

## CHAPTER SIX

### PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS/ NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL COORDINATION

---

This chapter describes the public outreach and agency coordination activities undertaken prior to issuance of the *South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report* (DEIS/R) in December 2005. This chapter also presents public and agency involvement activities from the release of the DEIS/R to the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

The preparation of this *Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report* (FEIS/R) has included consultation and coordination with federal, state, and local agencies, and with elected officials, community leaders, organizations and other individuals from the neighborhoods; and communities within the project area. Outreach efforts have included scoping meetings, open houses, and smaller, community meetings. **Appendix E** provides a comprehensive listing of activities and meetings. In addition, a detailed summary of public and agency comments on the DEIS/R is included in **Appendix L**.

#### 6.1 Public Scoping

The process of determining the scope, focus and content of an EIS/R is known as “scoping.” Scoping meetings are a useful opportunity to obtain information from the public, community organizations, interested agencies, and governmental agencies. In particular, the scoping process asks agencies and interested parties to provide input on the proposed alternatives, the topics of evaluation, and potential impacts and mitigation measures to be considered in the environmental document.



Community members compare preliminary alternatives

For the Doyle Drive Project, the scoping process began with formal notification to agencies. On February 16, 2000, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), as the lead agency for the project under the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA), published a *Notice of Intent* in the Federal Register (see **Appendix H**) to advise interested agencies and the public that an EIS/R would be prepared. On February 23, 2000, the San Francisco County Transportation

Authority (the Authority), as the project lead agency under the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA), distributed a *Notice of Preparation* (see **Appendix H**) to advise interested agencies and the public that an EIR would be prepared. The Authority distributed the *Notice of Preparation* to approximately 162 agencies, elected officials, interested parties, and public libraries in the study area.

The Authority also notified potentially interested organizations and individuals about the project and the public scoping meetings. The public meeting announcement was distributed to approximately 2,100 interested organizations and individuals, including property owners in the project area. Invitation letters were sent to elected officials to encourage their participation and the Authority published a newspaper advertisement in the *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 28, 2000) and in the *Marin Independent Journal* (February 29, 2000). A press release was distributed to approximately 136 area newspapers and media outlets.

Four formal scoping meetings were conducted by the Authority to gather input and comments prior to the development of the DEIS/R. On March 3, 2000, the Authority held an agency scoping meeting that consisted of a brief presentation by the project team with a facilitated question and answer period. Two public scoping open houses were held on March 14 and 15, 2000. Approximately 135 people attended the three meetings. The agency scoping meeting consisted of a brief presentation by the project team with a facilitated question and answer period after the presentation. In addition, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Advisory Commission hosted an additional scoping meeting on March 21, 2000. GGNRA transcribed the comments provided at that meeting. A summary of the scoping meetings can be obtained from the Authority or found on the project website ([www.doyledrive.org](http://www.doyledrive.org)).

An additional public meeting was held on February 23, 2004 at the Golden Gate Club in the Presidio. The meeting was held to provide an update on the progress of technical and environmental studies and to present an additional design alternative: Alternative 5, Presidio Parkway. The Authority sought input on a provisional decision to eliminate the single tunnel alternatives (Alternatives 3 and 4) from further consideration and to move forward with study of Alternative 5, in addition to Alternatives 1 and 2. A notice was mailed to over 2,000 individuals, organizations, agencies, elected officials and other special interest representatives, display ads were placed in both the *San Francisco Chronicle* and the *Marin Independent Journal*, and a media release was distributed to local newspapers and media outlets. Information was also posted on the project website ([www.doyledrive.org](http://www.doyledrive.org)) and letters were mailed to the Agency Working Group (also known as the Executive Committee) and the Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Authority's Citizens Advisory Subcommittee.

The meeting was attended by approximately 120 people and no comments were received that objected to the provisional decision to delete alternatives. Of the 26 comments received at, or following the meeting, half indicated support to proceed with the studies of Alternatives 1, 2, and 5. Other comments referred to historical resources, natural resources, construction, noise, safety, and parking.

All comments are documented in the *Final Public Meeting and Outreach Summary Report* dated April 21, 2004.

## 6.2 Public and Agency Coordination

Citizen and agency working groups were established to meet and receive updates on design and environmental issues and provide input. This section presents an overview of these committees and working groups.

### *Citizens Subcommittee*

A Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Authority's Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was established as a primary component of the public involvement process for the Doyle Drive Project. The Subcommittee meets periodically and provides input on a wide range of issues pertaining to Doyle Drive. Prior to the release of the DEIS/R, there were 17 Subcommittee meetings from March 2000 to November 2005, including a bus/walking tour of the project area with the Subcommittee and Agency Working Group. This was followed by a workshop on the design alternatives. Summaries and agendas from these meetings are posted on the Doyle Drive website. In advance of each Subcommittee meeting, informational packets with an agenda and other project materials are mailed to members of the Subcommittee, the Agency Working Group, the Authority's Citizen Advisory Committee, and a group of 83 interested parties before each meeting. The Subcommittee meeting agenda is also posted at the Authority's office. **Exhibit 6-1**, on the following page, presents a listing of the interest groups invited to participate in the CAC Subcommittee.

Prior to the release of the DEIS/R, topics considered by the Subcommittee have included the project purpose and need, screening of alternatives, refinement of alternatives, design and aesthetic considerations, traffic, environmental impacts, and neighborhood issues.

### *Agency Working Group (Executive Committee)*

The Authority established a public Agency Working Group, also known as the Executive Committee, to provide ongoing input on project development, alternatives refinement, scope and approach to environmental studies, and engineering considerations. The Agency Working Group generally meets bi-monthly and had 39 meetings from March 2000 to September 2005, prior to the release of the DEIS/R. In addition, two separate bus tours of the project area were provided for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the Federal Highway Administration. Presentations to various agency boards have been provided to groups such as the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission and the Presidio Trust.

**Exhibit 6-2** presents a listing of Agency Working Group members.

**Exhibit 6-1**  
**Invited Members: CAC Subcommittee**

- ▶ Citizens At-Large, San Francisco
- ▶ Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action
- ▶ Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission
- ▶ Commuters, Marin County
- ▶ Marina Merchants Association
- ▶ Planning Association for the Richmond
- ▶ San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
- ▶ San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
- ▶ Sierra Club
- ▶ Cow Hollow Association
- ▶ Fort Point & Presidio Historical Association
- ▶ Marina Civic Improvement and Property Owners Association
- ▶ Marina Neighborhood Association
- ▶ Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning
- ▶ Presidio Residents and Tenants
- ▶ San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Citizens Advisory Committee
- ▶ San Francisco Tomorrow

**Exhibit 6-2**  
**Invited Members: Agency Working Group**

- ▶ 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
- ▶ US Department of Veterans Affairs
- ▶ San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- ▶ San Francisco City and County, Department of Parking and Traffic
- ▶ San Francisco City and County, Planning Department
- ▶ San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
- ▶ San Francisco County Transportation Authority

### *Other Interested Parties*

In addition to the Agency Working Group, the project team held over 50 meetings with technical specialists from participating agencies to review environmental issues and provide input.

A number of other organizations, agencies, and individuals have been consulted about the proposed project. On April 19, 2001, letters were sent to 19 individuals and organizations concerned with the history and historic preservation of the Presidio. Consultation between agencies and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding this project has been ongoing since the first Doyle Drive Project meeting, which began with the development of the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The SHPO has participated in agency meetings to discuss and set the APE, as well as to advise on historic preservation issues for both archaeology and the built environment. In addition, representatives from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) have visited the project site and taken an interest in its development.

## **6.3 Additional Public Outreach**

In addition to the formal committee and working group meetings, other public outreach efforts included:

### *Outreach Meetings*

The Doyle Drive project team has periodically met with small groups of citizens and with individual citizens to discuss project issues. In spring 2000, the project team held stakeholder interviews and meetings with area residents and neighborhood organizations to introduce the project and identify key issues. Additional stakeholder meetings were held in winter 2001 to discuss the preliminary project alternatives. Representatives of the project team attended neighborhood association meetings throughout the process to present Doyle Drive Project issues (including approximately ten meetings in Spring 2004) to gather input on the provisional decision to eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4, and include Alternative 5 for further studies.

### *Newsletters*

Two newsletters were published addressing the Doyle Drive Project status. The first edition was released in January 2001, and focused on the purpose of the Doyle Drive Project and the alternatives being evaluated at the time. The second newsletter, issued in July 2002, discussed the alternatives that were chosen to be evaluated for the DEIS/R and the opportunities for public comment. Both newsletters were sent to a mailing list of over 1,500 individuals including elected officials, community members, and representatives from county and city agencies.

### *Fact Sheet*

A project fact sheet was developed in February 2004 to provide information on the alternatives being evaluated in the DEIS/R. The fact sheet was mailed to the Agency Working Group and the Citizens Subcommittee. It was distributed to attendees of the February 23, 2004 public meeting and was made available at subsequent neighborhood association and agency meetings.

### *Website*

The Doyle Drive website provides the public with the most up-to-date information about the project including the latest design alternative graphics and project schedule. The site provides the opportunity for the public to submit comments to the project team. Members of the public also can request to be added to the Doyle Drive mailing list through the website at [www.doyledrive.org](http://www.doyledrive.org).

### *Design Charrette for the Five Corners Intersection*

In July 2004, the Authority invited the public, local businesses, and the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) to participate in a series of facilitated workshops to define the existing problems associated with the Five Corners Intersection. This intersection is where Marina Boulevard, Mason

Street, Lyon Street, Doyle Drive, and Yacht Road meet. During the charrette, the public had the opportunity to discuss traffic operations and recommend general design options for this location.

Results from the charrette were submitted to DPT for their review, consideration and implementation, as

appropriate. Although not officially part of this Doyle Drive Project, there was extensive coordination and integration between both processes.



Working together at the Five Corners Intersection Charrette Session

## **6.4 Summary of Native American Consultation**

Through the consultation process, local Native Americans -- the Ohlones -- have been involved in all aspects of the investigation and planning for this project. Participants have contributed their knowledge and perception to the process and, as a result, have assisted in the overall assessment of significance and potential

impacts. Since release of the DEIS/R, the Ohlones were sent copies of the *Finding of Effect* document prepared for this project. In addition, on September 21, 2006, the Ohlones were invited to participate in a *Section 106* workshop. More information can be found in the *South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge - Doyle Drive Project Cultural Resources Technical Report*, October 2004.

**Exhibit 6-3** presents a listing of Ohlones outreach efforts.

**Exhibit 6-3  
Ohlone Outreach Activities**

ACTIVITY	DATE
November 22, 2000	Information letters mailed to twelve Ohlones groups
April 19, 2001	Project materials sent to interested parties
June 18, 2001	Meeting with interested individuals and Ohlones groups
August 21, 2001	Updated project information package mailed to interested individuals and Ohlones groups
November 11, 2001	An open house was held to present the information on an archeological site in the project study area
March 18, 2002	A formal meeting was held with Ohlones representatives to discuss findings from the archeological site testing

## 6.5 Section 106 Compliance

In addition, in compliance with *Section 106* of the *National Historic Preservation Act*, meetings have been on-going with several historic preservation groups with interest in the resources at the Presidio. Specifically, numerous meetings have been held with members of the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association, the California Heritage Council, and San Francisco Architectural Heritage to review their concerns about the project and to facilitate their participation in the *Section 106* compliance process.

## 6.6 Outreach Activities Related to the Release of the DEIS/R, Identification of the Preferred Alternative and Preparation of the FEIS/R

The release of the DEIS/R, selection of the Preferred Alternative and preparation of the FEIS/R have included consultation and coordination with federal, state, and local agencies, and with elected officials, community leaders, organizations and other individuals from neighborhoods and communities within

the project area. Outreach efforts have included public hearings, design and sustainability workshops, neighborhood outreach meetings, agency and subcommittee coordination, a public website and printed informational materials.

### ***DEIS/R Public Release and Distribution***

The DEIS/R was published in the *Federal Register* and officially released for public review on December 30, 2005. The formal review period ended on March 31, 2006. The DEIS/R was distributed to elected officials, key agencies, community groups and interested citizens. The package mailed with the DEIS/R contained companion materials, including CD's of the technical studies and a *Citizens' Guide to the Environmental Document*.

Copies of the DEIS/R and companion materials were made available to the general public through multiple sources, including local libraries, the project website, and upon request through the website, the project email address, or by calling the Authority.

### ***Citizens' Guide to the Environmental Document***

The *Citizens' Guide* is a booklet that summarizes the content of the DEIS/R. The *Citizens' Guide* was developed to provide an overview of the proposed Doyle Drive Project, the alternatives being considered, and key environmental factors that would result from the construction and long-term operation of the project. The guide was included in the DEIS/R packet and was distributed at stakeholder meetings and outreach events.

### ***Public Hearings on the DEIS/R***

In January and February 2006, the project team hosted two public hearings on the DEIS/R. The first hearing occurred on January 18, 2006, at 6:00 PM in the California State Building Auditorium. The second hearing was held on February 15, 2006, at 6:00 PM at the Golden Gate Club in the Presidio. Both meetings featured similar formats and content.

The public hearings were formatted as a combination open house and public hearing. The public open house occurred from 6:00 PM to 7:00 PM, during which time attendees could circulate among exhibit stations and talk to members of the project team. At 7:00 PM, the event shifted into a formal public hearing, which was recorded by a court reporter. A project overview was presented by members of the project team. After the presentation, hearing attendees offered formal comments on the DEIS/R. A panel of key members of the project team was present to respond to comments, as appropriate.

Members of the public received several forms of notification about the public hearings, beginning in December 2005. A direct mail notice was sent twice to the complete Doyle Drive mailing list of approximately 2,600. Legal notices were printed in two local newspapers: *The San Francisco Chronicle* and *The Marin Independent Journal*. Additionally, the project website featured the dates and times of the public hearings, as well as links to public transit and driving directions.



The project team conducted media outreach efforts prior to each public meeting. A press kit containing a press release, *Citizens' Guide*, public hearing flyer, project fact sheet, and CD with video files was sent to a comprehensive list of area media contacts. Media outreach efforts resulted in increased press attention to the upcoming public hearings and the DEIS/R review period, including a story on the KTVU Channel 2 News and articles in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, *San Francisco Examiner*, and other area newspapers.

### ***Design Workshops***

The project team conducted multiple design workshops to seek input on different elements of the project and to develop appropriate design refinements. Two workshops focused primarily on avoiding and minimizing impacts to cultural resources. Two additional workshops focused on the overall project design, with an emphasis on traffic calming and refinements to Presidio access. A final workshop focused on project refinements to reduce impacts on biological resources and wildlife. These workshops assisted in identifying design refinements to address concerns of interested agencies, organizations, and residents.

### ***Sustainability Workshops***

As a result of public input, the project team conducted three sustainability workshops to develop concepts for a sustainability program for the Doyle Drive Project. The first workshop focused on generating input for the development of a vision statement, guiding principles and goals/objectives for the sustainability program. The second workshop was held to develop evaluation criteria and the final workshop identified sustainable strategies for implementation of the sustainability program. The workshops were publicized to the Agency Working Group, Subcommittee and posted at the Authority for the general public.

### ***Citizens' Subcommittee***

The Subcommittee met four times since the release of the DEIS/R. In June and July 2006, two meetings were held to update Subcommittee members about comments received on the DEIS/R, provide an overview of the status of the alternatives, and to receive a recommendation on the Preferred Alternative. In November 2006, the Subcommittee received an update on the project status, the environmental process next steps, and discussed the process to develop sustainability principles for the project. The final meeting prior to the release of the FEIS/R was held to update the Subcommittee on the project and to provide them with a preview of the FEIS/R.

### ***Agency Working Group (Executive Committee)***

The Agency Working Group conducted eight meetings since the release of the DEIS/R.

*Milestones for the Selection of the Preferred Alternative*

After extensive public and agency involvement, consensus was achieved among key committees and the Authority Board of Commissioners voted to formally identify the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS/R. **Exhibit 6-4** provides a listing of outreach meetings where participants discussed the project and provided insight into the selection of a Preferred Alternative

**Exhibit 6-4**  
**Listing of Public Outreach Meetings**

DATE	MEETING
11/29/05	Subcommittee to the Authority's Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)
11/29/05	Executive Committee
12/07/05	Authority's Citizen's Advisory Committee
12/08/05	Cow Hollow Association
12/12/05	Meeting with Michaela Alioto-Pier's Staff
01/17/06	San Francisco Planning & Urban Research (SPUR) Noontime Forum
01/18/06	Public Hearing
01/24/06	Meeting with Lucas Digital Arts
01/25/06	Project Briefing with Mayor Newsom and Supervisor Alioto-Pier
01/26/06	Planning Association for the Richmond
01/26/06	Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District (GGBHTD)
02/02/06	Briefing on Natural Resources
02/06/06	Marina Community Association
02/08/06	Meeting with Presidents of Neighborhood Associations
02/13/06	Meeting with Lyon Street Residents
02/14/06	Meeting with GGBHTD Board Members
02/15/06	Public Hearing
02/21/06	Briefing on Traffic Modeling
02/22/06	Alternatives Workshop - Cultural and Natural Resources
02/23/06	Meeting with California Heritage Council
02/28/06	National Park Service Public Meeting
02/28/06	Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Meeting
03/07/06	Cow Hollow Association Meeting
03/15/06	Design Workshop
03/22/06	Peer Review Workshop
03/28/06	Executive Committee

**Exhibit 6-4 (Continued)**  
**Listing of Public Outreach Meetings**

DATE	MEETING
04/05/06	Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Workshop
04/20/06	Design Workshop
05/03/06	MOA Workshop
05/03/06	Meeting with staff from Alioto-Pier's Office
05/30/06	Executive Committee
06/20/06	Meeting with Lyon Street Residents
06/22/06	Subcommittee to the Authority's CAC
07/18/06	Subcommittee to the Authority's CAC
07/25/06	Executive Committee
07/26/06	Authority's Citizen's Advisory Committee
07/27/06	MOA Team Meeting
07/27/06	MOA Workshop
08/24/06	GGBHTD Building & Operating Committee
09/18/06	Authority Plans & Programs Committee
09/26/06	Authority Board of Commissioners
09/26/06	Executive Committee
11/09/06	Subcommittee to the Authority's CAC
11/28/06	Executive Committee
01/30/07	Executive Committee
03/27/07	Executive Committee
04/18/07	Sustainability Workshop #1
05/17/07	Sustainability Workshop #2
05/29/07	Executive Committee
06/11/07	Sustainability Workshop #3
07/31/07	Executive Committee
09/25/07	Executive Committee
11/27/07	Executive Committee
12/13/07	Subcommittee to the Authority's CAC
1/29/08	Executive Committee
3/25/08	Executive Committee
3/27/08	Subcommittee to the Authority's CAC

## 6.7 Summary of Public and Agency Comments on the DEIS/R

During the formal comment period of the DEIS/R, a total of 808 comments were received from the public. A total of 358 of these comments addressed the project alternatives, while 100 comments focused on traffic issues. The remaining comments addressed a wide variety of topics, as shown in **Exhibit 6-5** on the following pages. Of these topics, the major categories on which the public and agencies commented included:

- biological resources;
- noise;
- air quality;
- traffic;
- stormwater;
- cultural resources; and
- selection of the Preferred Alternative.

**Exhibit 6-6** on the following pages provides a summary of the public and agency comments on the alternatives.

Issues that the public stated were ongoing and that needed resolution included:

- treatment of roadway surface water runoff 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; and
- identification of cultural mitigation through the MOA and the assessment of any additional impacts of the mitigation measures.

Since the end of the formal comment period on March 31, 2006, additional input was received at project workshops and through other media. Some of the issues commented on during this time included:

- clarification of the connection to Marina Boulevard;
- continued concerns regarding potential new traffic patterns;
- configuration of the southbound exit ramp to Girard Road; and
- recommendations for the preservation of historic resources.

The project team will continue to gather input from interested parties and address concerns, as appropriate, within the framework of the environmental process.

Exhibit 6-5  
Number of Comments by Subject/Resource Area

SUBJECT/RESOURCE AREA	TOTAL
Air Quality	12
Animal Species	10
CEQA Evaluation	6
Community Impacts	18
Cultural Resources	43
Cumulative	11
Energy	3
General	41
Geologic	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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>808</b>

**Exhibit 6-6  
Summary of Public Comments on Project Alternatives**

ISSUE/OPTION	FOR (AGAINST)				
	TRUST	GGNRA	GGBHTD	GROUPS	CITIZEN
Alternative 1			(1)	(1)	2 (1)
Alternative 2					
Detour	(1)			1	18
Alternative 5					
Merchant Road Slip Ramp	1	1		19 (1)	35 (5)
Hook Ramp	(1)	(1)	1	(6)	2 (6)
Loop Ramp	1	1		5 (1)	6
Existing Configuration				(1)	1
Circle Drive					
Diamond	1	1		8	6 (16)
Diamond				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 W/B from Marina				2	4
Lyon Connection				4	2
Trapped in Tunnels					
Shorten Tunnels				2	5
Need for Reduce Shading				2	1
Against Future Additional Lanes				2	2
Intelligent Transportation Systems				2	1
Fugitive Light				2	
Alternative 5/2 Hybrid					2