From: Aaron Roth
To: jessica_carter@nps.gov; frank_dean@nps.gov
Cc: katharine_arrow@nps.gov; brian_aviles@nps.gov; nancy_hornor@nps.gov; Abby_Sue_Fisher@nps.gov
Subject: Re: Octagon House and residence at Shelldance
Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 9:11:53 PM

Here is my take on GMP and leasing and candidly most of its building use descriptions, feel free to through stones at it, but I think this solves this issue.

GMP is a programmatic document not designed to dictate or constrain or even contemplate specific building use, especially interim uses. Rather, it indicates direction and suggest uses. Building uses with high impacts (public programs) need higher levels of compliance and therefore it is helpful for high impact uses that they be mentioned in the GMP FEIS.

However, it does not have to be mentioned, and building uses are not constrained by the uses listed by the GMP. Hence, if we had published the hillwood school as being educational use but we ended up with a lower impact use such as ranger house, no issue in doing that through project review and/or supt decision. It is adaptive management of buildings.

With regards to residential leasing, generally a very low impact use, its good if it is mentioned in GMP for places where it is a major presence (like Fort Mason) but generally not necessary because impacts are so low. We can still have a vision that the octogon house services for visitors in GMP or a ranger house. But doesn't preclude also leasing it out as an interim action - no problem because the impacts of residential lease/ranger house are the same and frankly, shouldn't even be differentiated in the GMP, rather, like any good zoning document just reference "residential" use.

In summary, the GMP, like any master plan, is a good guide but not the same as zoning in a building use sense. Buildling uses are derived/suggested from GMP objectives/management zones but not determined specifically because GMP is a programmatic doc. Building use is utlimately the decision of superintendent, and may or may not require compliance, depending on that use. But residential leasing, because of its low impact, rarely needs any compliance.

This is a long way of saying, let's not worry about this too much. Curious if Brian agrees.

My humble opinion!

Aaron Roth
Deputy Superintendent
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
National Park Service
aaron_roth@nps.gov
415-561-4720

From: Carter, Jessica [mailto:jessica_carter@nps.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 04:04 PM
To: Frank Dean <frank_dean@nps.gov>
Cc: Arrow, Katharine <katharine_arrow@nps.gov>; Aviles, Brian <brian_aviles@nps.gov>; Aaron Roth <Aaron_Roth@nps.gov>; Nancy Hornor <Nancy_Hornor@nps.gov>; Abby Sue Fisher <Abby_Sue_Fisher@nps.gov>
Subject: Re: Octagon House and residence at Shelldance

Hi Frank and all,

At this point, we are just recommending the park keep options open with respect to the Octagon House and a couple other facilities that have any potential for the residential leasing leasing program. Perhaps we can discuss this in our GMP review session next week? As far as the Octagon specifically, I mentioned briefly a couple of weeks ago in Senior Staff that I would add this topic to a future agenda. We know there are several options for the site and look forward to discussing in greater detail.

Jessica

*****
Jessica Carter
Chief, Business Management Division
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Fort Mason Building 201
San Francisco, California 94123
415-561-4993

On Mon, May 20, 2013 at 6:40 PM, Frank Dean <frank_dean@nps.gov> wrote:

> I heard about this and no final decision on occupancy has been made by me. The priority is to get it preserved and occupied. The return/value is uncertain given it is a bit isolated, small, a quirky floor plan and the weather. It may also be a good candidate for a public safety employee house due to some security issues in the parking area below. Am open to discuss employee versus FMV, but this was not final. We could finesse the GMP wording to keep our options open though.
>
> Frank
>
> On May 20, 2013, at 5:16 PM, "Arrow, Katharine" <katharine_arrow@nps.gov> wrote:
>
>> Hi Brian,
>> Here is some additional information for those who are interested. Business Management Division is starting a new project to identity vacant, under utilized, or soon to be vacant (less than two years from now) buildings and set criteria to determine their highest and best use. At our divisional retreat last week, our team began developing goals, strategy, timeline, and roles. Beyond residential leasing opportunities, we will also work with other divisions and park partners to include their facility needs in the analysis.

We see residential leasing as a short-term opportunity to preserve our historic assets through functional re-use. Our goal is to ensure these structures are repaired and maintained so that they retain their viability 100 years from now. The residential master lease allows us to add and remove units as we wish, with some limitations on removing the original 25 buildings in the agreement. Units added are 'banked' in a complex equation that I won't go into here.

We will develop a Return on Investment (ROI) matrix for adding residential units so that there is an expectation for a fair return on our master lessee's investment of time and effort to facilitate rehabilitation projects. A typical home rehab on a historic residence has a 3-7 year payback. The master lease has a term of 10 years. Each unit is unique and will be evaluated against the criteria. Each proposed unit will be reviewed for NEPA/NHPA compliance and consistency with the GMP.

We need to understand if there are any constraints in the GMP that would exclude residential use and address them soon if necessary.

Katharine Arrow
National Park Service
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Building 201, Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 561-4971

On Mon, May 20, 2013 at 4:41 PM, Aviles, Brian <brian_aviles@nps.gov> wrote:

> Frank,
>
> The GMP goal for both of these facilities is to meet park operational needs or serve public uses. Katharine is asking about including them in the residential leasing program.
>
> Need your input: Would this be an interim solution to get the facility ready for future park uses (per the GMP), or should we anticipate making changes to the GMP?
>
> I'll ask Katharine for additional information and bring the topic back to you when we meet on 5/29.
>
> Thanks.
>
> **Brian A. Aviles**
> Senior Planner. National Park Service
> GGNRA - Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123
> 415.561.4942 office
> 415.561.4939 fax
> 415.624.9685 mobile

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Arrow, Katharine** <katharine_arrow@nps.gov>
Date: Wed, May 15, 2013 at 9:12 AM
Subject: Fwd: Draft Fort Miley CLR
To: Brian Aviles <brian_aviles@nps.gov>

Hi Brian,
CR is circulating a draft CLR for Fort Miley and in it they cite language from the GMP. Please confirm that residential use of the Octagon House is permitted under the GMP.

Katharine Arrow
National Park Service
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Building 201, Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 561-4971

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Haller, Stephen** <stephen_haller@nps.gov>
Date: Wed, May 15, 2013 at 8:15 AM
Subject: Re: Draft Fort Miley CLR
To: "Arrow, Katharine" <katharine_arrow@nps.gov>
Cc: Jessica Carter <Jessica_Carter@nps.gov>, Amy Hoke <amy_hoke@nps.gov>, Chris Rurik <chrisrurik@gmail.com>, Brian Aviles <Brian_Aviles@nps.gov>

Thanks for the Quick turn-around, Katharine. I think the recommendations in the draft CLR both on pages 88-89 and 92-93 clearly allow for rental to the public. It may be less clear whether rental to the public is included under "rehabilitated to interpret its history and provide for park operational or public use," which is the language in the GMP. I definitely suggest you check with Brian Aviles on that issue.

On Tue, May 14, 2013 at 4:03 PM, Arrow, Katharine <katharine_arrow@nps.gov> wrote:

> Hi Steve,
> Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft CLR. I see on page 88 a discussion tying in the GMP with the management zone for the Marine Exchange Lookout Area. There is a discussion starting about short and long term uses for the Octagon House. Please make sure that the language allows for the uses identified in the recommendations on pgs. 92-93. One option states that it could be "rented to the public". Is re-use as a residence consistent with the GMP and the draft CLR?
>
> Also, please change my job title in the bibliography to Business

Management Analyst.

Katharine Arrow
National Park Service
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Building 201, Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 561-4971

On Tue, May 14, 2013 at 8:52 AM, Haller, Stephen <stephen_haller@nps.gov> wrote:

> Good Morning,
>
> There is a draft CLR for Fort Miley on the common drive. Chris Rurik had touched base with Katharine when developing it, and we would be happy to have your comments if you have the time. Most important is to concentrate on the Treatment Recommendations, which are on pages 88-97. I believe you'll see thaey are in alignment with the new GMP. Can you possibly get back to us by the end of the week?
>
> Steve
>
> Go here: FOMA Common\Cultural Resources\Fort Miley Draft CLR