

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

DOYLE DRIVE

APPENDIX E

Public Activities and Meetings

Doyle Drive Project
Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report
and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

APPENDIX E

PUBLIC ACTIVITIES, MEETINGS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY December 2002 to Present

OUTREACH CONDUCTED	DATES	DETAILS
<p>CAC Subcommittee Meetings - Subcommittee members receive agenda, agenda report, last meeting's minutes and other documents as needed via mail. - Meeting agendas and minutes are posted on the website.</p>	<p>3/28/00, 6/14/00, 7/27/00, 8/15/00, 11/9/00, 1/30/01, 3/07/01, 4/19/01, 6/14/01, 7/31/01, 10/02/02, 1/31/02, 4/30/02, 9/23/04. 11/17/03, 4/29/04, 9/27/05, 11/29/05, 6/22/06, 7/18/06, 11/09/06, 12/13/07, 3/27/08</p>	<p>CAC Subcommittee members (29): Cow Hollow Association; Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action; Fort Point & Presidio Historical Association; Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission; Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association; Marin Commuters; Marina Neighborhood Association; Marina Merchant Association; Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning; Planning Association for the Richmond; Presidio Residents and Tenants; San Francisco Bicycle Coalition; San Francisco County Transportation Authority CAC; San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association; San Francisco Tomorrow; Sierra Club</p>
<p>Update letters to Subcommittee Members</p>	<p>9/4/01, 11/12/02, 1/24/03; 4/30/03; 2/11/04, 3/3/05, 11/2/05, 9/28/06, 11/7/07, 1/14/08</p>	
<p>Executive Committee Meetings - Executive Committee members receive agenda, last meeting's minutes and other documents as needed via mail.</p>	<p>3/28/00, 4/25/00, 5/30/00, 7/25/00, 9/26/00, 10/31/00, 11/28/00, 1/16/01, 2/27/01, 3/27/01, 4/21/01, 5/29/01. 6/26/01, 7/31/01, 9/25/01, 11/27/01, 1/29/02, 3/26/02, 5/28/02, 7/30/02, 9/24/02, 11/26/02, 1/28/03; 3/25/03; 5/27/03; 7/29/03; 9/30/03; 11/17/03; 1/27/04; 3/30/04; 5/25/04; 7/27/04, 8/28/04, 11/30/04, 1/25/05, 3/29/05,</p>	<p>Executive Committee members (41): Association of Bay Area Governments; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; California Department of Transportation, District 4; Federal Highway Administration; Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District; Golden Gate National Recreation Area/National Park Service; Marin County, Department of Public Works; Metropolitan Transportation Commission; The Presidio Trust; San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission; San Francisco City and County, Department of Parking and Traffic; San Francisco City and County, Planning Department; San Francisco County Transportation Authority; Department of Veterans Affairs</p>

OUTREACH CONDUCTED	DATES	DETAILS
	5/31/05, 7/26/05, 9/27/05, 11/29/05, 3/28/06, 5/30/06, 7/25/06, 11/28/06, 1/30/07, 3/27/07, 5/29/07, 7/31/07, 9/25/07, 11/27/07, 1/29/08, 3/25/08	
Fact Sheet "Rebuilding the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge"	April 2003	Fact Sheet produced for funding related outreach to the FTA
Fact Sheet "Transit Improvements"	April 2003	

OUTREACH PRIOR TO PUBLIC MEETING ON 2/23/04	DATE	DETAILS
Meeting Notice Mailer	Feb 2004	Approximately 2000 notices were sent to residents, property owners, the executive Committee, the CAC subcommittee, neighborhood groups and local elected officials.
Fact Sheet "Update on Project Alternatives"	Feb 2004	Distributed at public meeting 2/23/04, update presentations, included in letters to CAC Subcommittee and neighborhood groups (see below)
Display Ads	2/5/04	Marin Independent Journal
	2/9/04	San Francisco Chronicle
	2/12/04	Sing Tao Daily (Chinese)
	2/15/04	El Mensajero (Spanish)
Meeting Notice Posting	Feb 2004	Presidio Trust Library Crissy Center Presidio YMCA
Newsletter Ads	Feb 2004 issues	SPUR Newsletter Presidio Trust Newsletter
Press Release	Feb 2004	San Francisco Chronicle San Francisco Examiner San Francisco Bay Guardian KCBS KQED KPIX KRON KTVU Craigslist.org

OUTREACH PRIOR TO PUBLIC MEETING ON 2/23/04	DATE	DETAILS
Website Update	2/11/04	Information regarding the public meeting on 2/23/04, Alternative 5, and eliminating Alternatives 3 and 4 was posted.
Letter to CAC Subcommittee	2/11/04	Meeting Notice and Fact Sheet
Letter To Neighborhood Groups	2/11/04	<p>Meeting Notice, Fact Sheet and Invitation to schedule a Doyle Drive project update presentation</p> <p>Groups contacted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cow Hollow Association Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action Fort Point & Presidio Historical Association Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association Lake Street Residents Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association Marin Advocates for Transit Marina Civic Improvement and Property Owners Association, Inc Marina Merchants Association Marina Neighborhood Association Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning Pacific Heights Planning Association for the Richmond Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors Presidio Residents and Tenants Presidio Tenants Council Presidio Terrace Presidio Trust Richmond District Seacliff Properties Sunset District Tamalpais Valley Improvement Club Union Street Merchants West Presidio Neighborhood Association
Update Presentations to Advisory Committees	1/27/04	Executive Committee
	1/28/04	CAC Subcommittee
	3/25/04	Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD), Building and Operating Committee
Update Presentations to Individual Neighborhood Groups	2/26/04	California Heritage Council
	4/6/04	SF Architectural Heritage
	4/7/04	Presidio Community Town Hall Meeting
	4/21/04	Marina Merchants Association
	4/21/04	GG Valley Neighborhood Assn
	5/4/04	Cow Hollow Association Annual Meeting
5/5/04	Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association	

OUTREACH PRIOR TO PUBLIC HEARINGS ON 1/18 AND 2/15/2006	DATE	DETAILS
Meeting Notice Mailer		Approximately two weeks before each hearing, a direct mail flyer was sent to the complete Doyle Drive mailing list of over 2,400 people.
Display Ads	Weeks of 1/9 and 2/6	The San Francisco Chronicle The Marin Independent Journal
Press Releases	January/February 2006	San Francisco Chronicle San Francisco Examiner San Francisco Bay Guardian San Francisco Weekly KCBS KOED KPIX KRON KTVU-2 Sing Tao Daily Marin Independent Journal El Mensajero
Traffic Operations Analysis Handout	January 2006	The traffic operations handout provided detailed information and statistics used for developing the traffic model included in the DEIS/R.
Citizen's Guide	December 2005	A citizen's guide was developed to accompany the DEIS/R and serve as a basic overview of the project and description of the project impacts and proposed mitigation.
Website Update	December 2005	Information regarding the meetings on 1/18 and 2/15/2006 was posted.
Update Presentations to Advisory Committees	11/29/05	Executive Committee
	11/29/05	CAC Subcommittee
Update Presentations to Other Groups	12/8/05	Cow Hollow Association
	12/12/05	Supervisor Michaela Alioto-Piers Staff
	1/17/06	San Francisco Planning and Urban Research (SPUR), Noontime Forum
	1/24/06	Lucas Digital Arts
	1/26/06	Planning Association of the Richmond (PAR) Quarterly Membership Meeting

OUTREACH PRIOR TO PUBLIC HEARINGS ON 1/18 AND 2/15/2006	DATE	DETAILS
	1/26/06	Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District Building and Operations Committee
	2/2/06	Nature in the City Workshop
	2/6/06	Marina Community Association
	2/8/06	Presidents of Neighborhood Associations - Organized by Supervisor Alioto-Piers Staff
	2/13/06	Lyon Street Residents
	2/14/06	Lynne Newhouse Segal - Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District Board Member Briefing
	2/23/06	California Heritage Council
	2/28/06	Golden Gate National Recreation Area

This page intentionally left blank



To: SFCTA Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Gary Kannerley, PB Project Manager
Katie Eastham, PB Environmental Task Lead

Copy: Lee Saage, SFCTA Doyle Drive Project Manager

Date: July 17, 2006

Project: South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge
Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Project
SFCTA Contract Number: 99/00-7
PB Project Number: 13145B

Subject: Summary of Issues Related from the Public Comments on the DEIS/R

During the formal comment period, we received a total of 808 comments following the public circulation of the DEIS/R. Of those comments, 335 related to project alternatives and 100 are focused on traffic issues. The remaining comments are distributed amongst the various resource areas. Generally the comments either provide an opinion or request some clarification. The comments suggest only two areas that the analysis in the DEIS/R were insufficient. One area is the lack of traffic operational analysis in the neighborhoods surrounding the project. The second is a request for greater detail on the cultural impacts analysis. Table 1 provides a list of the number of comments by resource area.

No unexpected major issues of concern have been identified. However, ongoing issues that need resolution include:

- Treatment of roadway surface water run-off and proposed connection to SFPUC system.
- Continuing concerns regarding shading and coordination with marsh restoration.
- Agreement on right of way interests with the Presidio Trust.
- The identification of cultural mitigation through the MOA and the assessment of any additional impacts of the mitigation measures.

Below is a summary of the major issues:

Biological Resources

Twelve biological resources comments are repeats of previous comments made on the administrative draft that (for reasons unknown) were never reflected in the publicly circulated DEIS/R. An apology was sent to the Presidio Trust for this oversight and the comments agreed upon at the administrative draft phase will be included in the FEIR/S.



Table 1 – Number of Comments by Resource Area

Subject	Total
Air Quality	12
Animal Species	10
CEQA Evaluation	6
Community Impacts	18
Cultural Resources	43
Cumulative	11
Energy	3
General	41
Geology etc.	3
Hazardous Waste/Materials	1
Hydrology and Floodplains	25
Invasive Species	3
Land Use	13
List of Preparers	1
Natural Communities	16
Noise and Vibration	26
Park and Recreation Facilities	8
Parking	15
Plant Species	19
Project Alternatives	358
Public Involvement	1
Purpose and Need	9
Section 4(f)	9
Summary	6
Threatened and Endangered Species	1
Traffic and Transportation	107
Visual and Aesthetics	13
Water Quality and Storm Water Run-Off	12
Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States	18
TOTAL	808

While work will be needed to prepare the final responses, there does not appear to be any additional new study or survey information needed, with one major exception. GGNRA has restated its position regarding Tennessee Hollow that extensive studies on the effects of different shade levels on both plants and animals be made part of the EIR/S, with a further analysis on how wildlife might use the corridor (Presidio Council requests that this be part of a "metapopulation analysis").



In anticipation of this concern, the team conducted a Peer Review workshop on March 22, 2006. At the workshop a panel of three wildlife and plant experts not involved in the EIR/S presented their findings and commented on the shading issues and the adequacy of the EIR/S. The outcome of the review was an understanding that the wetlands below the ultimate facility could be designed with consideration for the potential shading issues. Shade tolerate plants could be selected for placement under the structure that would also encourage the wildlife to pass through the corridor. As the Presidio Trust has not started detailed plans for the wetlands development, the Authority offered to put their resources into assisting with the planning of the wetlands as part of the mitigation process rather than expending resources to expand an already sufficient shading study.

After the close of the comment period, the Authority sent a letter to GGNRA and the other stakeholders present at the Peer Review summarizing the discussion that occurred and restating its offer to assist with the wetlands planning as a mitigation measure for the project. No responses to the letter have been received to date.

Noise

Comments received from the Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action suggest that a noise study be conducted for areas beyond the identified construction limits. While this is not likely to change the impacts or the abatement proposed, it is a question that needs to be resolved since the original noise study did not extend beyond the anticipated limits of construction.

Several comments identified buildings where sound insulation might be desirable based on noise from operational levels or construction noise. Those buildings (106, 603 - Crissy Center) will need to be investigated in more detail during the design process to determine if additional abatement in the form of window or door replacement is warranted. No additional study is needed for these areas at this time although coordination with the building owners and tenants would be worthwhile to identify architectural details that might impact the historic resource (106) or the usefulness (Crissy Center) of the buildings. These are details that can be handled as part of the design process but may warrant some discussion in the final EIS.

Air Quality

We will need to obtain information on other sensitive receptors near the construction limits, besides those listed in the EIS/R, such as schools, hospitals, recreation, etc. We also may need to consult with FHWA regarding commitment to additional recommended AQ measures.

Comments were made regarding maintaining standards for PM 10, while references were made to the pending PM 2.5 rule. We will continue to monitor the implementation of regulations for PM 2.5 rule and potential impacts on the project.



Traffic Analysis

The traffic related comments general fall into four categories with the issues of neighborhood cut-through traffic accounting for 75% of the traffic comments:

- Need to include additional neighborhood intersections and streets in the analysis and results to show impacts to surrounding neighborhoods;
- Prepare a detailed Traffic Management Plan;
- Maintain the current balance of traffic volumes between Richardson Ave and Marina Blvd., and;
- Transit operations and improvements

Although the increase in traffic results from population increases anticipated outside of the project's existence, a larger number of intersections will be included in the FEIS/R to identify neighborhood traffic operations. In addition, proposed design refinements to maintain existing traffic distribution will be analyzed.

Storm Water

Comments were received questioning the storm water data report that had not been included with the draft EIS/R. The draft report has been completed and provided to the appropriate agencies for review as well as answer which agency is accountable to monitor the compliance to the plan.

The San Francisco PUC raised concerns that the potential impacts to their facilities had not been addressed and no early consultation with their agency had occurred. The project team did communicate with the SFPUC prior to circulation of the DEIS/R and has since meet with the PUC to coordinate the responses to their concerns.

Cultural Resources

The DEIR/S stated that prior to construction, a complete inventory of the historical buildings would be completed. However, the EPA sited the cultural resources section as having insufficient information and requested that additional information be included in the final EIR/S. Completing the cultural resource studies will require hiring a historian acceptable to the Presidio Trust. SFCTA is reviewing when the completion of the study would be possible but does not believe the study is necessary to make an alternative selection.

Pending the alternative selection, additional wetlands may need to be constructed as mitigation. Prior to constructing the wetlands, additional cultural resource studies will need to be completed for the land slated to be transformed into wetlands.

Selection of the Preferred Alternative

Many of the comments requested additional study on impacts from a project alternative or element or by the proposed mitigation measure related to the alternative, which are not likely to be selected for project advancement. The team must address these concerns but must explain in the cases where additional study will not provide additional value to the EIR/S.



Table 2 provides the breakdown of the comments that relate to project alternatives and expressions of a preference for an alternative and/or the design options. As can be seen from the table, there is overwhelming support for Alternative 5, Presidio Parkway. Of the various design option under Alternative 5, there is clear support for the Hook Ramp option at the Park Presidio interchange and a strong rejection of the Merchant Road Slip Ramp (MRSR) option. The east end options are less clear cut but the majority favor the Diamond option including all the cooperating and responsible agencies and most citizens. Support for the Circle Drive option is most clearly articulated by SPUR. Several other interested parties used the same arguments in support of Circle Drive as those presented by SPUR. The largest single issue is the protection of the YMCA swimming pool with 61 citizens demanding that the pool be saved.

As can be seen in Table 2, there are many individual issues. Some of the more common themes include:

- Concerns regarding life safety in tunnels during a fire or earthquake;
- Include bicycle lanes on surface streets;
- Eliminate of the connection between Gorgas Ave. and Lyon St.;
- Prevent the conversion of shoulders into future traffic lanes, and;
- Support for continued context sensitive design solutions;

Fifteen citizens expressed a preference for Alternative 2. Their reasons were: general (3); cheaper (5); less impact to resources especially historic buildings (7); maintain the existing traffic split between Richardson and Marina (3); and preservation of views from the roadway (1). Note that some citizens expressed more than one reason. The Cow Hollow Association, the Marina and Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants and a petition with 44 signatures also demanded the modification of Alternative 5 to maintain the existing traffic split.

Comments received since the close of the formal comment period

Since the end of the formal comment period on March 31, 2006, additional input has been received at project workshops and through other media. Some of the issues raised were:

- Clarification of the connection to Marina Boulevard
- Continued concerns regarding potential new traffic patterns
- Configuration of the southbound exit ramp to Girard Road
- Recommendations for the preservation of historic resources

The comments dated after the close of the comment period will not be included in the formal response to comments section of the final EIS/R. However, the project team will continue to gather input from interested parties and address concerns as appropriate within the framework of the environmental process.

Table 2 – Summary of Public Comments on Project Alternatives



Issue/Option	For (Against)			
	Trust	GGNR A	GGBHTD	Groups Citizen
Alternative 1			(1)	(1) 2 (1)
Alternative 2				1 18
Detour	(1)			(1) 1 (1)
Alternative 5	1	1		19 (1) 35 (5)
MRSR	(1)	(1)	1	(6) 2 (6)
Presidio Parkway Interchange	1	1		5 (1) 6
Hook Ramp				(1) 1
Loop Ramp				
Existing Configuration				
Presidio Access				8 6 (16)
Circle Drive				
Diamond	1	1		3 7
General Concerns				
Construction Schedule	1		1	1
Transit Improvement			1	1 1
Revise Alt 1 for Weight Restrictions			1	
Save Pool- Open During Construction		1		1 52
Bike Access Needed				2 4
2 Lanes WB from Marina				2 4
Lyon Connection				4 2
Trapped in Tunnels				5
Shorten Tunnels				2 1
Need for Reduce Shading				2
Against Future Additional Lanes				2 2
ITS				2 1
Fugitive Light				2
Alternative 5/2 Hybrid				2