

1 [Opposing Location of Proposed Presidio Fine Arts Museum]

2

3 **Resolution declaring official City policy opposing preferred alternatives 2 and 2A in the**
4 **San Francisco Presidio Trust’s Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**
5 **(DSEIS) that propose the construction of a large hotel and museum facility in the**
6 **Presidio.**
7

8 WHEREAS, The Presidio of San Francisco, described in the Presidio Trust Act as
9 located amidst the incomparable scenic splendor of the Golden Gate, is one of America’s
10 great natural historic sites; and,

11 WHEREAS, Preservation of the cultural and historic integrity of the Presidio recognizes
12 its significant role in our nation’s history as the oldest continuously operating military post,
13 dating from 1776 until the time of its closure, leading to its designation as a National Historic
14 Landmark in 1962; and,

15 WHEREAS, the Presidio Trust Act states that “new construction is limited to
16 replacement of existing structures of similar size in existing areas of development; and,

17 WHEREAS, The June 2008 Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP) Main Post
18 Update, Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) includes a proposal
19 for a new 100,000 square foot museum, a new 95,000 square foot hotel complex (doubling
20 the size of the existing theater), and additional structures totaling 265,000 square feet of new
21 construction; and,

22 WHEREAS, The massive modern-art museum and bulky hotel complex proposals
23 likely violate the Presidio Trust Act because they fail to preserve and protect the cultural and
24 historic integrity of the Presidio for public use and further fail to recognize its significant role in
25 the history of the United States; and,

1 WHEREAS, The museum and hotel proposal far exceeds the maximum of 110,000
2 square feet of new construction envisioned in the Presidio Trust Management Plan 2002
3 (“PTMP 2002”), adopted six years ago and resulting from many years of public input; and,

4 WHEREAS, The DSEIS includes two “preferred alternatives” describing the proposed
5 hotel and museum plan, where preferred alternative 2 would demolish 145,000 square feet of
6 existing buildings and proposed alternative 2A would demolish 161,000 square feet of existing
7 buildings, including historic buildings; and,

8 WHEREAS, Both of these preferred alternatives therefore would violate the demolition
9 limit of 46,000 square feet established in PTMP 2002; and,

10 WHEREAS, The Presidio Trust circumvented public input and involvement in reviewing
11 the museum proposal by severing the Section 106 process from the NEPA process, depriving
12 the public of full and timely disclosure of all the ‘Findings of Effect’ in the DSEIS (including
13 potential mitigation measures) and resulting in a completely flawed process that limited the
14 public’s ability to provide full and informed commentary; and,

15 WHEREAS, The DSEIS is legally deficient because it fails to analyze all environmental
16 impacts to the historic resources and the National Historic Landmark District as a whole which
17 may occur as a result of the proposed actions of the Trust; and,

18 WHEREAS, In a letter dated October 30, 2008, the President of the San Francisco
19 Planning Commission stated that, “[t]he majority of the Commission does not believe the
20 DSEIS is adequate because it does not fully evaluate the impacts to the National Historic
21 Landmark District (NHLD) as a whole and .. agreed that a significant negative impact would
22 occur at the Main Post under [the museum proposal]”; and,

23 WHEREAS, In the same letter, Commission President Olague noted, “the Commission
24 feels strongly that the proposed location of the museum is not appropriate”; and,

1 WHEREAS, The Commission urged the Trust to analyze the project’s consistency with
2 local plans and policies, including the San Francisco General Plan, noting “[t]he land use
3 analysis of the proposed project should inform the public and decision-makers how the
4 proposed project conforms or conflicts with local land uses, especially given the Presidio’s
5 location within the City”; and,

6 WHEREAS, In a letter to the Trust dated July 18, 2008, the CA State Office of Historic
7 Preservation (SHPO) argued that “the Proposed Action is demonstrably the most destructive
8 of all alternatives under consideration, especially in terms of number of buildings demolished
9 and the scale and stylistic incongruity of new construction .. [and] the Proposed Action
10 deviates markedly from the PTMP, which was written only six years ago”; and,

11 WHEREAS, In a letter dated April 4, 2008, GGNRA Superintendent Brian O’Neill noted
12 that the museum project would not conform to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the
13 Treatment of Historic Properties; and,

14 WHEREAS, Clearly, a full investigation of potential sites for the Museum within the
15 City of San Francisco has not been conducted, including an exploration of locations with easy
16 access to a wide array of visitor-serving amenities such as mass transit; and,

17 WHEREAS, The Fishers have compiled an exceptional collection modern and
18 contemporary art, the public display of which would make a valuable contribution to cultural experience
19 of San Francisco; now, therefore, be it

20 RESOLVED, That it shall be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco
21 to oppose the present proposal, envisioned in preferred alternatives 2 and 2A of the Presidio
22 Trust DSEIS, to construct a large modern art museum and hotel complex in San Francisco’s
23 historic Presidio; and be it

24
25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco urges the Trust not
2 to embark on any large-scale changes at the Historic Main Post without the full collaboration,
3 cooperation, and support of the National Park Service with sufficient public input; and be it

4 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City recognizes the valuable contribution offered by
5 the Fisher family to the people of San Francisco and urges the City, the Trust and the Fishers
6 to find an appropriate location for the establishment of this important facility.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25