

Chapter 7:

Cultural Resources Management

Cultural resource management was thrust upon the National Park Service at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The Nixon-era concept of “parks for the people, where the people are,” the genesis of urban recreation in the park system, did not naturally include conventional cultural resources, nor were historic and cultural features considered a primary asset by those who battled for Golden Gate National Recreation Area’s establishment. Hailing from the Sierra Club tradition, advocates such as Edgar Wayburn focused on the open spaces and natural features of the region; Amy Meyer and other proponents had been energized by the environmental movement as they harnessed the power of San Francisco’s neighborhood groups. They sought to protect open space and enhance local and regional quality of life, a common theme in the environmentalism of their day.³²⁹

In cultural resource management more than natural resource management, the Park Service undertook an enormous responsibility that the public only peripherally understood as part of the mission of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. In this initial formulation, the recreation area’s forts and other historic features were afterthoughts, a series of structures that had intrinsic value but were included because of their location, secondary to the real political purpose, open space and recreation, of the new park. Yet when the boundaries were finally drawn and the park signed into law, the Park Service inherited a complex historic fabric at the moment when a 1974 amendment to the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 formalized the management of such resources and demanded procedures and practices for their administration.

Golden Gate National Recreation Area bridged the transformation of national recreation areas from rural and remote to urban and multifaceted. The array and diversity of historic features in the park were the first of this magnitude in a national recreation area. Prior national recreation areas such as Lake Mead and Glen Canyon were created to accompany man-made lakes. The little aboveground historic fabric they possessed was usually recent and the creation of the lake set most earlier cultural resource fabric in a new context. Coulee Dam National Recreation Area, established in 1946 and later renamed Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area, followed this pattern, and later additions to the park system, such as the 1968 establishment of Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas, included largely recreational attributes. Even Gateway National Recreation Area, Golden Gate National Recreation Area’s peer in greater New York City, included fewer old military forts and gun batteries within its boundaries. The new Bay Area park contained far more than its counterparts and the significance of its cultural resources meant a great deal more in the history of San Francisco and the surrounding communities.

Golden Gate National Recreation Area was home to a remarkable constellation of historic resources, among the most diverse in the entire national park system. Historic and cultural resources included military buildings from the Spanish/Mexican and American eras, remnants of the history of San Francisco and the Bay Area, archaeological features that predated European contact, and a range of other features. Alcatraz alone presented a major cultural resources management question; its crumbling exterior, multifaceted history, and the Indian Occupation of

³²⁹ Hal Rothman, *Saving the Planet: The American Response to the Environment in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Ivan R. Dee Inc, 2000).

the late 1960s all demanded significant management of cultural resources. The arrangement that assured that the Presidio would eventually become part of the park added more than 470 national register structures and as many as 700 other National Register-eligible structures to Golden Gate National Recreation Area, a larger number than in any other national park area. Even as public perceptions of the park focused on natural attributes, the Park Service acquired vast cultural resource management obligations.

By 1972, cultural resource management was subjected to its own set of dictates, most of which derived directly or indirectly from the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, later amended in 1974 and 1980. The demands of this set of laws and regulations—different from NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, and other legal mechanisms that governed natural resources management—created a parallel structure that mandated two essentially separate administrative structures for the different kinds of resources. Statutory obligations such as compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the amended National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and later, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1977, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act of 1991, and a host of other laws and rulings demanded constant attention from park managers. They also consumed an enormous proportion of park resources. At the same time, cultural resource management also required the same attention to park use by its many constituents as did natural resource management. Especially after the addition of the Presidio in 1994, the Park Service found itself with responsibilities for one of the largest collections of historic structures in the park system at Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

At Golden Gate National Recreation Area's inception, a number of the components were already managed for their cultural resource value while other areas easily lent themselves to this management. These included Fort Point, under the Golden Gate Bridge; Fort Mason, where the Park Service established its headquarters; Sutro Heights and Sutro Baths; Cliff House; and a collection of gun batteries along the coast both in San Francisco and Marin County. Alcatraz Island enjoyed the greatest cachet with the public. Its history as a military fort and later a military prison had been subsumed by the era in which it served as a prison to the country's most infamous convicts, home to Al "Scarface" Capone, "Machine Gun" Kelly, Robert Stroud, colloquially known as the "Birdman of Alcatraz" even though he did not keep birds while at the Bay Area prison, and other renowned criminals. The number of historic prison structures on Alcatraz was enormous and their use, maintenance, and management demanded agency attention.

Fort Point, established as a national historic site in 1970, provided the most obvious cultural resource management setting. It preceded Golden Gate National Recreation Area and retained a separate superintendency until 1977. With the support of the Fort Point Museum Association, the Park Service began an extensive program to renovate the fort after inclusion in the park system. The chief ranger of the new park, Charles Hawkins, was a retired master sergeant who was a veteran of World War II's Battle of the Bulge. He had worked both for the Presidio Public Affairs Office and the Fort Point Museum Association, and played an instrumental role in the new site's early operations. *Charlie*, or *The Hawk*, as he was known, exemplified the characteristics of the "old Army," and effectively applied those methods to the NPS. He had a superb knowledge of the resource, and a uniquely effective way with bureaucracy. He was also a mentor to a generation of Park Service professionals who cut their teeth at old Fort Point.

By 1971, the Fort Point Museum Association had become a cooperating agency of the National Park Service, one of the many support organizations that assisted parks by providing volunteer labor, running bookstores and other fund-raising activities. Its members served as

guides at Fort Point and undertook small physical improvements. Architects and historians planned extensive renovation under Park Service auspices, and within three years, the decaying property became far more attractive. Iron balustrades and columns were sandblasted and repainted, ironwork rails for the casemate and gorge faces and along the barbette tier were reproduced, the lighthouse that was first constructed in 1864 was rebuilt, and examples of the historic cannon that had been in the fort were located and brought to the Bay Area. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, rehabilitation continued. The interior rooms on the second and third floors were refurbished, the brick exterior of the fort repointed, and a range of other renovations took place. Even after its integration into Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Point was treated as if it were a separate cultural resource unit.³³⁰ Of all the historic areas in the park, Fort Point most easily lent itself to conventional cultural resource management, protecting physical structures to underpin interpretation and other visitor activities.

In the ways that Fort Point typified conventional historic cultural resource management, Fort Mason represented a different dimension of cultural resource management. Fort Mason had powerful historic significance. It included a 1797 gun battery and structures from the Gold Rush and Civil War eras. Along with the Presidio, Fort Mason served as a training center and campground for Americans sailing west in their attempts at empire in the Pacific Ocean during the Spanish-American War in 1898, and thereafter. Fort Mason served as a principal embarkation station for the Pacific-bound troops of World War II, but by the 1970s, the military determined it no longer needed parts of the fort. In 1971, after Rep. William Mailliard had begun the initial efforts to create a national park area in the Bay Area, the Army released twenty-two of the sixty-nine acres of the fort to the General Services Administration (GSA) for disposition. Immediately, a range of claimants rushed forward. Rep. Manuel Lujan of New Mexico wanted to trade the lands to private developers for forested land in his home state. The GSA sought to build a new federal building and planned to sell the excess land for \$25 million to developers to finance the project. Nearby Galileo High School, which used some of the fort's buildings for overflow classes, sought to relocate its tiny campus to the more spacious waterfront. A proposal to turn the fort into a prison for youthful offenders also circulated. Mailliard and Rep. Phil Burton protested loudly, Mailliard pressuring the GSA for a commitment to keep the land until a Golden Gate National Recreation Area bill became law and Burton—in an irony that no one could have perceived in 1971—insisting that a prison facility on the fort was akin to building one next door to the Watergate Hotel, where then-U.S. Attorney General John Mitchell resided. On the local front, Amy Meyer and PFGGNRA battled against using the fort for anything but a park, and when Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established, the Park Service set up its administrative headquarters at Fort Mason.³³¹

³³⁰ John A. Martini, *Fort Point: Sentry at the Golden Gate* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Park Association, 1991), 41; John Hart, *San Francisco's Wilderness Next Door* (San Rafael, CA: Presidio Press, 1979), 95-96; "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Fort Point Museum Association," January 28, 1971; G.M. Dean to Executive Committee, n.d. ca. January 1971, both FPAR, Box 3, A44, Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting, Fort Point Museum Association.

³³¹ "Fort Mason Prison Plan Opposed," *SFC*, March 2, 1971; "Fort Mason Land Grab Proposed in Private Deal," *SFC*, October 22, 1971; "Strong Denial on Ft. Mason 'Grab,'" *SFC*, October 23, 1971; Donald Canter, "Deal for Ft. Mason 'Means Highrisers,'" *SFC*, October 19, 1971; "Galileo View on Fort Mason," *SFE*, April 8, 1972; Jim Wood, "Board to Get Galileo Campus Plan," *SFE*, April 19, 1972; Acting Director, Western Region to Director, National Park Service, June 12, 1972, Golden Gate National Recreation Area Briefing Book.

The perception of national recreation areas and the particular situation in the Bay Area played a large role in determining the future of Fort Mason. As they opened the Park Service office in 1973–1974, Whalen and his staff began to sift through the range of possible uses. The Bay Area needed more public space and buildings devoted to community development and public programs. The Park Service's strategy of creating an identity for itself and developing a support base easily encouraged the development of community projects within the park's physical and social boundaries. Nothing about the national recreation area category forbid such endeavors and, with the new pressure on the Park Service to be relevant to urban needs, community projects in historic space made considerable sense. These were precisely the programs at which William Whalen excelled, contributing to his choice as first as superintendent of Golden Gate National Recreation Area and his meteoric rise to director of the National Park Service.

Fort Mason became the home of such programs, a place for the development of public programs within park boundaries. Although San Francisco Supervisor John L. Molinari asked the Park Service to include an ice-skating rink and an indoor tennis facility in the fort, Whalen held firm to his plans. He wanted the fort to become a cultural center. Late in 1974, the park requested public proposals for use of the space and at a public meeting in what was then called the Hall of Flowers, more than 100 groups presented ideas. "Some of them were great and some of them were lunatic," Amy Meyer remembered, "and they were all things in between." By January 1975, twenty-nine completed proposals, far more than the Park Service had space to accommodate, had been submitted. Whalen turned to the Citizens' Advisory Commission, which created a subcommittee that initiated regulations for use of the fort. Activities needed to fulfill certain objectives to be included. Whalen offered parameters for use; programs could not be "predominantly commercial or lack ... significant visitor appeal." The committee recommended that three categories of activity – performing arts, fine arts and crafts, and education and research – comprise the initial lessees. The wide variety of proposals created numerous options, and at Wayburn's insistence, the commission reiterated that even in the cultural center at Fort Mason, uses had to be in concert with the national park system's values.³³²

The kind of daily, hands-on management that such a cultural center demanded was the forte neither of the Citizens' Advisory Commission nor Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The advisory commission lacked the staff, while planning and administration occupied the vast majority of the time of park personnel, who were already in the process of developing planning to manage the entire park. The Park Service actively sought one organization to oversee the entire cultural center; dividing responsibility among a number of interests assured countless headaches and a complicated and tendentious administration. With the recommendation of the advisory commission, the Park Service entered into an eight-year cooperative agreement with nonprofit Fort Mason Foundation in May 1976. The foundation established the Fort Mason Center to create and administer a broad, many-faceted center for the arts, humanities, recreation, education, and ecology. A community-based entity, the foundation drew support from many constituencies and

³³² Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission Minutes, October 5, 1974, 10, PFGGNRA I, Box 1, GGNRA Citizens Advisory Commission Minutes, 1974; Phyllis and Harris Legg to John L. Foran, October 9, 1974, PFGGNRA I, Box 1, GGNRA Land Acquisition Files; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission Minutes, January 25, 1975, PFGGNRA I, Box 1, GGNRA Citizens Advisory Commission Minutes, 1975; William Whalen to Amy Meyer, February 12, 1975; Fort Mason Interim Use Subcommittee Report, March 11, 1975, both PFGGNRA I, Box 1, Citizens Advisory Commission, Committee on Fort Mason; Amy Meyer interview, February 25, 2002.

because of its nonprofit status, could seek outside funding. The foundation and the new center opened their doors in May 1976.³³³

The dilapidated condition of much of Fort Mason made the first years of the cultural center difficult. The pier area, called Lower Fort Mason, had become a cluster of vacant warehouses, left to the shoreline's harsh elements. "The place was a mess. Nothing worked," Mark Kasky, who became executive director of the center, later observed. Buildings had been abandoned, some for as many as fifteen years, plumbing fixtures and electrical wiring had been removed, and garbage was everywhere. For historic structures, the questions of renovation loomed large, and the Fort Mason Center, with Park Service help, followed the guidelines of adaptive reuse. Once the cleanup was complete, six tenants moved in and about 125,000 people came to the center during its first year. Grants and money from San Francisco's hotel tax helped support the foundation and its activities, the Department of the Interior added \$1 million for renovation, and within a few years, the programs and offerings of the center were widely acclaimed. By 1979, thirty-six groups were in residence and as many as 120 used the facility. The center struggled with its budget at times, but by 1981, the project was heralded as a success. Three hundred thousand square feet of space in five buildings had been renovated at a cost of \$1.7 million, with the Fort Mason Foundation raising the bulk of the money. In the mid-1980s, the Park Service agreed to a twenty-year cooperative agreement with the Fort Mason Foundation, and an important local institution took another step toward maturity. As the 1980s ended, the foundation was midway through a \$7 million fund-raising campaign, securing more than \$3 million in pledges before the end of 1986. Under revised general leasing authorities, the Park Service and the Foundation eventually began to negotiate a new lease arrangement, and a new cooperative agreement as well, in order to provide commercial banks with the necessary collateral to secure the large loans needed to implement the Foundation's ambitious goals. Fort Mason Center had become a model for urban planning across the globe, described by one Bay Area newspaper as an "eclectic cultural park" that served a local audience in myriad ways.³³⁴

The Fort Mason Center was the prelude to numerous agreements with other park partners, nonprofit organizations with specific goals that coincided in some fashion with those of the Park Service. By the 1990s, such arrangements were commonplace. They included entities as diverse as the Bay Area Discovery Museum, the Point Bonita YMCA, the Headlands Center for the Arts, and the Deep Ecology Center in the Marin Headlands. Each served a community function, included education in some form in its mission, and could work closely with the park in an effort to attain specific objectives. Collectively, the agreements with such organizations reflected the park's commitment to the local community as well as its desire to communicate with the diverse publics of the Bay Area.

³³³ Memorandum to Fort Mason Sub-Committee, Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, Long-term Cooperative Agreement with Fort Mason Foundation, March 16, 1981, PFGGNRA I, Box 1, Citizens Advisory Commission, Committee on Fort Mason; Kay Keppler, "Fort Mason at 15," *North Beach Now*, March 1991.

³³⁴ Memorandum to Fort Mason Sub-Committee, Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, Long-Term Cooperative Agreement with Fort Mason Foundation, March 16, 1981, PFGGNRA I, Box 1, Citizens Advisory Commission, Committee on Fort Mason; Keppler, "Fort Mason at 15;" "Fort Mason Committee, May 12, 1979," PFGGNRA I, Box 1, Citizens Advisory Commission, Committee on Fort Mason; Sam Kaplan, "Fort Mason Pier: Creative Use of Military Surplus," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, July 12, 1981; Herbert A. Michelson, "Fort Mason an Eclectic 'Cultural' Park," *Santa Rosa Press Democrat*, May 21, 1987.

Lower Fort Mason and its cultural center never presented a conventional cultural resource management situation. Instead, the center brought the many forces in the Bay Area and the breadth of needs in the region together in abandoned and dilapidated historic space and created a renovation that met the standards of the park and the advisory commission. Adaptive use of historic structures created a different definition of cultural resources, one that included more than preservation and spoke to community and regional needs. It also prevented historic space from deteriorating, even though it altered that space. On occasion, some expressed concern that the activities of the center were too local—that it served a local audience at the expense of a national one that enjoyed as powerful a theoretical claim to the space—but the initiation of events that enticed out-of-town visitors, also became standard fare. The center became one of the places that visitors sought precisely because it reflected local culture. By the mid-1980s, the center attracted almost two million people a year, proving that the versatility of national recreation areas offered a tremendous asset for urban areas and that public-private partnerships such as the one between the Park Service and the Fort Mason Foundation could contribute greatly to the cultural environment of cities.³³⁵

Alcatraz Island presented another dimension of cultural resource management. In many ways the catalyst for establishment of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Alcatraz had the greatest command on the American public of any cultural feature in the park. The drawback was that its popular perception as “The Rock” reflected aspects of culture with which the Park Service felt uncomfortable; combined with the decaying condition of much of the island’s physical plant and the aftermath of the Indian Occupation, Alcatraz Island appeared a difficult and expensive place for the Park Service to manage. Not only was it expensive to renovate and to operate, it also seemed unlikely that the public would appreciate agency efforts on the island. Whalen himself felt that there was “something incongruous” about the island as a unit of the park system. As a result, in its earliest planning efforts, the agency offered the island not as a historic resource, but instead as a unique vantage point on the Bay Area. Perhaps the only intrinsic advantage the Park Service perceived was its ability to control the ingress and egress of visitors, preventing the island from being inundated by demand.³³⁶

In April 1973, the Park Service decided to open the island to the public for the first time, but much work had to be undertaken before visitors could come to the island. Two crucial circumstances needed to be resolved. The island had to be made safe for visitors and a transportation system to convey them across the bay had to be developed. Concessioners vied for the right to transport visitors; visitors offered a captive and likely very lucrative market. The General Services Administration (GSA) and the Park Service undertook cleanup, maintenance, and improvement on the island. Wooden fences and other barriers were set up to clearly mark the areas that visitors were permitted, railings in the cell blocks were replaced or repaired, and steel plates were placed over holes in the roadways and in the floors of buildings. Broken windows within reach of visitors were removed and in some cases replaced, crews collected debris and hauled it off the island, and a range of other small steps helped make the island cleaner and safer.

³³⁵ Bruce Bellingham, “GGNRA to Hold Hearings on Future of Blues Festival,” *Marina Times*, October 1991; Michelson, “Fort Mason an Eclectic ‘Cultural’ Park;” “Golden Gate NRA, FY 1986 Annual Report Highlights,” Natural Resource Management Records, Box 3, Raptor Program 1987.

³³⁶ “Draft, Environmental Statement, Proposed Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California, February 18, 1972, CCF, Box 1, L-7619, Doyle Drive, 1973; William J. Whalen, interview by Sara Conklin, March 27, 1993, GGNRA Oral History Interview.

The island presented numerous hazards even after cleanup. At least one guard tower and catwalk were unsafe, the warden's residence was hazardous, and the entire north end of the island was closed to visitors because of the dangers it presented.³³⁷ The Park Service faced a dilemma. Its initial efforts were designed to make the property safe, not to articulate its cultural resource significance. One of the crucial themes of NPS management of Alcatraz Island, the struggle between presenting a cultural resource to a public that thought it understood the island's value and maintaining its historic fabric, began almost from the instant the Park Service considered allowing visitors on the island.

The two largest cultural resource management issues on Alcatraz during the Park Service's first decade remained maintenance and safety and visitor access. Agency efforts focused on maintaining the area that was most attractive to visitors—the cellhouse. The Park Service also built a museum and bookstore in Building 64. Elsewhere on the island, the harsh salt air devoured metal and rust was everywhere. A steel catwalk that linked the model industries area to the recreation yard collapsed, and the Park Service removed another catwalk outside the dining area as it weakened and posed a threat to passing visitors. The gardens that soldiers and inmates once tended had been neglected in the absence of inhabitants and had spread over the island. The agency grappled with how to best present the resource and as a result, what resources to preserve and in what manner.³³⁸

Alcatraz Island retained powerful symbolic standing and a number of groups were not prepared to readily consign the island to conventional cultural resources management. At the Citizens' Advisory Commission meeting on November 19, 1977, the public was invited to comment on the three proposed options and to offer additional ideas. Among the new proposals were a number of time-worn ideas for Alcatraz. The World Island Committee sought to have the island become a symbol of the aspirations of humans to live in peace. Spokeswoman Dr. Lucille Green beseeched the commission to convert it to a place of "dignity and beauty." The United Nations Association sought a museum to the United Nations on the island to commemorate its role in seeking world peace; other proposals include a 240-foot high monument to peace, a proposal to turn the island back to the state of California, and one to turn the island into a source of alternative energy. There were countless others. The city of San Francisco also offered its perspective. The Director of City Planning, Rai Okamoto, announced that the city supervisors favored strengthening and rehabilitation of historic structures, continued public access, and the removal of rubble.³³⁹

³³⁷ Herman Allcock, David Ames, Lynn Herring, Steve Leding, Ed Pilley, and Ron Treabess, "Alcatraz Island, Interim Management Plan, Draft Interpretive Prospectus, February 1973," AD 6, File 116.

³³⁸ James P. Delgado, *Alcatraz: Island of Change* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Parks Association, 1991), 40-41; John A. Martini, *Fortress Alcatraz: Guardian of the Golden Gate* (Kailua, HI: Pacific Monographs, 1990), 140-41.

³³⁹ Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission Minutes, November 19, 1977; A Proposal to Develop an Indian Cultural Center on Alcatraz Island, California, 1974; Lucille Green, Louis R. Gomberg, and David Wolcott, "Proposal for a World Park on Alcatraz," November 19, 1977; Forest Shaffer to Golden Gate National Recreation Area Citizens Advisory Commission, November 19, 1977, PFGGNRA I, Box 2, GGNRA - Sites - Alcatraz, Proposals and Related Correspondence; Rai Okamoto to City Planning Commission, November 17, 1977, PFGGNRA I, Box 10, San Francisco Govt - Dept. of City Planning; Joyce Johnson, "The Grim Corridors of Alcatraz as a Tourist Attraction," PCC, 1975, Box 1.

Even with this complicated input and with the ongoing clamor to visit the island, the Park Service hewed to a conservative line at Alcatraz. The agency focused on the island's natural and parklike features, accentuating its spectacular view of the Bay Area and its natural setting. Historic preservation and its attendant objectives were obvious goals, and the agency focused on creating an attractive environment on the island. Aware that "the majority of future visitors... will continue to be attracted by the intrigue of the prison," the agency worked to shift attention to the island's natural features.³⁴⁰ This compromise meant that the Park Service determined to undertake two possibly mutually exclusive objectives on Alcatraz, to give the public the prison history it wanted and to point to other interesting dimensions that visitors may not have considered. Agency culture and its standards again tangled with the public's perception of significance.

An even more difficult cultural resources dilemma for the Park Service was Cliff House, above the remains of Sutro Baths. Graced by a fabulous five-story Gothic structure that was completed in 1896, the restaurants, dining rooms, art gallery, and a veranda that overlooked the water made Cliff House the center of San Francisco's recreational waterfront in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. After that property burned in a fire in 1907, a new building was constructed in 1909, far less lavish and impressive. As public expectations of leisure and patterns of movement and transportation changed, the area became an anachronism, declining and crumbling. By the 1970s, with the closure and demolition of the amusement park Playland-at-the-Beach, the area reeked of urban blight. None of the fine nineteenth-century structures remained; Sutro Baths, the last building standing, burnt to the ground in 1966. A few smaller structures, one often called a "tacky Cliff House" and described by author John Hart as "less than an echo, squat and blocky," replaced the grandiose structures of the early century. Amy Meyer herself did not care for the newer Cliff House, and as the public observed the area, sentiment for renovation or reconstruction emerged.³⁴¹

The Cliff House put the Park Service in an uncomfortable position. The new Cliff House had potential to be historic; its initial construction dated to 1908, the year after the fire destroyed Adolph Sutro's stunningly idiosyncratic structure. Built initially through the patronage of Sutro's daughter, the building was designed by the Reid Brothers, famous San Francisco architects, and repeatedly renovated as late as the 1970s. The building reflected the history of the area and its transformation—and some said decline—in clear detail; it just did not contain the physical structures that revealed the high points of that history. As a result, the battles over Cliff House forced the Park Service to weigh a restrictive reading of the National Historic Preservation Act against a conception of a more glorious, more spectacular, and likely more attractive history. Much of the architectural community and the CAC opposed the Park Service's perspective, citing the additional language in the NHPA that illustrated the lack of historic integrity and pointed out that there were better examples of the Reid brothers' work.³⁴² It took the Park Service almost twenty years to fashion a program that reflected the agency's belief that the structure was eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Even after the Park Service's extensive

³⁴⁰ General Management Plan/Environmental Analysis, Golden Gate National Recreation Area/Point Reyes National Seashore (September 1980): 37.

³⁴¹ Hart, *San Francisco's Wilderness Next Door*, 89-99, 104-05; Ariel Rubissow, *Cliff House & Lands End: San Francisco's Seaside Resort* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Park Association, 1993), 34-35; Alan Cline, "A Hard Look: Recreation Area's Unsightly Sights," *SFE*, January 27, 1978.

³⁴² Bartke to Haller, March 5, 2002.

documentation, the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) did not agree with the agency's assessment.

At the old San Francisco Maritime State Historical Park on the Hyde Street Pier, which was added to Golden Gate National Recreation Area in 1977 and became the independent San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park in 1988, the Park Service inherited another conventional cultural resource management situation. The maritime park suffered from a lack of financing. It had bounced from one underfunded branch of state government to another for more than a decade, all the while its floating stock of eight historic ships decaying. At its establishment, the new park acquired all museum collections held by Golden Gate National Recreation Area that were maritime in nature. Only artifacts that directly pertained to park lands, such as lighthouses, and shipwrecks, were retained. This intellectual/property interpark agreement transferred the Golden Gate National Recreation Area collections and all the museum staff to San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park.

Rep. Phil Burton craftily included it within the boundaries of the initial park without acknowledging that the area contained ships. William Thomas, a San Francisco reporter and Burton staff member, played an instrumental role in securing the ships for the park. In the nearby Aquatic Park Bathhouse, the San Francisco Maritime Museum, a separate nonprofit entity, also struggled. After it was included in Golden Gate National Recreation Area in 1978, Phil Burton continued to assist the museum. Eventually the building was named for his wife, Sala, who followed him to Congress. The museum's total collection became more than 14,000 artifacts and 150,000 historic photos, and the National Maritime Museum, as the property was called, became an important cultural resource addition to the park.³⁴³

Maintenance and funding for upkeep remained the primary issues at the museum. The ships received funding as a result of the machinations of Phil Burton. NPS Regional Director Howard Chapman persuaded Burton to include in the legislation a clause that let the revenues that accrued from rent at Haslett Warehouse and Cliff House fund the ships and the Fort Mason Foundation. Burton also arranged for an admission fee for the *Balclutha*, the primary attraction among the historic ships. After Burton's death in 1983, his wife, Sala, who succeeded him in the House of Representatives, extended the admission charge to the park's entire fleet of historic ships.³⁴⁴ Yet the maintenance costs of the ships were exorbitant and even with the addition of new revenues, money for upkeep remained scarce. As occurred throughout the park system, maintenance was deferred on the ships, creating a situation that meant that sometime in the future, the consequences of an established pattern of inadequate care would have to be faced.

The ships were an afterthought at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, illustrating the precarious position of cultural resources in the park. Again, the national recreation area designation loomed large. Even though the Park Service managed all of its units by the same set of standards, the idea of significant cultural resource management within a national recreation area remained hard for the public and sometimes for the agency to fathom. Even more, the public

³⁴³ John Jacobs, *A Rage for Justice: The Passion and Politics of Philip Burton* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 216; Judith Robinson, "You're in Your Mother's Arms": *The Life and Legacy of Congressman Phil Burton* (San Francisco: Mary Judith Robinson, 1994), 437, 453; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission Minutes, July 19, 1978, PFGGNRA I, Box 1, Citizens Advisory Commission Minutes; Bill Thomas, interview by Sara Conklin, March 31, 1993, GGNRA Oral History Interview; Harre W. Demorro, "Ships Rotting, Leaders Feud at Maritime Museum," SFC, February 24, 1991.

³⁴⁴ Thomas interview, March 31, 1993; 1979 Annual Report of the General Superintendent, March 1980, 22-23, SOA II.

perception of Golden Gate National Recreation Area as a series of individual units presented an enormous barrier to an appreciation of integrated cultural resources management. The Maritime Museum was the most extreme example of the perception of the park as individual units, a difficult marriage of objectives and personnel that reflected the complexity characteristic of the park. When visitors toured the ships or climbed the parapet at Fort Point, they perceived themselves as being in independent park units, decidedly not the same park as when they hiked in the Olema Valley or watched the sunset from the Marin Headlands. Cultural resource management underscored the diversity of the park's themes and the difficulty of communicating them as a whole to the public.

Among the many tasks of the GMP was an effort to reconcile the various dimensions of park management into a coherent overall strategy. Cultural resource management played an integral role in the planning process and was clearly represented in the final product. At the same time, a 1980 amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 added new expectations regarding cultural properties. In Section 110 of the amended document, every federal agency was assigned responsibility for the historic properties under its jurisdiction, an obligation that been implied in the original legislation but not made explicit until 1980. The twin obligations of Section 106 and Section 110 demanded agency attention. The result added complex new responsibilities at Golden Gate National Recreation Area and focused considerably greater attention on cultural resources.³⁴⁵

The GMP played a catalytic role in organizing the context for systematic cultural resource management and laying the basis for a cultural resource management plan. It introduced the Historic Resource Land Management Zones concept, creating a Preservation Zone, an Enhancement Zone, and an Adaptive Use Zone. Resources in the Preservation Zone were to be managed for their historic qualities; those in the Enhancement Zone were historic, but had always been devoted to recreational purposes, and those resources in the Adaptive Use Zone were historic in character but already adapted or likely to be adapted for park purposes.³⁴⁶ While an imperfect set of designations, the zone concept tried to put a framework around the unit-by-unit responses of the park before 1980. As the GMP did in nearly every facet of park management, it both formalized the existing patterns of agency response and pointed toward a new, more comprehensively planned future. As in other park areas, the GMP seemed to be pulled between the reality of responding to constituencies and the desire of the Park Service to take a strong and leading position in cultural resource management, thought, and practice.

In the Park Service, adaptive use of historic properties remained controversial. The Park Service had always uncomfortably mixed protection and use, beginning with the Antiquities Act of 1906 and continuing with federal statutes governing historic preservation in the 1930s. Especially after the advent of MISSION 66, the post-war era muted preservationist tendencies, but historic preservation again gained agency attention after 1960. The cultural climate of the 1960s and the emphasis on preserving vignettes of the natural past in the 1963 Leopold Report added momentum to an existing and already powerful strain of thought in the agency.³⁴⁷ Even in an era

³⁴⁵ *General Management Plan/Environmental Analysis, Golden Gate National Recreation Area/Point Reyes National Seashore, September 1980*, 85-94; "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act," 16 U.S.C. 470, published in the *Federal Register*, April 24, 1998, 1.

³⁴⁶ *General Management Plan/Environmental Analysis*, 20-21.

³⁴⁷ Charles B. Hosmer Jr., *Preservation Come of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949*

when the Park Service actively accommodated the public's desires, programs such as adaptive use inspired resentment in some quarters. Cultural resource managers were initially reticent about such uses, but with the incredible number of structures in Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and especially as a result of the abandoned ones at lower Fort Mason, rehabilitation seemed the only viable solution. Some within the agency grimaced, but in a national recreation area in an urban area, adaptive use was destined to become a cornerstone of cultural resource management.

At about the same time, the Park Service became concerned with external threats to the national park system. As a result of the legislative matrix that surrounded the National Environmental Policy Act and increased pressure for energy development in response to the OPEC oil crisis of the mid-1970s, park managers found that the once remote character of major natural national parks had become compromised and that activities outside park boundaries possessed colossal implications for the lands within. Air pollution that marred vistas at the Grand Canyon became symbolic of the problem, but the threats were even more widespread and diverse. Late in the 1970s, at the behest of two former NPS officials who were working for the U.S. House of Representatives Interior Committee National Parks subcommittee, the agency undertook a survey of threats to the parks. Each unit responded to a questionnaire that sought to discern not only what the threats to the parks were but how the Park Service expected to address them.³⁴⁸

At Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the response to this query revealed a great deal of information about the state of cultural resource management. The urban industrial character of the Bay Area combined with its ocean-side setting to create significant threats, especially to the park's cultural resources. Smog, smoke, and dust as well as salt air affected outside displays such as Hyde Street Pier, the historic ships, gun batteries, and even the coastal fortifications. Alcatraz Island appeared particularly vulnerable, as did the west face of Fort Point, where brick facades routinely deteriorated from the ongoing pounding of wind and surf. Air and water pollution and soil erosion at historic structures at both Fort Funston and Fort Baker presented obstacles to maintaining park resources. The Army presence created another uncertainty for the Park Service; while the military "displayed careful preservation management" for the Presidio's occupied structures within the context of its desire to modernize, the report observed that its habit of abandoning structures no longer useful posed cultural resource management problems. Once military buildings were no longer in use, all maintenance ceased—generally including heat. Worse, the park feared that the Army would point to the dilapidated condition of older buildings as a reason to replace them with new construction. If employed, this strategy posed a threat to historic resources in general. Nor was the park prepared to manage the endemic vandalism that occurred in a metropolitan area. Graffiti on seacoast fortifications and visitors trampling archaeological middens posed another category of threats to cultural resources.³⁴⁹ The threats report reflected the Park Service's ongoing issues at Golden Gate National Recreation Area:

(Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1982), 300-34; Rothman, *Preserving Different Pasts*, 186-220; Richard W. Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 136-38, 184; Ronald Foresta, *America's National Parks and Their Keepers* (Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, 1984), 132-36.

³⁴⁸ William Everhart, *The National Park Service* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1983), 75-92; John C. Freemuth, *Islands Under Siege: National Parks and the Politics of External Threats* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991), 20-22.

³⁴⁹ Questionnaire, "Threat to Cultural Resources in the Parks", Golden Gate National Recreation Area, January 12, 1981, CCF, Box 16, N-42, Weather and Climate, General.

outside impacts from the city and the Army, lack of resources for management, and a host of other factors beyond the park's control.

The solution to these problems was planning, park officials believed, and the planning process, which had been formalized with the GMP in 1980, continued. In June 1982, the Cultural Resource Management Plan for the park debuted. A candid document, it tried to set the tone for planning and felt no compunction about pointing out the numerous difficulties associated with cultural resource management. The plan followed the lead of the GMP, using the concept of Historic Resource Land Management Zones and further elaborating on them. By the terms of the CRM plan, Fort Point, the ships, lighthouses, fortifications, and historic buildings on Alcatraz were located in the Preservation Zone and were to be managed for the complicated and sometimes contradictory goals of facilitating public enjoyment and appreciation of their historic values. In practice, this meant that within these areas, historic preservation efforts focused on the protection of structures from deterioration. In the Enhancement Zone, consisting of Sutro Heights, Cliff House, and Aquatic Park, management practice preserved the basic integrity of the settings as well as specific structures. In the Adaptive Use Zone, which included Alcatraz's grounds, Upper Fort Mason, Haslett Warehouse, East Fort Miley and portions of the Marin Headlands, historic space was to be redesigned and adapted for recreational use while the integrity of historic space was maintained and if possible enhanced.³⁵⁰

While a historic preservation purist might scoff at such a set of goals, the plan made considerable sense at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. With 340 properties on the list of classified structures and twenty-six areas on the National Register of Historic Places, a fleet of historic ships, as well as a huge inventory of written, graphic, and photographic resources, the park had an enormous cultural resource mission, but it was not the only management obligation at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The CRM plan attempted to bridge the many-faceted mission of the park, its obligations in legislation and to the public, and to satisfy the countless constituencies that felt strongly about the park and its resources.

The plan also more clearly delineated the dimensions of cultural resource management at the park. It built from the historic resource studies of NPS historians Anna Coxe Toogood and Erwin Thompson, synthesizing their detailed historical work into a series of themes for the park to preserve. Prehistoric Native American peoples and their lives, primarily the Coast Miwok and the Ohlone—once called Costanoans by Europeans—who preceded Europeans and Americans in the region, formed one theme. The plan noted the presence of a number of sites inside the park, attributing their predominance in the San Francisco Unit to the development on that side of the bay. The less-disturbed nature of west Marin County, in particular, meant that many more archaeological sites were likely to be found. Cultural resources from the Spanish–Mexican period were divided among three locations, Fort Point, Fort Mason, and the Olema Valley. The first two likely held archaeological remains of that era, as certainly did the nineteenth-century adobe walls that had been enclosed in the Presidio officers club, and the Olema Valley contained ranchos that reflected the culture and social organization of the Mexican era as well as the dairy farming culture of the twentieth century. The plan acknowledged a lack of historical research focusing on this period and the need for further evaluation of park resources. The American period was divided into two time frames, one focusing on acquisition and the Gold Rush and the second focusing on the military period. The park had only a few cultural resources to reflect the first era.

³⁵⁰ *Cultural Resources Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, June 1982* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Recreation Area, 1982), 2-5.

The four Gold Rush-era structures at Fort Mason were administered by the Army, and the National Maritime Museum, with its ships and related artifacts, served as the primary illustration of this history. Submerged cultural resources, an activity in which the Park Service in 1980 had only recently begun to engage, also merited attention.³⁵¹

The most visible and best collection of cultural resources in the park illustrated the military experience in the Bay Area and the Pacific Rim. The park contained an outstanding collection of military and seacoast defense architecture and engineering, spanning the evolution not only of Americans' military prowess but of the Spanish and Mexicans who preceded them. This remarkable collection included the remnants of Spanish fortifications and every subsequent stage in the development of defense capabilities through the NIKE anti-aircraft missiles of the 1950s. With myriad physical structures and equipment, the park offered an outstanding opportunity to preserve the military past and to illustrate the history it preserved.³⁵²

The predominance of military historians in the Park Service made the elevation of military history in the park a certainty. Even in 1980, history in the Park Service remained closely tied to its roots in the agency, to the acquisition of the fabric of American history that accompanied the New Deal reorganization of the federal government in 1933. When the Park Service accepted the transfer in the 1930s of the battlefields that comprised American history from the Army, the triumphalist, progressive tone of that history had yet to be widely questioned. The pageant of the country's history had been presented as progress toward a greater good, and the Park Service, still strongly committed to broadening its constituency, embraced that style and pattern. This formulation endured in the agency through the great cultural upheaval of the 1960s and early 1970s even as the park system became more diverse both in its historic properties and in the interests of its professional staff.³⁵³ Yet the military legacy held powerful sway, and at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the structures to preserve and interpret it were present in great variety and quantity.

The GMP recognized maritime resources as the park's last major category of cultural resource fabric. The historic fleet, which included eight major ships and sixty smaller vessels, constituted an enormous cultural resource as well as a challenging set of preservation and protection issues. The park also contained three historic lighthouses, all listed on the National Register of Historic Places, on Alcatraz Island, atop Fort Point, and at Point Bonita. Wharves, piers, docks, and other shore-side embarkation points also qualified as cultural resources, as did shipwrecks and other submerged artifacts.³⁵⁴

³⁵¹ Ibid; Anna Coxe Toogood, *A Civil History of Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore, California* (Denver: Denver Service Center, 1980); Erwin N. Thompson, *Historic Resource Study, Forts Baker, Barry, Cronkhite of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California* (Denver: Denver Service Center, 1979); Erwin N. Thompson, *Historic Resource Study: Seacoast Fortifications, San Francisco Harbor, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California* (Denver: Denver Service Center, 1979); Erwin N. Thompson, *The Rock: A History of Alcatraz Island, 1847-1972, Historic Resource Study, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California* (Denver: Denver Service Center, 1979).

³⁵² *Cultural Resources Management Plan*, 6-10.

³⁵³ Rothman, *Preserving Different Pasts*, 187-209; Foresta, *America's National Parks and Their Keepers*, 129-35; Charles B. Hosmer Jr., *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1981), 1-14.

³⁵⁴ *Cultural Resources Management Plan*, 10-15.

Other cultural resources demanded agency attention. These included transportation resources, agrarian resources, engineering resources, and remnants of various urban lifestyles. An urban lifestyles theme articulated in the plan permitted two innovations that were more difficult to establish in other park areas. This theme reflected ethnic history and accentuated the complex and multifaceted ethnic and racial history of San Francisco. By 1980, the Park Service sought such cultural resources as part of its serious attempt to reach more broadly into American society and reflect the history of the nation's growing diversity. Recreation also presented a theme that the park could preserve and interpret. The structures that revealed its history, in places such as Cliff House, Sutro Heights, Playland, and Aquatic Park, also fell within park boundaries.³⁵⁵

The authors of the plan recognized significant gaps in research that impeded the management of cultural resources. By 1980, the Park Service had compiled a significant amount of information about park resources in its basic research reports and inherited a great deal of maritime history from the library at the San Francisco Maritime Museum, but the breadth of features meant that a considerable number of themes and resources remained largely unexplored. The deficiencies were most pronounced in knowledge of prehistoric peoples and for submerged cultural resources. Nor had Section 106 compliance proceeded throughout the park. A number of National Register-eligible properties required nomination forms and adequate documentation was absent for a number of park properties included in the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and the National American Engineering Record (NAER), later changed to Historic American Engineering Records, or (HAER). Other cultural resources that had been designated for restoration or adaptive use required historic structures reports. Oral histories had not yet been undertaken and minority history studies had only begun. With a park as complicated as Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the report averred, "continued and detailed historical research needs to be continued at all times." Only with such an effort could the agency keep abreast of its cultural resource management obligations.³⁵⁶

As in other facets of oversight, the cultural resource management plan created a context for managing the park. Instead of reaction to public demand, a pattern not only the result of the proprietary feeling of Bay Area residents for the lands included in the park, but also a direct result of the interactive way the Park Service handled its arrival in the region, the plan allowed the agency to look ahead toward clearly defined objectives. Officials could hold up the plan and use it to articulate reasons for their decisions, providing staff with the morale boost that clearly articulated policy often delivered. The plan provided a basis for action, a set of clearly articulated reasons and goals. In some situations, such a stance could be persuasive, but implementation continued to require more than just a plan. It meant entering into the complicated constituency negotiations that had become the hallmark of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The plan created a framework, a series of assumptions that agency personnel could point to as concrete goals, but that rarely impeded local constituencies from seeking their own ends. The framework let the park create a structure; it did not always let the plans agency officials desired become reality.

The difficulty in implementation stemmed from two disparate points of origin. Distinctly different segments comprised the historic preservation community in the Bay Area. One, military enthusiasts, focused closely on the buildings, structures, and landscapes associated with the

³⁵⁵ *Cultural Resources Management Plan*, 16-26.

³⁵⁶ *Cultural Resources Management Plan*, 27-54.

martial presence. Many were military retirees who became the intellectual descendants of the Fort Point Museum Association, far better positioned and better organized than their predecessors, but their concerns were confined to the preservation of Army, Navy, and Coast Guard sites. When military preservation was the issue, this group loudly used its considerable influence; when other issues came to the fore, they were often silent. Other cultural resources in the park had specific constituencies as well. The historic ships at Hyde Street Pier had a particularly vocal group of supporters, as did Cliff House, Alcatraz, and other features. All supported their individual causes, but a few supported cultural resource management in general. In most cases, the interest of groups remained specifically in one site and did not translate to an energized historic preservation community. The groups that did promote a general historic preservation agenda did so as a secondary concern. As did PFGGNRA, groups such as Headlands Inc. included historic preservation among its concerns, but only in concert with larger natural resource preservation issues. The national historic preservation organizations such as the National Trust only reluctantly got involved in local issues, preferring instead to influence policy. Even State Historic Preservation Officers (SPHO) found themselves tightly constrained by legal and institutional procedures and could rarely offer much help.³⁵⁷ Despite the variety of cultural resources, Golden Gate National Recreation Area's support continued to stem from the groups that helped found the park and their concerns leaned more to nature rather than the human past.

Another obstacle to successful management was the shortage of resources for management at the crucial moment that the plans were adopted. The early years of the Reagan administration were difficult for the Park Service and budgets remained constant or fell in real dollar value. Throughout the park system, shortages hamstrung managers. At Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the park was forced to leave countless staff positions vacant. In 1982, the year the cultural resource management plan was completed, Golden Gate National Recreation Area faced a reduction in full-time positions. At precisely the moment the park needed personnel to begin the process of implementing planning and persuading the public of the value of those decisions, existing staff had to do more with fewer resources.³⁵⁸ Management became a devil's bargain, an imperative to be sure, but one complicated by a wide range of factors that affected how the park handled its resources.

The most viable strategy was to rely on the prescriptions of the General Management Plan. The park lacked sufficient staff to fully implement and the structure of the plan provided an outline that let the agency meet its obligations. The Historic Resource Land Management Zones developed in the GMP became the basis for cultural resource management. The intensive use zones such as Alcatraz Island and Sutro Heights were defined as urban parkland and managed in that fashion. While this did not necessarily compromise the integrity of cultural resources, it did mean that resources in these areas would be subjected to considerable use and the consequent impacts. The question of heavy use guaranteed that cultural resource management in intensive use areas would consistently require the investment of resources.

Section 106 compliance, the assessment of federal undertakings on historic properties, demanded an enormous proportion of park attention. The number of properties that fell under the act was so great that Golden Gate National Recreation Area could simply not be expected to handle compliance with the available staff. In the National Park Service, responsibility for compliance was delegated from the Washington office to the regional offices. Regional office

³⁵⁷ Stephen A. Haller, interview by Hal Rothman, May 10, 2000.

³⁵⁸ Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report, 1982, SOA II.

personnel reviewed undertakings submitted by parks under a programmatic agreement signed by the Park Service, the National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. For each undertaking, the park submitted a form colloquially called the Triple X because it required three signatures. Regional office personnel reviewed the form to determine if the undertaking fell under the jurisdiction of the programmatic agreement. If so, the park received notification that it met its Section 106 Compliance requirements. If the agreement did not cover the undertaking, the regional office followed with a full consultation with the applicable State Historic preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to keep the agency in compliance. The Western Regional Office handled Section 106 compliance throughout the 1970s, 1980s, and into 1990.

The oversight of Golden Gate undertakings unraveled over a building replacement at the Julius Kahn Playground on the Presidio grounds. The relationship at Julius Kahn Playground in the Presidio stretched back seventy years. In 1922, the San Francisco Park and Recreation Department and the U.S. Army created the playground and a local institution was born. Early in 1990, transition of the Presidio from the Army to the park began and the national historic landmark status of the Presidio was being revised. At this juncture, Richard and Rhoda Goldman, two important supporters of Golden Gate National Recreation Area and GGNPA, offered to donate the funds to build a new clubhouse at the playground in memory of their deceased son. Governed by the "one up, one down" rule that kept the number of structures on the Presidio constant, the replacement of a building was permissible. Since the Army owned the land, but the city of San Francisco owned the building, not one but two other agencies held some jurisdiction. The Army asked for NPS assistance in assessing the impact of a replacement building on the property.

The question hinged on the status of the old clubhouse. If it was a historic structure or a contributing structure to the national historic landmark, then Section 106 would be invoked and the process changed. Park Service Historical Architect Ric Borjes observed that since the building was in the Presidio, it was likely to be a contributing structure, but the National Historic Landmark revision team, updating the Presidio's status, assured him that civilian properties inside the Presidio were not being considered as contributing structures. The decision seemed clear and headed for an easy route to resolution. Then the NHL team changed its determination and located the playground as a contributing structure to the national historic landmark. The decision created a new tone in the debate, which became a regrettable, rancorous situation. When the NHL determination included the playground, the Park Service backed away from the Section 106 process, ceding the lead role to the military. The Army still administered the Presidio; the transfer was slated but had not yet occurred, and the military's claim to lead agency status was easily made. At the recommendation of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the military hired a former park staff member, Glennie Wall, who had started a consulting firm that specialized in historic preservation, to undertake the 106 compliance action. The assessment eventually determined that the Kahn playground was ineligible for inclusion as a contributing structure to the national historic landmark and the state historic preservation office concurred.³⁵⁹

The SHPO's concurrence ended the grappling. When the existing playground was determined not to be an eligible property, the construction became a "no effect" action under Section 106. At an October 10, 1991 Citizen's Advisory Commission public hearing, David Warner, chief of Planning in Real Estate at the Presidio, announced that he believed the new

³⁵⁹ Ric Borjes, interview by Hal Rothman, June 2, 2000; Bartke to Haller, March 5, 2002.

clubhouse was "simple and well thought out." Deborah Learner of San Francisco Recreation and Park Department seconded Warner's perspective, and with little objection from the public, the commission passed favorably on the recommendation of "no adverse impact."³⁶⁰

The Section 106 struggle over the Julius Kahn Playground became a seminal event for cultural resource management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It made historic preservation seem as if it were a roadblock in the process of a change, an obstacle rather than the inventory and collection process required by law. Both Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the Goldmans were incensed at the delays caused by 106 compliance. It also soured relationships with some architects in the Bay Area, as the nearly two-year process had so drawn out the construction of a new playground building that the fray affected the perception of Section 106. Instead of a preservation tool, opponents began to see the law as a hindrance to viable objectives, a sentiment that had an ongoing and largely negative effect on historic preservation programs at the park.

The Kahn playground struggle also changed the Park's Service's 106 procedure. Golden Gate National Recreation Area administered a greater number of historic structures than the rest of the Western Region combined. The Presidio was already slated for transfer to the Park Service. The park possessed a sufficiently large professional staff to make determinations about National Register eligibility and sought its own programmatic agreement. In 1992, the park entered into National Park Service's first comprehensive programmatic agreement for park-level review at less than "adverse effect" level; instead of passing the decision to the regional office, Golden Gate National Recreation Area used its staff to make regional-level decisions at the park level. This decision simplified agency procedure and practice.

Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act also required park action. Section 110 expressed the intent of the act to assure that historic preservation was integrated into all federal agency programs. Included as a concept in the preamble to the original 1966 act and incorporating Executive Order 11593 from 1972, the ideas became Section 110 in the 1980 amendment to the act. In 1992, additions to Section 110 set out specific benchmarks to assure that historic and cultural resources were given adequate protection by federal agencies. Properties were to be managed and maintained to preserve their cultural value. Cultural properties that federal agencies did not control but that could be affected by their actions had to be addressed in agency planning. Preservation activities had to be carried out in consultation with other affected groups, as well as other federal, state, and local agencies. To comply with Section 110, agency procedures for addressing Section 106 had to be consistent with the guidelines of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and agencies had to hold permits accountable under Section 106. In addition, agencies were instructed to look to historic structures for adaptive uses before new construction when planning expansion.³⁶¹

Although on the surface it appeared that the 1992 amendments to Section 110 raised the standards for park management of cultural resources management, in reality the park had practiced the new standards at least since the GMP and CRM plans in the early 1980s. With the large number of structures and the tremendous demand for adaptive use, Golden Gate National Recreation Area took the lead in resolving countless situations, providing a blueprint for

³⁶⁰ Minutes of the Meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, Thursday October 10, 1991, OCPA, Box 41, CAC Minutes, 5-17.

³⁶¹ "Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs," *Federal Register*, April 24, 1998, 1-2.

implementation of these policies elsewhere in the park system. The park helped move historic preservation from the strict mode of the 1950s and 1960s, characterized by some as making historic buildings into museums, toward more interactive uses. Again, the complicated nature of resource management in an urban area, the quantity and variety of historic structures and other cultural resources, and the demands of policy and statute combined to put Golden Gate National Recreation Area into a leading position in implementing the new statutory obligations.

The evidence of this prescience showed in management situations across the park. Especially in the intensive use areas, the dictates of Section 110 came to the forefront. In each such situation, the concerns of new users, typically not federal agencies, had to be melded with the statutory demands of resource management. In these circumstances, the major check on compromising cultural resource management became the intensity of concern for statutory obligation. In most situations, Golden Gate National Recreation Area provided outstanding care of historic properties even when they were designated for adaptive use. Operating under the principle that a structure in use is a structure being maintained, and well aware that the agency was unlikely to receive adequate resources for all its cultural resources, the park pursued adaptive use as a protection strategy.³⁶²

Fort Mason, where adaptive use gave historic preservation a different character, illustrated the range of Section 110 issues. The fort itself was divided between two different kinds of areas. The lower fort became the Fort Mason Center, and its use skyrocketed as the events became "real cultural happenings." Adaptive re-use was of the essence, guided by the precepts of a Historic Structure Report in 1991. In 1978, 45,000 people came to center events. The following year that figure rose to more than 180,000, a harbinger of even more increases in future use. Also in 1979, the NPS began a long process of renovating the Great Meadow in Upper Fort Mason. Dirt was brought it and left for a number of years. Landscaping came later, allowing recreational space in the upper fort. The physical structures in the upper fort, both the old headquarters of the Army of the West, which the Park Service turned into its headquarters, and the nearby residences, in which military personnel still lived, were treated as a historic scene. The result was a fusion of historic preservation and adaptive use that anticipated the demands of statute in the same sector of the park. In 1992, Borjes attested to the success of Lower Fort Mason when the historical architect called it one of the first examples of creative management of historic structures to preserve them and use them.³⁶³

Section 110 questions were muted at Fort Point, which remained a premier historic resource as it had been since its addition to the national park system in 1970. Management of the old fort required considerable investment of resources, but its core mission, as a historic site, remained constant. By 1981, more than one million visitors per year reached the old brick fort, creating resource management issues that stemmed from their impact. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area maintenance staff played a crucial role in maintaining the structure, and Fort Point site managers gratefully acknowledged their efforts. As growing numbers of visitors reached the fort by public transportation, the trails to the fort from Battery East on the cliff above

³⁶² Minutes of the Meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, Thursday October 10, 1991, OCPA, Box 41, CAC Minutes, 22-31.

³⁶³ The Golden Gate National Recreation Area - 1979: Annual Report of the General Superintendent; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report, 1981; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report 1982; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report, 1983; Minutes of the Meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, Thursday October 10, 1991, 29.

the fort were inundated with visitors; at the same time, the continuous impact of ocean waves contributed to the deterioration of the brick walls of the fort.³⁶⁴ Management of the fort remained consistent with the goals of cultural resource management, for the fort—alone among the different units of Golden Gate National Recreation Area—had one and only one clearly defined purpose. It was historic, the public treated it as such, and the Park Service managed it in that manner. Its issues remained far less complicated than in other units of the park, where competing interests vied to define cultural resource features.

Decommissioned NIKE missile sites offered another window into cultural resource management. The park contained a number of these sites, vestiges of the recent past and heirs to a long tradition of coastal military defense around the Bay Area. Yet the missiles illustrated a classic Park Service and historic preservation dilemma: the history they offered was too recent when the park was established. It was hard for the agency to see the recent past as historic. Since the missiles were not fifty years old, the age required for assessment under the National Historic Preservation Act, the agency did not initially treat the NIKE sites as historic. After the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and the swords-into-plowshares program of the early 1970s, the NIKE missiles were the first weapons to be dismantled. As the last missile launchers in the Bay Area were being taken out of operation in 1974, NIKE Site SF-88L in Fort Barry was offered to the Park Service in a nearly intact demilitarized condition, but the agency declined. As was the case with many other cultural resources recent in time, the agency did not recognize the resource as valuable to its mission. Superintendent William Whalen felt the park lacked the capability to manage the site, and in 1976, no chief of interpretation had been appointed, leaving no advocate for the idea. Whalen accepted the lands, but without the missile equipment.³⁶⁵

This illustrated a typical conundrum for the Park Service, one repeated across the country with the advent of new parks. Very often, cultural resources in the parks did not illustrate the themes that the Park Service recognized as the reason for establishment. Equally often, the agency devalued existing resources so as to draw attention away from prior uses of the park. From Bandelier National Monument, where the Park Service removed historic structures in the 1930s only to wish they were still there in the 1980s, to Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the agency evinced a narrow approach to the range of cultural resources. In countless circumstances, the Bay Area included among them, it later regretted decisions and wished for the resources it had declined, removed, or altered.

As a cultural resource, NIKE Site SF-88L followed a common pattern. Its value increased over time. The Cold War became part of history and Americans recognized historic values in the places that reflected it. Once the Park Service recognized the historic and interpretive value of the missile site, preserving it served a broader and neatly historic purpose. The interpretation of a kind of military defense that no longer seemed real, but instead was an anachronism from an increasingly distant past. As a commemoration, the missile site worked well; it told a story about coastal defense and the evolution of strategy, techniques, and weapons that could be linked to other histories of the area precisely because a changing political climate had made them historic in the most distant sense of the word. In the 1970s, the NIKE site was too close to the present; in the 1990s, it had quickly become a relic of something far in the past.

³⁶⁴ Fort Point National Historic Site Annual Report, 1980, FAPR.

³⁶⁵ John A. Martini and Stephen A. Haller, *What We Have We Shall Defend: An Interim History and Preservation Plan for NIKE Site SF-88L, Fort Barry, California* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Recreation Area, 1998), 81-83.

Yet the NIKE site, Fort Point, and other purely cultural areas within the park were anomalies of management. At Golden Gate National Recreation Area, adaptive use and multiple-purpose intensive use situations dominated. The great number of structures and the need for space in the Bay Area made adaptive use a potent question of management. Visitor demand turned the intensive use areas from cultural resource issues into something far more convoluted under statute. In situations of overwhelming visitor use, complying with the terms of Section 110 was most difficult.

Alcatraz Island presented the most complex set of cultural resource management questions and as a result became the most difficult site regarding compliance. The island's history was varied, but the public's focus remained on one time and one specific kind of use, the federal prison that so captured the American imagination. By 1977, the San Francisco Visitors and Convention Bureau regarded the island as San Francisco's most popular visitor attraction. In 1980, 524,000 visitors saw the island in more than 10,000 personalized tours. The Park Service was inundated. Its assessment regarded the island as a series of historic resources with wonderful vistas and natural resources added, linked together by time. Its perspective became embodied in professional assessments that sought to shift public focus from the cell house and the concept of The Rock, to other dimensions of the island's past. Even National Historic Landmark status, attained at the same time as Fort Mason in 1986, did not change public perception. The public remained focused on the stories of the federal prison, of inmates such as Al Capone and on the idea that no one ever escaped from the island. Public demand stretched the Park Service's sense of the historic resources on Alcatraz Island and for a number of years, the agency had difficulty recognizing that no matter what the agency did, to the public, Alcatraz was a notorious prison.³⁶⁶

The greatest cultural resource management questions on Alcatraz involved resource preservation and visitor safety. No amount of fixing, cleaning or rehabilitating could guarantee safety. The structures on the island were old and had experienced all kinds of use. They were subjected to a harsh climate. The combination of wind, salt air, and precipitation contributed to an ongoing series of maintenance issues. Stabilization of structures became a concern. In 1979, a structural safety study pointed to countless hazards and during the 1980s, cultural resource management and maintenance on the island were closely aligned. Following the collapse of a six-foot by forty-foot section of wall of the cliff below the warden's house in 1980, the Park Service retained Dames & Moore, an engineering consulting conglomerate, to conduct a geologic hazard study to protect cultural resources from similar dilemmas. In 1983, the park marked off hazardous areas with an extensive system of yellow striping as an effort to make the island safer. By 1990, a program had been established with the Federal Bureau of Prisons that resulted in federal prisoners accomplishing considerable work on the island. In 1990, the park valued that labor at \$150,000.³⁶⁷ Again, safety steps intruded on the historic scene, continuing the pattern of straddling conflicting demands that characterized management of the island.

³⁶⁶ Bob Kirby, "Alcatraz Island, Annual Report, 1980," Golden Gate National Recreation Area A2621, Golden Gate National Recreation Area archives.

³⁶⁷ Denver Service Center and Royston, Hanamoto, Beck, and Abey, "Structural Safety Hazard Study Alcatraz Island, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, July 1, 1979," AD, File 154; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report, 1982, 20, SOA II; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report, 1983, 57, OCPA, Box 1, Annual Report 1983; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Annual Report, 1990, OCPA, Box 1, Annual Report 1990.

Section 110 also drove the process of submerged cultural resource management. Coastal waters under NPS jurisdiction contained a broad array of historic resources, but until 1980, when both the GMP at the park was approved and the amended National Historic Preservation Act passed Congress, submerged resources rarely found a place in the reactive patterns of the park. Only the massive Westside Transport project, with its enormous sewer box under Sloat Avenue, threatened submerged cultural resources and inspired NPS response. After the amendments to Section 110, the Park Service began proactive management. The first project statement in the 1982 CRM pushed for a survey of submerged resources. The founding of the Submerged Cultural Resources Unit (SCRU), located in the Santa Fe Regional Office Cultural Resource Management Center, followed. SCRU was one of the few projects in the center staffed by permanent Park Service personnel instead of seasonals, giving it a stronger claim on longevity than many similar operations.

Submerged resources at Golden Gate National Recreation Area benefited from the interest of an enthusiastic and knowledgeable staff member, James P. Delgado, a park historian who became affiliated with SCRU and whose activities drove the process. Typically the Park Service dealt with cultural resource management issues in a reactive manner. An outside threat or undertaking was proposed for a specific area and the agency crafted a response. Delgado's interest meant that rather than react, the Park Service initiated activity independent of outside impetus. Delgado's interest preceded the creation of SCRU, making Golden Gate National Recreation Area a particularly opportune location because research had already begun. By 1979, Delgado began to publish a spate of articles in professional journals that drew considerable attention to submerged resource management.³⁶⁸

At Golden Gate National Recreation Area and in the Bay Area, SCRU focused on Section 110-based survey work. Delgado's work led to more sophisticated management of shipwrecks and other underwater resources. Many were better managed by a conservation archaeology regime than by any kind of intrusive action, and the preemptive work of SCRU helped acquire greater knowledge and simultaneously preserve resources. In 1982, the unit undertook a survey of submerged resources in Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary and Point Reyes National Seashore. In 1989, the agency completed the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Submerged Cultural Resources Assessment. The study was an outgrowth of the Southeast Sewer Outfall Construction, El Niño in 1982 and 1983 and its impact on resources, and the personal interest of Delgado. The report documented ninety-seven shipwrecks in park waters; in the areas including the Gulf of the Farallones, the total reached 148. With its close attention to an often overlooked facet of cultural resource management, the report became the basis for resource management decisions along the shoreline and under the water.

Elsewhere, fashioning resources on land into manageable entities required the agency to embrace new concepts. The Park Service embraced the idea of cultural landscapes in the early 1980s, and they abounded at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. As the concept became an important trend in resource management, the park again became a testing ground for new ideas and policies. Robert Page, the person in the Washington Office responsible for cultural

³⁶⁸ James P. Delgado, "No Longer a Buoyant Ship: Unearthing the Storeship Niantic," *California History* 63, 4; James P. Delgado, "What Becomes of the Old Ships? Dismantling the Gold Rush Fleet of San Francisco," *Pacific Historian* 5, 3; James P. Delgado and Robert L. Bennett, *Research Design for the Historical Archaeological Examination and Documentation of the Remains of the 1848 Sidewheel Steamship Tennessee at Tennessee Cove, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Marin County, California* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Recreation Area, 1978).

landscapes, set up meetings to orchestrate the park's ability to lead agency thinking in this new category. Cultural landscapes enjoyed a complicated history in the park system. The original national parks were conceived to be devoid of humans, tributes to nature. The idea persisted in the park system that places people inhabited could not be sufficiently significant for national park status. As late as 1963, when ecology was on the rise in the park system and the Leopold Report, with its image of parks as "vignettes of primitive America," cultural landscapes remained secondary to the Park Service's traditional mission. The move to be inclusive that led to urban parks shifted the focus from landscapes without people to landscapes that could serve nearby people and that not incidentally, in which other people lived. By the time Golden Gate National Recreation Area was founded in 1972, cultural landscapes had begun to be a consideration for the Park Service.

The concept evolved further, from a description of a landscape to a way to analyze and categorize resources. Cultural landscapes gained importance in the park system, becoming codified in policy. In the late 1990s, *NPS-28*, the governing handbook for cultural resource management, included cultural landscapes among its categories of analysis. The idea evolved into a sort of organic theory, arguing for the historicity and significance of evolving landscapes of human and natural interaction instead of freezing them in a moment of time. The Cultural Landscape Assessment Inventory and Management System (CLAIMS) program developed a four-stage process with each level providing progressively more information. The fourth level mirrored an implementation plan. At Golden Gate National Recreation Area, park staff Patricia Quintero and Nick Weeks worked closely with Cathy Gilbert of the Seattle Office and Robert Melnick of the University of Oregon and Land and Community Associates to develop the concept. By the late 1990s, cultural landscapes had become an important tool for resource management. The concept allowed a kind of flexibility, arguing for both growth and change in the landscape as well as its whole over any specific part. CLAIMS and cultural landscapes made the Park Service significantly more able to include inhabited landscapes within park boundaries.

The emergence of the concept had powerful implications at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The park was very simply one enormous cultural landscape, a laboratory for the implementation of this idea; human habitation of the area stretched back at least 5,000 years. Every feature of the park had been used by humanity in some way and the entire park reflected those uses. Its urban location meant that expansion of the park necessarily affected people and often included them in the park. Unlike most national parks, Golden Gate National Recreation Area had been acquired from other agencies or by purchase from private owners, not selected from the public domain. As a result, human use and humans were ever present in the park. Everyone, especially PFGGNRA and the other groups that lobbied for the park, recognized this reality. In its early newsletters, PFGGNRA referred to the proposed park as a "greenbelt," recognizing that conceptually, their park was different. Unlike other parks, Golden Gate National Recreation Area would have to accommodate human activity and continued presence in ways that other national parks did not.³⁶⁹

For the Park Service at the onset of the 1980s, the cultural landscapes concept presented important opportunities. After ANILCA, the Alaskan National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and President Jimmy Carter's lame duck proclamation of national monuments throughout Alaska in 1980, expansion of the park system seemed limited to historic properties in the lower forty-

³⁶⁹ PFGGNRA Greenbelt Gazette, 2 n. 1 (ca. October 1972), KFC, Box 6, File 115.

eight states.³⁷⁰ Large expanses of land suitable for park purposes no longer existed except in private holdings, and the agency needed a way to add new areas to improve both its base budget and to maintain its standing among federal agencies. An urban park such as Golden Gate National Recreation Area provided ample opportunities to try out the new strategy even if follow-through did not always occur. No place in Golden Gate National Recreation Area was better suited to the cultural landscape concept than the Olema Valley. This collection of old ranches and grazing areas included in the park offered not only the American past in the form of ranches, dairy farms and other agricultural enterprises, but also the more distant past. Part of the area had been a Mexican-era land grant called the Rancho Tomales Y Baulenes, given to Rafael Garcia. After the Gold Rush of 1849, Italian-Swiss and Portuguese immigrants ranched the region, leaving not only historic fabric but strong local identification with the place. The CRM plan in 1982, which followed from the GMP, noted this presence and suggested its interpretation.³⁷¹

The cultural landscape concept remained a viable idea for park management, but selling it beyond the agency became problematic in some circumstances. The Park Service sought to use the concept to create a Sutro Historic District. Since the early 1970s, the Sutro Historic District had been a focus of park concern. Almost from the establishment of the park, advocates split over whether the existing historic fabric ought to be preserved or whether an attempt should be made to upgrade the property. The GMP laid the basis to “rejuvenate the unsightly development and recapture the spirit of another era.” In the decade following its passage, the agency planned that transformation.³⁷²

After almost twelve years, on July 30, 1992, the agency brought its plans for the district to the Citizens' Advisory Commission. Again, the park followed a long and involved period of public discussion, hearing numerous viewpoints and considering a variety of options. The results demonstrated the consensus. As Doug Nadeau, chief of Resource Management and Planning at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, noted in 1992, the Sutro District still needed polish. Unlike other intensive use cultural resource areas, the Sutro District had not been significantly improved in the preceding decade. The plan proposed restoration of the 1908 Cliff House, making the Sutro Baths ruins safe but not tidy—comments suggested that the public valued the ruin-like quality of the baths—and a partial restoration of Sutro's gardens on Sutro Heights to retain its character as a neighborhood park. “We are now beginning to scratch the surface,” Nadeau opined, of presenting the cultural and natural resources of the Sutro District.³⁷³

The major departure from the GMP in this formulation involved the construction of a new visitor center at Cliff House. The proposal resulted from the concept of cultural landscapes. Initially the park did not value the cultural dimensions of the Sutro District's resources. The visitor center proposal was an acknowledgment of much more than growing demand. It signaled no less than the acceptance of the concept of cultural landscapes in both natural and cultural resources management and the need to interpret these features of the park. Nadeau affirmed this change in perspective in front of the commission. “Our appreciation and understanding of the

³⁷⁰ Rothman, *Preserving Different Pasts*, 172-75.

³⁷¹ *Cultural Resource Management Plan*, 18-20.

³⁷² *General Management Plan*.

³⁷³ Meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission, July 30 1992, 16-20, OCPA Records Box 41, CAC Minutes.

natural resources of the site have increased tremendously," he told the commission. "'We all love the ruins. And we felt, based on some early studies we did, that they had no historical value. Now we know they do.'"³⁷⁴

In this sense, the development that came before the commission in 1992 was less intensive than the GMP version. The introduction of the cultural landscape concept provided an impetus to leave things closer to the way they evolved, to respect the past as the past in ways that planning generally eschewed. "Leave the ruins the way they are," intoned Cheryl Barton of EDAW, the consulting firm that assisted in design of the proposal, "let them be ruins and let them continue to ruin and interpret them."³⁷⁵ The cultural landscape idea allowed greater fealty to the past by permitting a broader assessment of significance than other forms of cultural resource management.

It was also more difficult to persuade people of the concept, for a cultural landscape typically offered a lens into an ordinary past. Even a full generation after the creation of historic preservation law, Americans still focused preservation efforts on the places and structures associated with the prominent. "Historical" meant great political and social leaders and their homes, the locations of important events such as battlefields, and not necessarily the places where ordinary people did ordinary things. As a result, the cultural landscape concept was always vulnerable to charges that its features were not significant. Eventually the California SHPO rejected the Sutro District as a historic district because it did not convey a turn-of-the-twentieth-century scene.

No place more comprehensively embodied the range of issues in cultural resource management than the Presidio. Home to 662 contributing structures, the Presidio National Historic Landmark included every possible category of management. Much of the post had been intensively used and the pattern seemed likely to continue. With the Army's departure, parts of it were likely to be unattended, a situation that the Park Service experienced at Fort Mason in the 1970s. Structures with tremendous historic significance were included in the post. The officers' club contained the adobe remnants of the Spanish and Mexican Presidio and Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt administered the order for the internment of Japanese-Americans after Pearl Harbor in one of the post buildings. Some have suggested that the Presidio offered the best museum of American military architecture between 1853 and 1941. All of these issues required management and meeting the obligations of Section 106 and Section 110 demanded an exceptional investment of resources.³⁷⁶

Relations between the Park Service and the Army were uneven between the passage of the Omnibus Bill in 1978 that gave the Park Service veto power over construction in Presidio and the decision to transfer the post to the park. The military had been accustomed to much greater leeway in its compliance activities. Its immense power and its ability to claim national defense as a reason for its actions gave it both cachet and the ability to make the system work in ways that other agencies could not. As the Park Service often noted, the Army served as an excellent

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 22.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 31.

³⁷⁶ Stephen A. Haller, *Post and Park: A Brief Illustrated History of the Presidio* (San Francisco: Golden Gate National Parks Association, 1997); Richard Drinnon, *Keeper of Concentration Camps: Dillon S. Myer and American Racism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 29-162.

steward of historic resources as long as it occupied structures. When it determined that areas no longer met its needs, much historic space suffered neglect.

The tension between the Park Service and Army stemmed from two provisions. The 1972 authorization of the park takeover took authority for future development from the Pentagon and gave the Department of the Interior veto power over new construction. The Army was able to win concessions for this language, but a few years later, Burton achieved his objective. With a clause that biographer John Jacobs observed was “indecipherable to anyone but Burton,” the congressman included in the Omnibus Bill of 1978 a provision that declared that the square footage of the buildings on the Presidio and on any other military lands slated for inclusion in Golden Gate National Recreation Area must remain constant. This meant that the military had to tear down square footage equal to anything it chose to build, needed the approval of the Department of the Interior, and in most circumstances, assured that the military would comply with Section 106 of the amended National Historic Preservation Act. Burton once again bound the military to his formidable will.³⁷⁷

The Army wielded great power in the Bay Area, and for almost a decade after 1978, it continued with its business as usual. Golden Gate National Recreation Area did not relish a confrontation over the Presidio; the destiny of the two Bay Area entities was closely intertwined and the Park Service, clearly the junior partner in terms of power and influence, was loath to initiate a confrontation it was unlikely to win—and even if it did win, could cost the agency far more than the victory might be worth. As late as the middle of the 1980s, the Army relied on its position as the defender of the nation to deflect criticism of its action. Its efforts were subject to the same review as were other federal undertakings, but the Army often ignored or circumvented statute. As a result, the Army might have been legally bound by the Omnibus Bill of 1978, but the statute did not often encroach upon military planning.

The construction of a post office in the middle of Crissy Field and a Burger King by the Presidio's parade ground contributed to the realignment of the relationship between the military and the Park Service. On October 10, 1985, Golden Gate National Recreation Area announced a \$5 million to \$7 million plan to restore Crissy Field. Golden Gate National Recreation Area's announcement followed by one day a report in the *San Francisco Examiner* that the Army planned a \$100 million development in the Presidio. Sierra Club members found a sign that announced a large post office and a concrete pad that had already been poured in the middle of the old airfield, a clear violation of the governing legislation. The Sierra Club learned that the planned post office was part of a one-stop shopping center that included the post office, which the Army leased to the U.S. Postal Service as a public facility, a Burger King, a child-care center, convenience shop, several barracks, and other buildings on the edge of the Park Service portion of Crissy Field and onto the adjacent Presidio. Amy Meyer recalled that at the time, environmental assessments, a document allowed by law to fulfill the function of environmental impact statements when the changes contemplated met specific standards, did not routinely arrive at the CAC. Meyer insisted that the commission receive the EA for the Presidio development, and when it was not forthcoming, she and others filed a lawsuit. As the struggle became public, an outburst from park supporters was immediate. The park, the advisory commission, and Congresswoman Sala Burton received a deluge of mail protesting the military's plans.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁷ John Jacobs, *A Rage for Justice: The Passion and Politics of Phillip Burton* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 213, 367.

³⁷⁸ Gerald Adams, “Marshland Planned for Crissy Field,” *SFE*, October 9, 1985; Amy Meyer to Judy Lemons, June

The pressure had an immediate effect. On November 1, 1985, Rep. Sala Burton announced that the Army had suspended construction plans. "Many of our mutual friends and neighbors are both concerned over some elements of the construction program," Superintendent Brian O'Neill wrote Colonel Robert Rose, Presidio commander, "and with a perceived incompleteness of the coordination and public review processes." The military recognized the power of public opinion allied against its action. "Let me assure you of our genuine interest in continuing the positive and valued relationship that has existed through the years between the Presidio, the National Park Service and the community at large," Rose responded.³⁷⁹

The Army found itself in a difficult position and retrenched. In January 1986, two federal reports, one by an Army judge and the second by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, found that the Presidio military construction program violated federal legislation. Calls for a congressional hearing followed, but the Army continued to maintain that it was within the law. The Sierra Club and PFGGNRA filed a lawsuit. It charged the Army with improper public notice and hearing for a federal undertaking, violation of the clause in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area enabling legislation that gave any excess military land at the Presidio to the Park Service because the Army did not intend to operate the post office for its own purposes, and violation of the "one up, one down" provision of the Omnibus Bill of 1978. A February 14, 1986, injunction halted post office construction. Finally, the Army relented. In April 1986, the Sierra Club and the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund reached an agreement with the Army and the U.S. Postal Service that led to the demolition of the partly constructed post office and relocation of the rest of the project away from Crissy Field.³⁸⁰

The environmental community rejoiced. A concerned group of citizens could assure that federal legislation applied even to the Army, and a decision that would have had vast implications for the eventual transfer of the Presidio was reversed. Dr. Edgar Wayburn, the Sierra Club's Vice President for National Parks and a founder of PFGGNRA, announced: "as has been said of liberty, the price of a national park system is eternal vigilance." The military had been stopped and the primacy of Golden Gate National Recreation Area had been achieved, albeit in the most unlikely arena. "Because our legislation was so protective, the lawsuit was successful," Amy Meyer reflected more than a decade later. "They didn't just stop building. It cost the government \$750,000, a torn down post office, and the rehabilitation of Crissy Field to deal with the fact." With the support of its constituencies, Golden Gate National Recreation Area successfully grappled with one of its larger rivals in the Bay Area.³⁸¹

21, 1994, PFGGNRA II, Box 5, Amy Meyer Correspondence, 1993-94; John Hooper to Sala Burton, October 11, 1985, PFGGNRA II, Box 12, Presidio Sierra Club Lawsuit – Correspondence, Individuals and Organizations; Meyer interview, February 25, 2002, 15-16.

³⁷⁹ Brian O'Neill to Robert S. Rose, November 26, 1985; Robert S. Rose to Brian O'Neill, December 19, 1985, PFGGNRA II, Box 12, "Presidio Lawsuit Correspondence."

³⁸⁰ John Fogarty, "Big Building Project at the Presidio Is Called Illegal," *SFC*, January 8, 1986; Dale Champion, "Park Service Backs Probe of Presidio Plans," *SFC*, January 9, 1986; Harold Gilliam, "Battle Cries Sound at Crissy Field," *San Francisco Examiner/Chronicle*, January 19, 1986; Amy Meyer to Judy Lemons, June 21, 1994, PFGGNRA II, Box 5, Amy Meyer Correspondence, 1993-94.

³⁸¹ "Presidio Settlement Announced: Post Office to Be Demolished," July 16, 1986, PFGGNRA II, Box 2, Post Office Settlement; Amy Meyer to Judy Lemons, June 21, 1994, PFGGNRA II, Box 5, Amy Meyer Correspondence, 1993-94; Meyer interview, February 25, 2002, 16.

Although the legislation that defeated the post office was designed to protect cultural resources, the historic fabric of the Presidio proved ancillary to resolution of the controversy. The issue mobilized the basic Golden Gate National Recreation Area constituency, the very group whose prime interests focused on nature and recreation. Cultural resource support groups were only peripherally in evidence. Although the statute that the groups used to fight the construction served cultural resource ends, the intent of the struggle was much larger than mere cultural resource management. The struggle addressed the questions of the ultimate transfer of the Presidio and of the power of advocates, special interest groups, the Army, and the Park Service.

It also pointed out one of the larger difficulties of cultural resource management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the issues that stemmed from trying to manage such resources within the context of a national recreation area. In the end, managing cultural resources in Golden Gate National Recreation Area worked best for visitors when the cultural resources were discrete from other park functions. Fort Point and Alcatraz, even with the designation for the birds, were clearly managed as cultural resources even when they were inundated with visitors. The public identified their primary purpose as cultural and even when faced with incredible numbers of visitors, the agency could fulfill its function because it and the public recognized the same values in the resources in question. Adaptive use worked well. As long as the tenants and their operations respected the resources and took an active role in managing them, adaptive use served as a way to simultaneously protect cultural resources and provide services for the community. Still, when people thought of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, they did not generally think first of cultural resources. The marvelous variety of military architecture, the Native American, Spanish, and Mexican-era sites, and the array of locations that reflected local and regional history were secondary to other values. Despite Sections 106 and 110, cultural resources management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area remained a secondary concern. The combination of public perception, limited resources, and the variety of statutory obligations meant that cultural resources management remained a struggle.

