But if you don't fall into the category of those requiring special accommodation, then, if you could wait to speak.

Jim Chappell.

JIM CHAPPELL: Thank you, Commissioners, I do sit in the front of the bus at the elderly seat, so I guess I'll be elderly here for you today. I'm not a neighbor of this project. I'm a neighbor of the Mission Playground, where Rec and Park, and City Fields Foundation are doing a wonderful job of building much-needed soccer fields there. I walk there past it twice a day on my way to work and feel good about that project.

Regarding the Beach Chalet EIR, I have some concerns, and that is that, as a planner, we have one document that we can look at and that is the Master Plan. And the Master Plan of Golden Gate Park is the result of thousands of hours, probably tens of thousands of hours of thousands of people over many years, city employees, city commissioners and the public.

And the Draft EIR dismisses the Master Plan, saying, "Consistency of the proposed project for the Park Master Plan will be determined by the San Francisco Park and Rec Department Commission when the
project is considered for approval." I think this also
needs to be seriously thought about by this Planning
Commission here today.

Just a couple of quotes from the Master Plan.
"The Master Plan for Golden Gate Park is intended to
provide a framework and guidelines to ensure a
responsible and enlightened stewardship of the Park.
The goal is to manage the current and future park
recreation demands while preserving the historic
significance of the Park. As such the plan is a
preservationist plan and proposed changes should
respect the historic context of the Park."

"William Hammond Hall envisioned the Park had
two different regions. The park plan east of
Strawberry Hill includes a variety of intensively
cultivated areas and developed facilities while the
parkland to the west is pastoral and woodland landscape
with open meadow defined by stands of trees and
enhanced by lakes."

"Over the years, facilities have been added to
the western park -- the soccer fields in question --
but the character of the landscape has remained as more
wooded, less refined parkland. This distinction should
be maintained with different landscape treatments for
the eastern and western portions of the Park."
So I sincerely believe that there is a compromise here, that Golden Gate Park continue to be as it was initially planned and as the Master Plan calls for and that a different soccer field configuration on that land is possible. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. So I'll ask Denise DeAnne to come up next, and then those in the front row can just follow her.

DENISE D'ANNE: Thank you. I'm Denise D'Anne, and I have not read the EIR, but I don't think that bright lights and artificial turf a park make. And the whole idea of a park is to bring nature into the city and this does not do it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

GENE THOMPSON: Thank you. My name is Gene Thompson. At the scoping session and later in writing I described a specific concern regarding crumb rubber. I do not see that concern addressed in this Draft, so I will repeat it.

The EIR must document how much crumb rubber migrates to areas surrounding artificial turf fields currently in use, then estimate the amount that will migrate into areas surrounding this project.

Using this figure, the EIR must calculate how much crumb rubber will accumulate in park soil over
time and how that accumulation will affect flora and fauna. Will animals directly consume the rubber? What are the potential effects as these compounds that are included in the rubber are broken down and absorbed into the ecosystem.

The Draft does discuss the presence of carcinogens in crumb rubber and the problem of leaching. But that problem is different than the accumulation in the soil of solid crumbs full of toxic compounds and their long-term effects on the ecosystem.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

SUSAN ENGLANDER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Susan Englander. I'm a member of the Harvey Milk Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Democratic Club, and we oppose the corruption of the Beach Chalet and fields by the laying down of Astroturf and the installation of stadium lights.

Parks, first of all, are for people and other living things, so no Astroturf. And I really share the previous testimony regarding the crumb rubber. The migration of crumb rubber, the danger of crumb rubber to children and to animals in Golden Gate Park.

With the Astroturf we will not save on upkeep. It will commit the City to years of repair and
replacements costs and just the grass itself is going to be a much lower upkeep in terms of preservation. So why switch grass for Astroturf.

No stadium lighting. This will only increase the level of light pollution on the coast which is something of great concern generally in urban areas.

Our parks should be a resource for all. It was -- again, as the last two speakers have said, it was created to have a balance between the urban environment and nature and this was, again, true of William Hammond Hall and John McLaren's original vision, something that they shared with Frederick Law Olmsted in his creation of Central Park in New York City. And also the desire to make San Francisco a distinctive place by providing both for its residents and for the nation, a place, a distinctive and beautiful place to recreate within the city.

The city is part of our infrastructure and it does help make us unique. Aside from Central Park, how many other city parks do you know of that are commonly referred to by many Americans? Certainly Golden Gate Park is one of the top city parks in the country.

We're a city that's hungry or green space and not faux green. We want a natural look by working with nature and we want something that's free to the public.
It was our park. When I was unemployed the Park was my refuge. When I was ill with cancer the Park was a restorative space. And I'm close to being an elder now and the Park will be my delight as long as I am welcome there. I want it to be a delight and not a blight for all. So keep out the Astroturf and keep out the stadium lights please. Thank you.

SECRETARY AVERY: So those in the second row that I approached.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: These are the people that requested --

JOHN SARGENT: Good evening. My name is John Sargent. I just want to say, I think one thing that's interesting we should make note of is it was the implementation of Scotch oak grass or Scotch oat grass that enabled the creation of Golden Gate Park in the first place. Prior to that there was a serious problem with keeping the sand out of the Park. And I think it would be really ironic at the present time for us to take something -- grass -- and replace it with a synthetic alternative.

John McLaren, the father of the Park cared as much and ecosystems as he did about useful space. And I just want to say that I am in agreement with every speaker previous to me. We need to think about what
the field does when we're not there. It is actually habitat and the presence of birds and other wildlife indicates that this is more than just a useable space for us.

Also I wanted to say I've only been blind for six years, and 35 years ago I played soccer and we played on a grass lawn and it was great. I wouldn't trade it for anything in the world.

And now that I'm blind, I enjoy the Park differently than other people do. I don't look at the grass and say, "Wow, it looks awfully green today." There are a lot of times when I'll be walking with my friends and I'll say, "Wow, do you smell that? Do you smell the fresh-cut lawn?" And my sighted friends will say, "Wow, you're right. That is one of the best smells in the world."

You'll never get that with Astroturf. In fact, you'll get quite the opposite. I have smelled Astroturf, I've fallen on Astroturf. It's not a pleasant experience as a sportsman or for anyone else as a matter of fact.

Also there are memories I have of Golden Gate Park. It's been my backyard for years. In fact, I kind of consider it the City's backyard and, like the past speaker said, it's a restorative place. Even now
that I'm blind I hear the birds, I hear the wind in the
trees, I smell the cut grass. And there's this one
memory I have. I was walking through the Park and it
had just rained and the sun had come out. And it was
in the twilight in the gloaming, and the grass was
luminescent.

And I was on the phone with my sister, and she
was rather depressed. And I said, "Jill, you won't
believe it. There are 200 robins feeding on the
grass." And you will never have that possibility with
Astroturf. You cannot yield habitat to expedience.
We have to think about what the Park is, not just for
us, but for all the other forms of life that enjoy it.

I think John McLaren and all the other
founders of the Park intended it to be a refuge not
just for us but for all wildlife. And I think the fact
that we now have herons and coyotes living in the Park
is proof that it is commodious for other forms of life
than ours. Thank you very much for your time.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. Next speaker.

TERENCE FAULKNER: Hi, my name is Terence
Faulkner. My father worked most of his adult life with
Golden Gate Park in the Rec and Park Department from
World War II straight through to his retirement in
1974. Our next door neighbor was Jack Spring, the
general manager of Rec and Park. My father and he
wrote some of the bond issues for Rec and Park. They
eventually went on the ballot and got passed. Both
Jack Spring and my father felt very strongly about
retaining the rural character of the Park.

What's being proposed here is something very
different. I passed by Crocker-Amazon Playground which
many years ago before I went to law school I was a
recreation director at and I saw what they did out
there with the klieg lights and the Astroturf and
everything else. Frankly, what's being proposed for
Golden Gate Park is Stalag 17 meets Golden Gate Park.
It turns the whole philosophy of what the Park was
intended to be on its head.

Jack Spring I know felt very strongly on this.
My father did too. Maintain the rural character of
Golden Gate Park particularly the central and western
portions. It was intended to be a natural reserve.
It was actually modeled after Central Park in New York.
The same concepts were involved. The only difference
is Central Park was founded in 1850. Golden Gate Park
was 20 years later. But the same philosophy was
involved, creating an urban environment kept as rural
as possible for the people in the cities. This is not
in line with that. It's going totally a different
Frankly, I think the city's park should be kept a park and it shouldn't be made into a fun thing just to, quote, "be gifted" with one thing after another. I know that John McLaren's favorite thing when he got his monument was putting hedges around it because he wanted to maintain the rural character. I know Jack Spring's attitude was that way. I know my father's attitude was that way. All the old line Rec and Park people I think pretty much have the same view of this. Don't change the character of the Park.

Also one of the earlier speakers talked about the birds and all the rest. We are part of the Pacific flyway. Lots of birds come through Golden Gate Park. They also lay down in our various other parks. We want to maintain an environment where they can survive the Pacific flyway. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. And again, if folks can limit their comments to the Draft's environmental impact report then I would really appreciate it. So we're going through the second row now, I believe.

SECRETARY AVERY: If there's anyone else in the second row that fits the description?

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: That wants to speak at this time.
SECRETARY AVERY: If not, we can go to the third row.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: We can go to the cards.

SECRETARY AVERY: There's a gentleman in the third row.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Okay. That's fine.

SECRETARY AVERY: There should be a chair up there.

GEORGE WOODING: There is. Thank you so much.

Good evening, Commissioners. My name is George Wooding. I'm with the West of Twin Peaks Central Council on the west side of San Francisco. I'm a soccer dad and I've personally sponsored many local soccer teams. I love soccer, adult soccer, youth soccer. However, I do not believe that the Beach Chalet soccer fields should become a synthetic field or feature nighttime lights. The field should remain natural with no lights. The West Sunset fields should also be considered an alternative.

The Planning Department needs to take also a comprehensive look at what is happening at the western edge. We're adding a wastewater treatment sewage plant right beside the soccer fields and you have to think what this is going to mean to the entire project.

I believe also that the soccer -- the Beach
Chalet soccer fields have not been fully renovated since 1998. The RPD is not giving the grass fields a chance to thrive and is quickly jumping to this new alternative, and I think they would be better served and the people of San Francisco would be better served if the fields remain grass. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. Anyone else requiring special accommodations? No? Okay. So we'll start then asking children -- families with children if they'd like to come up at this time. The children are here because of the school situation. I realize you have to be -- there she is. There's a child.

If you want to pull the mike down.

CLAIRE DWORSKY: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Claire Dworsky. I'm a sixth grader at Kathrine Delmar Burke School. And I play soccer, lacrosse, basketball and I run cross country. And I'm here to raise my voice against putting synthetic turf soccer field on the Beach Chalet fields. I love sports but I can't be so selfish to harm the environment. This is one genie you can't get back into the bottle. Kid!}.

The proposed EIR cites a Connecticut study that admits the water runoff from synthetic turf was fatal, fatally toxic to aquatic life. As the winner inner of a National Science Foundation Kids Science
Challenge, I studied the chemical content of grass and turf runoff water with Dr. Dina Deighton, from UC Santa Cruz, and we found that the water from the turf to be 100 percent fatal to all aquatic life. 100 percent. The EIR acknowledges this. The peer-reviewed studies confirm this.

The State of California and USGS say the Beach Chalet is likely to flood in the event of severe ocean storms. It's a matter of when, not if there will be a flood. If turf and crumb rubber get into ocean beach water, aquatic life would die.

I love sports but I also love Golden Gate Park and its ecosystem and I urge you to vote against this. It's a picture that paints 1,000 words. A video paints a million. I urge you to look at the video I made with my digital microscope of a daphnia magnus in the runoff waters from synthetic turf water. See how the rubber gets into its digestive tract and kills it.

Please, do not allow this. Please vote no. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: There's another child that I see. Then I'm going to start reading off cards so if you could come to the mike because I know you probably have to get up early for school.

GRAHAM GERRITY: My name is Graham Gerrity, and I
play lacrosse on the fields at the Beach Chalet. And one of the things, it's really hard to use. I know that I can't -- when I try to play there I can't scoop the ball. The grass is sometimes really overgrown in places. There's gopher holes; we step in them; we get hurt occasionally.

One time in another park that the grass is in a lot of the same state, my friend and I were running there. We had a soccer practice, he stepped in a gopher hole and broke his ankle. And it's not -- sometimes it's not very safe like that. And it's also hard to use for us, as I just said.

And one of the things that -- it would be a lot easier if we had a turf field because we wouldn't have to water it as much, for one, and it's obvious that we would get a lot more use out of it if it was like that, and if we had the lights there we could also play after dark.

And if you look at, say, Kimball fields where now is Astroturf, it's got a lot of use. And I know because I practice there too. And I see people everywhere playing there and it's really easy to work on and it's fun.

And I think the point of the fields there is really -- I'm not sure, I'm no environmental expert,
but I really think the main thing that it's used for is
for sports and so if we really want something that
works for sports, I think we should have one of the
things that's easiest for sports to be played on. And
now if the grass could be kept in perfect upkeep very
easily, then that would be nice, but I think it's a lot
easier to keep a turf field nice, ready to go every
time and really it would just be a lot easier and I
think we would all have a lot more fun playing on it if
that's really the point to these fields. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

We've heard from the children, so I'll start
reading off the cards. Chris Patillo, followed by Mike
Bueller, John O'Dell, Mike Lynes.

CHRIS PATILLO: A hard act to follow.

President Olague and members of the Planning
Commission, my name is Chris Patillo. I'm a qualified
historic landscape architect and cofounder of the
Historic American Landscapes Survey Northern California
chapter, also known as HALS. HALS is a companion
program that compliments HABS, the Historic American
Building Survey. HALS was created in 2000 and its
purpose is to record our nation's cultural landscapes
for future generations, these kids we just heard from.

While the value of his historic buildings has
been acknowledged for decades, only recently have we realized that our cultural resources are equally important. They tell the story of our heritage, they defined who we are as Americans.

The significance of the large urban park movement in the United States is well documented in many sources including the National Register nomination for our own Golden Gate Park. Few would question a claim that, second to New York's Central Park, Golden Gate Park is the most important example of this movement in the country.

As Planning Commissioners, you're charged with protecting this national treasure. Not just for San Franciscans but for all Americans and beyond that, to visitors from around the world.

Golden Gate park demonstrates who we are as Americans and what we value. It represents the forward thinking of William Hammond Hall and others who understood over 100 years ago our needs today, our need to be able to escape the intensity of urban living and be able to enjoy sylvan and pastoral views, to preserve nature within our city.

You'll notice that I'm speaking about the Park as a whole, which the EIR failed to do. The issue before you today is not just about the fields, one
small piece of the Park. Before you this evening is a proposal to profoundly and forever alter the Beach Chalet fields as we know them.

How will this affect Golden Gate Park as a whole? Imagine this. Suppose a museum curator wanted to alter the position of the hands in the painting of the Mona Lisa, possibly adding a bright and dazzling ring, would such change have a profound effect on the entire painting? Please ask yourself how will the addition of artificial turf and 70 new light standards affect Golden Gate Park as a whole, our masterpiece.

Thank you.

SECRETARY AVERY: Okay. Let me just interrupt you. The applause for the children was admirable and wonderful, and thank you very much. They deserved it. And if we can not applaud for the rest of the people, it would move this along a lot faster.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If they applaud, I'm going to boo.

MIKE BUHLER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Mike Buhler on behalf of San Francisco Architectural Heritage, and I'll limit my comments strictly to the EIR and its adequacies. Heritage agrees with the EIR's finding and the HPC's finding that the proposed project will indeed result in significant adverse impacts on
historic resources, including the Golden Gate Park Historic District, the Beach Chalet, Murphy Windmill and Millwright's Cottage.

Upon review of the EIR, however, Heritage believes that the report fails to adequately acknowledge conflicts with the Golden Gate Master Plan and fails to evaluate a reasonable range to potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project.

By proposing to introduce artificial turf and stadium lighting into the Park, the proposed project is clearly inconsistent with the Golden Gate Master Plan policies that prioritize protection of the west end's "pastoral and sylvan landscape."

As stated in our previous comments, Heritage believes that there is more than one feasible alternative to the proposed project. Indeed Alternatives 3 and 4 outlined in the Draft DEIR appear to be feasible because the DEIR acknowledges that they both meet the majority of project objectives. However, we believe that the city can improve on that.

We joined the Historic Preservation Commission in urging the Planning Department to consider an additional hybrid alternative that combines elements of alternatives 2, 3 and 4 including natural grass and reduced lighting. This compromise solution would allow
for renovated fields with natural turf and no or significantly reduced lighting at Beach Chalet, as well as renovated fields at West End Sunset Park using artificial turf and additional lighting.

This approach will meet most of the stated project objectives while retaining the essence of the historic naturalistic fields of Golden Gate Park's western end. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

JOHN O'DELL: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is John O'Dell. I'm a volunteer nest monitor in Golden Gate Park and I keep track of the -- this map here is 18 raptor nests in the west end of Golden Gate Park, of great horned owl, red shouldered hawks, red tailed hawks and Cooper's hawks.

I want to talk about the effect of light pollution on these birds. As you know the weather in the western end of the city is almost always gray, and so that gray overcast will provide a great reflector for these lights. And the environmental impact report has not adequately or addressed this at all.

These birds run on light cycles. Their mating behavior, their feeding, their is -- their -- I feel like Perry here. Their whole cycle of life, how they migrate is based on light. We're asking to turn this
park -- being asked to turn this park into an all-day summer project where we have five extra hours of light some days in winter.

Birds are not going to like that. So this is going to be potentially very, very bad for these birds. But also it's going to be very, very good for these birds' prey. And these birds' major prey are rats. These are the major suppressors of vermin in Golden Gate Park. If you get rid of these birds, the rats will increase. What happens then is you have increased pressure to use rodenticides and the rodenticides begin a downward cycle of poisoning birds as well.

We lost all our great horned owls 20 years ago to the use of rodenticides in Golden Gate Park. We now have three nesting pairs back and they've only been back for a few years. If we lose these birds, we lose an important part of what makes this place the wild -- park's wildness that the design of the Park envisioned.

Thank you.

MICHAEL LYNES: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Michael Lynes. I'm hear on behalf of the Golden Gate Audubon Society. For almost a century we've been working to protect the interest of the Bay Area birds' habitats and the people who care about them. I think all those issues come to the fore here. I want to be
very clear that we do support a project that meets the needs of recreational users, but we want it to respect the cultural and biological values of the western end of Golden Gate Park. And I will talk specifically about the DEIR now.

On the whole the DEIR is incomplete and fatally flawed because it does not adequately assess all the impacts, especially the impact to biological resources. It does not propose adequate mitigation measures and it fails to consider all reasonable alternatives.

First and foremost, it fails to assess impacts of the biological and aesthetic and cultural impacts. For my our comments today I'll focus primarily on birds. Our volunteers have been out there collecting data for years and they've detected use of the soccer fields by myriad species, including white crowned sparrows, red shoulder hawks and, during the breeding season, even a species that's rare to breeding in Golden Gate Park, the Hutton's vireo, right around the Park and the trees around the Park itself.

These species and others will suffer impacts because of the conversion of the area to what is the equivalent ecologically of a parking lot. There's no doubt about it. That's exactly what that is. They may
as well pave it over because that's what Astroturf is like, maybe worse, actually, given the water quality concerns.

Part of the DEIR's inadequacies in these regards is that it continually states conclusions that support its findings of less than significant impacts without citing studies or other data. This is not allowed by CEQA and it renders the DEIR fatally flawed. I'll give you an example.

This will take just the nine acres of the fields themselves out of use. If you look at this map, this is a map in the DEIR which shows you the amount of green space that's right here. There's only two other spots in the western end of Golden Gate Park that compare to that, and if you look in a broader -- within a five-mile radius, the red dots are spots within the Park that are about the size of Beach Chalet or larger.

There's not a whole lot of open grassland habitat within even that five-mile radius of the open space that's talked about in the DEIR. Instead they just lump together open space altogether. There's many other examples of the inadequacies of the study, for example, the lights, the noise, the increased human activity, the biological impacts that will occur once this turf has to be ripped up in eight to ten years.
They provide no basis for their conclusion that it will last 10 to 15 years.

It also fails to provide adequate mitigation measures, for example, nothing to replace the grasslands. Does nothing for the lights. And it does not consider alternatives. This will serve a regional audience. They should look at alternatives on a regional basis, not just the western end of the Park.

Thank you for your consideration.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. Sam Cuddeback, Jane Mudge, Chris Duderstadt, followed by Kathleen Stern.

LORRAINE WOODRUFF-LONG: I have children at home so I am going ahead as one of the special groups. My name is Lorraine Woodruff-Long. I am the executive director of the San Francisco PAL, the Police Activities League. And I am also a parent of two youths in San Francisco that seventh generation San Franciscans and public school kids here in San Francisco, very active users of the Park and both turf and grass fields.

At PAL we're serving --

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: I'm sorry. I don't mean to interrupt. I should have clarified it earlier. What I meant was sometimes there's children sitting in the audience and they have to sit here for the length of
the meeting so I was really gearing my comments towards
getting the children home so they could prepare for
school so that's --

LORRAINE WOODRUFF-LONG: I'm sorry. Thank you.
I've got kids at home waiting alone. But we serve
almost 5,000 kids every year in San Francisco and we
pride ourselves in never turning anyone away for lack
of ability to pay our very low fees. But we turn away
hundreds of kids and volunteers every year because we
simply don't have the space for them to play and the --
I'm here in support of the Beach Chalet renovation
because this would go a long way in ensuring that our
children of San Francisco would have more access to
healthy sports and activities.

And I want to -- at PAL our families, you
know, our 2500 kids that play soccer every year, those
families overwhelmingly prefer Crocker-Amazon and the
turf fields and in fact we're now having families
saying we refuse to go to grass fields because they're
dangerous and people are getting hurt. And we have a
very serious issue of that and those families aren't
here because they're home with their kids right now.

A really important thing I want to make a
point of which is up here, I brought something just
before I came. This -- these have been playing fields
for 80 years and this is not a change in use. I found something here, this is from 1959, it is the very first POA Journal that's talking about the very first PAL team, it happened to be a soccer team. And it's actually, this photograph was taken at the Beach Chalet in May of 1959. So these fields were soccer fields back then.

One of the things that's different from 1959 is our city had resources and money and the ability to completely keep grass fields up. We don't have that ability anymore. Through the generosity of the City Fields Foundation, we've made huge improvements to fields, provided much more access to sports for families and kids and also, you know, I'm very active in trying to keep families in San Francisco. This is just one more thing that we need to do to be able to help provide more access to kids because, quite frankly, we're having families leave because they can go do sports and activities in other cities.

This is not a zoning change. Let's make sure that we make it right for the families and kids that have been using these facilities for generations.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. If you're -- if you heard your name, please come up.
JANE MUDGE: Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Jane Mudge. I'm a resident homeowner and taxpayer in San Francisco.

I have two daughters in grades fifth and second. Both enjoy the parks tremendously and both play soccer, one competitive and one recreational. We've made a conscious choice the live here in San Francisco because of the offerings of urban life. But agency we all know, that's not without its compromises.

And I can assure you there are a hundred more mothers like me at home that aren't able to make it this evening. There have been many times where I've had to deal with my children being disappointed because games were canceled, there were injuries, the fields were overcrowded.

And I think a lot of the previous speakers have addressed the over -- the previous speaker addressed that. But one of the additional points that I wanted to bring up by delaying this proposal is that we always run the risk when a field is unattended, whether it's a field, playground or park, that it becomes vulnerable to urban blight. I think this proposal is thorough and it is fully funded which is fiscally responsible. So please I ask you not to extend the public comment period any further and I
request that you support the proposed renovations of the Beach Chalet.

SAM CUDDEBACK. President Olague, Commissioners, my name is Sam Cuddeback. I'm a parent, former soccer coach, lacrosse coach and long-time head of school at Drew School in San Francisco. In all of those roles over my 26 years here in the city, I've had an opportunity to work with kids and their families through sports.

I think that as I speak for the project, the comments that I would have about the Draft EIR is that I degree that it is adequate, it is complete, and I would point out again that it has found less than significant levels of impact in the key areas as the Department reported earlier.

It's very difficult in an urban environment to deal with two wonderful and very important but yet very competing issues. I think at the end of the day, however, as one who enjoys the Park fully, as one who enjoys being out and around actively myself, I still fall on the side of the kids. I fall on the side of the families. I fall on the side of active engagement through sport with life lessons. We're confronting issues of obesity, issues of the injuries in the fields that my students have been incurred to team players on
all kinds of teams, sprained angles, twisted knees. These are very real issues.

But at the end of the day about the EIR, I think we have to agree that the Draft EIR has been complete and addresses the issues that are important. Thank you very much.

KATHLEEN STERN: Good evening. My name is Kathleen Stern. I'm a 43-year resident of San Francisco currently living with my husband in our own home in the Outer Richmond, the DEIR states that the proposed Beach Chalet soccer fields renovation project has, quote, "a significant and unavoidable impact on historic resources," end of quote. I believe this impact is even more apparent after the magnificent recent restoration of the -- completion of the restoration of the Murphy Windmill.

The western edge of Golden Gate Park now has a windmill and its north and south corners with a wonderful path between the two. Just think of the hundreds and thousands of people that are going to come and visit those windmills and stroll between those two windmills.

A sports complex adjacent to the Park with artificial turf and stadium lighting is intrusive and incompatible with the surroundings. I would like to...
see the EIR include an alternative that restores the
Beach Chalet soccer fields with natural grass and no
lighting. This is the only alternative that is
compatible with the Golden Gate Master Plan that says
that the western edge of the Park should remain sylvan
and pastoral. Synthetic turf and artificial lighting
belong outside of Golden Gate Park. Thank you.

CHRIS DUDERSTADT: Commissioners, thank you. My
name is Chris Duderstadt. I started -- I have read the
entire Draft EIR. I find the mitigations quite
acceptable. My concern is reading the EIR it doesn't
deal with the safety of the users of this facility.

In 1992, I started with a shovel and a
wheelbarrow at Beach Chalet trying to fill the holes
that were rampant. In '96, if you could put up this,
please. We had a young boy I'll pan you through. This
was Alex Goodman. He broke his ankle in a hole at the
Beach Chalet.

I was fortunate enough to get this picture
before the mayor. It took us a little while but we
spent about four million dollars on our soccer fields.
In '98 we redid the soccer field. Willie was there,
everybody was there. He made two quotes that I think
we need to repeat. One he says, "We now have the best
11 soccer fields in the country in Golden Gate Park."
We will make the same commitment to maintaining these fields as we have restoring them."

A year later I did field surveys repeatedly. This was Beach Chalet a year later. It's not possible for us to maintain natural lawn fields in San Francisco with the number of recreational users we have. Even if we have all the gardeners in the world, we still can't do it.

I think you need to consider the safety of the children and adults that will use this field going into the future. It is historic, the natural grass, ruts and gopher holes I don't think should be considered historic. I think we move forward with this project and thank you very much.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. Dave Goggin, Rose Hillson, followed by Rupert Clayton and Patricia Eric.

DAVE GOGGIN: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Dave Goggin. And I want to talk about the Draft EIR it's disappointing that no real analysis of the effects of the light reflecting upward in the field surfaces themselves was included in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR's Photoshopped pictures and vague and naive verbiage are not sufficient.

Instead a full and rigorous analysis of the actual effects of the reflected uplight should be done.
The light reflecting upward from the field surfaces would not be trivial. It might well be the major part of the project's light emissions into the environment. Assuming that the artificial turf is made to duplicate the appearance of natural grasses as closely as possible, then the artificial turf should be expected to be about 25 percent reflective, as is natural grass. So it seems likely that of the 150,000 watts' worth of light produced, the majority of which illuminates the field surfaces, something like 30,000 to 35,000 watts' worth of light would be reflected skyward off the field surfaces. That's the same uplight as you would get by laying 20 to 23 of the 1500-watt fixtures on the field and pointing them upward. That's a lot of light.

Sutro Heights and Land's End are prime astronomy locations in San Francisco's last bit of dark sky resource. Few similar cities enjoy parklands easily accessible to residents and families where the universe can be so easily seen. For our coastal zone, the southern part of the sky is rich, for example, with beautiful star clusters that includes nebula easily visible with small telescopes or even binoculars. But the Draft EIR hardly acknowledges this valuable resource.
There has been much concern expressed that reflected uplight could create a large patch of new sky glow in the southward line of sight from these prime locations. The Draft EIR completely fails to model and quantify the project's effects on sky darkness at various angles as seen from these parklands. Full quantitative analysis of the project's effects on artificial night sky brightness should be carried out. Vague guesses are not sufficient.

The effects of reflected uplight could also be very significant in cloudy or foggy conditions. On cloudy nights, that 30- to 35,000 watts' worth of light reflecting upward off the field surfaces would bight illuminate the clouds with a strange and unnatural glow.

Many species of birds, mammals, insects and plants and trees depend on a natural day-night cycle for timing their life processes and many are sensitive to what may seem relatively low amounts of nighttime light. So that fake twilight could be very disrupting to the ecology and the surrounding wildlands.

I would just conclude by saying the compromise project alternative that has been proposed that calls for renovation of the fields with natural grass and no lighting. This is an alternative I could 100 percent
ROSE HILLSON: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Rose Hillson. The DEIR has many flaws and is inaccurate and incomplete with the findings on aesthetic impacts. For example, on the overhead, the criteria for judging visual impacts are arbitrary and inconsistent with my personal experience.

Their Draft discussion concludes, "The athletic field lighting would add new vertical elements to the project site. However this would not be expected to be so intrusive as to preclude the enjoyment of the natural features of the facility. I disagree.

The height of the lighting towers dominates over our whole perception of this scene. It more closely resembles a scene from War of the Worlds than pastoral parkland. The Draft discusses the simulated evening view from Sutro Heights, "although the lights would draw attention with the intensity of the lighting, they would not dominate this panoramic view."

This fails to take into account the intense point light sources that the sports lighting systems create. These lights stand out from miles away.

This photo shows the view of nightshirts at South Sunset Playground taken from about one half mile
away. Even at that distance, the sports lights are brighter than nearby streetlamps.

The Draft EIR shows a view from the railroad trail that would imply that one cannot see the fields. But if you walk further down the trail there are clear views under the trees through the field. Surely the light poles would intrude on our experience of the here.

Finally, important views of missing completely. The DEIR does not simulate the classic view from the Cliff House. The DEIR has no view from the beach towards the Park. Here we see the Beach Chalet with the moon rising behind. What will this view look like with 150,000 watts of light next to it.

These are just a few of the deficiencies in consideration of the impact that this project will have on the aesthetics of this area. I have not had time to review the entire DEIR but hope that you will extend the public comment period at least an additional 15 days beyond the 45 days so that we can address these and other deficiencies and due to the fact that over 360 pages are in this DEIR as opposed to most which are 150 pages. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

YOPE POST HOMOUS: My name is Yope Post Homous.
I'm a 48-year resident of San Francisco. I have lived in the Outer Richard since 2000. My wife and I chose this area in order to enjoy the western edge of Golden Gate Park. After noting the Golden Gate park master indicated that this section would remain pastoral and sylvan, I was shocked to see the proposal of Rec and Park to install a sports complex with artificial turf and stadium lights. I thought the Rec and Park would be protecting the Park for us not forcing us to fight for what we thought was already agreed upon.

My concern is also on the artificial turf. Beyond not belonging in a landmark park, it would just leach all those hazardous chemicals in the substrate. The lights would be also and encroachment to nature in that it would make undesirable for nesting birds and resting birds as it is on the Pacific flyway. And it would totally alter the nature of the Park and encroach on the beaches area as well as the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

RUPERT CLAYTON: My name is Rupert Clayton. I live near UCSF Parnassus at the eastern end of the Park. I'm commenting in order to oppose the project as it is currently planned, specifically the artificial turf and night lighting elements within Golden Gate Park.
I would like to use my comments to draw your attention to an important alternative approach that I believe should be analyzed within the environmental impact report. This compromise alternative would have two components.

The first part would be to renovate the Beach Chalet site with high quality living grass fields. This component would have a high quality grass playing surface on the four soccer fields in question. This would include a good soil structure and soil improvements for stronger grass roots so that they -- the surface stays in place and playable, an effective subsurface drainage to cut down on the loss of playing time due to rain, state-of-the-art irrigation to provide both full coverage of the field but also to save water by irrigating only when needed, new sod, and gopher barriers combined with an active gopher control program because these measures, contrary to what some people have said here, are actually able to control gophers and remove the holes that have been mentioned.

At Beach Chalet, would also propose to fix up the restrooms as needed and to provide ADA access in a way that's sensitive to the design of the Park and consistent with other meadows.

The components, noting the Beach Chalet would
be night lighting or expansion of the number of parking spaces, so we're looking for a balanced proposal within the Park.

Then the second component, alongside the Beach Chalet improvements, would be to make improvements at another site. This, for sake of discussion, would be the West Sunset playground. These improvements would include renovations to the playing surface at that other site, four soccer fields, potentially for other athletic fields at that site, and also sports lighting to increase nighttime play.

We do realize that there's a strong need for the soccer within the city, and we believe that these two components taken together would accomplish that. So we feel that this compromise alternative is a fundamentally obvious alternative that the EIR must address and analyze and the Draft as it's currently written does not do that.

Elements of those features are in Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 of the EIR but they're not combining one plan. Therefore, the analysis faults each of those alternatives in various ways. We'd like to see them combined in one plan. Bringing together those components provides a way to have much better youth and adult soccer facilities within San Francisco while
avoiding significant environmental impact to Golden Gate Park and the wider environment.

I think the benefits of that plan should be fairly obvious to you as Commissioners. And thank you for your time, and I hope you'll direct that that alternative is considered. Thank you.

PATRICIA ARACK: Good evening. My name is Patricia Arack. I am a long-term resident of the Outer Sunset on the Great Highway, 25 years. I was shocked when I learned of these plans to put in artificial turf and the stadium lights. I was further shocked when I read the EIR and saw that it was listed as having not a significant impact. I beg to differ with that assessment of what this project will do to a really wonderful wild, sandblasted, windy, cold, natural environment that is a refuge for so many people, not just soccer players.

The character of the landscape will be forever changed. This is not Coney Island, this is not Southern California beaches, this is our Golden Gate Park, which was designed to be natural and wild and a home for the animals.

Two things that I am very much against, the stadium lights, this will cause a substantial degree of degradation of the visual character at night. When I
first moved into my house 25 years ago, I always heard
migrating birds honking up above as they flew by and
each year there were fewer and fewer. I hardly ever
hear them now. This project would put in a light and
heat island that would further confuse any migrating
birds and send them off course or they would avoid this
area, which is the Pacific flyway, altogether.

These bright lights will cause a glare. The
visual impact, if you see this photograph, the stadium
pole rises very, very, much higher than the tree line
and I don't know how many poles are there going to be,
10, 15, I forget. But it's going to be a truly
changed -- a true negative change to this environment.

The artificial turf, I thought the young girl
who gave her presentation about the hazards of this
toxic substance was brilliant and should absolutely be
listened to. This is not something that we should put
in a park. Soccer players are a small percentage of
the population that use this park. This park is for
everyone and it's also for the animals. I beg you to
consider not approving this project.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. Mary Anne Miller
followed by Pinky Kushner, Miriam Pinchuk, Oscar Frick
and Anna Myers. And I'll just keep calling names,
Susan Hirsch, Eric Hansen, David Wilkinson.
PINKY KUSHNER: Pinky Kushner. I've lived in the Inner Sunset for 30 years. I'm a member of the Conservation Committee from the Sierra Club. I'm sure you all know the various considerations that make up an environmental impact report: Land use, land use planning, aesthetics, cultural and paleontological resources, wind and shadow, recreation, biological resources, hydrology, water quality, hazards and hazardous material, agriculture, forest resources and air quality.

This laundry list is frequently kept as a laundry list in an EIR. I think this is wrong and especially it's wrong in this Draft EIR.

All of these items are not equal according to the intent of California Environmental Quality Act law. What you've just been handed is the legislative intent and the additional legislative intent of the California law. The legislative intent speaks of quality environmental, high quality environment, the preservation and enhancement of the environment, the management of natural resources.

This was -- this was actually written around 1970. Recently it was further explained in Section 21001 as additional legislative intent. This you also have. "Develop and maintain a high quality environment
now and in the future and take all action necessary to protect, rehabilitate and enhance the environmental quality of the state."

"Take all action necessary to provide the people of the state with clean air, water, enjoyment of aesthetic, natural scenic and historic environmental qualities."

This says nothing about recreation. This says nothing about obesity. This is something about nature. And this is a natural setting, at the western end of Golden Gate Park that deserves to be preserved in a natural state. The fact that Rec and Park rehabilitated that in 1998 and probably hasn't touched it since in a dense urban environment tells you something about the state of affairs in Rec and Park, that they would propose artificial turf instead of doing normal upkeep. Thank you very much.

SUSAN HIRSCH: Thank you, President Olague and other members of the Planning Commission. I'm Susan Hirsch and I'm the project direct for the City Fields Foundation, the nonprofit that's partnering with the Rec and Park department on this project.

When we started this project five years ago, our so many mission was to make sure that there were enough safe, accessible sports fields for local kids.
And as reported in the Draft EIR, this city is very short on fields for kids. Simply, there are not enough fields for kids to play on. With Rec and Park as you may know we've completed six other fields across the city and each of these projects has been enormously popular with ballplayers and most of the Park neighbors.

And although all of our other projects have undergone environmental review, the proposed Beach Chalet and athletic fields renovation is the first to go under a full EIR. And with Rec and Park we willingly requested additional review leading to the EIR in order to be sure that we were providing the community with the assurance that this project was good for the Park and safe for the environment.

And that's exactly what this Draft EIR has found. This project will have practically no environmental impacts.

The EIR thoroughly examined many of the issues you hear that have been raised today. It is very comprehensive and data-driven. The Beach Chalet has been studied extensively for over two years with an abundance of community participation. We're asking you that you do not extend the review period which would give it further project delay that would benefit so
many kids who have already been patiently waiting for
the renovation.

There was a lot of talk about families leaving
San Francisco, and you've heard from a couple of
mothers who were here today. It's hard to get to these
meetings and parents would like to participate but many
often may have busy lives. I raised two kids here
myself and sometimes it's not easy to find a lot of
things that are safe and accessible for kids, but this
city has a lot to offer. And we need to find ways to
help kids and families stay in San Francisco.

So this project can give them one more reason:
High quality safe fields at Beach Chalet. Thank you
for your interest.

MIRIAM PINCHUK: Hello Commissioners. This is
first time I've -- my name is Miriam Pinchuk. This is
the first time I've ever read an environmental impact
report. And this one is a lengthy document so I
focused only on a couple of issues.

I was shocked at the lack of scientifically
valid data presented in Section 4, Hazards and
Hazardous Materials. I have worked as a medical editor
for more than ten years editing research papers and
medical information. In a 15-minute search on a
publicly accessible database, I was able to identify
numerous scientifically valid studies on hazards associated with artificial turf, on MRSA in artificial turf, and studies on injuries that compared artificial turf with grass playing fields.

The most recent study on injuries was published in November 2011. None of these studies was included in the Draft EIR. And contrary to the arguments I have heard from City Fields and their supporters, the evidence on injury is clear. There is no difference in the number of injuries sustained on grass playing fields compared with artificial turf fields. There is no difference in terms of the number of minor structures or in the number of severe injuries. The only difference is in terms of the types of injuries.

Section 4 of the Draft EIR reviews studies from 2007, 2009 and 2010. Yet the Draft EIR cites no studies from 2011. Given the dearth of appropriate scientifically valid data presented in the report, I would like to ask that an unbiased independent expert with knowledge of scientific method and research conducts a thorough review of the scientific and medical literature before any conclusions are drawn about the hazards of artificial turf, either to the environment or to health, and its ability to reduce
injuries.

Additionally, I ask what the findings of RPD's 2008 task force be removed from the Draft EIR owing to the clear conflicts of interest present in the sections on material compositions -- they cite conversations and reports commissioned by manufacturers as evidence -- and the fact that the ecosystem study group did not even prepare a formal written summary.

I further ask that only scientifically valid reliable studies that have been peer reviewed or published in peer-reviewed journals be included in Section 4, for without valid studies the report cannot draw valid conclusions. Thank you.

MARY ANNE MILLER: Mary Anne Miller. I know we're way beyond paper, but I would ask Ms. Avery to pass these to you because the third page contains the alternative that's been referenced by some other speakers and I want to speak to that as well. Thank you.

There is a major misnomer in the title of this EIR study, which calls the project a "restoration," a term which gives the false impression that the fields are going to be renewed. Nothing could be more inaccurate to call the complete reconstruction of the entire area a simple renovation. If I came to your
backyard and scraped away everything that was there and
gave you something that I thought was better and you
came home, you would see that I could not ever call
that a "renovation."

Reading the project description leaves no
other impression than that the project is entirely a
new development with only a segment of the existing
restroom retained and renewed. Everything else will be
scraped away and a new sports facility complex will
rise in its place.

A true restoration is envisioned by the group
Ocean Edge and it's the third page on what I've handed
to you. This is a compromise alternative. Really,
everyone who is opposed to the project as is wants
those fields restored in a true restoration.

So this compromise alternative would add more
hours, it would be safe, it would not have lights. We
are not serving out-of-town soccer clubs. We are
serving the children of San Francisco in daylight time,
not in rainy season. Although drainage could be put
there so you could play right after a rain. But the
point is who are we serving.

The cumulative impacts are insufficiently
studied, in my view. The environmental impacts of the
proposed soccer fields project should be reviewed
together with the impacts of the proposed recycled
water treatment facility. Do you realize that that's
supposed to happen right in that same western part of
the city next to the Murphy Windmill? It's not studied
in the EIR. Nor is this huge effort that's being done
with the oversight of SPUR with multi agencies to study
Ocean Beach and the Ocean Beach area.

So please, Commissioners, study the project
objectives. They talk about this as being in the north
part of the city. It's in the west. And so you cannot
serve this project -- you can't serve northern
interests or northern needs. Thank you very much.

ANNA MYERS: Good evening. My name is Anna Myers.
I'm 18 years old and I have spent my entire life in San
Francisco. I spent my childhood living one block away
from Golden Gate Park. Especially after my backyard
was filled with lead, Golden Gate Park was my backyard.
I spent my childhood running along the trails through
the trees, sitting by the ocean and enjoying the
wonderful natural preserve that it is for all
residents.

I am very concerned about this proposed
project for many reasons. I am concerned about the
toxic chemicals which are found in the rubber compound
used in the Astroturf. I am very concerned
particularly about the stadium lighting that is being proposed to be put in. I'm sure as San Francisco residents you've all had the privilege of sitting on Ocean Beach after dark looking at the waves. It's beautiful. And from all the pictures I've seen, from all that I can imagine, having huge nearly spotlights put in so close to the beach would absolutely ruin that. I do not believe that something that would benefit so few residents, when they can go elsewhere to play, is justifiable to ruin something as wonderful as the Park for so many residents. Thank you.

JOHN WILKINSON: Thank you, President Olague and members of the Planning Commission for hearing this important item today. My name is John Wilkinson. I'm going to read a message by my brother David, who is a San Francisco resident. The message is on behalf of Project Vega, a San Francisco nonprofit which provides free soccer to San Francisco youth and is supported by our Park and Good Samaritan Resource Center, akita Good Sam in the Mission.

We strongly support the play fields initiative plans to renovate the Beach Chalet athletic fields and urge to you close comment on the DEIR so that every San Francisco kid can have a place to play. Project Vega provides free soccer to kids of all backgrounds and
skill levels in San Francisco. Our biggest challenge in fulfilling this mission is the lack of accessible playing fields in San Francisco. For many kids and their families as you've been hearing, the lack of access causes them to leave the city to find sufficient playing time. This is a terrible outcome for the city.

Also the use of synthetic turf means fewer injuries and the ability to play in adverse weather, a huge boost to our kids so they can play year round supporting a healthy and positive childhood. We support the Beach Chalet renovation and urge you to move past comment on the DEIR to support the project renovation. Thank you very much for your time.

ERIC HANSEN: Good evening, President Olague and members of the Planning Commission. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak here tonight. My name is Eric Hansen. I'm a resident of the Outer Sunset District. I have two children, a 4-year-old and a 14-year-old that are both actively involved in the soccer community.

Our family has experienced tremendous positive impacts from the field renovation projects that have happened throughout the city such as Crocker-Amazon, Kimball and South Sunset, and we are hopeful that this project will move forward and we'll be able experience
these positive impacts at the Beach Chalet.

It is important to note that the project that
you have here in front of you today has been around for
several years and has gone through a great deal of
public comment already. The turf and lights are still
part of this project but an effort has been made by Rec
and Park in the city fields to minimize those impacts,
and the design has been shaped to fit within the
context of the Park and the Beach Chalet area as much
as possible. Delaying this process any further will
only result in more seasons that our kids will miss
proper fields at the Beach Chalet.

The stated project goals are to increase the
amount of playing time for our kids in the city of San
Francisco. And the turf and lights are very important
components to meet those goals. The EIR documents the
history of Golden Gate Park and how it has been shaped
by the residents of San Francisco throughout the years
to meet their needs. This includes lights.

As early as the 1920s lights were used in the
Park for tennis courts. There are lights at Kezar
Stadium currently. There are lights in several
designated night use areas. There are lights for
driving and walking paths. And these lights are used
if the Park to increase the nighttime enjoyment for the
SF residents and also the safety of the users.

If you look at the Beach Chalet area right now, it is quite dark. And this only contributes to the homelessness, encampments, drug use and other illicit sexual activity happening around the perimeter of the Park.

ANDREW SOLOW: I don't think that's proper. You can shut up.

SECRETARY AVERY: Okay. Wait, wait, wait, wait. It's not proper for any of you to speak out of turn.

ANDREW SOLOW: That's right. But you don't disrupt him.

JOHN SARGENT: You're disrupting us right now, sir. Please keep quiet.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're going to need to leave if you're going to continue commenting.

SECRETARY AVERY: We're need to call the sheriff in here if you guys cannot restrain yourself. This man has a right to address this Commission and say whatever it is he needs to say, just like you do, without your comments.

ERIC HANSEN: So the point I was trying to make is that the lighting in the Park increases the enjoyment for the SF residents and increases the safety for those residents.
In conclusion, I'd just like to say again that I believe that the EIR is the result of a thorough and balanced analysis and the project and its alternatives have been analyzed thoroughly, and I ask that you move this project forward without delay. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

Mark & Beckett Roskoski, Hiroshi Fukuda, Pam Hemphill, Rasa Moss followed by Pamela Rupright.

I'll keep calling names. Tes Welborn, Cary Jones, Jimmy DeLisle.

RASA MOSS: I'm Rasa Moss, 43-year resident in San Francisco, grandmother of a dynamite 6-year-old soccer player who loves soccer and will not play on artificial turf I hope. He wants to play on grass. The Draft EIR has several serious flaws. It reaches firm conclusions unsubstantiated by evidence, enumerates particulars without pointing to questions and inconsistencies that arise and fails to consider cumulative polls.

It also fails to take the perspective wide enough to encompass the project's probable or possible impacts on the treasured western end of Golden Gate Park and Ocean Beach which is inseparable from the Park as a recreational and natural destination. The final Draft needs to deal with all these flaws and I hope you give it time.
For example, the section on biological resources concludes, "The proposed project in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity would not have cumulative considerable impact on biological resources (less than significant)."

Yet five special status species would or could be affected, 52 different bird species have been observed in the project area the report says, and the introduction of nighttime lighting has the potential to interfere with migratory corridors and impede use of wildlife nursery sites. Also, says the report, it can be assumed that numerous birds pass overhead or in the vicinity.

So does all this support the conclusion and not just for this proposed project, for others past, present and in reasonably foreseeable future?

According to the EIR, the loss of habitat would be insignificant because there's lots more in the Park. But the Park has been shrunk. Its habitat has been shrunk even as human use grows. A little bit from a smaller whole becomes a lot, and this is not considered.

Regarding the lights, what supports the conclusion there would have been minor impact on birds?
Where are the studies? I also fail to find a total amount of new concrete that would cover natural ground. These are just some of the details.

On matters of toxicity and health hazards from synthetic turf, a diligent enumeration of existing studies by -- or until now seem to be existing studies -- shows that very little research has been done to support the conclusion in the EIR that we have nothing to worry about.

Please, let's be imaginative. Get a patrol of soccer players out there with little shovels. Do something about the gophers before every game. And let's have grass.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: I'd like to ask people to clear the doorway. It's creating a hazard. And if you heard your name, if you could please start coming up to the mike.

TES WELBORN: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Tes Welborn. I would like to point out a couple of defects with this EIR. One of them is that it's missing a comparison of combining grass restoration at this site with installing at West Sunset Playground artificial turf. A playground is the appropriate place. That's an alternative that was not considered.

Another problem with this EIR is it doesn't
explore the toxic components of powdered tires and how
they get into people's clothes, they get into
skin, they get into the air and they go home with the
kids. There's nothing in this EIR that addresses that.
Why that omission.

A couple of other things. The Golden Gate
Master Plan is compatible with having grass
restoration. It would -- having grass restoration even
with modest lights would allow the historic district to
be kept. Otherwise you're violating that. And I'd
like to point out that one of the project objectives is
to say that nighttime use would be a community good.
It's not necessarily a community good. I don't think
it's a community good for me, that's for sure. And for
a lot of children and families in San Francisco. So
please get this EIR fixed. Thank you.

MARK ROSKOSKI: Good evening members of the
Planning Commission. I'm here with my son Beckett. We
live two blocks from Golden Gate Park. He goes to
public school and we take the Muni wherever we can.
As it is we have to ride four times a week 30 to 40
minutes to the play fields.

Play fields are like schools and libraries.
The fields need to be useable and activated so that
families who want to stay in the city have healthy,
active kids. We'll be brief because he's got to get home and do his homework. We believe the study is thorough and should be approved in your report. Thank you.

HIROSHI FUKUDA: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Hiroshi Fukuda, and I'm the president of Richmond Community Association and also the chair of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, Land Use Committee. And tonight I'll only be responding in regards to the Richmond Community Association because the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods has not had a good time to review this as a committee.

From that point of view, we believe the public needs adequate time to review and understand the DEIR on the Beach Chalet project, so please allow the public this necessary time for complete review and understanding of this project.

After a quick look on some of the chapters, it seems obvious that the project values the increased hours of soccer play above protecting the parkland. In the chapter on cultural resources, the DEIR states that the project's impact on cultural resources would be quote, "significant and unavoidable," unquote.

On the original intent of the Golden Gate Park, isn't that a violation of the Golden Gate Park
Master Plan?

Some of the chapters I was able to read quickly, not complete them, but there's some questions about artificial turf. What happens to the field when it wears out in eight to ten years? And this is important because it's not just at Beach Chalet. There are approximately 30 acres of artificial turf throughout the city. They have also had to be replaced, and to replace this is a rather -- it's expensive undertaking. And the city at this point does not have the budget for hardly anything. So what's the guarantee that it's going to be replaced properly.

Seems that Astroturf would be a much easier reasonable cost-effective replacement. And what would be the impact on the parkland if there's no money to either replace the turf ten years or put back the natural grass. This whole entire question about artificial turf was not fully studied in the Draft environmental impact report.

It also did not fully evaluate natural turf and the benefits and the new technology that have been used to insert natural turf in other areas of the country and also throughout the world.

Alternative sites have not been fully investigated. The entire park needs to be fully
investigated and the west Sunset Park. So please provide another 60 days for this review. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

PAM HEMPHILL: I'm Pam Hemphill. I'm a physician, and I'm a 41-year resident of San Francisco. I think the DEIR is really inadequate in terms of medical things and hazards. There's a whole orthopedic literature that has to do with how artificial turf is not in fact safer. We've been hearing that it's safer over and over. Well, I think that literature got ignored and I did submit it at one point. There are a lot of articles, there's some specifics that only apply to artificial turf like turf toe. You may want to research "turf toe" and the heat effects of playing on artificial grass that gets to very high temperatures on hot days. We're having more of those hot days than we had before.

I'd like to show you a picture. These are stairs at Crocker-Amazon and I looked at that at first and thought, "What is all that black stuff?" That is the crumbles coming down from the playing field. These stairs are swept regularly. Those crumbles are coming to a house near you.

So you may want to find out what they are and I don't think that's adequately talked about. Thank
you. Good evening.

MICHAEL GERRITY: Good evening. My name is Michael Gerrity. I'm taking Pam Rupright's spot, if that's important for your records. She'll come up here a little bit later, but I've got to get my guy home.

I'm a father of three in the city and a coach of the Rip Tide Youth Lacrosse Club. I attended my first meeting on this subject over two years ago. I'm sure there are others prior to that. All the arguments made here this evening were made at that time two years ago, many of them by residents who indicated they were from the Inner Sunset area who naturally have concerns about this project in their backyard.

But there has also been overwhelming support for this project from all kinds of members of the community that perhaps can't be here tonight. But I hope that's recognized because we were sort of forced into doing an EIR project for something that really seemed to make sense from the get-go.

Now that EIR process has been done. It was a painfully long process and expensive use of taxpayer resources, but the comprehensive document has concluded the impacts of turfing this field would be minimal.

I urge you along with a large number of San Franciscans to not let this project be delayed any
I recognize there's a lot of emotion around Golden Gate Park, but the bottom line is that this space is already dedicated to athletic fields. Over 75 years ago, someone decided that one of the many things the Park should provide is a space for teen sports and they devoted about 1 percent of the Park's acreage to this purpose. It is not one of the grassy meadows. It has not been set aside as part of the serene landscaping of the western edge of the Park.

This small piece of the Park was set aside specifically for teen sports and that purpose is its historic value. The reason we're here tonight is that for large parts of the year those fields are closed or in poor condition and, frankly, are not capable of fulfilling the original planners' intent to have that used for teen sports. Go out there right now and you'll see a chain link fence and a sign that says you can't play. Go out there in February and March when my lacrosse team is assigned to practice in this field and you'll see that sign almost 50 percent of the time.

I like a nice grass field as much as the next guy, but in a city with this much demand for field space, even if we had a maintenance budget, the only way to make grass fields viable is to close them for
large chunks of time so that they can rehab and then
close them again every time there's substantial rain.

That means the field can only be used in
certain seasons and games and practices are regularly
canceled. And this happens all the time, even if it's
sunny outside. If the fields are wet, they're closed
and thousands of kids and adults that use the fields
each week are out of luck. Turfing the Beach Chalet
fields simply means we'll be able to use the space that
has already been provided for teen sports.

In the same way that tennis courts in the Park
need to be hard courts, in the same way that roads to
the Park need to paved to meet the demands of city
usage, turfing these fields allows the most people to
benefit from the Park and all its intended uses. And
team sports is one of them. In a city that has a huge
shortage of playing fields, has an active athletic
population and has a major problem giving families a
solution, this solution is nothing short of obvious.

JIMMY DeLISLE: Thank you. Good evening. My name
is Jimmy DeLisle, and I'm a student of San Francisco
State University that's studying in environmental
studies and I'm also a resident in Menlo Park. I want
to keep my time short and provide others time for their
own thoughts and so they can get home on time or early.
I wanted to hit specifically upon the implementation of said planned lights in the EIR and how they would harm bird migratory patterns, increase light pollution and harm specifically the California red bat, the red bat's hunting ability at night, like in the early evening. So I strongly suggest that the EIR, like, review this and I also agree on previous comments of not using the synthetic rubber turf instead of the normal grass. And thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. I'll keep calling names. If you've heard your name, you can step up to the mike.

CARY JONES: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Cary Jones. I'm assistant commissioner in the local area for California Youth Soccer Association. I'm here on half behalf of the local youth soccer leagues including the Mission league, the Viking league, and the SFPAL.

We've heard that the Beach Chalet is a traditional facility in San Francisco for ground sports. The previous renovation of the Beach Chalet fields occurred in 1998 only after the risk of injury on a poorly maintained surface were made known to Mayor Willie Brown. At that time a fence was put up in order to restrict access in order to preserve the field.
Youth leagues in San Francisco affiliated with CYSA represent over 6,000 boys and girls who depend on the city of San Francisco for safe places to play. Organized sports for kids offer a positive alternative to juvenile crime and they help prevent childhood obesity. Parents of these 6,000 kids are all San Francisco taxpayers and surely deserve to have their tax dollars spent wisely to provide safe places to play.

While the Draft EIR is generally quite thorough, I have a problem because it does not fully address the impact of the field's surface on the users. What is the impact on a player being injured by uneven grass or a gopher hole? How does a child learn how to pass a soccer ball over a grass pitted with dirt paths?

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you. Jeffrey Cope, Colin Schmidt, Emily Queliza, Dr. John Rubio, Deanna Hodgin, Marcia Madrigal, Courtney Gattuso, Ellen Koivieto, David Romano. And if you're in the overflow, if you heard your name, start coming forward.

COLIN SCHMIDT: I'm a parent of three. I live two blocks from Kimball Playground. I can assure you that I still see the moon, I still see birds, lots of wildlife. That project has dramatically improved the quality of life of our neighborhood and of San
Francisco, really.

I'm also the executive director of America SCORES Bay Area. I represent 500 families from a soccer and academic program from 15 public low income schools mostly in the Bayview and Mission and Western Addition. 80 percent are low income families. These are -- we play five days a week soccer. We play five days a week on pavement. These are kids who play on pavement and school blacktop. On the sixth day we go to Crocker-Amazon.

Half of our games are on turf, half of the games are on grass, a quarter of the games that are on grass get canceled, and at times the kids who play on the turf, we have 60 kids playing on a space that's made for 20 kids. We represent the overcapacity.

So we believe that this project would provide access for kids all over the city to the outdoors. We believe it's an issue of access, and we support wholly this project. We think it's been studied to death. Fields all over the city, urban field projects, and these things are the envy of cities because of how their funded and how they're studied and the impacts are minimized. Thank you.

EMILY QUELIZA: Good evening. My name is Emily Queliza, the associate director with America SCORES Bay
Area and I also work with Colin for the past eight years. And I'm also a 32-year resident in San Francisco living in the Sunset but driving from corner to corner of our city. Seeing the splendor that we call the metropolis and this masterpiece that is truly the heart and soul of you, me, him and all of us behind me.

We have benefitted from the Silver Terrace renovation, Garfield, Crocker, and also Campbell, but it's just not enough as Colin had mentioned prior. It's all about the quality of life and experience that this will bring and that's my job day to day for the first through fifth graders that I work with daily plus the families who come to me in the Tenderloin, Crocker and Mission area. I represent those families and this project would affect them as well as everybody across the city. So not moving forward will jeopardize and stifle the quality of life for all of us. So let's move forward. Thank you.

DAVID ROMANO: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is David Romano. One flaw in the proposed renovation that not adequately addressed by the Draft environmental report is that this site cannot support more than the current setup of three playing fields in use at any one time. We are at maximum load.
On a summer weekend when the Park is most visited there is already a heavy load of traffic from people going to Ocean Beach, to the Beach Chalet to the Park Chalet, to the Queen Wilhelmina Tulip Garden and Windmill and to the Golden Gate Park golf course and the Archery Fields all located right there, and people just wanting to visit the western end of the Park.

The increase in traffic that will occur if four fields are in use will result in noise pollution, air pollution and congestion beyond the Park's ability to absorb it. I live within a quarter mile. As it is, there is not enough parking for the Beach Chalet and the Park Chalet, and people park at Ocean Beach or in the Park.

There is not enough parking at the Golden Gate Park golf course to meet the demands on a summer weekend and the parking overflows into the Park. The archery fields are very popular all year round and 47th Avenue in the Park, just opposite the entrance to the soccer fields, is often parked up.

If this proposal goes through, there will be a massive traffic jam every weekend right in front of the Queen Wilhelmina Tulip garden. What about the weddings that take place there? People pay the city to reserve the Tulip Garden for their ceremony, but there will be
no parking for the guests.

The Draft report does not properly address these concerns but glosses over them. In every instance where there are impacts noted, the Draft report says that they are not significant, not substantial. Are we going to squeeze every last bit of life from Golden Gate Park and pave paradise to put up a parking lot.

Please extend the comment period. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: I'll keep calling names.

Annemarie Donjacour, Anastasia Glichstern [phonetic], Edgar Mayora, Carrie Russell, Cheryl Schultz.

MARCIA MADRIGAL: Hi. My name is Marcia Madrigal, and I live in the Outer Richmond, and I am here to support the turfing of the Beach Chalet soccer fields. I have a 15-year-old son who has played out there and has practiced out in the Beach Chalet soccer fields.

And I just wanted to say that, when -- he's a teenager and that when he is kept busy with sports it keeps him occupied. And I feel that we need more playing fields in San Francisco so our older kids who are teenagers will have something to do. And not only during the day and also at night it would be nice if there was lights out there and if it was cleaned up.

Right now the only people that go out to the
1 Beach Chalet soccer fields are the players themselves and the parents. And it is dark out there. And it is kind of a strange area, so I think it would be great if we could clean it up and help our older kids have a place to practice. And we need more fields in San Francisco. And so I do feel it is a community good. Thanks.

8 COURTNEY GATTUSO: Good evening. My name is Courtney Gattuso and I'm an environmental studies major at San Francisco State University. As a resident of the city, I would like to express my concerns about the proposed Beach Chalet renovations. I understand that the project will consist of the conversion of four existing soccer fields to a synthetic turf alternative. Although the turf will not need additional watering and maintenance, the composition will include toxic heavy metals that will have the potential of leaching into the city's local groundwater and surrounding environment.

20 These chemicals will disrupt the well-being of the species habitat and bio accumulate within the organisms that live in the area. I would like to urge the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department to consider the possibility of dismissing the synthetic turf alternative and continue using natural grass.
methods to prevent harmful toxins from affecting the
individuals who visit Golden Gate Park and the species
who inhabit it.

Thank you.

JEFFREY COPE: Good evening. My name is Jeffery
Cope. I am an environmental studies student at San
Francisco State University as well as a resident of the
Sunset District. I have a great appreciation for
living so close to such a beautiful and historic park,
and I sincerely believe that the value of Golden Gate
Park will be greatly lessened with construction of the
synthetic turf fields and installation of the field
lights.

The Beach Chalet renovation project has
beneficial aspects such as reducing the fencing around
the field, renovating existing bathrooms as well as
construction of a small playground, picnic tables and
barbecue pits. And although I see these aspects of the
project as being potentially useful, I cannot support
the entirety of this project and the plans for the
synthetic turf fields and the proposed field lighting.

It is my belief that these are environmentally
irresponsible acts and I believe that the project's
third alternative, the grass turf and reduced lighting
alternative is the only -- is the most responsible way
to carry out a project like this.

I'm concerned with the use of the heavy metal often associated with these synthetic surf fields as well as its capacity to leach toxic chemicals into the ground and its potential impact on water quality. Less lighting would reduce light pollution and visual impacts on the surrounding residents such as myself. I believe the Park is more than just a field for us to play sports on and I ask you to please consider the well-being of the inhabitants of Golden Gate Park as well as the environment as a whole. Thank you.

ELLEN KOIVIETO: Hi. My name is Ellen Koivieto. I'm a San Francisco public school teacher and an Outer Sunset resident for a long time and I travel through this area every day.

I'd like to encourage more time for evaluation and comments on this Draft EIR because it's a huge document and just in the section I've gone through in my copious amounts of spare time, it's clear a number of issues brought up in the scoping session either have not been addressed or have been sidestepped.

For instance, in the information on lighting I found that the views provided from the Sunset, specifically the view from 48th and Lincoln was at street height yet the houses in the Outer Sunset have
living areas in second and third floors exclusively. From those heights, the 60-foot lights will be blindingly visible and this has not been addressed.

There's no consideration for fog except one sentence unsupported by specifics. This area is foggy the majority of nights, as those of us who live there know. Fog substantially changes light bounce and is not address in the Draft EIR. The only elevation view is from Sutro Heights but I think it's called Golden Gate Heights between 16th and 20th and Kirkham and Pacheco, is that right? Is that Golden Gate Heights? Okay.

They have a clear unobstructed view of these lights every night. And I don't know why that wasn't considered. It was brought up in the scoping session. There is no view from the beach given, yet the beach users will be affected and, again, I don't know why this wasn't addressed if the beach users were brought up in the scoping session.

All the views are at twilight but the effect of the lights will be so much greater after full dark, as had been brought in the scoping section, yet this was not addressed as well.

Other issues I found just in quick scans of some sections are the lack of definition of a shrub. A
forester at the scoping session said there's no set
definition of tree versus shrub anywhere in any of the
literature and a number of the shrubs that are included
for removal in the plan at the site are 30 feet tall or
more.

The damaging of the western windbreak by the
project was not really truthfully considered and,
living out there, sand is an enormous issue. The
location of the 1-to-1 tree-shrub replacement, some
other place, some other parkland wasn't specified. If
it's not in the western windbreak, there's going to be
issues that way.

There were only two visits for bird surveys
and one of those two days of visits was done in
February. There are tons of people would have more
adequate, more thorough bird survey information
available from the area and I didn't see any of that in
there.

So if there is no additional -- I'm sure
there's other things like this to be discovered in the
report. Like I said, I'm a public school teacher; I
don't have very much time. But if there isn't going to
be more time for additional review and to go through
this Draft EIR, then I would like this very incomplete
EIR to be rejected or sent back to the drawing board.
Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: If your name was called, please come forward.

EDGAR MAYORA: Good evening. My name is Edgar Mayora. This is Filipe Rodriguez [phonetic]. We represent a club league that's 35 older and 50 and older. We pretty much have 32 years since the league opened. We been playing at Beach Chalet for that long. And we're the one we always play out there in the Beach Chalet because it accommodated the children first and then they give us the Beach Chalet.

He broke his leg twice (indicating). And he's still playing.

We pay insurance so much every year. Unbelievable, go, high, high, high. And our community is not that strong economically to pay so much insurance, but I'm sorry but I'm get emotional all the time. We try to pay most we can of insurance and ask for help. And sometimes it comes and sometimes not.

Our league, most of our players are from the Mission area and we also have the right to use Golden Gate Park. And please, if you do the synthetic it would be grateful for everybody who practices soccer and all ages. We deserve to play it at the Golden Gate Park. Thank you.
PRESIDENT OLAGUE: There was someone, I guess, Andrew Solow, if he's here? Andrew Solow, Brandy West, John Rizzo, Roland Campos. I know I said some names, so just, thank you.

CHERYL SCHULTZ: Good afternoon, Supervisors, or good evening, Supervisors. My name is Cheryl Schultz.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: You just promoted us.

CHERYL SCHULTZ: Oh, Commissioners. It's been a long night. My name is Cheryl Schultz and I've been long-time Richard District resident along with my husband.

Couple things that I wanted to talk about.

The DEIR does not address the dangers and serious injuries caused by synthetic turf versus natural turf and somebody else did bring that up but I did want to make sure that it is addressed in the final DEIR. ACL injuries, as people have talked about, are serious injuries caused by synthetic turf.

Also, I wanted to talk about the synthetic turf causing approximately 400 tons of debris that would need to go directly into our valuable landfill. It is not currently recyclable and it is not, as verified by the California Environmental Protection Agency, there are no standards for recycling this material. The only thing that is mentioned in the DEIR
about this is 400 tons of material that will have to go into landfill is that the manufacturers will look into what they can do about it. To me that's just not good enough when this has to be replaced every ten years.

The other thing I wanted to talk about is that the DEIR proposes to increase field playing hours to 14,320 playing hours per year. However, their small traffic study concludes that the traffic will be unchanged on many streets, decrease on others, and increased by point 1 percent on other streets.

That's just simply impossible, so I request that a further traffic study be included and that it be more readable: instead of by percentage time that it be by car per street increased into the Park and be more realistic.

Lastly, I did want to say that we want kids to play on soccer fields. And the Alternative 2 was a very good alternative. It is the Sunset Park, I believe. I can't see it here on my notes, but the West Sunset Playground. It met almost all of the requirements, playing field, lighting, and the CEQA Code says that because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate significant effect if it meets alternatives then --

PRESIDENT OLAGÜE: Thank you. You can submit your
comments in writing.

CHERYL SCHULTZ: Thank you.

ANDREW SOLOW: Good evening, Commissioners. I believe the Beach Chalet renovation and project alternatives are thoroughly analyzed in the DEIR. I support the plans to renovate the Beach Chalet athletic fields and ask that you move this project forward without delay.

That aside, I have to say that the biggest single impact that got ignored is what happens to children, especially disadvantage children, when they don't have recreational opportunities. The least expensive recreation pretty much always relates to the use of some kind of an athletic field. Athletic fields in San Francisco is what we have been short of ever since I co-founded the Mission Youth Soccer League back in 1993. And I have been beating my head against this problem of a lack of soccer fields and a lack of proper maintenance of grass soccer fields in San Francisco since then.

The impetus for my spending a lot of my free time and money on youth soccer and athletic field condition and availability in San Francisco was having 20 children who were all in a street gang try to beat me to death with baseball bats in front of my own
house. That is the impact of not providing an adequate
amount of recreational opportunity for youth.

It's very important that we understand that
viscerally. Most of you have never had that
experience. I'm only here because I'm a private
investigator and I dumped two full cans of tear gas on
an entire street gang. I took a few lumps but I'm
still here and I'm still walking and talking and I hope
to be for a while. And as long as I'm still walking
and talking and breathing, I'm going to speak up in
favor of recreational opportunities for children.

Maybe birds are a little bit important, but
we're human beings and we're supposed to take care of
our children first. Children are supposed to be first.

Birds, from my point of view, I'm sorry, I'm a
Republican, I eat birds. We don't eat our children.

We eat the birds. This is basic. We have to
understand what we're talking about here. Children are
supposed to come first.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Your name for the record, sir?

ANDREW SOLOW: Andrew Solow.

ANASTASIA GLICHSTERN: Good evening. My name is
Anastasia Glichstern. I am not prepared to speak. I
am not a speaker. I just came in to be counted against
this project which actually is a crime. I mean to put
toxic waste in our Golden Gate Park is a crime. But I looked it up just superficially yesterday, artificial turf on Wikipedia. And I don't know why anybody would want their children to play on it. Like it seems to be bad for everybody.

I printed something. I'm kind of excited and cannot read it very well, but basically, one of these things current and former players from the -- have recently criticized the surface, expressing concern that, among other things, it may exacerbate injuries. American national team manager Bob Bradley called on FIFA in June, 2009, have courage and ban artificial surfaces.

Now, I don't think why city is installing all this toxic waste all over the city, because it seems to be completely awful. Somebody is making money on these things, and that's probably why it goes in. I'm sorry. You know, the injuries are worse, the heavy metal might leach into the water table. Regular disinfection is required. It needs to be replaced every seven or eight years and the city doesn't have any money. So why is this project even talked about? It's complete mystery.

Friction between skin and artificial turf causes abrasions and burns to much greater extent than
natural grass and, by the way, if you don't maintain something since 1991, of course it will be ruined. There's no mystery in it. Its limited life, periodic cleaning requirements, petroleum use, toxic chemicals from infill and some heightened health and safety concerns. That's the same with artificial turf.

The biggest impact of the game of the turf was in the bodies of the player. It caused more wear and tear on knees, ankles, feet and lower back, possibly even shortening the career of the players who played a significant portion of their game on artificial surfaces. This is about baseball, not soccer, but the same goes for soccer. Thank you.

CARRIE RUSSELL: Hello, good evening. My name is Carrie Russell and I'm a native San Franciscan. I grew up on Stanyon Street, and I now live in the Inner Richmond. I also have played as an adult in many co-ed soccer leagues, coached high school soccer and Beach Chalet and also played as a child out there.

I'm opposed to the project. I grew up practicing field hockey and soccer at Beach Chalet. And I want to address really the attitudes of this project, the impact on the attitudes of children now and in the future.

I grew up practicing field hockey and soccer
at Beach Chalet. The spring and fall evenings I spent on those grassy fields running wildly around in the fog taught me the thrill of physical exertion in a natural setting. I believe the enjoyment of sports and physical activity is one of the most important tastes we can cultivate in our children if we wish them a hardy life of health and happiness.

An intimate appreciation and experience of the natural environment is equally important. It seems vital to me that the child's personal connection to nature is born in those experiences of finding their speed running full tilt after a ball, plunging through glorious mud puddles and panting on their stomachs happily spent with blades of grass tickling their kneecaps. It was for me anyway.

So I'd like to encourage a closer look at some of the state of the art alternatives that use natural grass. San Francisco prides itself on its green leadership and it seems a natural extension of that leadership. Furthermore, I love the woman's suggestion about getting kids out there with their shovels. Why not? What a great way to instill some great values in our children and preserve a natural environment. Thank you.

ROLAND CAMPOS: Good evening, Commissioners. My
name is Roland Campos. I've been a -- almost a
lifetime resident of San Francisco, particularly the
Sunset Parkside area. And I feel very fortunate to
have such a beautiful park as Golden Gate Park close
by.

This DEIR, it talks about the environment.
What environment are we talking about? We're talking
about the environment of Golden Gate Park, and what is
that environment? I think it's the environment defined
in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

I'd like to point out some passages from the
Golden Gate Park Master Plan on Section 4, Page 5,
says, "It is particularly important to maintain the
rural character in the western park." I don't think
that stadium lights and plastic turf would be
considered a rural character.

Also, Section 6, Page 1, it says, "The demand
for recreation needs to be balanced with the
objectives, preserving the original intent and purpose
of the Park as a sylvan and pastoral retreat. I don't
think plastic turf and stadium lights qualifies as
respecting that.

Also Section 9, Page 5, says regarding
lighting, "Lighting is for safety purposes and is not
intended to increase night use." I don't think the
individuals that conceived the project, as proposed at
this point, took into account those elements. So I
urge you to extend the comment period and to oppose the
project in its current state of design. Thank you.

JANET CLARK: Good evening, President and members
of the Planning Commission. My name is Janet Clark.
And I know how important physical activity is for kids.
And I am a physical education teacher at Lincoln High
School. So I mean, I really know the importance of
sports and having kids active. I'm also a resident of
Parkside. And I'm six blocks from South Sunset. And
you know, people come up here and say that, you know,
that the lighting would not have an impact. I'm Six
blocks away and I could look out my back windows and I
can see those lights. And so that's why I felt it was
really important to come here and express my concern.

Also, you know, Golden Gate Park is my -- and
city residents -- it's their playground. You know, we
have a beautiful coastline. And Golden Gate Park
shouldn't have artificial turf and it shouldn't have
those lights shining.

I just feel like, you know, I know that city
has shortages of playing fields, but it's not only just
soccer. It's also baseball, it's also girls' softball
games that get rained out too. I mean, that can be
like if your kid's game is rained out, it's kind of
like a learning lesson. It's not like, okay, you're
going to be disappointed. Well, we all need to learn
how to be disappointed.

The last thing I want to say is, like, are we
more worried about having one -- one more soccer field
with those magnificent lights in such a sacred place as
Golden Gate Park? I mean, I'm not opposed to having it
somewhere also but, I mean, I just oppose the project
and I'd ask the Planning Commission to extend the
public comment period. Thank you.

DR. JOHN RUBIO: Good evening. My name is
Dr. John Rubio. I work with the San Francisco Unified
School District. I applaud your ability to sit here
this evening and I have meetings like this as well so
good job. In San Francisco, in the 1940s, we built a
school on the edge of McLaren Park. And there was
great outrage, but we did it because we were focused on
children and we knew we had to do it. It was before my
time and before some of our times, but it was important
then.

I heard speakers tonight say, "What about our
experience?" And "the park is for us." And "nature."
I just don't understand. What about the children?
Most people opposed to moving on and continuing with
this plan do not have young children. Thousands of
young children -- their learning experience is to go
somewhere else.

That young lady who spoke so eloquently
tonight, she was great. I love her science interest.
She left San Francisco several years ago. She plays on
great beautiful turf fields in Burlingame and Redwood
City and San Mateo. They're beautiful. She's smart
for not mentioning that. I really like her, she's
really smart.

So the thing is for me, really, the choice is
children, light; young people's needs, older people's.
It's a very simple choice and you have a very tough
job, but I just ask you and I implore you as an
educator, please focus on the children. You cannot
walk across that field without tripping and falling.
It's a disaster. It is a disaster. And our children
need great turf fields so they have a place to play and
they're fighting for space and I appreciate your time.
Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: I'll keep off reading names.
Kelley Watts, Raymond Holland, Andrea O'Leary, Jim
Lazarus, Tom Mack, Shawna McGrew.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Can I just chime in for a
second? I've heard a lot of testimony from people
about the project and kids and all that stuff. That has nothing to do with the environmental report. And as a matter of fact this Commission has no approval powers over this project except for the environmental report. So if you're urging us to reject the project or approve the project, that's the Rec Park Commission, not us.

So I can't prevent you from testifying and expressing your opinions and all of that, but you should keep in mind that this Commission is not the one that ultimately approves this particular project.

I know that we have the power to accept or reject the environmental report which is a little different kind of animal, but the actual project approval lies with Rec Park Commission.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you, Commissioner Sugaya.

But it's true. If people can focus their comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report, as we stated earlier in the hearing, we would all appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Very good. I appreciate it too. I'm an advocate for children's soccer. I'd just like to say that up front, then I'll get to the EIR. The Beach Chalet project and even its Alternative 2 will entail the introduction of a quarter of a million
1 pulverized tires into the public space. These tires were found by the EIR to contain over 50 chemicals and heavy metals, the most extreme impact rating available to the Planning Department reviewers. This potentially significant impact seems extremely inadequate in light of what's being discovered daily about the material used in these fields.

On tests done on synthetic soccer fields and tires crumb infill, over 400 volatile organic compounds were detected. And among the chemicals identified, eight appear on the California Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer. The SBR material contains carbon black, which makes up 60 percent of the synthetic field's infill. This is not in the EIR.

Carbon black is an industrial chemical which is composed of nano particles. The International Center Agency for Research on Cancer paneled experts conducted a comprehensive inner review and concluded that there was sufficient evidence of carcinogenic response to carbon black in laboratory animals so that even in these early stages of research, they have classified carbon black as a possible human carcinogen.

Recent research shows the intake of carbon black nano particles kill immune cells in lungs and the
mechanism of pulmonary response. This needs to be in
the EIR.

As the tires break down through oxidation and
erosion back into particulate form and dust, it enters
the human body in a variety of ways. This EIR does not
address the complexity of our physiology and how it
tries to handle such a of toxins, which is
unpredictable at the very least. Today medical science
cannot accurately predict the long-term health
consequences of repeated exposure to these children
that we want to encourage to play sports and lose
weight, through other means hopefully than coming up
with cancer.

Investigative science regarding its impact on
the organs of developing children or the sick is in its
infancy. The EIR almost totally is based on industry
reports and political reports that cannibalize other
industry and political reports. The EIR does not
Mercer transmission and yet it states virtually zero
disinfectants will be used on the fields.

It also makes a claim that carbon black will
not break down into nano particulates. There's no
basis for this in science, I've never seen anything in
the material and there's nothing in the EIR to support
this assumption based on a guess. Thank you.
PRESIDENT OLAGUE: I'll keep reading. Just keeping coming.

EDWARD PERTCHECK: Hi. Hi, Commissioners. Thank you. My name's in there. I didn't get called yet, but he has to go to bed. My name is Edward Pertcheck.

A lot of people are saying that we're doing this renovation project for the kids and, you know, we don't let kids play with toys that have lead in them. This has -- most artificial turf fields have way beyond the amount of lead that we would allow our children to have in their toys. And children shouldn't be on these fields, adults shouldn't be on these fields, but certainly kids, you know, in their younger years and in their teen age when their brains are developing, they shouldn't be around these heavy metals and other chemicals.

Tires -- tires were designed to be tires. Tires were not designed to be a playing surface. And people mentioned, you know, this is the use of taxpayer money. Because these fields have to be thrown away every ten years, we as taxpayers -- and I live in the Bayview -- we as taxpayers are going to have to pay to have these replaced every ten years. And yet San Francisco claims to be an environmentally friendly city and we have a goal of no landfill use by the year 2030.
And someone told me that, "Oh, they're just going to exclude Rec and Park. Rec and Park didn't have to comply with that." But taxpayers are going to have to comply with that and taxpayers are going to have to pay for the replacement of these fields every eight to ten years.

I mean, if you look at studies, I mean, the fact of the matter is maintenance on natural grass and maintenance on artificial turf costs the same if you look over time. The yearly average of maintenance costs the same. I live near Silver Terrace Playground. It's an artificial turf field. It's not maintained properly. The city doesn't have the money to maintain any kind of fields properly.

But artificial turf, if you maintain it properly, does require water to cool it down, does require water to clean it. There have been instances of people who have gotten staph infections from artificial turf because things can't biodegrade naturally on it.

So I would recommend that we have longer time to comment on the Draft EIR and that the EIR that we have right now be rejected. Thank you.

ANDREA O'LEARY: Andrea O'Leary. San Francisco prides itself on being a green city. We're getting
ready to, I think yesterday or tomorrow we're and ban
every plastic bag in sight. We're also going to be
banning paper bags as last I recall. But we're willing
and ready to put rubber and plastic and every sort of
fake product underneath us everywhere else in our play
areas. Somehow that just doesn't jibe in my mind.

I think that all of my learned colleagues here
have given you plenty of reason to extend to comment
period of this study. There are just may too many
things that are just left unvetted, skipped over,
denied. It sounds a little bit too much to me like the
lobbyists have entered the halls of McLaren Lodge. And
I really think that it's time that we really get down
to the nitty-gritty of this.

Why is this such a big push? Is it because
the Fields's Foundation is such a big, large, important
organization that they can really kind of bully their
way into this? This is going to be decided, the
deciders are going to be the Rec and Park department.

Last several years I'd say the Rec and Park
department is about making money. All of our parks are
supposed to sort of pay for themselves. So, whoa, can
you see the money flowing in from this stadium complex
now? That is a real concern I think that people really
need to hear more about.
Now to my own personal pet peeve. The beach, the ocean, the fog, with these huge lights extended into it. This is called a light pollution. Every little dinky town I can think of and even many of the and most of the large cities in this country have standards about dark skies, the black skies. What is considered a standard so that you don't pollute that anymore than we already have.

Does San Francisco not have any of these standards? And if so, what do they say? I didn't see anything in this EIR study that said anything about that. I know of tiny little towns that pick their light fixtures very carefully so that they can still see stars at night. I think that is a cultural heritage that needs to be respected, and I don't think that this has been -- this has been scooted over, let's say, in the name of the almighty dollar.

This is not just about children. This is about everyone and everything. Thank you.

RAYMOND HAMMOND: Good evening. My name is Raymond Holland. I'm representing the Planning Association for the Richmond, PAR. Mr. Sugaya, thank you very much for pointing out what's at issue tonight. There's reason that the next commission that will be looking at this is called the Recreation and the Parks
Department. They get to basically try to reconcile those two competing needs because that's what we have tonight.

Park does not yet have a position on supporting or opposing this project. Part of the reason is we've been rate waiting for the EIR to come out. You now have the Draft. We're going through it. Some of us may have read all 360 pages. Others have not done so. And we've had no opportunity to get together and discuss it and develop a position. That's the reason we requested 60 days additional for the public review and comment period. If that's too much, we just ask that we settle for 30.

We've also made another request besides extending the public review of the comment period. The other one has to do with when you certify or consider for certification this particular EIR, I guess it would be next summer sometime after you've gotten all the details in, we hope you will consider it in conjunction with the EIR, the final one, for the water treatment plant that is designed to go in between the soccer fields and Murphy's Windmill.

The reason for doing that is twofold. Number one, we think that the scope of this particular Draft EIR is far too narrow. It doesn't even consider the
cumulative effect of this other proposal for that particular portion of the Park. Not only on the Park but also in the immediate neighborhood.

So we'd like to reiterate that request that you schedule the consideration of both EIRs together and we will by that time, believe me, have proposals from Recreation and Park Department and we'll be there to either support or oppose either over both projects. I don't know which it's going to be right now. A lot will depend on the EIRs that you approve.

One thing we have with regard to the present Draft EIR that sort of stood out for us that concerned us was there's an implication in the current Draft EIR for the soccer fields that the only things that would take place on them when the lights are up would be sports activities. We hope that's the case. There's all too much evidence lately that when you have an open field and you have permanent lights, gee, concerts. Bill Graham comes back to life. And we hope that's not the case. Thank you.

SHAWNA McGREW: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Shawna McGrew. I'm third generation San Franciscan. I believe I'm the only one in this room who has worked for the Recreation Parks Department for 37 years. I worked on the Master Plan, I worked on the
recreation assessment report. I'm not sure whether any of you are aware of that. We're 76 percent of the people that were surveyed in this very expensive report wanted in Golden Gate Park walking, hiking, biking trails in a natural setting.

I also worked on the last parks bond urging taxpayers to vote, vote for it because amongst the other things was the renovation of athletic fields. There was nowhere in that document stating that the Beach Chalet fields would be paved over.

I want to tell you a little story. I was also a soccer coach in my young days when I was a recreation director. Besides playing soccer we could go on field trips. One day -- and this is a true story -- we walked from Stow Lake Boathouse down to the Beach Chalet. The kids marveled at the forest and asked what country were they in. I was shocked that the kids had never seen that many trees. And being from the Hunter's Point projects, maybe they had never seen a tree.

San Francisco Rec Department has at least at this count, I believe, 60 soccer pitches but only Golden Gate Park.

The project is a significant environmental disaster for Golden Gate Park and its surrounding
communities. Though somebody already closed with this, I want to close again with this. Don't let your legacy you paved paradise and you put up a parking lot and you paid a dollar and a half to go to a tree museum. Thank you.

TERRY BAUM: I'm Terry Baum. I have been a homeowner in San Francisco for 33 years and I'm a Green Party activist and I was also candidate for mayor in the last election. And I am going to speak only to the Draft environmental impact report.

We have heard from so many people in so many instances in the commentary that there were areas that were not covered in the DEIR or they were misrepresented or unrepresented, or not thought out, not followed through. We have heard pretty much totally blanket there's a total division between the two sides.

The people who want soccer are completely absolutely delighted and thrilled with the report, and those won't the preserve the wild nature of Golden Gate Park are very disturbed with the report.

I feel that this report is simply not objective. It's -- does not serve the function of a DEIR. Just to take the very first thing that is considered, which is the aesthetic impact, the people
who wrote this report decided that there was an insignificant aesthetic impact of having 150,000 watts of light at night and 70 huge light poles.

Now, I'm sorry, but I don't think anybody's saying, "Oh, darling, let's go out and stroll and bathe under the glare of the beautiful lights of the stadium." Or "Lets go out and watch the sunset behind those fabulous light poles." It is absolutely idiotic to say that there's an insignificant aesthetic impact.

The only way that somebody could say that was if they came to this -- the job of writing this report, of studying the situation with orders to come up with a report that absolutely validated the installation of the soccer fields. This is not a DEIR. It's a DSJ, a Draft snow job.

And I really feel it is incumbent upon the Planning Commission if you have any integrity to reject this DEIR and demand -- which is really a DSJ -- and demand something that is not a snow job, that is not something that is just going to push the project of the soccer fields through that will really objectively examine it from an objective point of view. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

SUZANNE DUMONT: Suzanne Dumont. I have the honor of presenting you with a letter from Deborah Learner,
who was working for Recreation and Park as a park planner and capital project manager from 1978 until 2001. Her comments are most important -- she couldn't be here tonight, but her report is most important because she wrote the Golden Gate Park Master Plan, 1999. And that is a very clear document about what Rec and Park, the direction they should be taking that they're not following and that the Draft EIR just ignored. So I'll leave these here for you.

I think many of you might have heard about the lead paint contamination at Stow Lake. The reason I bring this up is that Rec and Park has for the last two months been ignoring the public's requests for remediation of the lead paint contamination that they caused in October and November. They sandblasted, powered, scraped and basically blew lead paint particulate all over Stow Lake.

The reason I'm bringing this up is that in the Draft EIR it mentions that all lead paint codes and regulations will be followed. Well, the same thing was said about the boathouse and now we have contamination and we have a coverup going on. So please do take note of that.

The other thing that no one has mentioned or that I haven't heard is that Rec and Park just redid
the Polo Fields for a million dollars in grass. Do a problem with gophers and horses and not -- with children and not with horses? I don't know what's going on there.

And they always -- at their meetings, it's really interesting at the Rec and Park Commission meetings. You frequently hear our mismanager, Phil Ginsberg, talk about how proud he is of the golf courses and that they get awards for how wonderful the courses are and how pristine they are and how everybody from around the world rants and raves about our golf courses and the real grass and the gorgeousness of the maintenance.

And you can't afford that for the soccer fields for the kids? Our kids need the soccer fields. I have no doubt of that. I think you've got to follow the money on this one, you guys, and I know the Draft EIR needs to be held back or refused. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Joseph Butler, Steve Begley, Dan Richman, Joan Wood, Johanna Thomashefski.

After the next speaker, we're going to take a short recess for the court reporter.

JOSEPH BUTLER: Good evening, President Olague and members of the Commission. My name is Joseph Butler and I'm both an architect and a parent here in San
Francisco. As an architect, I'm a qualified expert to make evaluations of historic resources as defined by CEQA.

This evening we've heard from many experts numerous examples of deficiencies in the Draft environmental impact report, conclusions that are not based on facts in the record, the exclusion of facts from the DEIR which do not support the project objectives. That indicates that this is neither the objective nor thorough analysis that's required.

The DEIR underestimates the significant adverse effect of altering the cultural landscape which links the acknowledged historic resources at the west end of Golden Gate Park by placing windmills in the shifting sands of Ocean Beach to facilitate the transformation of dunes to a landscaped park and then, having succeeded the building of the Beach Chalet, to provide for recreational use of the beach and its adjacent existing natural grass fields.

Preserving the original intent of creating a natural setting has nothing to do with replacing the natural grass fields with a toxic field of rubber, heavy metals and petroleum by-products.

The architectural historic resources at the western edge of Golden Gate Park are not only
consistent with the surrounding cultural landscape, they are in fact responsible for it. Adding a nine-acre toxic field will never be consistent with them. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: With that we'll be taking a short recess.

(Recess taken)

SECRETARY AVERY: Call to order. Okay. The Planning Commission is back the session.

Commissioners, we're still in the midst of public comment on the Beach Chalet Draft EIR.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: At this point, I would like to ask if there any folks still in the overflow room. There are plenty of seats in here, so I just wanted to encourage people to join is in this room. I think we have more cards at this point. A lot of folks thought maybe their cards got lost, but it's not the case.

We had over 100 cards and a lot of folks are handing them in in bunches. So I just wanted to let people know that no one's card was overlooked. It's just that we did receive over 100 cards tonight.

I'm going to go ahead and just ask that, you know, anyone who's interested in speaking at this point just start coming up to the mike. I don't know if you wanted to line up on this side of the room. It's
probably better than lining up in front of the door.

So --

DAN RICHMAN: You called my name?

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: If I called your name, then
certainly.

DAN RICHMAN: My name is Dan Richman. Good
evening. Thank you for your time and patience. I
don't have much to say because it's all been said so
eloquently this evening except for two things.

One of the major deficiencies I found in the
report along with other deficiencies was it seems to me
one of the most vital elements of an urban environment
are the people who live in the city. I wonder if it
would be possible to poll all the folks who live if the
western part of the city. And I don't mean just soccer
parents on one side and environmentalists on the other
side, but just the people who live there. I wonder if
that wouldn't be a sort of a necessary part of an urban
environmental report. Something to think about.

And secondly, children -- and I'm a parent --
certainly need activities and there's a problem with
obesity and there's all these other factors that are
absolutely important. But couldn't -- and someone
said -- made a funny little thing about kids getting
out there with little shovels. Well, why couldn't
maintenance of fields, natural fields be integrated into the curricula of schools.

This would give children -- city children -- people complain about how they're so disconnected from nature and disconnected from the natural world, even from the physical world because they go from school and go home and they locked into their screens.

Well, here is a great opportunity for children to become intrinsically involved with the natural processes and actually maintaining the very fields they play on. Just think of how proud that would make them.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you.

JOHANNA THOMASHEFSKI: Thank you, President Olague and the Planning Commission for hearing all of our voices tonight. I know it's been a long night for all of us. My name is Johanna Thomashefski and I'm a co-founder and executive director of a nonprofit in the city called Lacrosse for Life. We provide free lacrosse to underserved youth in the city and we focus our efforts in the communities of Bayview and Hunter's Point, primarily children of color, both boys and girls. And we work with about 400 kids each year.

On behalf of these kids and their families, I'm here to ask you to move forward on the renovation
of the Beach Chalet fields and to accept the DEIR as it has been comprehensive and I believe it is complete.

I'm not going the leave this with you because I came up with so many other thoughts while I was listening to everyone speak. And I do value the process of democracy and have been interested in hearing everyone's thoughts. But to the point of safety and nature, the natural field and grass in Hunter's Point have been shown by multiple studies to be full of toxins which are incredibly harmful to both humans and wildlife and in no way are ecologically sound.

This is displayed by the asthma rate in Bayview and Hunter's Point is double the rest of the population in the city and higher rates of cancer as well. In the absence of restorative action on the eastern part of the city and the comprehensive nature of the DEIR, it seems logical that if we are a city that cares about children and physical activity and safety, the Beach Chalet project seems to be a no-brainer.

When I moved to San Francisco nearly 12 years ago it astounded me that many children asked if we were still in San Francisco and we played lacrosse at the Polo Fields, which, to comment to the person who asked
what happened to them, they are pretty much always
closed to make sure that they look like a million
dollars actually went into it.

Unfortunately, I'm no longer surprised but
continue to remain saddened that the most beautiful
spaces in our city remain, in essence, closed to the
public while the ugliest always seem to be available.

The proposed renovation of Beach Chalet would
triple time on the fields, the fields in general of the
city and not just Beach Chalet. Playing lacrosse helps
kids who are often forgotten feel a part of something.
Playing in Golden Gate park along the ocean will make
them feel a part of something spectacular.

Lacrosse for Life is often in a stereotype of
an inner city program. We practice on the worse
fields, don't have regular bathrooms and are hidden
away. The EIR addresses all of these issues in a safe
and ecological manner.

When lacrosse fields were lined at Polo
Fields, the kids were thrilled. I can't express the
excitement of our team to be on a turf field, to know
all our home games would not be rained out, and to feel
pride in showcasing the city to our opponents.

Lastly, I would like to remind the Commission
that the field and Golden Gate Park in general is not
just for the citizens who live on the western end but for all citizens of the city and this would definitely increase the opportunity for the children who don't have regular access to the Park. Thank you.

STEVE BEGLEY: My name is Steve Begley. When I first heard about the proposal to tear up the meadow and the soccer fields and replace it with a modern facility, I didn't really know what to think. But since it was Golden Gate Park I asked myself one question. What would McLaren do? So I did some research and found out.

I've got this great book here. This is "San Francisco's Golden Gate Park." And it turns out that when John McLaren was in a situation where powerful interests in the city wanted to go into the western half of the Park and put in modern facilities for the good of the community, John McLaren said no. He fought them and he won and that is why the 1915 Pan Pacific International Exposition was built down at the Marina and not in Golden Gate Park.

There are other examples too from this book, Page 119, great story. McLaren was -- right now they were starting to have a railroad line that was going to be built through the Park. McLaren wants to block this but, you know, he doesn't have an environmental impact.
report that he can go to and say, you know, "Train pollution bad, trees good."

So he tried to figure out how to block this. And right then the city engineer and the railroad people were saying, "Trains are good for the Park. The people need them. Besides, there aren't that many trees and plants along the route anyway."

So a couple days later McLaren storms into City Hall and says, "If this proceeds and plants and shrubs will have to be dug up along that route."

Because he's Scottish. So the supervisors decided to go out and see who was right. So he brings them all down there, they get out and they see a field of floral beauty.

Supervisors say, "Okay, McLaren, you win. Rail line canceled." The supervisors leave. McLaren turns to his 300 workers and says, "All right, you can go home, lads. They had worked all night to plant those roses and chrysanthemums just to block the rail line.

So what would McLaren do today about a proposal to tear up seven acres of meadow and natural grass and replace them with Astroturf, concrete and electric lights? He would block it. That's what McLaren would do.
JOAN WOOD: Yes, good evening, President Olgaue and Commissioners. I haven't been here since you got promoted. I'm a native San Franciscan, so naturally I'm against this project.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: And your name for the record?

JOAN WOOD: Joan Wood. I live in North Beach. It's a professional soccer stadium and it's masquerading as a gift to the children. All the projects that I'm against are either masquerading as being something for children or a way to create jobs. So I'll let it go at that.

When the city let Stow Lake go to a New Mexico firm I pretty much gave up. But I owe it to my mother, she was a native San Franciscan also, to be here to try to persuade you. Even though you're not in a position to turn the project down, I think you could send a heck of a message if you sent the EIR back for corrections or perhaps if you extend the public comment period. This is a very important thing. There's a reason San Francisco was again voted to be the second best city in the United States. It was in the paper yesterday. I forget where the first one is. I think it's in the South.

When the city let Stow Lake go, one has to wonder. And way back Sutro Baths, nobody rebuilt them.
I know St. Francis Riding Academy will never come back the way things are going.

One of the defects in the EIR is that the trees, many of the trees are called brush or bushes. That way they won't have to be examined one by one. It's very important that the windbreaks are built into Golden Gate Park because you've got a big ocean out there that's blowing a lot of wind in.

There are even more trees connected to the water project also, and I think it's a misstatement about these trees being most of them being brush. Again, you could send a message even if you can't stop the project, and I hope that you will. Thank you for listening.

RIC OLIVAS: Hi. My name is Ric Olivas. I'm the president of California Soccer Association North. We have over 3,000 adult members, men and women playing soccer in San Francisco. And our membership unanimously support the adoption of the EIR as it is. It's kind of ironic that the very people who demanded and forced an EIR over two years ago now are opposed and against everything that's in the report. You don't hire an electrician to fix your plumbing. You hire an expert. And I believe that the city and county went to the best people they could to render
this report.

I think the report should be accepted as written and move forward. It's a long time and delay now, and it's just going to be another year or two because they're going find more and more things to complain about and to ask for extensions and every time that they get a report that they don't like, they're going to fight it down for another one.

I'm one of those kids that was in the picture for the PAL in the '50's I played then. And the beach was not much better than it is now. I would urge all of you to take a trip out to the Polo Field and find out why they're closed. Take a trip out to Beach Chalet, find out why it's closed. It's closed because it's dangerous. Kids get their legs broken. Adults who are playing on it who play at a greater pace with a lot more weight, I'm sorry to say, will injure themselves worse because of the holes and the ruts.

San Francisco City and County does not have the money to maintain the fields in proper shape, in pristine shape so that nobody could get hurt. So all the rhetoric about whether it's good or bad really falls by the wayside because they just don't have the money to keep them maintained the way they should be.

Turf fields do not suffer that problem. I
travel all over the United States as president of a
state association. Everywhere in this country, cities,
counties, school districts, colleges are all turning
their fields over to synthetic surfaces. Why? Because
it has been proven to them that it works. It saves
them money. It saves them problems.

Down the line, the estimate of eight to ten
years of replacement for a field, that's not true.
They haven't gotten to the limit yet of how long these
fields are actually going to last. Oregon has one of
the first synthetic surface fields that was put in.
The university up there plays there. And that's
field's over 15 years old, and I can guarantee you it's
not in as bad shape as Beach Chalet or the Polo Fields
and it's not ready to be replaced. Thank you.

MIKE SINGER: My name is Mike Singer. I'm a
resident of the Marina and I'm part of an endangered
species in this city. I'm a native San Franciscan. My
wife's a native. My kids are native. So we've all
decided to stay here. And I think we all know about
the exodus of families in the city. And there are two
things that are really sort of the main drivers behind
that. One is the schools, which you really don't have
much control over. The other is the lack of
recreational facilities. We pay higher taxes to be
here. We'd like something for our kids. If you don't have something for the kids, you start losing the families. Once you start losing the families, Lee you'll lose the city.

Personally I think this is a wonderful project. I've given a lot of time back to the community. I'm the president of the San Francisco little league. We have about 2,000 players a year. We could take a lot more. We had to close some players out this year. We handle girls' softball. We handle youth baseball and we also handle challenger division for cognitive and physical disabled kids.

We're all volunteers. I've been doing this -- this is my fourth year as president of the league and I can tell you we have some very passionate families that were shut out this year because they don't have a place to play. We don't have enough fields.

We play on Treasure Island. We also pay for time in the Presidio. And we can still use more.

Both my boys play a lot of soccer. I'll leave you with this. I was out at Crocker-Amazon this year for two separate tournaments. Being a native San Franciscan, I was proud to be out there for these tournaments. I saw people all over the place in an area that hasn't been improved much. Every ethnicity, every demographic. It
was a blast for me. I was proud of it.

My youngest son who's 11 had an international tournament through the French-American School. Teams came in from Kenya, from Canada, from Europe. I was proud. I think it's great. This would be a wonderful, wonderful project for our city. I urge you to move it forward. Thank you very much.

PAM RUPRIGHT: Good evening. Thank you for hanging in here so late tonight. My name is Pam Rupright and I'm the president of the San Francisco lacrosse club, the Rip Tide. We're a youth lacrosse club that service kids ages seven through high school, all boys and girls. I'm also a resident of San Francisco, a 10-year homeowner in the Sunset and 20 years in the city itself. My kids are native San Franciscans.

I'm going to urge you tonight to please accept the EIR and move this project forward. There's been ample time for comments already. There's no need for extension of comments on a report that's obviously comprehensive and thorough.

I will say our club serves approximately 300 kids right now and the only reason it's not more is because we don't have the field space to accommodate them. Girls' lacrosse is one of the fastest growing
sports in the nation right now and I had to cap the number of girls we take because we simply don't have enough fields to practice or play our games on. We would really like to let every kid who wants to play lacrosse play and we've never turned away any child for lack of financial resources. We give quite a bit of financial assistance.

I would love to have another A season ever where none of our games are canceled because it rained at some point during the week. The Beach Chalet project with one additional lacrosse field in the city would go a long way towards making that happen. So thank you very much and I really urge you to allow this project to move forward.

JONATHAN GOLDBERG: Good evening, Commissioners and President Olague. My name is Jonathan Goldberg and I'm hear representing San Francisco Beautiful. We are a 64-year-old organization devoted to creating, enhancing and protecting beauty and livability in San Francisco. We've been involved in many park issues in general and Golden Gate Park in particular, working on the restoration of Murphy's Windmill, pursuing a preservation alternative to the Millwright's house and overall landscape restoration in the Park.

The findings in the DEIR in the Beach Chalet
renovation are inconsistent with the Master Plan of the Park. Many have pointed out that the western two thirds are to be preserved as wooded and natural spaces in the midst of our dense urban environment.

We are concerned that the DEIR failed to address the installation of synthetic turf and high intensity stadium lights that will further disrupt the unique character of the Park, beach and surrounding neighborhoods during many hours of the night and day. We believe hybrid Alternatives of 2, 3 and 4 should be reviewed and studied in further detail focusing on the natural improvements to the fields to ensure that greater playing time is available to field users. The playing field's natural features should be enhanced, not replaced.

If you do not send this DEIR back to Planning because of its limitations and inconsistencies, please extend the comment period 60 days or, as Ray Hollings said, we'll take 30. Thank you.

BILL CROWLEY: Hello. Appreciate you staying late for this. My name is Bill Crowley. And looking at the -- I was reading the EIR and it says, "This EIR analyzes potential impacts" -- sorry, "potential effects of the Beach Chalet athletic fields renovation project."
Then it says, later on it says, in respect to the grass turf with reduced lights alternatives, it says, "Installation of the new grass field turfs would eliminate potential for less than significant water quality impacts due to the installation of the synthetic turfs, i.e., potential for contaminates in the run-off from the synthetic fields." So right there it's saying it's not much of an impact.

But then later under the synthetic turf without lights alternative, it says, "The no-project alternative would be an environmentally superior alternative." So it's contradicting itself at -- above it was saying it's not significant, and here it's saying the no-project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. So let's look at it, see if it is this soot, this rubber crumb is significant, is it harmful.

There was an article in the September 4th Chronicle titled "Tattoo Health Risks, Research Raises Concerns." And it's -- one excerpt says, "black tattoo inks, which are usually made of soot, contain products of combustion called polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons or PAHs. The PAHs in inks include benzo[a]pyrene which as identified in an EPA toxicity report as 'among the most potent and well-documented skin carcinogens.'"
Continuing with the Chronicle article, it says, "It is so potent that it is routinely used in animal tests to grow tumors. It has also been linked to skin cancer in shale oil workers."

So it turns out that this rubber crumb contains benzo[a]pyrene. This was documented in a November 2008 paper called "Hazardous Chemicals in Synthetic Turf Materials and Bioaccessibility in Digestive Fluids." It says the benzopyrene was found to be above the safe limits to the point where if it was in the ground it would have to be taken out.

Says, "Our findings with respect to the PAHs that appear above or at safety levels are fairly consistent with findings of Plesser and Lund in Norway." "Historically, significant exposures to PAHs via dermal contact were reported in workers handling used engine oils and chimneysweeps.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Thank you, sir. And you can submit your comments in writing, of course.

JESSICA DOWELL: Thank you, Commissioners, for listening to everybody tonight. I was all brave over there and now I'm -- so forgive me. I would just like to urge you to reject the Draft EIR.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Your name for the record?
JESSICA DOWELL: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Jessica Dowell. I'm a landscape architect. I live just a few blocks from this project, and I enjoy the night light at Ocean Beach pretty much every night so I feel personally impacted. But also the reason why I would urge you to reject the DEIR is the inadequate address of the biological and health concerns addressed earlier. And urge you to encourage the Rec Department to look at alternatives as brilliantly proposed by Rupert earlier.

And this isn't a project where it's children versus the environment or we're not pro-gophers here. I grew up playing soccer on adequately maintained soccer fields and I've also been to the hospital because I've stepped in gopher holes. They were not on soccer fields.

This is a project that is viable and -- I'm sorry, this project could be very viable and make everyone happy by combining uses. And I believe just this last week SF Environment is now including in their assessments sustain a biological diversity and since sustainability is part of our, I don't know, goals here in the city, layering uses biological diversity which is natural grass, and also recreational opportunities is an excellent example of how we can bring all of
these things together.

So, as proposed earlier by Rupert, by combining alternatives and using a better strategy of construction of the soccer fields, we can accomplish all these things. We might not be able to play a million hours all year round as we would on synthetic turf, but we also wouldn't risk the possible health risks on synthetic turf either. And as you know, a lot of times these projects sometimes have to be dug up years later after lawsuits find out, oh, this stuff really is bad.

So it's a big risk we're taking and we have an opportunity to overlap use here in a fabulous way and I think we can accomplish that by rejecting this DEIR and asking that Rec do a better job of looking at alternatives. Thank you very much.

JACKIE CORLEY: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Jackie Corley and I don't represent anyone. My husband and I have lived in the city for 17 years. Our two kids, 16 and 14, were born and raised here, go to school here. And I came here straight from work and I've sat here and missed my family dinner because I feel this project is important.

Over two years ago when this project was proposed, my family ecstatic, ecstatic that we wouldn't
have to drive the 30 minutes to Crocker when we were
lucky enough to have their team get space there. But
then the process we had to explain to our kids had to
come to a halt for a very important reason. This EIR
had to be done and it was important to everyone that
the effects, the impacts had to be studied carefully so
the city could make a decision taking into account
everyone's views, and that that was worthwhile.

But that's been done now. And as the
Commission has before it, there's a 360-page very
thorough report. And I think one of the Commissioners
brought up what you've heard tonight are some very
passionate and genuine and legitimate concerns about
this project when it's really a policy decision. Yes,
there will be impacts. Of course there will be.
You'll see the lights and those have to be weighed
against the benefits.

But that's not a decision for this Commission
to make. That's a decision that needs to be made by
Park and Rec and probably ultimately the Board of
Supervisors. But the report you have before you is
enough for them, together with comments from the
community like you've heard tonight, to make that
decision. I think the thing before you is is it
thorough, is it there? And it is all there.
A delay is simply going to delay that decision one way or the other, whatever -- what it is. Putting more time for comments isn't going to change anything. The comments you've heard tonight, by far the vast majority can be made again and properly considered.

But I do think it's important that the delay -- that we shouldn't delay any further for no reason. It's time to move on and allow the report, such as it is, and it's thoroughly studied to go forward.

Now I do want to address the question of alternatives because that has been studied and I think it's important that those speakers today who have had experience with their kids and themselves playing on the grass fields can tell you that is not a legitimate alternative. Now, it may be the decision to make is no. That's too bad, and we'll just live with it. But it is not a legitimate alternative. The grass fields do not work.

My daughter's high school in the spring rents a field out of the city and a bus to take them out of the city just to practice because there are not fields here and the grass fields don't accommodate them. So that's a policy decision that needs to be made, not by this Commission but down the line. But this report is
thorough. It's been -- taken two years. And all the people in this city deserve now this argument you've heard tonight to be made and decided one way or the other at the next stage. Thank you.

TERRY ROLLERI: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Terry Rolleri. I'm a native San Franciscan and a homeowner from the Richmond District. When I came here tonight I did not know really very much about this DEIR. But everything I've heard about it tonight tells me that it's got enough holes to drive a truck through it.

I don't -- I'm not an engineer but I'm not an idiot. If you tell me you're going to put up these lights and it's not going to have any impact, that's ridiculous.

I think one of these speakers hit this nail right on the head when she said, "This is not an EIR. This is a snow job." It -- it was written to justify conclusions that have already been reached, so maybe we should just vote on it and send it on to the Park and Rec and ultimately the Supervisors because that's where the decision will actually be made. But it seems like this is very inadequate from everything I've heard tonight.

The one comment I will make that has nothing
to do with the EIR is I'm concerned about kids having
enough recreational space. Let's remember this is San
Francisco, it's a limited land mass, you can't have
more of something without having less of something
else. We all want more housing, more parking, more
room for kids. We all want more of everything. But
come on, it's a limited land mass. Thank you.

RICHARD IVANHOE: The evening, President Olague,
Commissioners. And thank you for being here. I'm glad
I don't have your job.

My name is Richard Ivanhoe. I live in the
Haight Ashbury which is the eastern end of Golden Gate
Park. I've seen very young children play soccer
informally near the Children's Playground in Sharon's
Meadow, put up a couple of nets and play. But that's
not about the EIR.

So I'm going to ask that you extend the
comment period. I'm going to try to submit written
comments. More time would be helpful.

A couple of things, the recreation and open
space element is currently under revision. And I don't
know when it's completed it may or may not have an
impact. In the EIR there was a chart about the current
uses of the Beach Chalet fields. I kind of like to see
more detail on that, you know, who actually uses the
fields, where do they come from, what ages are they? And the same for the proposed new users. In that chart it showed that there was little or no use between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. And that makes sense for school days, but I don't understand why not on the weekends or in the summer?

I've read the executive summary, browsed the rest of it. The executive summary mentions whether things need objectives, the objectives are somewhere else and I'm not clear whose objectives they are. I'm not sure if the turf field replacement will come from Rec and Park's capital budget for maintenance budget, and they do seem to have a problem with their maintenance budget.

And I think I'm a better writer than speaker so I'll try to submit written comments. Thank you.

WALTER VAN RIEL: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Walter van Riel. I don't think I have much more the add than what's been said. But I'd just like to add my perspective as a soccer player. I enjoy playing soccer on Sundays and playing on a natural field that is poorly maintain hurts and sometimes I play on the artificial fields and it's much more comfortable to play. And so I think it -- and we all know that these fields with the lights
will allow much more playing time. They don't need the maintenance that the natural fields require. So I recommend that you accept the report and move forward with the project. Thank you.

JOHN RIZZO: Thank you, Commissioners. I'm John Rizzo speaking for the Sierra Club. We've submitted a letter asking for an extension of the comment deadline. We're still looking into several issues. We're looking into issues of hydrology which doesn't seem to be well, we're still looking into it. We're looking into the issue of what would the impact of ten acres of essentially paving this area in the middle of this open habitat area next -- connecting the national park land.

And we're also looking into the relevance of the attorney general's settlement with field turf and other artificial turf companies. The attorney general, Brown at the time, sued these companies and they came to a settlement agreement. It was a Proposition 65 suit, so we're till looking into that as well.

So we're asking for a short extension of 60 to 90 days, thank you.

KEVIN BARD: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Kevin Bard. I'll be brief. I'm on the board of the Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club. And as you probably already know, we are opposed to this project. But the
reason why I've been here since 5:00 is because, guess what, I live there. I live on 48th Avenue and Irving. I probably live closer to the site than anyone who has spoken here. And I am very concerned about this project. I'm opposed to it.

So I would respectfully request for you to send this Draft environmental impact report back until my neighborhood is surveyed appropriately. I haven't gotten one survey asking me about how I feel about the possible impact of this drastic proposal. I walk around Golden Gate Park all the time every day. It's my home. It is my backyard.

So you should reject this, send this back and have the Rec and Park Department do a full survey for the people who actually live on 48th Avenue and Irving and on an equally similar side on the Outer Richard area. I got a survey asking me how I felt about the AT&T electronic box and I sent that back saying I opposed it. I have heard nothing from Rec and Park about how I feel as a tenant for over seven years living on 48th Avenue and Irving, how I feel about this program.

And a lot of people are concerned about people with their children fleeing San Francisco. I'm the only African-American who's spoken, and if this project
goes through, that will give me a reason to flee San Francisco. Thank you.

JOHN NEWMAN: Good evening, honorable President, honorable Commissioners. My name is John Newman. I'm a fourth generation San Franciscan. I had the pleasure of growing up here in the city and playing soccer on these very fields of the Beach Chalet as a little boy, continuing my soccer playing all the way through the University of California at Davis for four years and playing with so many wonderful kids who have actually gone on to represent the United States who grew up playing on those very fields. And I'd like to see that opportunity afforded to many, many more kids and the members of our community in San Francisco.

I'm a real estate lawyer. I'm very familiar with the California Environmental Quality Act, and I have read the Draft EIR cover to cover. I believe that the Draft EIR addresses the issues that our California Health and Safety Code instructs us to study. It identifies potential impacts, it weighs all -- it looks at alternatives, it does the necessary risk analysis and at the end of the day I believe that's probably the calling here of the Commission this evening which is is the Draft EIR adequate? Have the essential issues required by law been considered? And I think the
answer to that is yes.

And therefore I would ask this Commission to accept the Draft EIR, not extend the time period for comment and move further consideration of the application and the project on to other departments of the city. Thank you for your time.

DENNIS MOSGOFIAN: Good evening, Commissioners.

My name is Dennis Mosgofian. I'm a native San Franciscan. I'm also on a committee. I serve on PROSAC and I'm on a committee that is actually reviewing the Draft Rose document. And it occurs that I think, at this point, that timing of this process as well as the timing of the redraft or the revise of Rose is a little off. And it would suggest to me and to others that it would be appropriate for this process to have a little extra time for public comment both because of its possible interrelationship Rose.

But let me make that particular point. This is -- not from PROSAC but from me. I think the DEIR apparently establishes a priority of paved fields over the natural character of Golden Gate Park. I fully appreciate the need for fields. I've got three children, two of them who play soccer and I've got a grandson who plays soccer.

But I think it's a false dichotomy, it's a
false debate that's been set up between kids and nature
or kids and the environment. As one fellow said
something about kids versus birds and he eats birds. I
understand that. I ate a bird on Thanksgiving. But
that's really not what that debate is about.

My wife likes to tell me when we go shopping
and we're looking at something and she's, "Oh, gee,
that's $89." And we'd only thought about spending 59.
And she says, "Yeah, but the debate is not over zero to
89. It's between 59 and 89." And the debate here is
not between kids and nature or nothing and artificial
turf. It's between natural turf and artificial turf.
That's what the debate is.

And I think it would be useful -- I think it's
useful if that is more carefully addressed in the EIR
than I think it is. Perhaps you guys have framed it
the way you think that is, but I think that's the
debate. So the real question is not no playing time
for children versus lots of playing time including up
till 10:00 p.m. at night, but rather what's the
difference between the playing time on well-maintained
fields, which Rec and Park does not do, I understand
that but theoretically it could do with sufficient
funding, well-maintained natural fields, grass fields,
and the artificial turf.
But there's a bigger issue here and that is, very simply, that it's all about Golden Gate Park. It's not about artificial turf. And Golden Gate Park is, as you've been told over and over again as the DEIR says, it's natural. It's not supposed to be artificial. And that really raises a precedent. And here's the precedent. If it does it in that field, it will do it in the Polo Fields. And why not in big Rec and what about Kezar?

And you then have to deal with the cumulative impact of that decision and that precedent on future fields in Golden Gate Park. Thank you.

ELLEN EDELSON: Hi. My name is Ellen Edelson [phonetic] and I'm a resident of the Sunset District. I'm also born and raised in San Francisco, and forgive me because I get nervous speaking in public like this. But I've just a few comments. I agree that the DEIR should be rejected and good enough is not good enough. Good enough is not the standard that we want to hold this to. This is a long-term project. Once it goes in, whatever it goes in is going to be in for a long time and we have to address the long-term impacts of this.

In my lifetime in San Francisco I've seen space after space, lot after lot, parcel after parcel
of open space being slowly removed with concrete and buildings and other such things. And I know we live in an urban environment but not enough credit is given to the impacts of wildlife and of the open space that we all say that we want. We call this a green city and yet we're putting in plastic and I don't believe that the artificial turf is well studied. I'm concerned about the toxic impacts, the crumbs that come off of it. And so I ask that you reject that, at least give us more time to have comments.

And I totally agree with all the people who've said that the residents don't know about this. I happen to know because I happen to know. I'm but -- so many people do not have a clue that this is going to be done. And I totally agree that not only the people of the Ocean Beach immediate area but the Richmond and the Sunset -- I live on 26th Avenue and I can see the ocean from my back window. So these lights and the glow of the lights will impact me and impact all of my neighbors. So people don't have a clue about this and that needs to happen. This is not addressed. And that's a real serious problem.

And I'm sure I have other things that I want to mention. Just the loss of biodiversity is really a factor and the birds and things. This is not well
considered. Loss of trees is going to impact all of us. And the fact that it's in Golden Gate Park is a problem too, as people have said. This is a natural open area and artificial turf does not belong there. And the precedent it would set, I strongly agree with whoever said that earlier. So that's something to be thoughtful of. Thank you.

JUDY BERKOWITZ: Good evening, Commissioners and President Olague. Judy Berkowitz, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. We respectfully request a 90-day extension on the comment period. As you are probably aware, Coalition is all about process and procedure and because, as you have heard many times, this is a -- as you know anyways, it's a 360-page document. It doesn't comply with the Golden Gate Master Plan.

So the members of the Committee and the general body of coalitions would like a 60- to 90-day extension of the comment period.

As well as Mr. Mosgofian said, this is running at the same time as the Rec and Open Space elements of the San Francisco general plan. And as Mr. Rizzo said, there are some legal decisions that need to be made statewide.

So the EIR is intended to be an informational
tool that helps the city leaders make critical
decisions. We need to have certain things in place
on -- for instance, the legal ruling that Mr. Rizzo
mentioned and the Rec and Open Space element before
this comes into play. Thank you very much.

GREG MILLER: Good evening, Commissioners. My
name is Greg Miller. The adequacy of an EIR depends on
the facts being accurate and complete but it also
depends on its interpretation of those facts and
whether there's a significant impact. And in looking
at the report, I find there are a number of cases where
the thinking, the reasoning in taking the existing
facts is curious, arbitrary and, in my mind,
controversial. I'll try to give you a couple of
examples.

First of all, the EIR concludes that there are
no significant adverse impacts on the visual effects
particularly of the lights. And they paint this in
terms of, if I recall correctly, "Well, yes, the fields
will be bright at night, say, when viewed from Sutro
Heights but only subtends a very small area of the
visual field which is vast so it's not going to bother
anybody."

I find that reasoning very questionable
because the lights are incredibly intense spotlights
that can be viewed for miles. So what happens when you look at a scene and there's something that's very visible and very intense? Your vision's distracted to that. The rule that they're using doesn't take that into account.

Same thing with the lighting poles in the fields. They say, "Well, yes, introduces vertical elements but it doesn't distract from the perception of the natural area." Well, when you go to Paris and you look at the skyline and you notice a very thin thing sticking up in the skyline, you notice that. That's the Eiffel Tower. It's tall, it protrudes and attracts your attention. There's no sense of reasoning in all this stuff that takes that into account.

It doesn't have -- you can't apply a simple silly rule like how many percentage of the visual field it is covered by something coming from this project. It's the nature of it and the scale of it and the context of it that matters, and that's lacking in the EIR.

A second example of that. The EIR concludes that there are no cumulative impacts to the historical resource by this project even though PUC wants to build a two-acre water treatment plant adjacent to it between it and the Murphy Windmill. Its reasoning is based on
the fact that, well, you really only see these sites individually and it will be blocked by trees. So therefore if I look at the Murphy Windmill I really can't see the water treatment plant because there's a hedge of bushes over here and likewise.

Problem here is, as has been explained, the Park is designed as an integral whole that works together by people moving through it and experiencing it. These kinds of arbitrarily rules basically leap to the conclusions that are very strong and dramatic but I think incorrect and need to be reconsidered very carefully. Thank you very much.

ANN CLARK: Good evening and thank you for being so attentive all this time. I'm Ann Clark, a San Francisco resident on the west side. I have granddaughters who play soccer. Before I make my comments I want to submit into the public records for public access and sunshine two reports that will pertain to the written document I will submit. One is "Seeking Green" by SPUR and one is "Giving Every Child a Chance to Play Ball by City Fields Foundation. I request that a third report be submitted and that's the Ocean Beach Master Plan, also by SPUR. These are my comments and I'll speak very.

The most -- the biggest and the most
significant problem with the DEIR is the people count.
This is a huge problem. People have enormous impact on
environment sustainability and preservation. The DEIR
people report is fuzzy, incomplete and lacks data.
Therefore the whole report is not thorough or
comprehensive.

To begin to look at people count, I did an
initial preliminary study this November. Three main
parameters were used, the DEIR schedule information,
365 days a year, Monday through Sunday 8:00 a.m. or
9:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., rain or shine, for 365 days.
I actually used 355 days in the study.

Second was commonly accepted soccer league
standards. And third a vehicle count because the DEIR
states there will be little use of public transit and
bikes. I'm telling you this now because I think you
will be as surprised as I was at the results.

Factored at 355 days, annual soccer people
counts, 1,350,334 soccer people at the Beach Chalet
project. There will be 337,569 vehicles going to the
soccer complex, 337,569 vehicles leaving the soccer
complex. That's important because of the environmental
affect going and coming. And 675,168 vehicles that
will need parking to accommodate the overlap of play
time and league standard warmup time.
Heaviest soccer people and vehicle impact are Saturdays and Sundays which also are the heavy impact for nearby areas: neighborhoods, beaches, the zoo, businesses. Also heaviest impact day for the western area of the Park. Three additional findings 23,780 total soccer hours and no soccer playing time for kids under eight and minimal time for kids under 10 during the school year.

This whole area needs to have extensive research and I'm making suggestions about how that research needs to be completed. Until it is completed, the DEIR should be withdrawn and this information should be included. Thank you very much.

FRANK TRISKA: Hi. My name is Frank Triska and I'm probably the only person in the room who feels sorry for Recreation and Park Department. On one hand they're expected to provide a natural setting for all of us who enjoy pastoral scenery. On the other, they're obligated to provide the greatest diversity of recreational activities for the most people at the lowest cost.

I think most people agree that soccer is an appropriate use for this particular parcel. I would like to see the most safe surface, but on one hand people say grass is dangerous because people fall and
break their legs; on the hand people say that it's
toxic and therefore should not be installed.

Well, if you could resolve these issues by
extending the comment period, I would say do that. But
somehow I don't think that's going to happen. In the
absence of a sure solution and in the absence of
deciding which is really best, what I would like as a
citizen is to have the lowest cost alternative which
provides the best use with the lowest cost per
participant hour. I don't know what that is.

You people do environmental impacts reports
before. This is not new. If you think this is really
bad, you should reject it. If on the other hand, this
is pretty reasonable compared to what you usually see,
then it's time for the process to get moving.

Basically, despite the fact we've been sitting
here for hours, no matter what you decide the world
isn't going the end tomorrow. Thank you.

MARTHA HOFFMAN: Hi, Commissioners. You're good
listeners and I think everybody really appreciates it.
I'm Martha Hoffman, long time advocate for Golden Gate
Park and I participated in the Master Plan process.
The west end of Golden Gate Park was designed to be the
most wild and forested part of Golden Gate Park. Three
objectives of the Master Plan were to continue
forestation throughout the Park, implement a shrub restoration program and improve wildlife habitat values around the Park and to designate areas with high wildlife values as special management areas.

I spend much time in the Park and am an advocate for wildlife. I came to speak on their behalf because they were obviously not consulted or considered in this DEIR process. The west end of the Park is rich with wildlife, possum, skunks, racoons, fox, birds, now coyotes and on and on and on. They have a tough time in the city and the west end of Golden Gate Park is their habitat of safety. It's their refuge. And they add to the richness of humanity and certainly to the planet.

This project is the opposite of the Master Plan goal of improving wildlife habitat. It would be totally destructive for their well-being and it would have a very negative impact on the well-being of Golden Gate Park. I really think this Draft EIR is unacceptable. Thanks.

NANCY RUEFELL: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Nancy Ruefell [phonetic]. I too want to compliment you for your tolerance and your patience. I would like to ask that you please extend the comment period. I know you've heard that, but I think you've heard enough
tonight to raise at least some questions in your mind about the complexity of the situation and some of the cursory review that has been presented to you.

And I appreciate that fact that this document is a tool and what you are doing in the Planning Commission is providing not only to the Rec and Park Commission but to everybody in the city the right tool to make the right decision. This is a very wonderful gift that you will give to us is your time and your consideration, and you need to make sure that this is the very best tool we can possibly have because what we're talking about is Golden Gate Park.

I want to call to your attention your own agenda, Item 15, and it says that at 5:00 o'clock they're going to talk about the project site would remain in its current as an athletic field complex within an urban park. Oh, that's not true. This is not an urban park. This is Golden Gate Park. All night tonight you've heard about that.

If this is what the problem is is that somebody has misunderstood Golden Gate Park as something ordinary, then we have a much larger issue. So I just want to put that out there.

I'd like to also support the comments earlier this evening from Mr. Holland from PAR. I thought he
had an excellent point. He needs time to be able to
digest this and to bring this to his constituents. And
this is a very important document. And you've also
heard people tonight shocked that they're just hearing
about it. And we have a gentleman here would like to
have a survey presented to him.

And I think this has to resonate with you is
that the time for a comment will benefit us all. Maybe
it will add a little bit of time to this process. But
we're going to end up with something good in Golden
Gate Park. It will be soccer fields. It will just be
the best that we the possibly come up with when this
body, each of you, help us come to that right decision.
And the right decision is resolving some of these
extremely important issues you've heard tonight. And
unfortunately the EIR hasn't done its job.

So let's get to work. I'll send in my
comments. Give us some time so that all the people, my
group can speak and the people at PAR and everybody
else gets a chance to weigh in because we understand
it. Thank you.

KATHERINE HOWARD: Good evening, Commissioners.
Katherine Howard, SF Ocean Edge and Golden Gate Park
Preservation Alliance. For two years our volunteers
have reached out to people all over San Francisco.
When we tell them about this soccer complex you know what they say? "They want to do what to Golden Gate Park?"

We've had no trouble getting signatures on petitions. We've now collected over 3,000 signatures, which is news, by the way, to my group behind me. We worked very hard to get this EIR and we waited a long time for it. Meanwhile the soccer players have become more and more frustrated because Rec and Park has chosen not to maintain the fields. So we have our EIR. We want to use it to solve this situation.

The Draft EIR is deeply flawed but it contains the seeds of hope. That hope lies in the compromise alternative that we have proposed. Renovate the West Sunset playing fields and turn the Beach Chalet fields into a high quality natural grass playing field with no lights. We turn to you, the Planning Commission, to help forge the compromise.

First, please extend the public comment period so we can all get through this very complex report and ask more well-informed questions. We want the best Final EIR as possible.

Secondly, ask the Planning Department to seriously consider the compromise alternative and research it carefully with an eye not to tearing it
apart -- any idea can be demolished if you work on it hard enough -- but to try to find a way to make it work.

Lastly, I'm going to ask everyone to sit back, close your eyes and visualize for a moment Golden Gate Park. What do you see? A series of paths that wind through groves of trees, through meadows along peaceful lakes, people on family picnics playing informal games, strolling through forests that have taken years to grow, perhaps a child gazing in wonder at a hawk as it soars above him. And at night after the people have all gone home, nature throws her cloak of darkness over the parkland. The birds nestle in their perches, the night creatures come out, and a deep sense of tranquility settles on the Park. What a marvelous treasure we have right here in our city. This is what we want to protect. Please help us to save Golden Gate Park. Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Is there any additional public comment on this item? Seeing none -- seeing none, public comment is closed.

Commissioner Antonini?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Well, thank you. I think most of you who remain in this room are familiar with the process, but I think there was some confusion
earlier and, as most of you know, we are making no
decision tonight. And your comments tonight, our
comments, the comments that have been received since
October 26th and will be received until December 12th
will be combined with the DEIR to create the EIR which,
of course, will come back to us sometime in the early
summer.

And I think on the subject of any kind of
extension, I mean, compared to some of the other EIRs
we've had, particularly Candlestick Point, Hunter's
Point, five huge volumes, and Cal Pacific Medical
Center and others that were much, much more extensive
and much more widespread, had had a lot more issues
than this fairly focused EIR, you know, I think this
is, you know, I don't feel that that's necessary.

As you heard at the beginning of this comment
period, the comment period for -- under CEQA is 45 to
60 days. I count this as being 49 if I did the math
right. And I think given the size of this and the fact
this it's -- the last speaker mentioned, they've been
collecting signatures and been aware of this for two
years, a lot of the people who are opposed to the
project or feel the project should be modified in ways
to make it more acceptable, I don't know that anything
new is going to come of extending it any further. And
all those comments have to be answered and that's why you have a period that's going to take another five months for staff to get the final EIR to us.

And again, the decision is not made by us. In fact it will be made ultimately -- other than the decision to certify the EIR -- the decision as to what form this project ultimately takes will be made by Park and Rec, as most of you know.

So that being said, I guess what we have to talk about is are there alternatives? There are alternatives. I thought they summarized them well based upon the project itself. I know other alternatives have been brought up by you regarding West Sunset and other places that could be used in lieu of this. But that's not really the project we're analyzing. We're analyzing what to do with this particular set of fields and how they should be.

Should they be artificial turf or natural turf? Should they be lit or not lit? And then the other improvements that nobody commented too much on, the stands, the paved areas to allow access, the increasing the size which is part of the project that was analyzed. We're going to end up with a larger field than what we previously had. So I mean, there are a lot of issues here.
I think the alternatives were good with particular attention to Alternate No. 2. Those of you who spoke about the possibility of natural turf blight, there -- I did a lot of study on the use of the newer natural turfs on areas where -- near some football stadiums where they park on them and they use them for recreation too.

Now, how active this recreation is, but there have been a lot of advances on this, the natural turfs and so this is something that, you know, I think in your comments you can certainly ask. And have those been analyzed, the newest turfs.

Again, they're going to take maintenance and this is the big problem that's been pointed out. And we are maintaining Polo and Kezar and a lot of other natural grass fields. So is it realistic to expect that even the highest grade and the newest type of natural turf, can we expect that is it's going to be maintained with the kind of usage that we need. And even with that being said, it will be quite clear that the usage will be less given the fact that you have to rest the natural turf. That's a decision that Park and Rec will have to make, of course.

And the other thing was not addressed in here, we talked about the lighting and there was an
alternative that would use less lighting. I think there is an amount of light you have to have. I mean, you have to be able to see. You know, it does not have to be daylight quality, so there is probably that alternative that was analyzed.

What was not analyzed was shutting the lights off a little early. Instead of 10:00 o'clock, how about 9:00 at night? I mean, that would still give you a lot of additional time, particularly this time of the year because, as you may be aware, a lot of schools, this is a soccer season. It happens in the winter months. So to try to practice a soccer team, it's pretty hard to get it in after school between 3:00 and 5:00 when it gets dark.

So the lighting is really important to allow these practices. In fact a number of schools, private and I don't know about public, but they actually use a lot of energy and cause a lot of pollution by having to take their students to Daly City and Pacifica to practice because they can go to lighted fields that are available there and we don't have enough in San Francisco for practicing.

So there is an environmental benefit even though you're going to have lights and you're going to have the down side to the environment of having lights,
you're going to have the up side of people not having
to travel as far to practice. So there's two sides to
this, of course.

As far as the glare from the lights which has
been brought up a lot, there's been a big improvement
and anybody who's gone by AT&T Park, which has a very
high degree of lighting to be able to play major league
baseball, the glare is very minimal there. You see
that there are lights on there. It does not flood the
whole sky with lights. So this has been improved and I
would expect that the lights that would be used here
would probably be adapted.

In fact they did analyze -- there was talk
about the birds and there was analysis in that report
and I know most have you have read the report already
that talked about if it's not seen as a source of
light, it isn't as attractive to the birds as it is if
it's, you know, just seen as a lighted area below their
flight path. So I think that by modifying these lights
a lot of the adverse effects that were mentioned can be
modified.

As far as the West Sunset alternative, there
were groups and schools and people were willing to pay
to have that renovated and unfortunately it wasn't
worked out with the city many years ago. So to expect
that that would happen now may not happen either.
So ultimately, you know, there has to be the money
brought forward to be able to convert that and maybe
the funding would be there to do it at West Sunset. It
might be transferable from here.

And you know, I did hear some talk about the
cumulative traffic impact and it was brought up that
we'd have three times the playing time that we do now,
so it is important that that traffic study properly
address what the amount of traffic would be. Of course
that's the maximum usage that is addressed with the
three -- three top times the amount of available field
playing time doesn't mean you're always going to have
people constantly coming in cars at all hours of the
day and night as it's available.

Then there were some comments about the fog.
Being a resident of western San Francisco, I would not
say it's foggy a majority of the time. Probably in
July and August it is. But the other months we have
our foggy nights and we have our clear nights and
winter is typically, when it's not raining or overcast,
very clear, crisp nights.

Then the tree issue did not come up too much
but there was a discussion about whether these were
considered brushes or trees and what was going to be
cleared out. The area between Murphy's Windmill and Beach Chalet is an overgrown mess, in my opinion, right now and needs to be thinned out just for health reasons.

I mean, The Olympic Club and Harding Park have taken a lot of the trees out and have trimmed the other ones in a way that the turf and everything is a lot healthier because it lets sunshine in there, not the mention the safety factor. So I think it's not the number of trees that are taken out but the way these trees are removed or perhaps thinned out is really the critical issue here. And that may need a little bit more to be addressed a little more thoroughly in the report.

But that area is dangerous in there. And I think another benefit of the lights, not the field lights, but the other lighting around the facility that is part of the whole project will add to security in the area and people might actually want to be walking around there at night, which you probably wouldn't want to do now given the conditions in the thickness in the brush.

And the other thing that came up that I thought was really important, this is an area for all of San Francisco. It isn't just for the residents in
western San Francisco. And it's really important when some of the people came who were soccer players and others from other parts of the city and they said, "You know, it's going to benefit us too." So we have to remember that just because you live close to there and you may have more direct impact doesn't mean you're the only decision maker in what's done.

Also there was a question about non-sporting events. This does not analyze non-sporting events as far as I can see. The analysis is for sporting events only at this field.

Then another person brought up the question -- a couple people brought up the waste treatment plant that's proposed apparently by SFPUC. This is a separate project. I mean, I don't think it's right to try to analyze them together because that might not happen. And it will be evaluated on its own merits and so I think it should be considered. Yes, it is a possibility that that could happen but we're going to have that make that decision independently and one project is not dependant upon the other.

So those are my main comments so far. I think it was a well done report from what I've read so far. I think your comments make it an even better report. I'm sure that you'll have a lot more, so we'll have a
very good EIR when it's completed.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Sugaya?

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Thank you. I appreciate all the public comments. I think it will strengthen then the EIR. However, I am quite supportive of an extension, but I'm not going to ask the rest of the Commissioners because I don't have the Commissioners with me on that. The majority of the Commissioners will not support an extension I do not believe.

That said, I think that the cumulative effect does include the treatment plant site and that's been mentioned before. Granted it's a separate project but the EIR needs to take into consideration the potential for development that's already been voiced, I believe, and should be analyzed in this particular document.

I don't know much about soccer fields and where they're located in the city. Actually I'm not a big fan of organized sports, but -- well, I mean, I'll give you an example. When I was a kid, we played around at night, you know, football, basketball. I'm kind of little but they let me play anyway. And it was unorganized. That means we went to the schoolyard, fooled around until it got dark. Did we care? No. You could hardly see the ball. That was kind of fun. You can't do that with organized sports, right? You've
got to have all these lights and everything and you've got rules and stuff like that. So anyway, that's my experience and that's kind of like how I think of playing on fields for an extended period of time when the sun goes down.

That said, like alternative sites, I don't know. If this is a facility that's supposed to serve the entire city, then maybe the EIR needs to take a look at not just sites around Golden Gate Park and the western part of the city but McLaren and other parts of the city as well.

And then another thing I think is, and Commissioner Antonini pointed it out, the potential for the use of this site for other activities other than athletic events. And I don't know how the EIR deals with that or if it has to deal with that. A response to my comment, I'm sure, will tell me whether that's a legitimate concern or not because, as we know, any flat space in Golden Gate Park seems to be ripe for events other than athletic events. And you can be sure that Hardly Bluegrass is going to move into that space if it's available and also, what is the other one? Outside Lands or whatever it's called?

So anyway, I don't know if that's a legitimate part of the EIR's analysis, but I raise it as a
I may have some other things that I submit in writing, but that's it for now.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Miguel?

COMMISSIONER MIGUEL: Yeah, you look at the west he said of the Park and you hear terms such as "sylvan," "pastoral," and "wild wooded parkland." But neither {} John Olmstead or William Hammond Hall ever designed any soccer fields. And I don't think McLaren did either, at least to my knowledge.

What happened roughly 80 years ago, if my timeline is right, is there was a change from that pastoral wild wooded concept and they put in soccer fields and they're there. And that's one of the problems that we always have with historic landscapes basically is that they either do or do not accommodate change. And Golden Gate Park has accommodated change in many ways. It has done so slowly, it has done so thoughtfully, but there are soccer fields there. And they're there for a particular reason.

You know, the Park is historic but I don't believe it is static and I don't believe it should be static. I've dealt with -- and the only thing I'm going to comment on now, I'll have other comments written later -- in references to the adequacy of the
or the coverage of the EIR, is the Golden Gate Park Master Plan because there were many, many references to it publicly today and there are many references to it in the EIR document in front of us.

I have dealt with the Master Plan since 1998 and before because I was on the citizen's committee that helped write it. And by the way, even the head of Planning's environmental department, Bill Wycko was a Planning Department resource for the plan.

That document is a bureaucratic document as are all things that come out of city, state or federal government. It says one thing in one section and it contradicts it 10 pages, 15, 20 pages later on and gives a third opinion someplace else. But if you take a look at the Master Plan, it gives short shrift to the west end of Golden Gate Park. Master plan is a little over 200 pages long. Two pages constitute the west end plan.

Soccer fields are mentioned as part of three sentences in that section. The west end diagram notes "additional soccer fields," refers you to the Richmond Sunset Treatment Plant diagram that says "new soccer and multi-purposes field." The accompanying text says, "The recommended plan proposes expansion of the existing uses surrounding the site, one additional
soccer multi-use sports field, a picnic area
reforestation areas and a parking lot are proposed."
That's directly from the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

But perhaps the most telling sentence in that
entire two-page section is this: "The goal of this
area plan is to increase legitimate activities and
transform this part of the Park." Okay?

I could go on from there, but I think you get
the gist of it. As to the requested extension period,
considering all the EIRs that have come before this
Commission, this is relatively simple. It's relatively
shorten even at 360 pages. All the people I've been
speaking to in the past year, particularly two years to
an extent and very much more intensively since August,
are the same comments we've had all along. Everything
we've heard this evening has been stated months ago.
It's all covered in the EIR, maybe not as fully as some
people would like, but the fact that they have made
their comments, the responses document will have to
deal with it. And so I see no reason for extension
whatsoever.

For a change this is one EIR where traffic and
transportation have become relatively minor matters.
The speaker that gave the number of users, the amount
of traffic was interesting, but these are uses over a
planned number of hours a day, not like a concert where everyone comes together at once and so you do not have the same type of traffic and transportation situations. As to Commissioner Sugaya's comment and Ray Holland's comment on the possible other non-athletic -- because music may be considered recreational -- non-athletic uses that may come to this area if it is improved as proposed, I do think that should be commented upon in the responses document because outside lands and bluegrass would glom onto this in a second if it was as proposed. And I will have more comments about that.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Moore?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I believe that there were numerous comments made by numerous experts tonight pointing out numerous deficiencies that would make me personally supportive of an extension partially because I believe within the three minutes these people had to present their points there was not enough room to really fully bring forward the full extent of what was implied here.

I do believe that there were medical experts, I do believe that there were people with athletic field experience which I believe has been completely pushed upper the rug in the document as it stands. And while
I believe that the Golden Gate Park is potentially resilient and will remain resilient to accommodate change, I do not believe that the proposal as it is stands is really very much in keeping with the spirit of the Park.

And I compare that to another major transformation which occurred in San Francisco in the last 20 years and that is the adaptation to the Presidio from a military base into what is now public and one of the most amazing and beautiful designed appropriate uses of open spaces and recreation along the San Francisco waterfront. In Golden Gate Park and what's proposed and what's been pushed very singularly in this EIR, I think we are doing something which is not at all in keeping with the basic spirit of what that park requires us to conserve.

And that does not mean that I do not support the physical and sports and recreational activities like they are, but I would rather like to see them transformed into an ecologically forward-looking project rather than into what I believe is sideways- or backwards-looking project.

I do believe that there is across the world enough examples where indeed the maintenance and even the relevance of turf as it used to be has been
examined and studied and there are new ways of building natural turf with ecologically sensitive solutions relative to water, the use of pesticides and on and on and on. That is the same kind of science and the same kind of study which goes into golf courses. That new technology has not been described by example or by reference anywhere in this EIR.

I'll probably write some additional comments on that, but one of the things which is of concern, it was briefly touched on in passing by some of the people who were presenting is indeed the disconnect with us as a city having properly updated our Recreation and Parks element, which is indeed an integral part of the policy document referred to as the general plan. And that is hanging out. And one of the most important things in that particular element is for me the further commercialization of our open spaces, and not just of Golden Gate Park but everywhere else in the city.

And while I think it is a collective policy discussion we would all have the think about in order to make our city fiscally viable, to do a wholesale commercialization without having reflected on that in the larger context of the city for me is an ill-timed and somewhat irresponsible way of doing it. And I'm very cautious sitting in this place here to call it
irresponsible because that's an accusation and I'm not quite sure how to say it. I'd rather stick with ill-timed or hoping that it could be done more thoughtfully. So take back -- strike that word "irresponsible," please.

I'm saying that because as planning commissioners, as planners, as architects, as citizens, I think we need to be able to reference projects with comprehensive plans and with comprehensive policy discussions. And I do not believe that we have completed the policy discussion of where we want to go with our recreation and park open space as a city from here on into the future.

PRESIDENT OLGAUE: Commissioner Borden?

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Yeah, I just wanted to thank everyone who came out today to give your thoughtful comments and I think that the document will be a much stronger document because of the comments and that you understood now these uncovered areas, which I think that there were a lot of important issues about the Golden Gate Park Master Plan, the lighting, more research around the turf issues and having that embedded.

I recognize this is all covered in the document but not to the degree that people would like.
I hope in the comments responses that we can dig a little deeper to the extent that that's possible.

I think what's really challenging in the area around turf that we have is it's sort of like the cell phone antenna problem we have, right? The research is conflicting and you can find good data that says both sides, and we probably won't know the real impact for quite a long time, not for another 60 days or another six months. We'll never truly know.

And that's just a really realistic decision maker reality of where we are with a lot of things, not just with turf fields as we restore them in Golden Gate Park and other parts of the city. I think we all lament the loss of grass, but at the same time we have a reality that we have been trying encourage people to do zero-scaping and to get away from doing that.

In general planning projects, actually, when we do residential development we actually are saying how can you do things that reduce water usage and, you know, and so it's a very challenging thing when you have a city that's very underfunded and doesn't have the resources to maintain fields that it owns. And I don't know that we ever well have the resources.

And as you talk about the recreation open space element and we talk about the issues about
privatization of the parks, I think the issue is money. And actually it's interesting that the Presidio is an example because the Presidio actually has a huge economic engine which you can spend in 10,000 or $20,000 a month to rent a house there. And that helps fund some of the nice things that they can do. And they actually are doing quite well economically because they have other assets that they're able to leverage and we don't have other assets we're able to leverage related to the Park.

I think we need to be really responsible, obviously, in looking at the alternatives. I think if we do look at the EIR, it actually says the environment superior alternative is the off-site alternative. So the document is not saying that the turf fields or anything like that is the environmentally superior alternative. I just want to make that clear out there because I know there's a perception that the document says, you know, the proposed project is the best thing since sliced bread. It actually does not say that. It says otherwise.

And even at the end of this whole process, I don't know that we'll ever conquer having all the information we'd like to know about all the different particular nuances of this project and the impacts. I
think that the issues that were brought up today, wastewater treatment center, the additional looking at the lights in the light pollution and the fog issues, I think are all important ones that we need to look at. And I'm pleased that people have taken the time to write letters, and if you didn't already put your comments in writing that have more extensive information, that would be great.

If there are other experts who have information input, I mean, it only strengthens the document if we can respond to those things. But at the end of the day, luckily for us -- or unluckily, I don't know -- we don't have to vote on this project. We have to vote on this document.

And you know, to be honest, every EIR has the same challenge that we have received before us. We always could have more information but we'll actually never have enough, and that's kind of where we kind of lie between the reality and the need to actually move forward and the challenge of all of our planning processes, they take way too long and they're never actually in concert. And unfortunately it would stymie progress for a very long time if everything had to be in sync because I guess we'd just have one big -- I don't even know how we'd actually coordinate that.
But I do want to say thank you all for participating in this process. I think what we've all seen is everyone is passionate about Golden Gate Park. It is our crown gem of San Francisco, and I think everybody wants to make sure that we all get to use the Park in the ways that we like to explore nature or recreate. And this document is seeking to kind of get some truth into the environmental issues around that. And ultimately the project will be decided in another place at another time.

SECRETARY AVERY: Commissioner Fong?

COMMISSIONER FONG: Thank you. Well, I kind of want to follow up on your thoughts about the different reports, conflicting reports about toxicity and that's really not for us because we're not in a position to make that kind of judgment. But I want to thank everyone for coming out. It was great to hear so many San Franciscans and native San Franciscans are involved and concerned. And while this hearing is controversial to some degree, it reminds me how lucky that we all are to be talking about waves, talking about birds of prey, talking about fog, fresh air, wind, grass and trees. And it's a good opportunity to remind ourselves how lucky we are to live here in San Francisco.

I am supportive of moving forward. I do think
the EIR is adequate. I don't think giving it more time
would necessarily answer any more questions. I think
it does bring up questions. I'm not sure if the word
"deficiencies" is appropriate or not but I think it
does bring up questions which I'm looking forward to
seeing those in writing.

Just as a little side note and I'll try to
keep it on the environmental side, but a very fast
growing sport in San Francisco is called futsal.
Futsal is an indoor version of soccer being played on a
basketball court largely because of the lack of fields
or the difficulty to schedule practices and games. So
I think that's a telltale reason, direction why we do
need more fields to be more reliable for kids.

As far as team sports, I happen to be a big
fan of team sports. I think it gives you a lot of
different lessons in life in how to deal with problems
in life and how to deal with problem situations, how to
deal with teamwork, leadership, following and taking
directions, giving directions. And I'd be happy to
pick you on my team any day.

But yeah, all right, well, I'm supportive of
moving forward, and I think all of the questions that
were brought up are legitimate ones. They are all
valid questions.
Not to get too far off topic, but while I have the microphone for a second, I realize that this is the right direction right now. I also personally feel that this is a Band-aid. I think it is a Band-aid for Rec and Park needs more funding. And for those natives that want to get involved, the residents who want to get involved to try to get Rec and Park and other parts of the city, DPW to fix potholes, that's a whole different issue, probably shouldn't be brought up here, but that's probably a big city budget item that I think we all should be engaged in if we're concerned about {something} like this because we do have the money to take care of it.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Antonini?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Just a couple of other things. The Presidio was brought up and most of you are aware they do have athletic fields with lights in Presidio and you probably haven't been out driving recently because of the construction, but it's up in that area there.

I'm a big fan of natural turf and lawns and, you know, in fact it really makes me sad when I see beautiful homes and people have put tar bark in front of it or gravel or, worse, cemented it and you wonder why they to that.
But that being said, it is turf management is tough, and one of the things we have in San Francisco which of course we passed regulations a few years ago to limit the use of pesticides, or herbicides rather, and I'm not sure how much they use and there are a lot of good natural fertilizers out there -- I'm not sure how much they use those.

And I don't think they aerate their lawns that often which is another problem. It's labor intensive but that's, you know, all their fields would do a lot better if they did that. I'm not saying they don't do it, but you know, these are all sort of the issues we struggle with when we try to make these decisions about natural turf and artificial turf. And there are a lot of issues that are involved.

The final issue is exposure. I think the choice has been made at least for now to continue with the natural turf at Kezar and at the Polo Fields. The Beach Chalet is closer to the ocean. It's damp more of the time probably and I'm not sure but I think their exposure is, you know, they don't have a lot of really good southern or eastern exposure due to the trees and the other things around there and so it's even more of a challenge to support the turf there.

I don't know, you'd have to talk to some of
the experts in Park and Rec or whoever's working on those to find out. I'm sure it could be done. It just would be more of a challenge, I think.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Moore?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I have one question for Mr. Lewis.

On your instruction sheet, you are asking that written comments be submitted by December 12th addressed to Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer and the address. Does that mean that people will not submit by e-mail? That's been very confusing in the two most recent EIRs because there's no e-mail address given, and people don't know what to do.

DON LEWIS: I have received plenty of comment letters through e-mail. We're going to respond to those. Any e-mails that we receive are going to be in the comments and responses document.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Would you please state the e-mail.

DON LEWIS: Bil.wycko@sfgov.org [sic]. You can also send them to Don Lewis as well, don.lewis@sfgov. That'll work.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Sugaya?

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Isn't it also true that -- isn't it also true, staff, that -- in the past
uncertain on certain environmental reports we've been
told by staff that they've been responding to comments
that have come in well after the comment period is
over; is that true?

SARAH JONES: Yes. Sarah Jones, Planning
Department. When a comment is submitted, it's
considered part of the record, and so for, you know,
the purposes of addressing everything that's in the
record, if the comment comes in after the comment
period we address it to the best of our ability.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Thank you.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Commissioner Miguel.

COMMISSIONER MIGUEL: Just because of the question
about e-mails, if that is policy, the e-mail address
should be on the cover. Thank you -- in the future.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: I'm not sure what -- Ms.
Berkowitz raised a concern. I don't know.

JUDY BERKOWITZ: Just quickly, Bill Wycko's
address is Bill.wycko@sfgov.org.

PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Again, I don't see the support
for an extension of the comment period, but I do want
to thank everyone for coming out. And even every
three-minute statement or concern that was raised will
have to be addressed. So I think that, given the
multitude of issues that were raised, we will have a
And I think what this raised for me a little bit was a process question and in the future, I guess this is something maybe we could discuss during the Commissioners' comment period is the idea of providing more education to the public about, you know, exactly, you know, the Draft EIR process, the EIR, and, you know, what types of comments are expected regarding the different documents and who has jurisdiction over what and what it means because I think sometimes it's impossible for members of the public to actually understand the process that goes on here.

So I don't -- I welcome the comments that even the ones that related to the project because I think it was important sometimes. This is a forum still where people are able to raise those issues even though ultimately it will be Park and Rec that makes -- but there's still -- in other words there's still a lot of time.

So the Draft EIR will probably take months before the final EIR with the comments and responses is responded to and then, you know, then there's Park and Rec and, you know, other bodies. So there's still plenty of time to weigh in on this project. It doesn't end after tonight.
So again, I want to thank the staff for all your work on this and the public for coming out. So I guess the public hearing on this is closed at this point.

And you have till December 12th to give responses and definitely the e-mail address was given.

SECRETARY AVERY: Thank you, Madame President.

At this point, you are now at your general public comment category.

(Whereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 9:35 o'clock p.m.)
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In the fall of 1996 this picture was slipped to Mayor Brown and we began the process of restoring our field. In the following three years we spent over $4 million on new irrigation, soil, sod, and fences.

NONE of the restorations could survive the level of use we have in San Francisco.

Alex Goodson broke the end of his tibia, across the growth plate, when he stepped in a hole on Beach Chalet #3. He is one the first casualty of Rec and Park this season.

6/6/98
Beach Chalet Opens

"We now have the 11 best soccer fields in the country, in Golden Gate Park!"

"We will make the same commitment to maintaining these fields as we have to restoring them!"

SF Field Report 6/27/99

This Report and others can be found at www.sfpix.com
CEQA was adopted in 1970 and intended to:

- inform governmental decision-makers and the public about potential environmental effects of a project;
- identify ways to reduce adverse impacts;
- offer alternatives to the project; and
- disclose to the public why a project was approved.

Chapter 1 POLICY

§ 21000. LEGISLATIVE INTENT
The Legislature finds and declares as follows:
(a) The maintenance of a quality environment for the people of this state now and in the future is a matter of statewide concern.
(b) It is necessary to provide a high-quality environment that at all times is healthful and pleasing to the senses and intellect of man.
(c) There is a need to understand the relationship between the maintenance of high-quality ecological systems and the general welfare of the people of the state, including their enjoyment of the natural resources of the state.
(d) The capacity of the environment is limited, and it is the intent of the Legislature that the government of the state take immediate steps to identify any critical thresholds for the health and safety of the people of the state and take all coordinated actions necessary to prevent such thresholds being reached.
(e) Every citizen has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.
(f) The interrelationship of policies and practices in the management of natural resources and waste disposal requires systematic and concerted efforts by public and private interests to enhance environmental quality and to control environmental pollution.
(g) It is the intent of the Legislature that all agencies of the state government which regulate activities of private individuals, corporations, and public agencies which are found to affect the quality of the environment, shall regulate such activities so that major consideration is given to preventing environmental damage, while providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.

§ 21001. ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE INTENT
The Legislature further finds and declares that it is the policy of the state to:

(a) Develop and maintain a high-quality environment now and in the future, and take all action necessary to protect, rehabilitate, and enhance the environmental quality of the state.
(b) Take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with clean air and water, enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic, and historic environmental qualities, and freedom from excessive noise.

(c) Prevent the elimination of fish or wildlife species due to man's activities, insure that fish and wildlife populations do not drop below self-perpetuating levels, and preserve for future generations representations of all plant and animal communities and examples of the major periods of California history.

(d) Ensure that the long-term protection of the environment, consistent with the provision of a decent home and suitable living environment for every Californian, shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions.

(e) Create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony to fulfill the social and economic requirements of present and future generations.

(f) Require governmental agencies at all levels to develop standards and procedures necessary to protect environmental quality.

(g) Require governmental agencies at all levels to consider qualitative factors as well as economic and technical factors and long-term benefits and costs, in addition to short-term benefits and costs and to consider alternatives to proposed actions affecting the environment.
Officer Ray Bini watches Nazzareno Grech and Charles Stellini warming up for the first Police Athletic League soccer match.

Police Athletic League Underway!
P.A.L. Response Is Excellent

Second Vice President Ray White was appointed Chairman of the Police Athletic League by President Weiner and given power to select his own committee.

This committee met for the first time on Saturday, April 11 and elected officers and a Board of Governors. Brother White was selected as Chairman by acclamation. John Cavalli, Vice Chairman, Waldo Reesink, Treasurer and Peter Gardner Secretary were chosen to fill the other posts.

It was decided by the Board to put each sports activity under a chairman who would be responsible for his own end of the program.

Directing the baseball portion of the P.A.L. is Jake Caulfield of the Narcotics Detail, football by Dan Shelley of General Works Detail and Milton Piro of the Homicide Detail will organize and run the basketball activity.

At the April Association meeting many members volunteered to assist in any way they could. Their names will be forwarded to the head of sport in which they wish to take part. Anyone else interested in coaching, managing or in any way working in the P.A.L. may contact the Secretary.

1st Team
A soccer team consisting of 24 boys from the Bayview district has been entered in the San Francisco Soccer Football Association Juvenile League.

Coaching the boys are Rocky Thompson of the Auto Detail and Tom Applegate of Co. E.

The response, both from the boys and from these men, has been very gratifying to the Board of Governors and it is hoped that others will see their way clear to donate some of their off-duty time.

Gymnasium
The P.A.L. now has the full use of St. Patrick's gym which is located on Clementina Street between 4th and 5th. The only problem facing us is that of manpower to keep the gym open and supervised. There have been offers of athletic equipment which will be accepted as soon as there is a place to keep it. This gym may be just the place.

The basketball and boxing programs will operate out of this gym also.

The Guardsmen
Mr. Thomas O'Toole of the Guardsmen contacted Ray White through Tom Gray of the Downtown Association. They wish to donate $1,500.00 a year toward the P.A.L. Members of the Board met with them and informed them that we would be happy to accept their donation but only under the condition that the publicity attendant to donations of this kind would be played down.

It was felt by the Board that all...
money should go into a fund from which monies could be drawn as needed. If donations were accepted for specific sports it would be difficult to disburse the money where the need would be greatest. There won’t be any names other than P.A.L. and the name of the team (selected by the players) on any uniform, this way a person who contributed one dollar could feel as good as one who put in one hundred.

Emblem Selected

The emblem of the P.A.L. will be a seven pointed star with the letters P.A.L. in the center; underneath the star there will be a small scroll bearing the name San Francisco. This emblem will be on all uniforms and equipment owned by the League.

Cooperation Good

The cooperation of everyone who has been contacted in regard to this project has been excellent. The Chief, people outside and many, many members of the Association have promised full effort.

This Association program can only function properly if the work load is spread over a large number of men. It has all the earmarks of the greatest single civic contribution ever undertaken by policemen in San Francisco.

It’s our project, let’s see it through.

MISSION PRESCRIPTION PHARMACY
18th & Guerrero 
GRAND LODGE DE DIMASALANG, INC.
499 Broadway
SOUTHER WAREHOUSE CO.
1006 North Point St. 
FRED’S SUPER SHELL SERVICE
Divisadero & Oak Sts., MA. 1-8151
STAR-ELI LIQUORS
501 Divisadero
COLDWELL, BANKER & CO.
Real Estate — Insurance
Property Management — Loans
77 Sutter St. 
CIVIC CENTER STATIONERY
468 McAllister MA. 1-8041

Compliments
of
COL. R.E. FRANKLIN
WALTER B. LOMAX
465 California
BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES
LOCAL 97
240 Golden Gate Ave. PR. 5-2664
KINKADE BRAKE SERVICE
341-10th Street HE. 1-1234
GEO. NORTON MACHINE CO.
366-10th Street UN. 1-4294

May, 1959

SILVER CREST RESTAURANT BAR & GRILL
140 Bayshore
BERONIO LUMBER CO.
Martin & Kansas VA. 4-3283
MANILA CAFE & GIFT SHOP
606 Jackson Street
READYMIX CONCRETE CO., LTD.
Carolina & 18th Street
MAX ROSENFELD
KELL’S CLEANERS
399 Cherry Street AT. 2-4282

P.D.S. Delivery Service
359 CHINA BASIN
YU. 6-0740

ANTONI TRUCK LINES
1493 ILLINOIS STREET
MI. 8-1991

SUTRO & COMPANY
Throughout
460 Montgomery St. EX. 2-0900

Matson Navigation Co.
215 Market

Mark Morris Tire Co.
999 Geary Street San Francisco 9
ORDway 3-3441

CARAVAN LOUNGE
GARDEN RESTAURANT
THE HOME OF
CHAMPAGNE DINNERS
CHINESE ITALIAN & AMERICAN DINNERS
ENJOY A CHAMPAGNE SUNDAY BRUNCH ITS "UNUSUAL"
EDDY & LARKIN
FREE PARKING PR. 8-130

Ocean Shore Iron Works
1660 Jerrold Ave.

NEXT MEETING
TUESDAY, MAY 19th
DOVRE HALL
8:00 P.M.

State Mortgage Corp.
Ed Allen
340 Market Street
YU. 2-7131

Meehan N’ Minetti’s Sports Club
Cocktails
1637 Market Street
San Francisco

American Independent Oil
111 Sutter Street
YU. 6-3771

Now... for that Regal Feeling
Regal Pale Brewing Co.
3520 - 20th STREET
APPENDIX AE

Supplemental Aesthetics Supporting Information
This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration.
**GUARANTEED PERFORMANCE**

Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting. ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting

---

### EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Luminaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S3-S6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration.*

---

### ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

**Soccer 2**

Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- Size: 330' x 195'
- Grid Spacing = 30.0' x 30.0'
- Values given at 3.0' above grade
- Luminaire Type: Green Generation
- Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
- Avg Lumens/Lamp: 134,000

**CONSTANT ILLUMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Target Points</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg/Max</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max/Min</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG (Adjacent Pts)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lamp Tilt Factor</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Luminaires</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg KW over 5,000 hours</td>
<td>43.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max KW</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

---

By: Eric Svenby

File #: 139305BC-R2
Date: 29-Jan-10

Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting. ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting

---

Scale in Feet: 1:60

NOTES: Light levels shown are with just the top row fixtures plus the two outside btm row fixtures on only.
### EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole Luminaires</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>GRADE ELEVATION</th>
<th>MOUNTING HEIGHT</th>
<th>LAMP TYPE</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>POLE</th>
<th>THIS GRIDS</th>
<th>OTHER GRIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S5-S8</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>1500W MZ</td>
<td>10/10*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration

---

### ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

**Soccer 3**
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- **Size:** 330' x 195'
- **Grid Spacing:** 30.0' x 30.0'
- **Values given at 3.0' above grade**
- **Luminaire Type:** Green Generation
- **Rated Lamp Life:** 5,000 hours
- **Avg Lumens/Lamp:** 134,000

#### CONSTANT ILLUMINATION

**HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
<th>No. of Target Points:</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg/Min:</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max/Min:</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG (Adjacent Pts):</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV:</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lamp Tilt Factor:</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Luminaires:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg KW over 5,000 hours:</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max KW:</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guaranteed Performance:** The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

**Field Measurements:** Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

**Electrical System Requirements:** Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

By: Eric Svenby
File #: 139305BC-R2
Date: 29-Jan-10
NOTES: Light levels shown are with just the top row fixtures plus the two outside btm row fixtures on only.
**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Luminaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S7-S8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S10, S9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals*  60 28 32

This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration

---

**GREEN GENERATION LIGHTING**

**GUARANTEED PERFORMANCE**

*NOT TO BE REPRODUCED IN WHOLE OR PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF MUSCO LIGHTING. ©1981, 2010 MUSCO LIGHTING*

---

**Soccer 4**

Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- **Size:** 330' x 195'
- **Grid Spacing:** 30.0' x 30.0'
- **Values given at 3.0' above grade**

**Luminaire Type:** Green Generation

**Rated Lamp Life:** 5,000 hours

**Avg Lumens/Lamp:** 134,000

---

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Soccer 4**

- **No. of Target Points:** 77
- **Average:** 34.9
- **Maximum:** 49
- **Minimum:** 21
- **Max/Min:** 2.31
- **UPL (Adjacent Pts):** 1.54

**CV:** 0.18

**Average Lamp Tilt Factor:** 1.000

**Number of Luminaires:** 28

**Avg KW over 5,000 hours:** 43.79

**Max KW:** 47.6

---

**CONSTANT ILLUMINATION**

**HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**

- ** Entire Grid **
  - **No. of Target Points:** 77
  - **Average:** 34.9
  - **Maximum:** 49
  - **Minimum:** 21
  - **Max/Min:** 2.31
  - **UPL (Adjacent Pts):** 1.54
  - **CV:** 0.18
  - **Average Lamp Tilt Factor:** 1.000
  - **Number of Luminaires:** 28
  - **Avg KW over 5,000 hours:** 43.79
  - **Max KW:** 47.6

---

**Guaranteed Performance:** The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

**Field Measurements:** Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

**Electrical System Requirements:** Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

---

By: Eric Svenby

File #: 139305BC-R2  Date: 29-Jan-10

Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting. ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting

---

Print Date (29/Jan/2010) & Time (15:30)
EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole Location</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Grade Elevation</th>
<th>Mounting Height</th>
<th>Lamp Type</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Other Grid</th>
<th>Other Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1-S2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>60’-60’</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>1500W MZ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3-S4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td></td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>1500W MZ</td>
<td>10/10*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration

ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Soccer 1
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- Size: 330’ x 195’
- Grid Spacing = 30.0’ x 30.0’
- Values given at 3.0’ above grade

- Luminaire Type: Green Generation
- Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
- Avg Lumens/Lamp: 134,000

CONSTANT ILLUMINATION HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
<th>No. of Target Points: 77</th>
<th>Average: 51.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum: 73</td>
<td>Minimum: 39</td>
<td>Avg/Min: 1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG (Adjacent Pts): 1.32</td>
<td>Max/Min: 1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV: 0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Lamp Tilt Factor: 1.000
Number of Luminaires: 40
Avg KW over 5,000 hours: 62.56
Max KW: 68.0

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

By: Eric Svenby
File #: 139305BC-R2
Date: 29-Jan-10

NOTES: Light levels shown are with all fixtures on.

GUARANTEED PERFORMANCE

Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting. ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting
**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole Luminaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QTY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration*

---

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Soccer 2**
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- Size: 330' x 195'
- Grid Spacing = 30.0' x 30.0'
- Values given at 3.0' above grade

- Luminaire Type: Green Generation
- Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
- Avg Lumens/Lamp: 134,000

---

**CONSTANT ILLUMINATION HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Target Points:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg/Min:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max/Min:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UG (Adjacent Pts):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CV:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Lamp Tilt Factor:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Luminaires:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg KW over 5,000 hours:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max KW:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Guaranteed Performance:** The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

**Field Measurements:** Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

**Electrical System Requirements:** Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

---

By: Eric Svenby
File #: 139305BC-R2  Date: 29-Jan-10
Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting. ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting

---

**SCALE IN FEET 1:60**

---

Print Date (29/Jan/2010) & Time (15:51)
**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>GRADE ELEVATION</th>
<th>MOUNTING HEIGHT</th>
<th>LAMP TYPE</th>
<th>QTY / POLE</th>
<th>THIS GRID</th>
<th>OTHER GRIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S5-S8</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>1500W MZ</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration*

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Soccer 3**
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- **Size**: 330' x 195'
- **Grid Spacing**: 30.0' x 30.0'
- **Values given at 3.0' above grade**
  - **Luminaire Type**: Green Generation
  - **Rated Lamp Life**: 5,000 hours
  - **Avg Lumens/Lamp**: 134,000

**CONSTANT ILLUMINATION**

**HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**

- **Entire Grid**
  - **No. of Target Points**: 77
  - **Average**: 50.5
  - **Maximum**: 73
  - **Minimum**: 39
  - **Avg/Min**: 1.30
  - **Max/Min**: 1.89
  - **UG (Adjacent Pts)**: 1.32
  - **CV**: 0.16
  - **Average Lamp Tilt Factor**: 1.000
  - **Number of Luminaires**: 40
  - **Avg KW over 5,000 hours**: 62.56
  - **Max KW**: 68.0

**Guaranteed Performance**: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

**Field Measurements**: Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

**Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements**: Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

By: Eric Svenby

File #: 139305BC-R2  Date: 29-Jan-10
Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting. ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting
EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole Luminaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Spill @ 150’**
Beach Chalet Sports Field  
San Francisco, CA

- **Grid Spacing = 30.0’**
- Values given at 3.0’ above grade
- **Luminaire Type:** Green Generation
- **Rated Lamp Life:** 5,000 hours
- **Avg Lumens/Lamp:** 134,000

**CONSTANT ILLUMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Grid</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Target Points:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Average Lamp Tilt Factor:** 1.000
- **Number of Luminaires:** 160
- **Avg KW over 5,000 hours:** 250.24
- **Max KW:** 272.0

Guaranteed Performance:
The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

**NOTES:** Light levels shown are with all fixtures on.
ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Spill @ 150'
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

- Grid Spacing = 30.0'
- Values given at 3.0' above grade
- Luminaire Type: Green Generation
- Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
- Avg Lumens/Lamp: 134,000

CONSTANT ILLUMINATION
MAX VERTICAL FOOTCANDLES

Entire Grid
No. of Target Points: 142
Average: 0.576
Maximum: 1.10
Minimum: 0.10
Average Lamp Tilt Factor: 1.000
Number of Luminaires: 160
Avg KW over 5,000 hours: 250.24
Max KW: 272.0

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +/-3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

NOTES: Light levels shown are with all fixtures on.
EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

INCLUDES:
- Soccer 1
- Soccer 2
- Soccer 3
- Soccer 4

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +/- 3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>MOUNTING</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>LAMP TYPE</th>
<th>QTY / POLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>1500W MZ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S1, S10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2, S9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S3-S8</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>1500W MZ</td>
<td>10/10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 160

* This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration

SINGLE LUMINAIRE AMPERAGE DRAW CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGLE PHASE VOLTAGE</th>
<th>BALLAST SPECIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120 220/120</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 208/120</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 220/120</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 240/120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 277/120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 347/120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 380/120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 415/120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 480/120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1500 watt MZ 15.0 8.6 7.7 7.5 6.5 5.1 4.7 - 3.7

GUARANTEED PERFORMANCE
Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be +/-10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LD4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +/-3% nominal voltage at line side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

By: Eric Svenby
File #: 139305BC-R2
Date: 29-Jan-10

Musco Lighting
Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting

Print Date (29/Jan/2010) & Time (11:20)
ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Blanket Grid @ 60"
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

Grid Spacing = 30' x 30'
Values given at 60' above grade

Luminaire Type: Green Generation
Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
Avg Lumen/Lamp: 134,000

CONSTANT ILLUMINATION
VERTICAL FOOTCANDLES: 70° TILT

Entire Grid
No. of Target Points: 1855
Average: 576.1
Maximum: 2
Minimum: 0
Avg Min: 527.10
Max: 1853.43
UG (Adjacent Pts): 123.02
C Mat: B-27
Average Lamp Tilt Factor: 1.000
Average Lumens: 112
Avg KW over 5,000: 175.17
Max KW: 190.4

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be ±10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at the side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

By: Eric Svenby
File #: 139305BC-R2b
Date: 28-Apr-10

Musco Lighting, Inc. 1981, 2010 Musco Lighting

Notes: Light levels shown are with the 30°F zone on only.
Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be ±10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at the site of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

NOTES: Light levels shown are with the 30°C zone on only.
Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be ±10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at the side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (3m) of design locations.

By: Eric Swenby
File #: 139305BC-R2b
Date: 28-Apr-10

Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting ©1984, 2010 Musco Lighting
ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Blanket Grid @ 90°
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

Grid Spacing = 30.0' x 30.0'
Values given at 93.0' above grade

Luminaire Type: Green Generation
RATED LAMP Life: 5,000 hours
Avg Lumens/Lamp: 134,000

CONSTANT ILLUMINATION
VERTICAL FOOTCANDLES: 720° TIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
<th>No. of Target Points</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Avg/Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
<th>UG (Adj. Pts)</th>
<th>Avg Lamp Tilt Factor</th>
<th>Num Lamps</th>
<th>Avg KW over 5,000</th>
<th>Max KW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>175.17</td>
<td>190.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be ±10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at the site of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

NOTES: Light levels shown are with the 90°F zone on only.

By: Eric Svenby
File #: 139305BC-R2b
Date: 28-Apr-10

Print Date (28/Apr/2010) & Time (16:33)
NOTES: Light levels shown are with the S5FC zones on.

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be ±10% in accordance with IESNA RP-4-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at the site of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

By Eric Swenby
File #: 139305BC-R2b
Date: 28-Apr-10
Not to be reproduced in whole or part without the written consent of Musco Lighting ©1981, 2010 Musco Lighting
ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Blanket Grid @ 70°
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

Grid Spacing = 30.0’ x 30.0’
Values given at 73.0’ above grade

Luminaire Type: Green Generation
Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
Avg Lumens/Lamp: 134,000

CONSTANT ILLUMINATION
VERTICAL FOOTCANDLES: 270’ TH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
<th>No. of Target Points: 155</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg/Min:</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Lum:</td>
<td>179.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG (Adjacent Pts.):</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lamp TH: Factor:</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Lumens:</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg KW over 5,000:</td>
<td>250.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max KW:</td>
<td>272.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be ±10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at the site of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Blanket Grid @ +80°
Beach Chalet Sports Field
San Francisco, CA

Grid Spacing = 30.0' x 30.0'
Values given at 83.0' above grade

Luminaire Type: Green Generation
Rated Lamp Life: 5,000 hours
Avg Lumen/Lamp: 134,000

CONSTANT ILLUMINATION
VERTICAL FOOTCANDLES: 270’ TH

Entire Grid
No. of Target Points: 1800
Average: 0.00
Maximum: 0
Minimum: 0
Avg/Mn: 0.40

UG (Adjacent Pts): 1.09
cV: 1.14
Average Lamp TLR Factor: 1.000
Num Cases: 160
Avg KW over 5,000: 250.24
Max KW: 272.0

Guaranteed Performance: The CONSTANT ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed for the rated life of the lamp.

Field Measurements: Averages shall be n+10% in accordance with IESNA RP-6-01 and CIBSE LG4. Individual measurements may vary from computer predictions.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume +3% nominal voltage at the side of the ballast and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

NOTES: Light levels shown are with the SSFC annex(s) on.

By: Eric Sweby
File #: 139305BC-R2b
Date: 28-Apr-10