

# **F O R T   B A K E R**

Final EIS

## **PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

**Please Note:** Responses to the following hearing comments are presented at the end of the transcript.

BEFORE THE  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Meeting of the  
ADVISORY COMMISSION  
for the  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
and  
POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

GGNRA Park Headquarters  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, California

Wednesday, November 18, 1998  
7:30 p.m.

REPORTER: Frances Lorraine

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
AND POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

- - -

ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

- - -

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1998

- - -

GGNRA Park Headquarters  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, California

The meeting was convened, pursuant to  
notice, at 7:30 p.m., Chairman Rich Bartke presiding.

Commissioners Present:

- RICH BARTKE, Chair
- MICHAEL ALEXANDER
- HOWARD COGSWELL
- NAOMI GRAY
- REDMOND KERNAN
- MEL LANE
- TRENT ORR
- CARLOTA DEL PORTILLO
- LENNIE ROBERTS
- MERRITT ROBINSON
- HANK SCIARONI
- JACK SPRING

Commissioners Present (Continued):

ED WAYBURN

JACQUELINE YOUNG

ALSO PRESENT:For the Golden Gate National Recreation Area:

BRIAN O'NEILL, General Superintendent

B. J. GRIFFIN, Presidio General Manager

NANCY HORNOR, Park Planner

MICHAEL FEINSTEIN, Staff Liaison

For the Presidio Trust:

CRAIG MIDDLETON, Director of Government Affairs

C O N T E N T S

|                                                       | <u>Page</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Call to order                                         | 6           |
| Approval of Minutes                                   | 7           |
| Commissioner Del Portillo Sworn In                    | 8           |
| Presidio General Manager's Report                     | 12          |
| Presido Trust Report                                  | 15          |
| Superintendent's Report                               | 17          |
| Fort Baker Plan and Environmental<br>Impact Statement | 24          |
| Public Comment:                                       |             |
| ✓ DAVE PEIXOTTO                                       | 29          |
| ✓ BILL PATTERSON                                      | 33          |
| ✓ BONNIE PITMAN                                       | 35          |
| — MARK DUPREE                                         | 38          |
| H. J. GORDON                                          | 43          |
| JANE PIERETH                                          | 48          |
| — MARGARET ZEGART                                     | 51          |
| COURTNEY DAMKROGER                                    | 53          |
| — GARY WALKER                                         | 56          |
| KEN MANNSHARDT                                        | 57          |
| BRIAN HUSE                                            | 59          |
| LUCIA BOGATAY                                         | 62          |
| ROBERT J. LULL                                        | 65          |
| JOHN DIAMENTE                                         | 70          |

|                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
|                                   | 5  |
| Committee Reports:                |    |
| Presidio Committee                | 91 |
| Public Comment (Non-Agenda Item): |    |
| MARGARET ZEGART                   | 93 |
| Adjournment                       | 96 |

1 Nancy Hornor is the chief of the planning  
2 effort on this. Nancy, do you want to start off?

3 FORT BAKER PLAN AND EIS

4 NANCY HORNOR, PARK PLANNER

5 MS. HORNOR: Thanks, Rich. I think you  
6 might have gotten people worried when you said that I  
7 was going to do a presentation.

8 But this is the second of three meetings  
9 that we will have about the Fort Baker plan. And at the  
10 first meeting last month, we gave a presentation of the  
11 plan. And at this time all I really want to do is spend  
12 a few minutes just to give the context of the comments  
13 that we will hear tonight.

14 We are in the middle, a little bit past the  
15 middle, of the public review period for the  
16 environmental impact statement on the Fort Baker plan.  
17 And the EIS evaluates the impacts and describes our  
18 proposed action for Fort Baker in three alternatives.

19 The plan and the alternatives were  
20 developed through a fairly lengthy process involving a  
21 lot of information gathering, data collection, really  
22 getting our feet on the ground, and then working with  
23 the public to identify and refine the concepts that are  
24 in the EIS.

25 We have had a really very wonderful and

1 positive planning process with a lot of very insightful  
2 participation from other agencies, organizations and the  
3 public over the last two years. And we have a proposed  
4 plan that meets the objectives that we identified  
5 through the planning process, and we worked those out  
6 also with the public in our Advisory Commission.

7                   And just in general, those are to achieve  
8 sustainability, to relate to and retain the site's  
9 special qualities, to promote public access, minimize  
10 environmental impacts and complement the permanent site  
11 tenants and other GGNRA sites and programs.

12                   The highlights of the proposed plan are:

13                   \* A conference and retreat center in the historic  
14 buildings around the parade ground and in the general  
15 residential area to the north of the parade ground.

16                   \* Expansion of the Bay Area Discovery Museum  
17 primarily within the complex that they operate in today.

18                   \* Retention and some modest expansion of the U.S.  
19 Coast Guard station at Fort Baker.

20                   \* Retention of the waterfront open space and  
21 improvements of that space through restoration of the  
22 beach.

23                   \* General site improvements that expand from the  
24 waterfront throughout the rest of the site including  
25 improved public trails, site restoration and general

1 access improvements.

2 \* Conversion of the marina and the historic boat  
3 shop to a public-serving facility with short-term  
4 moorings to accommodate day use and overnight visitors,  
5 food service and bicycle rentals provided in that space.

6 The alternatives evaluated in the  
7 environmental impact statement are a very close  
8 resemblance to our 1980 General Management Plan concept,  
9 which is similar in many ways to the proposed plan.

10 With the exception that it has similar uses  
11 but with much higher density, and just in general a  
12 higher level of traffic, parking and activity on the  
13 site, as well as a 700-car parking staging area for  
14 shuttle transportation and to the Marin Headlands.

15 The No Action Alternative, which is really  
16 a minimal action alternative that would really just do  
17 the minimum to protect the special resources that we  
18 have at the site, but not a lot of additional actions.

19 And then an office and cultural center  
20 alternative, which would use the historic buildings at  
21 Fort Baker for something that would look a little bit  
22 like perhaps Fort Mason Center or the Thoreau Center for  
23 Sustainability, or other areas within the park where we  
24 have park partners, nonprofit and for profit  
25 organizations that operate programs in the historic

1 buildings, and would also retain in the marina and  
2 boatshop area something very similar to the operation  
3 that you see there today.

4           The public comment period began on October  
5 7th and it extends until December 7th. We anticipate  
6 that we will be -- we are already getting comments in  
7 and we are beginning to analyze those comments and work  
8 on them because we would really like to be able to  
9 complete the final EIS in January.

10           And then after a 30-day no action period,  
11 we hope to complete a Record of Decision in February,  
12 and really get into the next job which is implementation  
13 of the plan. So that we can get on with preserving the  
14 buildings and restoring some of the open spaces.

15           The testimony tonight is part of the record  
16 of the environmental impact statement. There is a  
17 verbatim transcript created from the meeting tonight.  
18 And the comments that we receive tonight will be  
19 responded to in the final EIS.

20           We encourage people that speak tonight to  
21 also submit comments in writing if you would like to  
22 elaborate or further document what you say tonight. And  
23 our park staff and some of our consultants are on hand  
24 tonight to clarify anything that we can for the  
25 Commission and answer any question.

1                   But the bulk of the response to comments  
2 will be in the final EIS that will be completed in  
3 January. So with that, I will turn it back over to you,  
4 Rich, and we can have public comments.

5                   CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you very much,  
6 Nancy. We are now going to call upon those members of  
7 the public who have signed up to speak.

8                   And we will ask you to come one at a time  
9 up to the podium where there is a microphone, because,  
10 as Nancy explained, we do want to get your comments down  
11 and make them a part of the official record for this  
12 environmental document, as well as for our own  
13 information.

14                   There are more than a dozen people that  
15 have signed up so far to speak. So I am going to ask  
16 you to try to limit your remarks to about three minutes.  
17 We have learned that if you have come prepared, you  
18 probably can get your message across in that length of  
19 time.

20                   First of all, we would like you to identify  
21 who you are. Also, if you are representing a group or  
22 an agency of any kind, please identify who that group or  
23 agency is.

24                   I will call two names. The first name will  
25 be the person who is at the microphone to speak. And

1 then the second person that I call would be the one who  
2 is getting over there ready to go, so there won't be too  
3 much of a gap between speakers.

4 And the first one I have is H. J. Gordon,  
5 and the second speaker would be Bill Patterson. So, Mr.  
6 Gordon, would you please take the microphone. And would  
7 Mr. Patterson please move over and --

8 MR. GORDON: If I could, I would like to  
9 defer to Mr. Peixotto to speak in my place.

10 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right. Is he here to  
11 speak?

12 MR. PEIXOTTO: Right here.

13 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right, you are Mr.  
14 Gordon?

15 MR. PEIXOTTO: I am representing Mr.  
16 Gordon. Mr. Gordon will represent me.

17 (Laughter.)

18 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right.

19 STATEMENT OF DAVE PEIXOTTO

20 PRESIDIO YACHT CLUB

21 MR. PEIXOTTO: Ladies and gentlemen of the  
22 Advisory Commission, my name is Dave Peixotto and I am  
23 the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Presidio  
24 Yacht Club. And this is a nonprofit public service  
25 organization located on East Fort Baker.

1 I will represent the views of our 550  
2 members regarding the draft EIS on the Fort Baker  
3 General Management Plan.

4 First, we appreciate the National Park  
5 Service is conducting the planning process for Fort  
6 Baker, and the opportunity to advise the National Park  
7 Service on the impacts of their preferred alternative.

8 We are especially pleased, however, to  
9 present approaches which will in fact present more  
10 benefits to the public. We have three points to make.  
11 I will make one, and other speakers, including Mr.  
12 Gordon, will make others.

13 First, we request that the alternative  
14 which allows the Air Force to continue operating the  
15 marina be adopted in a manner that allows the Air Force  
16 to meet the Park Service's objectives.

17 Secondly, our views are that the majority  
18 of the docks must remain in order for the harbor to be  
19 viable. And, finally, there are serious public safety  
20 concerns about the proposed plan.

21 I will make the first point, and other  
22 speakers will make the other two points.

23 First, the U. S. Air Force has the funds  
24 and the organizational ability to meet the goals of  
25 increased public access and use, making the marina a

1 more desirable and useful facility for the public.

2 We strongly urge the National Park Service  
3 to take advantage of these benefits and allow the Air  
4 Force to continue operating the marina.

5 The Air Force began demonstrating its  
6 commitment to greater public access when it took over  
7 the facility from the Army in 1995. The Air Force  
8 launched a significant capital improvement program and  
9 has opened the facilities to public access and to public  
10 programs. And there are considerable public programs  
11 currently going on at the yacht club facility.

12 In addition to meeting all the National  
13 Park Service's objectives in the marina area, the Air  
14 Force is uniquely qualified to retain historical  
15 military relevance at Fort Baker.

16 Air Force sponsorship and cooperation with  
17 the Park Service will also allow immediate  
18 implementation of the final general management plan,  
19 speeding up the time table considerably, versus waiting  
20 for the Park Service to officially assume control of  
21 Fort Baker.

22 Continued operation by the Air Force is  
23 compatible with the objectives listed in the draft EIS,  
24 particularly to achieve financial sustainability and  
25 promote public access to and from the water.

114-A

114-A

1                   If for some reason the Air Force is unable  
2 to continue operating the marina area, the Presidio  
3 Yacht Club is well prepared to assume responsibility.  
4 The Presidio Yacht Club has managed the historic  
5 boathouse, the marina and docks for over 40 years, first  
6 under the Army, and for the past three years under the  
7 Air Force.

8                   While we hope to become a park partner  
9 under the Air Force, it is important to note that the  
10 yacht club has become a nonprofit corporation. We are  
11 totally committed to full and public use consistent with  
12 the Park Service's mission for Fort Baker.

13                   The proposal includes removal of Building  
14 665 adjacent to the boathouse. And we believe that must  
15 be reconsidered. The floor space that that building has  
16 is necessary to accommodate the greatly-expanded public  
17 services that will be offered at the marina. An active  
18 marina is a magnet for visitors.

114-B

19                   We are not in agreement with the Park  
20 Service's proposal to remove the marina docks and  
21 replace them with moorings. The marina and docks are  
22 integral to the goals of offering the highest level of  
23 public access and benefits while addressing critical  
24 public safety concerns.

25                   Our next speaker will get into the issues

1 of the docks, and the final speaker from the yacht club  
2 will talk about public safety.

3 I thank you for considering our comments  
4 and request that you modify the final EIS and general  
5 management plan to reflect these points.

6 Thank you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. The next name  
8 that signed up is Bill Patterson, to be followed by  
9 Bonnie Pitman.

10 STATEMENT OF BILL PATTERSON

11 BAY AREA DISCOVERY MUSEUM

12 MR. PATTERSON: I am, indeed, Bill  
13 Patterson. And I am here representing the Bay Area  
14 Discovery Museum. I am the president of its Board of  
15 Trustees.

16 I want to thank the Commission for its ear  
17 this evening and very directly endorse positively the  
18 proposed plan and EIS. I hope it won't sound immodest  
19 to you all to say that we feel that the Discovery  
20 Museum, in our eleven years of operations, serving as we  
21 have over a million visitors, that we are a unique  
22 resource for the Bay Area and for the Park System.

23 And we are very eager to continue that  
24 legacy, indeed take it to a new level of quality. We  
25 represent 5,600 member families throughout the Bay Area.

1 And we are very pleased with the degree of collaboration  
2 we have had with the Park Service, both in operations  
3 and in the planning process.

4 We have worked diligently over nine years  
5 to improve the structures on our site. And we have  
6 today invested \$8 million of private capital in making  
7 the museum what it is today.

8 We are prepared to invest another \$8  
9 million to \$10 million in the site, contingent on the  
10 approval of this plan. And we are ready to work with  
11 the park to make that work in the most effective way  
12 possible.

13 We are supportive of the educational  
14 mission of the park and its interpretive focus. I know  
15 one of the major emphases of our campaign will be to  
16 increase our outreach to underserved communities, and to  
17 serve the schools. Because at present we are capacity  
18 constrained -- to serve the schools to an even greater  
19 extent.

20 I think we have got a very demonstrable  
21 track record of effectiveness in enhancing the education  
22 of the public education system. We have got a fine  
23 working relationship with the park system. And we are  
24 really pleased to be part of this important step forward  
25 for the park.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you.

3 MR. PATTERSON: Bonnie Pitman, our  
4 Director, will be speaking a little bit later on some  
5 specific comments on the plan. But I appreciate your  
6 consideration.

7 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right. Well, Bonnie  
8 Pitman is up next. And then Mark Depree.

9 STATEMENT OF BONNIE PITMAN

10 BAY AREA DISCOVERY MUSEUM

11 MS. PITMAN: I am Bonnie Pitman, the  
12 Executive Director of the Bay Area Discovery Museum.

13 Of course, I have had wonderful  
14 opportunities over the past months to speak with many  
15 members of the Commission and, of course, the  
16 extraordinary staff of the GGNRA and GGNPA, as we have  
17 been collaborating in the preparation of the plan for  
18 Fort Baker.

19 One of the exciting opportunities of being  
20 the executive director at the Bay Area Discovery Museum  
21 has been this planning process, which has been somewhat  
22 unique and needs to be credited to an excellent way in  
23 which public/private partnerships can come together.

24 All of us have needs down at Fort Baker.  
25 And we just had a presentation last night for our board

1 with families that had been surveyed throughout the Bay  
2 Area as to why they came to the Bay Area Discovery  
3 Museum.

4 And right up there with educational value  
5 was the extraordinary site. I think all of us who have  
6 been at that location know that as it becomes more  
7 visible within our community, more people will want to  
8 take advantage of it.

9 To this end, what the Discovery Museum has  
10 been doing over the past year is not only looking at how  
11 we can expand and enrich our facilities to serve the  
12 public through the addition of space at the site, which  
13 would be carefully planned, not happening all at once --

14 Several people have asked me that question.  
15 It would be done in careful alignment with the new  
16 curriculum that we will be launching that is being  
17 created in collaboration with the GGNRA.

18 The new curriculum called "My Place By the  
19 Bay" will really center on that core message for  
20 children and families about the bay supports life. And  
21 what is the unique ways in which the natural, cultural  
22 and built environment come together and teach children  
23 and families, actively, physically, about their capacity  
24 to change the world in which they live by becoming  
25 stewards of the world around them.

1                   It is a curriculum that will be created in  
2 partnership with the GGNRA. And Howard Levitt and his  
3 team have been meeting with us, as well as experts from  
4 around the Bay Area who are involved in this.

5                   The implementation of the new curriculum  
6 really will strengthen our partnership with the National  
7 Park Service. I think we will stand unique among the  
8 childrens museums in the country with having an overall  
9 core curriculum that is so directly related and routed  
10 in the community.

11                   Importantly, the curriculum will be  
12 manifested through the redesigning of some of our  
13 exhibitions which are so popular, so that there will be  
14 stronger educational content.

15                   The addition of the new Discovery Park,  
16 which will become a synthesis of the understanding of  
17 the outdoor and the indoor learning environment, will  
18 become a wonderful way in which families and children  
19 not only today but in the future understand the unique  
20 world of the water, the land and the people.

21                   The only concept that we have or concern  
22 that we have in the EIS is maybe there isn't enough  
23 parking. The Bay Area Discovery Museum will require  
24 paid attendants. In addition to the tremendous number  
25 of free people, we have one of the highest free

115-A

116-A

1 visitations in the United States among childrens  
2 museums. It is part of our alignment with the park.

3 We want to develop any parking needs in  
4 collaboration with GGNRA, and are confident that as we  
5 refine this process careful consideration can take  
6 place. We have noticed that as Fort Baker has become  
7 more prominent in the news, more people are already  
8 discovering this extraordinary site.

9 So with that one comment, I would like to  
10 say that I hope you will read USA Today on December 5th  
11 and find out that we have been selected as one of the  
12 ten best childrens museums in the country. And once  
13 again, be a strong supporter, as we always have been, of  
14 the GGNRA and of the park.

15 We are very proud to endorse this package  
16 and certainly see that it is part of our future.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Our next  
19 speaker is Mark Dupree. After Mark Dupree, I am going  
20 to ask the real Mr. Gordon to stand up.

21 (Laughter.)

22 STATEMENT OF MARK DUPREE

23 TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE

24 MR. DUPREE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for  
25 giving me the opportunity to speak this evening. My

1 name is Mark Dupree. I am the deputy director of  
2 services at Travis Air Force Base.

3 I want to emphasize that I am a civilian  
4 representative. I have been involved with the Presidio  
5 Yacht Club since October '95 when we first assumed  
6 manager responsibility for the facility. And I am  
7 present tonight on behalf of General Rogier who is the  
8 Wing Commander at Travis Air Force Base.

9 You probably have seen a little bit about  
10 the news of Travis recently. And I would like to give  
11 you a little background on our mission because it is  
12 germane to what we are doing at the yacht club.

13 First of all, as you have probably seen in  
14 the last few days, due to the Iraqi crisis our personnel  
15 have been deployed and very much involved in what is  
16 happening around the world.

17 What you probably have not seen in the news  
18 is that we have also been involved in the recent tragic  
19 disaster with Hurricane Mitch in Honduras and Nicaragua.  
20 And sometimes things don't make the media that are as  
21 exciting. And, of course, this is extremely meaningful  
22 and we continue to be involved in procuring airlift for  
23 that tragedy.

24 But this kind of mission, whether it is the  
25 refuelers that have been involved with the Iraqi crisis

1 that I discussed a moment ago in an effort to deter  
2 aggression, or the cargo transporters that we are using  
3 for global humanitarian airlift, the Travis personnel  
4 have been very much involved in the Presidio Yacht Club  
5 and what it is doing for our efforts there with our  
6 personnel.

7                   Our base is composed of about 7,000 active-  
8 duty military in Solano County, as you probably are  
9 aware. We also have 4,200 reservist men and women in  
10 the community that support our global reach mission. So  
11 it is a community of about 17,000 with the family  
12 members.

13                   The various missions that I have outlined  
14 are really important to our personnel and families.  
15 That is, the yacht club is very important to the  
16 personnel and families and the experience they have  
17 there. And oftentimes it is decisive in their  
18 continuing their military career at a time when  
19 retention is one of our biggest concerns.

20                   The positive recreational experience when I  
21 first got involved in October '95 I thought wasn't  
22 nearly as great as it has become. And the kind of  
23 involvement we have from sailing trips to sailing  
24 instruction to an opportunity for our personnel and  
25 their families -- who are often deployed, by the way, to

1 remote parts of the world for long periods of time --  
2 are very meaningful. And I get constant customer  
3 feedback from our personnel about that positive  
4 experience.

117-A

5 The one thing I want to make comment on is  
6 the loss of that opportunity has not been properly  
7 addressed in the draft EIS. In other words, losing an  
8 opportunity for our personnel hasn't been fairly  
9 analyzed in the draft as I read it. And we plan to  
10 submit to you written comment in that regard.

11 One thing that we do do at Travis in the  
12 squadron that I direct is that we also, in addition to  
13 the dozen or so businesses, we are responsible for  
14 childcare, youth and teen activities for about 1,300  
15 children from six weeks to 18 years in three child  
16 development centers, youth centers, teen centers and so  
17 forth.

18 That kind of activity I see as very  
19 integral and germane to what the Discovery Museum is  
20 doing and what we can do in the future, as has been  
21 proposed as far as activity for youth in such areas as  
22 youth sailing and boating opportunities at the yacht  
23 club.

24 In closing, I want to emphasize that the  
25 only interest that Travis Air Force Base has in the

1 yacht club is strictly recreational in nature for our  
2 personnel. And we have seen the payback and the return  
3 that we get from their involvement in that activity.

4 Many of these personnel, of course, are  
5 from all over the world, I emphasize. We now have a  
6 large but very diverse community at a time when we are  
7 really trying to retain the best and brightest in our  
8 military world.

117-B

9 And also our program experience that we  
10 have in our services squadron I think could very much go  
11 a long ways to helping continued operation. And would  
12 work very well with the National Park Service in the  
13 kind of partnership that we could do in the form of a  
14 inter-federal agency agreement as outlined in the 16  
15 October letter that General Rogier sent to the GGNRA.

16 And I think as already has been testified  
17 by Dave Peixotto that our revenue and the volunteer  
18 labor pool that represents the Presidio Yacht Club has  
19 already done such things as reroof the facility, a major  
20 electrical upgrade that you see going on right now, and  
21 handicap access, et cetera.

117-B

22 So the joint use and inter-federal agency -  
23 - because we are, after all, a sister federal agency --  
24 would be something we would like to propose and to see  
25 you consider.

1 Thanks very much for the opportunity.

2 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. H. J. Gordon,  
3 followed by Jane Piereth.

4 STATEMENT OF H. J. GORDON

5 PRESIDIO YACHT CLUB

6 MR. GORDON: I'm the real Jack Gordon and  
7 I'm hard to miss. I am also the newly-elected commodore  
8 of the yacht club. I didn't run fast enough when they  
9 passed out the ballots. And as I think Mark Twain  
10 commented on the man who was ridden out of town on a  
11 rail, "but for the dignity of the position I would  
12 cheerfully decline."

13 My subject or my remarks are going to  
14 address unintended consequences. Whenever you make a  
15 plan, there are usually things that happen that were a  
16 result of the plan that were not seen in advance. And  
17 we want to point some of those out.

18 First, the draft EIS did not adequately  
19 consider the impacts of the wind, current and tidal  
20 conditions at Horseshoe Bay. Unlike the relatively  
21 benign conditions, for example, in Ayala Cove and Angel  
22 Island which faces northeast, the prevailing winds being  
23 west, south and northwest, we face southwest.

24 And but for the breakwater, the harbor  
25 would be largely unusable for significant periods of the

118-A

1 year. Even with it, you get a great deal of wind swirl.  
2 It is not unusual for the wind to change 200 degrees of  
3 direction in a hundred yards of travel.

4 Which means you have got it behind you when  
5 you are sailing, then all of a sudden it is alongside of  
6 you, then it is in your face. The result is that even  
7 very skilled sailors have run afoul and collided with  
8 other boats.

9 Now, if you put out 40 moorings, as the  
10 plan calls for, in Ayala Cove mooring buoys have each  
11 about nine foot of slack to allow for the tidal  
12 conditions.

118-A

13 If you assume it's a boat of say 25-30  
14 feet, you now have a 42-foot circle in which that boat  
15 is going to swing when the tide and the wind changes.  
16 You have a very significant risk of collisions between  
17 boats or collisions with boats sailing in and trying to  
18 change directions.

19 If you have docks as we have at present,  
20 the dock is fixed to a piling. It is not going  
21 anywhere. And it is relatively easy to secure the dock  
22 and the boat to the piling, and therefore it is a much  
23 safer operation than mooring buoys are.

24 We can all attest this. Some of us have  
25 moored there overnight. And it is not always a pleasant

118-A

1 experience and frequently it is not a safe experience.  
2 I have been up four times a night checking to make sure  
3 my anchor didn't move.

4 So the unattendant consequences of the  
5 draft EIS is to create a relatively unsafe or less safe  
6 condition in the harbor than the current situation.

7 Second, let me talk about money in several  
8 aspects. One of the models used in the EIS for  
9 consideration was Ayala Cove on Angel Island. It has 23  
10 mooring buoys and 40 docks. Bear in mind those  
11 proportions. That is almost two docks to every mooring.

12 When I go to Angel Island, I have to get up  
13 early in the morning. Because if I don't get there  
14 before all the docks are used up, I can tie up to a  
15 mooring and I can look on the shore, but I can't go  
16 anyplace because I have not perfected the skill yet of  
17 walking on water.

118-A

18 Boats on the bay that are under 30-35 feet  
19 in length do not customarily have dinghies, a small  
20 rowboat that you can use to get to the shore. So with  
21 only mooring buoys, you can come in and you can look at  
22 the land but you can't get there.

23 The unattendant consequence of going to a  
24 predominance of moorings over docks is that this will  
25 restrict shore access to those who own larger, more

1 expensive boats. Now, I don't think for a moment that  
2 the Park Service was intending that they conduct an  
3 excursion harbor for the wealthier boat owners. But  
4 that is a likely effect of removing the docks and  
5 replacing them with moorings.

118-B

6 So shifting from a preponderance of docks  
7 to a preponderance of moorings will have the unintended  
8 effect of reducing the service and availability to the  
9 boating public.

118-C

10 Third, the docks provide revenue, which is  
11 essential to fund the bulk of the facility operations.  
12 You can collect some money from people from tying up to  
13 a mooring buoy. And you can reasonably charge more if  
14 they tie up to a dock.

15 Even so, day use of the facility, which  
16 occurs primarily on weekends and only during the better  
17 seasons of the year, is not going to generate enough  
18 funds to maintain the moorings, the docks, the historic  
19 boathouse, the emergency docks, let alone fund a number  
20 of programs to enhance the public access to the greatest  
21 recreational asset of East Fort Baker, the bay itself.

22 Our current experience -- and this is done  
23 at no expense to the taxpayer -- is that a mix of about  
24 60 boat owners, about ten boats available for rental,  
25 and space for five or six visitors, and perhaps some

1 more visitors at moorings -- and we have averaged only  
2 two visitors a week -- is an economic mix that provides  
3 the money for continued maintenance of the harbor, the  
4 docks, the boathouse and, most important for future  
5 public use, our sail training and boat maintenance  
6 programs.

118-B

7 Without the dock rentals that are paid just  
8 when somebody is there sailing, but every day and all  
9 year round, the things we want to offer the public as a  
10 park partner could not be done, or could only be done at  
11 such a price as to again have the unintended consequence  
12 of discriminating in favor of those with more disposable  
13 income.

14 The permanent rental of a significant  
15 number of berths is the economic engine that allows the  
16 facility to be operated and maintained and provide  
17 public services at a very affordable cost.

118-C

18 Lastly, we are a volunteer cooperative  
19 organization. And we represent something de Tocqueville  
20 commented on in 1831, "the propensity for Americans to  
21 form organizations for a common purpose and produce a  
22 public good."

23 Recognizing that every park program  
24 represents a dynamic compromise between the state of  
25 nature and economic development to enhance public use

118-C

1 and enjoyment, let us continue to work for the public  
2 use and enjoyment.

3 Retaining a fairly large number of long-  
4 term rental berths is necessary to get the poorly-  
5 skilled and semi-skilled labor with which we maintain  
6 our facilities. The volunteer labor of those berth  
7 users provides the maintenance and support which keeps  
8 the whole place operational.

9 Thank you for your attention.

10 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you very much. Our  
11 next speaker is Jane Piereth, followed by Margaret  
12 Zegart.

13 STATEMENT OF JANE PIERETH

14 PRESIDIO YACHT CLUB

15 MS. PIERETH: Good evening. My name is  
16 Jane Piereth. I am a member and volunteer instructor  
17 with the Presidio Yacht Club sail instruction program.  
18 I am a Coast Guard reservist with 17 years of search and  
19 rescue experience on Coast Guard small boats. And I am  
20 the founder of Sailing Education Adventures, which is a  
21 nonprofit community sailing program based at Fort Mason.

119-A

22 What I would like to ask this evening is,  
23 if it is not broken why fix it? Currently, the Presidio  
24 Yacht Club operates a clubhouse and marina which caters  
25 not only to club activities for the Air Force and the

119-A

1 Coast Guard personnel in the Bay Area, but also hosts a  
2 myriad of other public activities.

3 The Tamalpais Outrigger Club, Sailing  
4 Education Adventures, the Farallon Patrol of the Point  
5 Reyes Bird Observatory, Drake High School science  
6 classes, visiting sail and power vessels, the Coast  
7 Guard, all currently make use of the docks at Horseshoe  
8 Bay.

9 The Fort Baker plan proposes to eliminate  
10 the docks and install 60 mooring buoys. But mooring  
11 buoys are not the preferred method for hosting visiting  
12 boaters. Boaters visiting Fort Baker with only mooring  
13 buoys for tie-up will need to bring a small boat, as  
14 Jack has mentioned.

119-B

15 Most recreational boaters do not own a  
16 small boat. Those visiting Horseshoe Bay to make an  
17 ocean trip will not want to drag a small boat with them  
18 out on the ocean.

19 Many of our visitors that come to Horseshoe  
20 Bay from further up in the Delta or the inner-bay area,  
21 do so particularly so that they can have an ocean  
22 experience with a safe jumping-off point. They will not  
23 bring a small boat. They will not be able to visit Fort  
24 Baker.

25 Also, transitting to and from a moored

1 vessel to a small boat can be dangerous in the wind and  
2 wave conditions that we experience in Horseshoe Bay.  
3 This precludes the majority of boating visitors to  
4 Horseshoe Bay from visiting Fort Baker, which seems to  
5 be contrary to the intent of the park plan.

119-B

6 Picking out a mooring buoy in Horseshoe Bay  
7 will be a challenging experience for a skilled skipper  
8 and difficult for inexperienced skippers. The bay,  
9 particularly in the spring and summer months, is very  
10 windy with wind shifting direction constantly due to the  
11 proximity of the hills. Often there are white caps.

12 The prevailing wind is from the west and  
13 southwest. If a mooring buoy is missed and way is not  
14 gained immediately, a boat can be blown on to the rocks  
15 or the beach. By contrast, at Ayala Cove, if a mooring  
16 buoy is missed, the boat is blown to open water.

119-A

17 If it is not broken, why fix it? The  
18 Presidio Yacht Club can continue to cater to visiting  
19 boaters at safe docking facilities, allowing people to  
20 visit Fort Baker without needing to bring in transit in  
21 small boat.

22 The docks, maintained by members and staff  
23 of the Presidio Yacht Club, provide a valuable resource  
24 to the public at Fort Baker. It would be a disservice  
25 to the public to eliminate this resource.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Margaret  
3 Zegart will be followed by Courtney Damkroger.

4 STATEMENT OF MARGARET ZEGART

5 AN INDIVIDUAL

6 MS. ZEGART: Good evening, and thank you  
7 for this opportunity to speak with you.

8 I am a supporter of the process that is  
9 evolving and always have been appreciative of the effort  
10 of your Commissioners. I am anxious to have you realize  
11 that there is a term called "accessibility" which I am  
12 very aware of.

13 And one of these is transportation. And  
14 the staging area, which I do not believe should be in  
15 Fort Baker. And I have a concern about where you are  
16 going to place this. And, particularly, I was going to  
17 address this under Item 6 of your agenda.

120-A

18 But I will say now that there is a place  
19 that the master plan -- and it is called the Tamalpais  
20 Community Area Plan -- has designated in Tam Junction  
21 area at Manzanita which we had hoped you would be able  
22 to use for a staging area.

23 A building is being proposed. And right  
24 now it is in the planning process, the planning  
25 commission going to the supervisors which will occupy a

1 large portion of the space that we had hoped our  
2 community could share with the GGNRA in parking.

3 And I hope that the staging area won't by  
4 default end up at Fort Baker. Because we hope that you  
5 shall take your Alternative 1 for the conference center.

6 The second thing I would like to say in  
7 regards to accessibility is the charge and the fee. And  
8 just as the previous people have pointed out in  
9 relationship to the harbor, all people should be able to  
10 use this facility, not just the affluent.

11 That has been one of the most wonderful  
12 things about the GGNRA. You have not charged to go to  
13 Stinson Beach. You have made your facilities available  
14 to the public.

15 The Discovery Museum at the time I first  
16 commented upon this, when I inquired, has had  
17 outstanding free public events. But admission has not  
18 been provided to the museum itself.

19 I am the grandmother of a family and for  
20 several years my children and my grandchildren were able  
21 to go on a family membership. And it is just a  
22 wonderful place. And as a grandmother, I went along  
23 with them sometimes.

24 However, the price of family membership  
25 rose. And they had to change their planning financially

120-B

1 so they don't go there and we don't have that wonderful  
2 access that we had to all their exhibits and all their  
3 splended creative activities.

4 I think that as all museums, the Discovery  
5 Museum and any other events and any other concerns you  
6 should have, should have a one-day-a-month free access.  
7 I think that should be a prerequisite for enlarging the  
8 Discovery Museum.

9 And that is not anything that seems to me  
10 to be unusual in your concept. So I would like to point  
11 that out in terms of access.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Courtney  
14 Damkroger, followed by Gary Walker.

15 STATEMENT OF COURTNEY DAMKROGER

16 NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

17 MS. DAMKROGER: Good evening to the members  
18 of the Commission. I am Courtney Damkroger, and I am  
19 here representing the National Trust for Historic  
20 Preservation.

21 I am happy to be here to lend the National  
22 Trust's enthusiastic support for the concepts that are  
23 outlined in the Fort Baker plan.

24 The Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
25 and the Golden Gate National Parks Association have a

1 great opportunity and a great challenge in setting out  
2 the plan for Fort Baker.

3                   The National Trust supports the  
4 philosophical underpinnings of the plan. And those,  
5 namely, are first and foremost that it is part of the  
6 National Park.

7                   Second, the objectives to rehabilitate and  
8 to revitalize the historic buildings and setting, to  
9 create a sustainable park site through evaluation of  
10 such measures as energy-efficiency, waste-reduction,  
11 water-conservation and the use of green products.

12                   And to accomplish these goals of protecting  
13 the vital historic and natural resources that make Fort  
14 Baker a spectacular site, by selecting a use, the  
15 conference and retreat center, that will provide the  
16 economic basis needed while also enabling broad public  
17 use.

18                   Turning specifically to historic  
19 preservation issues for just a second, it may be obvious  
20 but also important to note that Fort Baker is an  
21 extremely important site.

22                   It is listed in the National Register of  
23 Historic Places and contains at least 40 historic  
24 buildings and associated landscape elements and other  
25 resources.

1                   It is critical that these buildings be  
2 retained and rehabilitated. The cost to do this clearly  
3 cannot be born by the National Park Service. The choice  
4 to reuse the site as a conference and retreat center  
5 will not only meet a market need but will also finance  
6 in large part the cost of the conversion and the  
7 upgrading.

8                   Finally, these brief remarks have been  
9 forward looking. And I would like to make a point or  
10 two about the state of the site today.

11                   In order for this ambitious plan to be most  
12 effective, the buildings must be well cared for today.  
13 That is, until they are turned over for rehabilitation  
14 and for reuse.

15                   That means that it will be important for  
16 the Army to continue to be a good partner to the  
17 National Park Service by conscientiously maintaining the  
18 buildings during the transition period.

121-A

19                   Actions taken now, for example, turning on  
20 low levels of heat in the building, clearing gutters and  
21 downspouts, regrading to prevent water seepage, and  
22 stabilizing building elements, will better enable the  
23 revitalization of this great site.

24                   This is a good plan for a jewel of a site.  
25 And the National Trust would be pleased to work with the

1 Commission, the park and the park's Association to help  
2 realize it, and will submit more thorough comments on  
3 the EIS.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you, please do.  
6 Gary Walker will be followed by Ken Mannshardt.

7 STATEMENT OF GARY WALKER

8 COAST GUARD STATION GOLDEN GATE

9 CHIEF WALKER: Good evening, and thank you  
10 for letting me talk tonight. I am Chief Warrant Officer  
11 Gary Walker. I'm the Commanding Officer at Station  
12 Golden Gate, the Coast Guard station actually in Fort  
13 Baker.

14 For the past two years, I have had the  
15 pleasure of being involved as you have evolved this  
16 plan, working with the Coast Guard. We have become very  
17 involved with the planning and what you have actually  
18 been trying to set up here.

19 And we have actually evolved to where we  
20 have become more involved with the Park Service, have  
21 actually become a full partner -- a park partner -- as  
22 this has been going on.

23 We certainly support the direction you are  
24 going. We are very concerned about the site as well,  
25 because it is a wonderful jewel and very important for

122-A

1 our operations in San Francisco and in the coastal area  
2 as we run search and rescue and law enforcement around  
3 here.

4 As a park partner, we have certainly opened  
5 up because of the evolution of what you have going on,  
6 as more open houses and working on signage, working with  
7 school groups, really becoming involved as you take over  
8 and become more actively involved in opening up there  
9 and opening up to different groups coming in.

10 And it has actually been a pleasure to be  
11 able to do that. And I think it has been a wonderful  
12 opportunity. So, you know, I really support what you  
13 are doing. We have had participation in it and we see  
14 it as a positive for our long-terms goals in the area as  
15 well.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Ken  
18 Mannshardt. And then Brian Huse.

19 STATEMENT OF KEN MANNSHARDT

20 BAY AREA SEA KAYAKERS

21 MR. MANNSHARDT: My name is Ken Mannshardt  
22 and I represent the Bay Area Sea Kayakers, otherwise  
23 known as BASK, a sea kayaking club formed over 12 years  
24 ago with a membership of over 500.

25 BASK actively promotes safe boating. I am

1 the current safety officer of the club and a past  
2 president.

3 Bay Area Sea Kayakers became involved with  
4 the East Fort Baker planning process because we feel  
5 that this is an exceptional launching and access point  
6 to the bay, the gate and the ocean.

7 BASK, myself and many other kayakers have  
8 been using East Fort Baker for many years. Kayaking  
9 inherently has a low environmental impact. It therefore  
10 tends to draw a low-impact type of participant. We  
11 actively carpool to all our activities and pick up after  
12 ourselves before we leave.

13 I think planners should use caution, if  
14 they ever actively promote small boat use at East Fort  
15 Baker. East Fort Baker is a very small oasis of shelter  
16 in anotherwise very exposed part of the bay.

17 Once you clear the shelter at Lime Point at  
18 the base of the north tower, you are exposed to the full  
19 conditions of the gate which are the waves, the currents  
20 and the wind. These are the very conditions that draw  
21 experienced kayakers here.

22 This point is very obvious if you consider  
23 the popularity of kayaking in nearby Richardson Bay, as  
24 compared to that of East Fort Baker.

25 BASK is very pleased with the planning

123-A

1 process so far. While we support the proposed plan, we  
2 also have no problem with the other alternatives. This  
3 is because we are essentially asking for nothing more  
4 than continued access to this great place.

5 Specifically, our interests are:

- 6 1. Convenient access to a beach with  
7 automobile parking to facilitate the loading and  
8 unloading of car-top kayaks;
- 9 2, Convenient day parking, including overnight  
10 parking for overnight trips on the bay;
- 11 3. Nearby restrooms.
- 12 4. One issue not addressed in the draft is the  
13 matter of user fees and parking fees.

14 Speaking personally for myself and on  
15 behalf of a number of other kayak club members involved  
16 in this process regarding the overall plan, we support a  
17 low-impact plan with attention to open space and natural  
18 habitats, and a sensible application of sustainability.

19 Thank you very much.

20 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Brian Huse  
21 will be followed by Lucia Bogatay.

22 STATEMENT OF BRIAN HUSE  
23 NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

24 MR. HUSE: Thank you, Chairman Bartke,  
25 members of the Commission, my name is Brian Huse. I am

1 the Pacific Region Director for the National Parks and  
2 Conservation Association. We are America's leading park  
3 advocacy organization. And I represent about 400,000  
4 members, 70,000 of which live here in California.

5 I want to thank you for the opportunity to  
6 comment. And I especially want to thank the Park  
7 Service and the GGNPA for the fine work they have done  
8 on the creation of this plan for East Fort Baker.

9 From the scoping period through the  
10 development of alternatives and finally to this draft  
11 plan, they have been open to the public. They have  
12 created opportunities for comment and they have created  
13 truly a fine plan. We thank them for this.

14 As such, NPCA endorses the plan. It has a  
15 number of strengths. First, it emphasizes cultural and  
16 natural resource restoration and protection, a  
17 fundamental mandate of the National Park System.

18 It proposes to restore native habitat for  
19 the Mission blue butterfly and rehabilitate coastal  
20 scrub and scrub habitat and the oak woodlands in the  
21 area. It also enhances the visitor experience at East  
22 Fort Baker consistent with these resource protection  
23 goals.

24 We support the conversion of the marina and  
25 the boatshop for full public use. We, parenthetically,

1 appreciate the Air Force's offer to assist the Park  
2 Service in the continuation of the marina facilities.

3           However, we must stress that as a national  
4 park unit, it is not appropriate for privileged uses to  
5 exist which would conflict with the full public access  
6 to the site.

124-A

7           There might be some other opportunities  
8 that the Park Service and the Park Association would  
9 want to look at on how to use that site. But NPCA  
10 cannot support privileged access to an area that is a  
11 national park.

12           We also support the retention of the  
13 current park partners whose missions are consistent with  
14 these park goals. And finally, the goal to assure  
15 environmental sustainability throughout the project is  
16 noted and appreciated.

124-B

17           We do have two concerns, and will express  
18 these further in detailed comments that we will submit  
19 before the deadline. And one is a lack of analysis of  
20 the carrying capacity of the area, with conference  
21 facilities and facilities that will enhance and attract  
22 a great number of visitors. There is a potential to  
23 overwhelm the site and impair the resource protection  
24 goals that are so important in this plan.

25           Secondly, the idea of financial

124-C

1 sustainability, while attractive, may also tend to draw  
2 the Park Service away from, again, the importance of  
3 protecting fully the natural and cultural resources that  
4 are found in East Fort Baker.

5 So we advise caution with promoting a self-  
6 sustaining conference facility and encourage the park to  
7 work with NPCA and other organizations to find other  
8 alternative funding for the site.

9 Thank you again for the opportunity to  
10 comment. And we will deliver more comments as we  
11 finalize them.

12 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you very much.  
13 Lucia Bogatay is next, and the last speaker is Robert J.  
14 something, and I can't read the last name. So would  
15 Robert J. --

16 VOICE: Lull.

17 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right.

18 STATEMENT OF LUCIA BOGATAY

19 FORT POINT AND PRESIDIO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

20 MS. BOGATAY: Good evening, Chairman  
21 Bartke, and members of the Commission. I am Lucia  
22 Bogatay. I am here on behalf of the Fort Point and  
23 Presidio Historical Association. I sit on the board and  
24 serve as co-chair of the Architecture -- and we are now  
25 adding -- Archaeology Committee.

1                   Our comments are informed by our  
2 participation in the workshops and tours that have been  
3 organized by the Park Service and the GGNPA. And they  
4 are based on a partial review of the draft environmental  
5 impact statement, and two meetings we have held with  
6 staff. We will give more specific written response when  
7 we have completed our review of the EIS.

8                   Our main concern is always that the  
9 cultural history be respected and interpreted and the  
10 historic fabric be treated well. And that the balance  
11 of the future uses and historic past is both appropriate  
12 and comfortable.

13                   The current proposed plan appears to be a  
14 balanced, feasible and respectful approach to the goals  
15 of public participation, preservation of historic fabric  
16 and the sustainable uses in concert with nature.

17                   We are delighted that the process has  
18 resulted in such an apposite plan. Remaining is the  
19 working out of details and the final design of the  
20 interpretation of the site's history.

21                   Among the details that we care about are  
22 the following:

- 125-A [ 23                   1.     That there be ferry service to the site.  
24                   We think the site is something that historically was  
25                   accessed by water. And that appreciating it from the

1 water is going to be critical to interpreting it.

125-B [ 2 2. We are concerned that the conference center  
3 be worked out at the lowest economically feasible size  
4 to preserve the tranquility which makes Fort Baker  
5 special.

125-C [ 6 3. That the new uses contribute to the mission  
7 of the Park Service and not be too orthogonal to it. We  
8 know this to be in your evaluation criteria, but we will  
9 be interested in the working out of this criterion.

125-D [ 10 4. That there continues to be a helpful  
11 nautical presence in the form of volunteers or park  
12 partners to keep the Travis sea yachtsmen on board.

125-E [ 13 5. And that the Bay Area Discovery Museum  
14 include the interpretation of history of the site in its  
15 own curriculum, which it may already do. Forgive me, if  
16 this is the case.

125-F [ 17 6. And that some of the Capehart housing be  
18 reserved for employees, both to preserve a presence  
19 during slow times and to reduce the traffic and parking  
20 needs on the site.

125-G [ 21 7. Also, that the character of the site  
22 lighting be in keeping with its history. And that its  
23 natural darkness be preserved, which is surely a  
24 sustainable approach.

25 8. And forgive me from going from broad to

125-H

1 specifics here. I am going back to broad now, because  
2 to us the most important issue is that the plan include  
3 the conservation and interpretation of Battery Cavallo.

4 Although this last item has been made a  
5 separate project, we feel that it is key to providing a  
6 tangible proof of the historic purpose of Fort Baker.  
7 The interpretation of the battery will help motivate the  
8 interpretation of the entire site, as well as adding  
9 another opportunity for enjoying inspiring views.

10 So, the conflict between nature, Mission  
11 butterflies, and the preservation of history, must and  
12 can be resolved in favor of both. We have great hopes  
13 that this will occur in time for the grand opening of  
14 the new conference/retreat center.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Robert Lull  
17 will be followed by John Diamente.

18 STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. LULL, M.D.

19 AN INDIVIDUAL

20 DR. LULL: Thank you very much for the  
21 opportunity to address you. And thank you for  
22 responding that you received my written E-mail which  
23 contains some of the concepts that I will be talking  
24 about today.

25 I am a physician at San Francisco General

1 Hospital. Before that in my previous life I was a  
2 career physician in the Army serving at Letterman Army  
3 Medical Center.

4 And I have been a member of the Yacht Club  
5 at Fort Baker. I haven't been very active and involved  
6 in their operation but I have witnessed what has been  
7 going on over there.

8 I would like to emphasize that the goal  
9 here is to achieve full public access to the site. And  
10 those young soldiers at Travis Air Force Base basically  
11 need separate help.

12 It is kind of like they are in a sense  
13 handicapped members of the public and that they have  
14 special duties that pull them away and make it very  
15 difficult for them to get access. These are people who  
16 are not requesting privileged access.

17 They are people who are requesting the  
18 ability to maintain some access to the facilities here.  
19 These are the people how are out there right tonight,  
20 you know, out there on assignment protecting our  
21 freedoms here in this country.

22 And I think that we need to make sure that  
23 they have some way of having some recreational  
24 activities like the rest of the public will have in the  
25 Park Service plan. And this will require some special

126-A

1 organization to make that possible, because it just  
2 doesn't happen easily when they have all the other  
3 responsibilities that happen in their military lives.

4 Also I could point out that, if you look at  
5 some of the people who have talked on behalf of the  
6 organization there, people who are older than I am and  
7 have been around a lot longer -- I have seen them in  
8 action -- these are the Private Ryans from World War II  
9 who have been there and have been members of this club  
10 for 40 years.

11 I don't think you should yank this  
12 opportunity away from them and this access from them  
13 either. These are people who have sacrificed a lot in  
14 their lives. They are the same people who have been in  
15 Korea and Vietnam and Desert Storm.

16 I think that the Presidio Yacht Club  
17 members are a very unique resource. And I think you  
18 should look upon them as a resource to the Park Service  
19 plan that will help you implement and provide a much  
20 richer experience for the public who are attending the  
21 Fort Baker facilities.

22 These people are a unique resource about  
23 the history, the military history of Fort Baker. These  
24 are like living historical objects to talk with and for  
25 the public who come there.

126-A

1 I can see a program where they develop an  
2 openness to the public, as well as providing access  
3 that's easy for the active duty soldiers at Travis Air  
4 Force Base where they can provide this unique, colorful  
5 history to the people who come to visit and joint them  
6 in the boathouse and the restaurant facility there.

7 They can provide programs that have been so  
8 successful with the Travis enlisted personnel and their  
9 families and teaching them about sailing and teaching  
10 them about the unique features of the bay and sailing on  
11 the bay and the waterfront there at Fort Baker.

12 This has been something you have heard the  
13 Air Force people talk about how helpful this is to them.  
14 You can imagine how this could be when it is opened up  
15 to the entire public. These people are a resource to be  
16 utilized, not to be discarded.

17 This is also a great resource for people in  
18 terms of the skills of sailing and the unique features  
19 of sailing on the San Francisco Bay. Programs to help  
20 teach people about nautical skills couldn't be handled  
21 by a better group of people than this unique group of  
22 people.

23 And they have already expressed their  
24 willingness to create this kind of partnership with the  
25 park and develop this kind of openness, whether it would

126-B

1 be serving not only the active duty people at Travis Air  
2 Force Base, but the general public coming to the site.

126-B

3 I also happen to agree with their analysis  
4 about not having docks at the shoreline and having  
5 buoys. Buoys are going to be -- you know, you are not  
6 going to be able to have very many buoys out there with  
7 the weather conditions.

8 I have tried landing a boat there. And if  
9 you haven't done that in bad weather, you need to try  
10 that before you end up approving the plan as it  
11 currently stands.

126-A

12 I would just like to end by saying that  
13 people are the most valuable resource of any  
14 organization. You need to utilize the uniquely talented  
15 people that are present and that have expressed their  
16 desire to be partners with you in the plan. Don't  
17 discard them. Help them to be available to the public.

18 You will find that this will add richness  
19 and depth to the entire project and make this a much  
20 more user-friendly place for the public. And with docks  
21 at the shoreline and access for a ferry, you will be  
22 able to get more people in there to utilize this and  
23 appreciate it.

24 Thank you very much for the opportunity to  
25 comment.

1 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Next, John  
2 Diamente.

3 STATEMENT OF JOHN DIAMENTE  
4 THRESHOLD INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR  
5 ENVIRONMENTAL RENEWAL

6 MR. DIAMENTE: Mr. Chairman, I just defer a  
7 minute, if you please, to Jane or John Doe. Thank you.

8 JANE OR JOHN DOE: My name is Jane or John  
9 Doe, probably from the canal community of San Rafael,  
10 perhaps from Marin City, California, two communities  
11 probably interested in this entire community. And as I  
12 visit this Commission, I know the good will around the  
13 table.

14 The public turns at some point to how can  
15 we use some small percentage of the resources going into  
16 the planning and development of this resources for the  
17 second most contiguous community in Marin City, and  
18 beyond that the large, especially teenage, constituency  
19 represented by Marin City and the canal community.

20 Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Oh, are you  
22 coming back?

23 MR. DIAMANTE: Mr. Chairman, John Diamente  
24 of Sausalito. I am Threshold International Center for  
25 Environmental Renewal. Threshold, I think, is one of

1 the first, if not the first, nonprofit parties of record  
2 to take an interest in preserving the rehabilitating one  
3 of the buildings of this facility pending the fruition  
4 of the master plan.

5 I am a resident of Sausalito. May I say  
6 how lucky we are to have the caliber of the planning  
7 efforts and personnel that have gone into this effort,  
8 and the foresight and wisdom of the Advisory Commission  
9 as well.

10 Of the EIS and so forth, I love the  
11 emphasis on nature. And particularly the implications  
12 that that has for saving the potential and the working  
13 dynamics of the harbor and the marine facilities there.

14 I love the emphasis on the retreat center,  
15 promising as it does a certain tranquility about this  
16 facility which is perhaps at bit at odds with the  
17 traffic and transportation dynamics we are all wrestling  
18 with.

127-A

19 My concern specifically previously has been  
20 addressed to the planners. And it is consistent with  
21 those of other speakers about the role of the facility  
22 as a staging area and the volumes of traffic and  
23 transportation that go through there.

24 I grew up in Sausalito and this was one of  
25 my playgrounds. So, as you probably noticed, I am a

1 sailor too. So, for the second or third time, let me  
2 strongly second the expert input you had from members of  
3 the Presidio Yacht Club and all other sailors, and  
4 nautical visitors and users of this harbor and the bio-  
5 marine enclave.

6           What I and Threshold would like to do --  
7 and this facility might be a very good place for it --  
8 is to develop a cartographic center. And I speak to you  
9 as one who is so enthusiastic about the role of nature  
10 in the plan and the plans for the facility, as a sailor,  
11 as someone who spent a long time, perhaps 30 years, as a  
12 public interest activist and environmentalist.

13           Threshold, by the way, is Threshold, Inc.,  
14 founded by a remarkable chap named John Milton. And  
15 Threshold, among many other things, can offer a few  
16 specific resource adjuncts to the planning which the  
17 planners are familiar with.

18           One of those is great expertise with flora  
19 and fauna. Threshold's writ and track record runs to  
20 park planning and biotic reserve accomplishments from  
21 Africa to the Caribbean to Asia.

22           We have a strong resource expertise in  
23 transportation and alternative transportation to the  
24 automobile. Our principals have a long record of  
25 retreat hosting and comforts hosting, to say nothing of

1 participation.

2                   And the aforesaid Mr. Milton in fact now  
3 practices something called "Sacred Way." It is one of  
4 these quest programs where he takes people out on  
5 wilderness and self-learning expeditions, self-  
6 realization treks on several continents. All this, I  
7 think, is to the good. And in some small measure  
8 perhaps helpful to the planners.

9                   But along the way, Threshold gave its name  
10 to Threshold of America, Inc., which is the named  
11 Threshold we most often see here in these precincts,  
12 specifically Threshold Foundation sponsored by Tides  
13 Foundation at the Thoreau Center.

14                   So for those of you who may think the name  
15 is confused, it really isn't. We sort of -- our name  
16 sort of godfathered that Threshold. We are a much  
17 lower-key Threshold and they are the conspicuous  
18 Threshold.

19                   We always get the telephone calls, and we  
20 say you must want the Threshold that gives away money.  
21 Their phone number is -- . Because we give away  
22 expertise, specifically ecological expertise.

23                   And along the ecological path we became  
24 very involved with the North American Bioregional  
25 movement which, to make a long story short, is kind of a

1 revival of the Watershed Association movement of the  
2 19th century in this country where people took  
3 responsibility for their watersheds and their sort of  
4 biogeographic provinces, and other clumsy names for  
5 "your place."

6           And in the course of that work, we  
7 developed some expertise in mapping these areas. And it  
8 is the mapping and the overlays of maps, starting with  
9 the place and adding different factors, trying to check  
10 myself in the encyclopedia, sort of definitions of the  
11 whole thing.

12           But suffice it to say that mapping, hands-  
13 on mapping, especially by children, is an activity that  
14 might go very well here. It would seem to be a very  
15 good adjunct to the Discovery Museum's very impressive  
16 decade of activity, a place where children could come,  
17 could learn about cartographic techniques, not only  
18 terrestrial, but marine, maritime, and make maps and do  
19 maps.

20           And of course, now, especially in the San  
21 Francisco Bay Area, we have the digital technology  
22 adjuncts to mapping from remote sensing data to all the  
23 digital arts and crafts which are so impressive.

24           But the other role of using the building  
25 and rehabbing the building and using our expertise in

1 taking care of old buildings until such time as the plan  
2 sort of gathers steam and that the real resources come  
3 aboard, Threshold being able to bring in interim  
4 resources, is perhaps a facility for visiting  
5 cartographic scholars.

6 So that we are discussing this informally  
7 with planning staff. Whether using one of the houses we  
8 have specifically been interested in, or the existing  
9 housing over the hill in the Rodeo Beach area, to be  
10 able to have a place where distinguished visiting  
11 scholars could come not only from across the pond in  
12 Berkeley --

13 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Could I ask you to wind  
14 up your remarks, please?

15 MR. DIAMANTE: Thank you. Not only from  
16 across the pond in Berkeley, but from around the world  
17 in the IUCN and other distinguished organizations, to  
18 stay for a week or several months, and lend their  
19 talents and their expertise to very probable kinds of  
20 conferences and retreats that might happen here.

21 So, the one, the hands-on adjunct for  
22 children and, two, accommodating visiting cartographic  
23 scholars, and all the while having this cartographic  
24 center there.

25 That said, all these purposes I think

127-A

1 really invite a much closer look at the traffic  
2 situation here. The Discovery Museum, while a  
3 tremendous asset to the whole community, has generated  
4 an extraordinary amount of traffic.

5 So it behooves us, I think, to keep a close  
6 weather eye on the developments of the Sausalito  
7 shuttle, which Mr. Paul Anderson, the Marin Scope and  
8 the Chamber of Commerce is trying to develop.

127-A

9 I think we want to keep a close eye in  
10 consultation with our maritime brethren about the ferry  
11 adjunct, which I know the planners hope for, and perhaps  
12 in the long-term and otherwise try to mitigate the  
13 traffic so that children and our chauffeur-driven  
14 generation and other users of this facility come to it  
15 with the lightest impact possible.

16 Thank you so much for your time.

17 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you.

18 It is now time for the Commission members  
19 to ask questions and make comments. But before we do, I  
20 would like to ask Nancy Hornor to come back up.

21 Nancy, I know how hard you worked on this  
22 planning, but you had some help. And you didn't  
23 introduce the people who helped you. Could you do that,  
24 please?

25 MS. HORNOR: Sure. Well, tonight members

1 of our team that are here are Cathy Barner, who is the  
2 Golden Gate National Parks Association director of park  
3 projects. Ron Golem who is with the National Park  
4 Service, and he is working on the business and  
5 implementation side as project manager.

6 John Skibbe, landscape architect with the  
7 Parks Association, also one of the project managers  
8 during the planning process. And the consultants that  
9 are here are John Pelka with EDA, who was the primary  
10 author of the environmental impact statement. And Dick  
11 Tellis with Wilbur Smith & Associates is also here  
12 tonight.

13 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Great. Thank you for  
14 introducing them. But before you go away, there was a  
15 comment made by the representative from the National  
16 Trust about the Army's maintenance of the buildings.  
17 And I wonder if you would respond to that?

18 I think we are a little bit concerned about  
19 the condition of the buildings that we are going to  
20 inherit from the Army and what's being done. And is the  
21 maintenance being done? And if not, what can we do  
22 about it?

23 MS. HORNOR: Okay. Well, I will say a  
24 little bit about that. And maybe John Skibbe can also  
25 chime in. There have been two people, one on the park

1 staff and John Skibbe from the Association, that have  
2 been in conversations with the Army, as well as Ric  
3 Borjes, our historical architect.

4           And many months ago the Army and the State  
5 Historic Preservation and the National Park Service  
6 signed an agreement where the Army would continue to  
7 maintain the historic buildings in this period of  
8 transition.

9           Many of those buildings are vacant. There  
10 really are only a handful that are still occupied. And  
11 I think at the presentation that we did last month, you  
12 could see from the slides that we used that the  
13 buildings are really not in good condition. The roofs  
14 are not good.

15           There is just a general concern about lack  
16 of maintenance. And the heat is not on in the  
17 buildings, which is a really big concern. And the  
18 longer those buildings are vacant -- now, they have been  
19 vacant a little over a year -- the costs really start to  
20 go up significantly in the rehabilitation of those  
21 buildings.

22           So, we are very concerned. We have  
23 continued to work with the Army and the Army has tried  
24 to bring money invest in some maintenance of the  
25 buildings. And John is going up to Fort Lewis on Friday

1 to meet with the Army with someone else from our staff,  
2 to find out really what progress has been made.

3 So it might be a little premature to say  
4 exactly what the outcome of that is. But we are very  
5 concerned about the maintenance of the buildings. And  
6 we will know more on Friday.

7 John, do you want to say anything in  
8 addition to that?

9 MR. SKIBBE: I would just like to say --

10 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Excuse me, John, we won't  
11 be able to hear you unless you are on the microphone.

12 MR. SKIBBE: -- this issue of operation and  
13 maintenance by the Army for the next two years until the  
14 property transitions to the National Park Service really  
15 has been one of our most difficult issues in trying to  
16 get resolution on certain things.

17 First of all, what monies are actually  
18 available by the Army for operation and maintenance at  
19 Fort Baker? This figure is really unknown. And we have  
20 not know for the past couple of years exactly what had  
21 been funded and what will be funded in the future.

22 As Nancy said, there are three major issues  
23 that we need to address. First is the heat. There has  
24 been no heat in any of those buildings for two years.  
25 We are coming up on a third winter, and as you know last

1 winter was very wet as well. And when you go in the  
2 buildings, they do smell musty and are very cold and  
3 damp.

4 Second is pest reports and infestation.  
5 Recently, two porches on two of the buildings had to be  
6 completely replaced. And uncovering and pulling apart  
7 the siding, they were completely deteriorated due to dry  
8 rot and infestation of termites.

9 The last is plant maintenance. There's  
10 many foundation plants that are heaving foundations,  
11 steps and other things. Trees are shading the sides of  
12 buildings and not allowing light to get in.

13 These sound like small things, and they are  
14 actually quite easily fixed, and would go a long way to  
15 securing the future use of those buildings. So those  
16 are our concerns.

17 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right. If you can  
18 use any help from the Commission, please let us know.

19 Michael Alexander has a comment on that.

20 MR. ALEXANDER: Rich, excuse me, I would  
21 take issue that these are small things. Heat off in  
22 buildings adjacent to the Golden Gate is not a small  
23 thing. It is something that can be measured in the  
24 millions of dollars.

25 We have had that experience once. And I am

1 shocked that the heat has been off for two years. I  
2 regard this as a critical issue. And I am going to ask  
3 the Commission to, at the appropriate committee meeting,  
4 propose taking action immediately. I mean, this is an  
5 emergency.

6 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you. Brian?

7 SUPERINTENDENT O'NEILL: I would just like  
8 to add to what Nancy and John reported, that we did have  
9 the opportunity to have a series of briefings back in  
10 Washington with National Park Service personnel,  
11 Department of Interior personnel and all the relevant  
12 committees of Congress.

13 And I think, without exception, the  
14 question about the existing Army commitment to the  
15 buildings during the transition period, together with  
16 exactly what the timeline for that transition would be,  
17 was a very prominent concern in their mind.

18 And I think that we had indicated that we  
19 were in good faith discussions with the Army to  
20 determine the extent of their commitment to be able to  
21 sustain the maintenance of those buildings, because  
22 clearly they have not resourced this over the last two  
23 years. And I would say it is more than a minor concern.

24 We have vented in a very strong way to the  
25 Army our concerns about their lack of attention to the

1 buildings. And we are giving them every opportunity to  
2 walk their talk with respect to the actual physical  
3 commitments they are prepared to make in this year's  
4 budget.

5 I was, I guess, heartened to know that this  
6 is on the radar screen of practically everyone back  
7 east. And if the Army is not forthcoming in dealing in  
8 some way with their obligations during this transition  
9 period, I am sure there are others who are going to  
10 raise this question as well.

11 But we are going up to hopefully try to  
12 reach some accommodation or resolution of the commitment  
13 of dollars for maintenance with the Army this week. And  
14 hopefully that will be a good signal of commitment.

15 If it is not, I think we all have a major  
16 problem that we are going to have to address.

17 CHAIRMAN BARKTE: Thank you. Ed?

18 DR. WAYBURN: I would like to add my  
19 comments. I was at East Fort Baker the day before  
20 yesterday. And I know there will be a meeting of the  
21 Marin committee tomorrow. But I, too, think that this  
22 is more than a minor matter.

23 I saw the sagging roofs, the gutters which  
24 were full of debris and I felt the cold rooms as we went  
25 through. I think that we need to get whatever power the

1 Commission has behind the effort to get maintenance on  
2 these buildings this year. Because the costs will go up  
3 every month that there is no proper maintenance.

4 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right, other comments  
5 or questions from Commission members? Naomi.

6 MS. GRAY: I would like to have a look at  
7 this whole business about the yacht club and other kinds  
8 of things that are going on in terms of accessibility.  
9 Because, you know, we go through a lot of this often  
10 when the private sector and the public sector somehow  
11 can run into some difficulties.

12 I think it is important that we are sure  
13 that as a national park that there is absolute  
14 accessibility to everyone. And I don't know, Nancy, if  
15 that's been talked about and how is that facility to be  
16 used. Is it to be leased to some private concern or  
17 what is the situation?

18 I heard about membership organization.  
19 Who is the membership organization and what are the  
20 dues? It is things like that, as you all know, that I  
21 am interested in having information about.

22 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right. Would you  
23 like something right now?

24 MS. GRAY: No, I just want to raise the  
25 issues so they that can be put into the mix for further

1 consideration --

2 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: I agree. I think --

3 MS. GRAY: -- and discussion, but not to  
4 resolve tonight.

5 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Right. Other -- Redmond?

6 MR. KERNAN: Yes. One, I want to  
7 compliment staff. I know that there were various  
8 efforts by various groups to try and have what you might  
9 call a preemptive strike to use parts of Fort Baker.  
10 And I know they were pushed back with some effort and  
11 probably a lot of personal anxiety.

12 And I think that this process is a healthy  
13 one and I want to compliment the staff for preserving  
14 the opportunity and going through an appropriate  
15 process. Sometimes I don't always say thank you enough,  
16 but I thank you.

17 Two major focuses. One is to understand  
18 why Fort Baker is there. And that has to do with its  
19 role in the defense of the Bay Area beginning with  
20 Battery Cavallo, but going on to Batteries Duncan and  
21 Yates.

22 Battery Cavallo is like a word, unless you  
23 go out there. And then even then it is so overgrown you  
24 don't understand what it is. So I would ask that the  
25 Park Service make a presentation at a suitable point in

1 time to the Commission.

2 I took the opportunity to meet with John  
3 Martini and go through some of the records and to look  
4 at the ancient photographs and renderings and things.  
5 And it is a fascinating place. It was a major  
6 fortification of earthworks with underground chambers  
7 and so on -- I won't go into it all.

8 But it needs to be presented. And I know  
9 that is the intention. But I would like to elevate the  
10 consciousness of that. Because I think we need not only  
11 to say yes, it will be done, it is in the plan, but to  
12 find a way of implementing it.

13 That either the Park Service and/or the  
14 park partner who comes in here will take on that  
15 responsibility and accomplish some level of improvement  
16 that allows for the interpretation of that site.

17 And by the way, it will be a site that  
18 everybody will go to for either sunrise or evenings or  
19 something, because you get the most fantastic view to  
20 the east.

21 The other thing is that in the Fort Baker  
22 complex someplace, and perhaps it is a visitor center,  
23 should be an interpretation of the role of the site  
24 through the whole period of defense, which goes all the  
25 way from Cavallo in the 1870s to the Nike missile sites

1 out on the headlands. But people lived here at Fort  
2 Baker.

3 I am concerned that the 350-person  
4 population as a conference center is a bit high. I  
5 understand that in an excess of caution or prudence the  
6 Park Service has decided to EIS the high side.

7 And that's okay, I won't object to that.  
8 But I would suggest that it is a balance of what income  
9 is needed to deal with all of the infrastructure and  
10 other issues that there are.

11 And I would ask that the Park Service, when  
12 they get ready with an RFQ or P or whatever it is that  
13 is used to bring in a reuser, bring that back to the  
14 Commission so we could look at whether we can get by  
15 with 250, 300 or whatever the numbers are. Because as  
16 it is, I think it begins to dominate the site. And I  
17 would not want that to happen.

18 I am also concerned -- you know, I have  
19 been dealing with the Presidio and there is a general  
20 mission statement about the purpose of the Presidio,  
21 hard-fought but important.

22 There isn't such a mission statement with  
23 Fort Baker. And I would be concerned that our RFQ-P  
24 have within it what the intention is in terms of the  
25 conferencing that will take place. While I would be

1 concerned that the Fort dealership should have someplace  
2 to meet to increase sales, I don't think that need be  
3 Fort Baker.

4           And perhaps some larger purpose, at least  
5 in my mind, might be served by having people come there  
6 to meet a variety of issues which are more appropriate  
7 to the park purpose. So I would be concerned that there  
8 be a suitable mission statement framed for going out.

9           I would also be concerned that the design  
10 is appropriate and sort of subtle in terms of all of the  
11 infrastructure that would be done.

12           I must admit to being a reservist and one  
13 who had a reserve unit over there. And a member of the  
14 Presidio Yacht Club long ago and having had my boat  
15 there. And having sailed in. I have a vivid memory one  
16 time of having the wind behind me sailing in and  
17 somebody had the wind behind them sailing out.

18           (Laughter.)

19           MR. KERNAN: And I knew that soon there was  
20 going to be a problem for me or that person. Because  
21 the wind just swirls around in there. It is not an easy  
22 location.

23           I believe having that yacht club -- which I  
24 no longer am a member of and I no longer have a boat  
25 there -- is an asset that should be treasured and kept.

1 There is a collective volunteer energy that the Park  
2 Service should, if it weren't there, go out and try to  
3 create. And this represents the Armed Services of the  
4 United States, which is diverse and which should be  
5 represented there.

6 And I know that when I was there one of the  
7 purposes of having that club and assigning certain  
8 berths to non-reservists, to active duty -- you have to  
9 get on a waiting list to get a berth in San Francisco.  
10 If you are active duty, you come and you have gone  
11 before you name comes up on a waiting list.

12 So you need access that is set aside for  
13 those in the armed services that are active duty, that  
14 can gain that access without having to go through the  
15 waiting list process. And so I would urge very much  
16 that we find a way to work with them to keep them  
17 operating in some fashion that makes a suitable part  
18 partner open for people to use, et cetera.

19 I urge slips instead of moorings. I know  
20 how small that place is. When you sail in and out there  
21 isn't a lot of room. So I would urge that we make no  
22 decision regarding moorings because I am predisposed  
23 towards slips. And you would have to kind of prove it  
24 to me that the moorings would work. Because they just  
25 take an awful lot of space and prevent other boats from

1 manoeuvring.

2 I think it is important that employees live  
3 at the site, whether they are park partners or National  
4 Park Service. But if it is all visitorship for  
5 conferences and the conference is over, people leave and  
6 there aren't people living there, that would be a  
7 tragedy. Because that provides kind of eyes and ears on  
8 the site. So I would urge consideration in having some  
9 number of employees in residence.

10 I think for parking, it is always  
11 difficult. But I would consider what is being done at  
12 Crissy Field where some of the areas designated as  
13 parking perhaps could be grass but have an underlying  
14 soil cement or grass crete (sounds like) or the various  
15 names for methods of having an area you can park on, but  
16 when it is not parked on it looks like grass and doesn't  
17 feel like a foreign parking lot.

18 So those are my comments. Not all of them  
19 are necessarily directly applied to an EIS, but they are  
20 concerns that I would like to get off my chest. I feel  
21 better for doing it. Thank you for listening.

22 (Laughter.)

23 CHAIRMAN BARKTE: Does anybody else want to  
24 feel better? Merritt.

25 MR. ROBINSON: I heard a reference to

1 something that I think is very important. And that is,  
2 the use of the main bay where the boats are hauled in  
3 all on the railroad.

4 I think an interpretive facility there  
5 allowing boats that are in quasi-public ownership or  
6 whatever -- you have to have some way of judging this --  
7 could bring their boats in and clean them and repaint,  
8 whatever work needs to be done right there, with the  
9 public having an opportunity to watch it from another  
10 bay.

11 I think this could be a very educational  
12 thing. It certainly would be very helpful to the owners  
13 of boats. And if we do it right with Sea Scouts and  
14 other such energies, as well as the Army perhaps, that I  
15 hope would spread out the use of this sufficiently to be  
16 truly in keeping with Park Service standards.

17 I have been taking notes here concerning  
18 these concerns as each person expresses them. And I  
19 will be wanting to put together a Marin committee  
20 meeting to discuss this.

21 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: Thank you, Merritt.  
22 Other comments or questions?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right. The process  
25 from here on is that the public comment period is still

1 open. And if you wish to comment, do so in writing.  
2 You do so to this address here at this building. And  
3 that comment period is until December 7th. And if you  
4 don't get your comments in by December 7th, then bombs  
5 away. It's too late.

6 That applies to the Commission members,  
7 too. If you wish to comment in writing to the staff,  
8 you may do so. But then it will come back -- well, the  
9 staff will then do a staff report. And it will  
10 incorporate the comments that it has received and any  
11 responses that are appropriate to those comments.

12 And then the final environmental impact  
13 statement will be done. The one we have now is called  
14 the draft. The final one will be done. That will come  
15 back onto our agenda next year for final adoption.

16 If there is no further business, we will go  
17 to the next item on the agenda.

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN BARTKE: All right, the public  
20 hearing is closed and we are now on to No. 5 on the  
21 agenda, Committee Reports. Only one committee met this  
22 last month that I know of, and that is the Presidio  
23 Committee chaired by Redmond Kernan.

24 MR. KERNAN: Yes, thank you. We had a  
25 brief presentation by Howard Levitt on the long-range

# FORT BAKER

Final EIS

The following are responses to the oral comments provided during the November 18, 1998 hearing on the Draft EIS. A copy of the comments (hearing transcript) precedes this page.

**Comment 114. Dave Peixotto, Presidio Yacht Club.**

**114-A**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #7 – Preference for Retaining PYC/Travis AFB.

**114-B**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #6 – Preference for Docks over Moorings.

**Comment 115. Bill Patterson, Bay Area Discovery Museum.**

Comment noted, thank you.

**Comment 116. Bonnie Pittman, Bay Area Discovery Museum.**

**116-A**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #2 – Parking

**Comment 117. Mark Dupree, Travis Air Force Base.**

**117-A**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #8 – Impacts to Current Users of Boat Shop and Marina.

**Comment 118. H.J. Gordon, Presidio Yacht Club.**

**118-A/B**

Comment noted, thank you. Also, please refer to Master Response #6 – Preference for Docks over Moorings.

**118-C**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #7 – Preference for Retaining PYC/Travis AFB.

**Comment 119. Jane Pierth, Presidio Yacht Club.**

**119-A**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #7 – Preference for Retaining PYC/Travis AFB and Master Response #8 – Impacts to Current Users of Boat Shop and Marina.

# FORT BAKER

Final EIS

## **119-B**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #6 – Preference for Docks over Moorings.

## **Comment 120. Margaret Zegart.**

### **120-A**

NPS is working with Marin County to evaluate the potential of several locations for parking lots from which to stage a shuttle service to Muir Woods and other park sites. The Manzanita lot is one of the locations being considered.

### **120-B**

Comment noted. Promoting public access and providing for park user diversity are stated objectives of the proposed plan (DEIS Section 1.3). During implementation of the plan, NPS would work with all partners at Fort Baker to maximize accessibility to a broad range of users where possible. BADM currently has an extensive program of free or discounted admissions that are available to a variety of low income and special needs individuals, families and groups in addition to 3 free festivals each year. Over 30% of admissions to the museum are free or discounted.

## **Comment 121. Courtney Damkroger, National Trust for Historic Preservation.**

### **121-A**

Comment noted. Please see response to comment 15-B.

## **Comment 122. Gary Walker, U.S. Coast Guard.**

### **122**

Comment noted.

## **Comment 123. Ken Mannshardt, Bay Area Sea Kayakers.**

### **123-A**

Comment noted. See response to comments 12-A and 12-B.

## **Comment 124. Brian Huse, National Parks Conservation Association.**

### **124-A/B**

Comment noted. Please refer to response to comments 18-A and 18-B, and 7-G.

## **Comment 125. Lucia Bogatay, Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association.**

### **125-A**

Comment noted. Please refer to Master Response #5 - Ferry/Water Shuttle.

### **125-B**

Comment noted. The NPS will seek the smallest possible economically feasible project that meets the objectives of the Plan. The Final EIS has been revised to include this as a mitigation measures (Refer

# FORT BAKER

Final EIS

to Section 2.6.6 under the “Size of Retreat and Conference Center” heading). Also, please refer to response to comments 18-B and 7-G.

## **125-C**

Comment noted. Please refer to response to comments 18-B and 7-G.

## **125-D**

Comment noted. Please refer to Master Response #7 – Preference for Retaining PYC/Travis AFB

## **125-E**

Comment noted. The Museum does interpret the history of the site through historic photographs exhibited in its buildings. NPS and BADM would explore opportunities for additional age-appropriate interpretation.

## **125-F**

Comment noted. Please refer to response to comment 15-K which addresses this same issue.

## **125-G**

Comment noted. Please see response to comment 15-L.

## **125-H**

Comment noted. Please see Master Response #4 - Battery Cavallo.

## **Comment 126. Robert J. Lull.**

### **126-A**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #7 – Preference for Retaining PYC/Travis AFB and Master Response #8 – Impacts to Current Users of Boat Shop and Marina.

### **126-B**

Comment noted, thank you. Please refer to Master Response #6 – Preference for Docks over Moorings.

## **Comment 127. John Diamente, Threshold International Center for Environmental Renewal.**

### **127-A**

Comments regarding preferences for future and interim uses are noted, thank you. The planning team has worked with Marin City community representatives in its planning and public involvement effort and will continue to work with Marin City and other Marin community organizations during plan implementation. Please note that interim uses are not considered in the proposed plan and EIS as it is anticipated that there would be a relatively short period of time between the transfer of buildings from the Army to NPS for purposes of plan implementation. Under the Proposed Action, it is likely that all existing buildings suitable for such a use in the long term would be needed to support the conference and retreat center. The plan does not address other portions of the Marin Headlands. With regard to the commentors concern related to environmental issues, Section 2.6.6 of the Final EIS has been revised to provide more refined and stringent traffic mitigation measures. Among the new measures identified is one which requires the BADM to phase proposed expansion so that a Transportation

# **F O R T   B A K E R**

Final EIS

Demand Management (TDM) program is in place prior to occupancy of new space. For information related to ferry service, please refer to Master Response #5 – Ferry/Water Shuttle.