crowded which is typical on weekends. Please take the input of the SFBA (San Francisco Boardsailing Association) into account before making changes. Thank You, Jonathan Hahn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 68 **Project:** 63094 **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 16:09:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** DO NOT widen the promenade.

Widening the promenade from 20 feet to 30 feet at East Beach will only increase bike traffic and foot traffic. This makes it more difficult to cross the promenade to gain access to the beach, not only for beach goers, but also for board sailors. Creating this widened promenade and then reducing it by 10 feet creates a choke point and congestion. Resurface it, but keep it 20 feet wide.

DO NOT reconfigure east beach parking area.

Do not eliminate parking along the promenade taking away easy access to the benches for the elderly and handicapped. These people enjoy sitting in their car parked along the promenade and enjoying the view. The proposed plan takes away the parking places north of the bathrooms and to the west along the promenade that face the water. The proposed plan also eliminates some of the benches. Keep the parking lot as it exists. Post signs, repaint stripes and directional arrows, and install speed bumps and stop signs where needed.

Keep the park a park.

DO NOT create more pavement. Parking on the grass or dirt is not an issue. The parking area is rarely full... only on hot weekends and special events.

"Brown is the new green". We're in a drought. Leave it alone.

Keep the parking grounds available for the professional dog walkers west of the bathrooms under the trees.

Keep the lawn area surrounding the bathrooms green and irrigated. Keep the parking area immediately surrounding the bathrooms for the board sailors. They need to park next to a grassy area and to have access to their vehicle for their equipment.

Do Maintenance!

Fix the bathrooms! Repair the sewage lines and the water lines.

Excavate the beach so there is no longer a pond that is created during storm and monthly extreme high tides. Stagnant water breeds mosquitoes. Add sand.

Line the estuary from the walking bridge to the bay with boulders on the east side, or create a bulkhead similar to the west side.

Excavate the beach with more sand along the existing promenade concrete sea wall.

The grant money is deemed for maintenance and repair. Use it for that.

DO NOT reconfigure the east beach parking area.

Conduct an environmental impact study on the proposed project and make the report available for public viewing and comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 69    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The schematic design repeatedly relies on the assertion that the current Crissy parking area only holds 400 cars and there will be no net loss of parking. The parking area was originally designed to accommodate 500 cars, and in peak times holds significantly more than 400, contrary to the NPS's repeated assertions. (I understand the NPS is relying on parking counts conducted for them. As a regular user of Crissy Field I know that those counts are not accurate and are significantly underreporting the car count at peak times.) The current schematic design calls for far more than maintenance, and represents a significant change to the Crissy parking lot configuration. The proposed changes will likely exacerbate overcrowded parking conditions on the weekend and worsen the traffic flow, while limiting access to regular users. While a redesign of the parking lot may be in order in the future, it should not be rushed through without full public participation and full consideration of the impact of proposed changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 70    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 17:34:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A question has been raised about the need for an environmental review should my suggestion that bicycle riders\* be directed to walk their bikes, not ride, in congested areas of the Crissy Promenade. (My comments submitted April 13,2016). I question whether a review is warranted.

A bicycle is a vehicle under California law. In this case, riders would be directed to walk only in designated places. This is the sole restriction. Riders would remain free to continue to use any route, walkway or roadway they currently use.

I see this analogous to a minor change of any traffic instruction which is currently available to the NPS without environmental review. For example, a new "SLOW", "DETOUR" or any sign advising a changed or revised trail or road condition.

The current system is inherently unsafe and puts other trail users at risk as they must dodge moving bicycles in congested areas. I wonder if the current allowance of uncontrolled riding violates provisions of the ADA?

\*Some of these riders are operating electric powered bicycles. Should their operation also remain unlimited ?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 71    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089

**Received:** Apr,22,2016 18:16:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on this important initiative. The Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary has its headquarters facility on Crissy Field, adjacent to the promenade. Everyone who visits this campus, whether it be staff, guests, students, educators, or public visitors, crosses the promenade to access our buildings. Please consider the following:

There are 4 main access points to our campus from the promenade. We request that at least one of these remain open to foot traffic during the phasing of the project, and that appropriate signage be placed directing people to the nearest entrance point during construction.

All promenade grading should tie into existing campus entrances and storm sewer outfalls and not create any tripping hazards or non-compliant ADA slopes.

The entryway to the campus driveway where it crosses the existing promenade is currently asphalt, and should remain asphalt or another hard surface capable of supporting vehicular traffic.

The promenade gets heavy use from utility trucks and other large maintenance vehicles (Presidio utilities, PGE, ATT, SF Fire Department, etc.) between the driveway on the southeast of campus and the campus entry driveway. The (sub)surface of the new promenade should be heavy-duty to allow for such traffic.

We hold outdoor education programs throughout the school year, and are concerned about construction noise and safety issues regarding large vehicles. We request that the work adjacent to the campus be completed when no classes are scheduled between Dec 1, 2016 - Mar 15, 2017, and that a detailed construction schedule be shared with us as soon as possible.

There is currently no ADA-accessible path or bus drop-off point for our campus. Although perhaps beyond the scope of this repair effort, we request (the work be done in a way that is compatible with the) new grading and construction of an ADA path and pull-out across Mason Street from the Planet Granite

(Building 924)

The new parking lots at East Crissy Beach should have permeable surfaces. If the budget does not allow for this, then GGNRA should allocate a small portion of the lot to test different permeable treatments so park partners have better information and guidance to draw from when they are required to construct similar surfaces in the future.

The sanctuary anticipates tying into any new greywater irrigation system on Crissy Field when this reclaimed source becomes available in the future. This would require a small trench which could be repaired and resealed with the same surface as the one currently being installed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 72    **Project:** 63094    **Document:** 72089  
**Received:** Apr,22,2016 20:21:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO. DO NOT reconfigure the east beach parking lot.  
NO. DO NOT widen the promenade to 30 feet.  
YES. Resurface the promenade.

Leave east beach and the promenade just the way it is. Do not change anything. Do the required maintenance. Plant more grass in the parking areas. Do not pave. Add more sand and excavate the beach to eliminate the pond created at extreme high tides and storm surge. Eliminate standing water that leads to breeding mosquitoes and possibly zika.

DO NOT remove the front row parking spaces facing the water. DO NOT deprive the handicapped. DO NOT take away good "lookout" parking spaces that can possibly aid a board sailor in distress.

Leave the east beach layout alone. DO NOT change a thing.

---