

Reviewers	Page	
Public Hearing January 18, 2006	Comment Letter	Responses
Vaughey, P.(Cow Hollow Neighborhood Merchants)	184	207
Sachs, J.	189	208
Covert, R.	194	209
Lem, L.	196	210
Blum, J.	197	211
Levin, M.	199	212
Hermann, Dee	203	213
<i>Reviewers listed in order from transcripts</i>		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
IN PARTNERSHIP WITH
CALTRANS, FHWA, GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE HIGHWAY AND
TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
IN COOPERATION WITH THE PRESIDIO TRUST, THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS

DOYLE DRIVE DRAFT EIS/R
PUBLIC HEARING
MILTON MARKS CONFERENCE ROOM
455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE (LOWER LEVEL)
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2006
7:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

---o0o---

A P P E A R A N C E S

KAY WILSON
Moderator

MYRNA VALDEZ
GARY KENNERLEY
Parsons Brinckerhoff

MICHAEL PAINTER
MPA Design

JARED GOLDFINE
California Department of Transportation

LEE SAAGE
San Francisco Transportation Authority

JOE STORY
DKS Associates

P U B L I C S P E A K E R S

Patricia Vaughey
Jackie Sachs
Richard Covert
Lewis Lem
Michael Levin

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS READ FROM CARDS FOR:

Jan Blum
Dee Hermann

---o0o---

1 end of the time that you speak, then, any questions that
2 we can, we'll forward to the panel.

3 If the questions are -- we want to answer as
4 many as we can, but if they're too technical or too
5 detailed, then you can know that they'll be answered in
6 the final environmental document. But the ones that are
7 fairly straightforward we'll try to work through tonight
8 so we can clear up as many questions as you have.

9 And then after that, if the -- if you have a
10 clarifying comment after the panel questions, we'll give
11 you a minute just for a clarifying comment. We would
12 ask that no time slots will be yielded or traded.
13 Please don't interrupt the speakers with side
14 conversations or applause. We want to be able to hear
15 everybody. And please turn off those cell phones and
16 beepers. We don't want to be too draconian here, but we
17 do want to get through and hear from everybody. And we
18 appreciate your cooperation. And let's get some speaker
19 cards up here, please.

20 Just raise your hand, and we'll be glad to --
21 Okay. Well, we'll start out with the first two, and
22 I'll check back in a few minutes.

23 Patricia Vaughey?

24 PATRICIA VAUGHEY: Good evening.

25 KAY WILSON: Good evening.

1 PATRICIA VAUGHEY: Patricia Vaughey for the Cow
2 Hollow Neighborhood Merchants.

3 There were two slides back on No. 5 concerning
4 Marina Boulevard's entrance. And I want to make a
5 statement, first, that our association has a stand that
6 we all have to share the burden in the greater
7 neighborhood and that all of us are going to have to
8 share some of this traffic.

9 But there are two slides that Gary produced.
10 One of them, he says that Doyle Drive was one third on
11 Marina Boulevard and two thirds on Lombard. And yet the
12 next slide, it says 22 percent on Lombard. And Gary
13 said that's 2 percent. And it's actually 11.

14 My question is, is this -- is what studies did
15 you do with this transportation analysis for your model,
16 and what was the mathematical principle behind it? I've
17 asked this question several times, and no one can seem
18 to answer it.

19 At the time the stop signs were put on Marina
20 Boulevard, Lombard was at 98 percent. And then when the
21 stop signs went up, it went up to 104 percent. Then,
22 after the dot com boom, it went down to 96 percent, and
23 now it's up to almost 99 percent. With 11 percent
24 increase, not counting the projected 25,000 by 2030, we
25 are going to be approximately 110 percent over maximum

1

2

1 capacity. What mitigations do you have for this? We
2 already have Greenwich, Filbert, Chestnut, Alhambra,
3 Francisco being inundated with people that want to get
4 off of Richardson and divert throughout our
5 neighborhoods. Marina Boulevard, after the stop signs
6 went up, on Baker they put a "no right-hand turn." So
7 now the cars are going up Scott.

2
cont

8 My question is, is what mitigations are you
9 going to do to help the entire neighborhood on this, and
10 how can you rationalize diverting some traffic from one
11 neighborhood to another so close together? And that's
12 my big problem.

3

13 My next problem on this is, the section near
14 Lyon and Bay, the diamond portion and the circle
15 portion, not the highway part, but the part that goes
16 into the Palace of Fine Arts, there's some great impacts
17 on the neighbors. Okay?

4

18 And I want to know if there is any way we can
19 get that mathematical principle behind that study,
20 because I think you're a little bit off on some of it.
21 And I'd like to be able to have a look at that
22 mathematical principle myself.

23 Thank you.

24 KAY WILSON: Patricia, you've asked some meaty
25 questions. Let me summarize a couple of them for the

1 traffic folks and see how they do.

2 What studies were done as far as the
3 transportation model, and what were the mathematical
4 principles behind that?

5 We'll start with that, and then I'll go to the
6 other two.

7 Joe?

8 JOE STORY: I guess it's a Joe question.

9 KAY WILSON: I think so.

10 JOE STORY: Thanks.

11 Actually, the traffic analysis was done in two
12 different -- with two different steps. The first step
13 is to look at the forecast on what's supposed to happen
14 by 2030. And that part of it was handled by the
15 Authority staff themselves. And of course, with Doyle
16 Drive as an existing roadway -- and we certainly have a
17 no-build condition -- we needed to see how traffic
18 volumes would actually change by 2030.

19 The way that the TA does this is, they have
20 what's called a multimodal regional traffic model that
21 it's built that is designed to simulate traffic behavior
22 characteristics across the entire Bay Area. It's
23 specifically focused in the city of San Francisco.

24 And that focus actually looks at the travel
25 speeds and the travel times of each length of every city

1 street in the entirety of San Francisco. That -- when
2 you get outside of the city, the other regions are
3 represented by the portion of the model that replicates
4 what's done by MTC, or Metropolitan regional [sic]
5 commission at the regional level. And that allows for
6 the forecast to be technically consistent with FHWA
7 standards for doing projections.

8 But a more specific answer to Pat's question
9 is, the volumes are a result of traffic speeds. And the
10 model has what's called an "equilibrium assignment."

11 So between any two points or any two districts
12 in the model, it looks at the minimum travel-time paths
13 and looks at several different paths and assigned
14 probabilities to each of those paths so that what ends
15 up happening is, some people may choose to go from
16 Downtown to Marin County via Marina, and some of those
17 people may choose to go from Downtown to Marin County
18 via Lombard.

19 And the probabilities are directly related to
20 what is the travel time on each of those paths. Then
21 the model has what I would call a feedback mechanism
22 that the higher the traffic volumes get, the model then
23 begins to say, "Well, the road can't handle this much
24 traffic. It's going to get slower and slower."

25 And also there's this relationship between the

1 theoretical capacity, the carrying capacity of the
2 roadway, and the actual speeds that are achieved on the
3 roadway.

4 KAY WILSON: Okay. A couple of follow-ons: What
5 mitigations have we proposed to address traffic issues?
6 And how can you rationalize diverting traffic from one
7 neighborhood to another?

8 JOE STORY: That's certainly an interesting
9 question. I would begin by saying it's almost a
10 chicken-or-egg question. And the reason I say that is
11 because the alternatives were designed, and then the
12 question came up whether or not the alternatives would
13 create significantly more or less problems on the
14 adjacent roadways.

15 And while we did identify some percentage
16 changes between the alternatives, in the aggregate, the
17 alternatives did not have what I would call a fatal flaw
18 in terms of significantly making a negative result
19 happen. One of the reasons for that is, as Gary said in
20 his presentation, is most of the traffic increase is in
21 the non-peak direction rather than in the peak
22 direction.

23 KAY WILSON: Patricia, do have a follow-on comment
24 or question?

25 PATRICIA VAUGHEY: No one seems to be able to tell

1 me what the principles behind this model are. And my
2 only question on that is, the studies were based on
3 2000. And we're at 2006 right now. And we had a great
4 increase before Lucas, and now we have a great increase
5 after Lucas.

6 And I'm just wondering, for the greater
7 neighborhood, if we're not being more cautious -- I
8 think we can do a better job. I think I like what we've
9 done. I am on the citizens advisory committee.

10 But we've got to look into these issues because
11 the side streets of all of Scott, from Marina Boulevard
12 on up, as well as the side streets of Greenwich and
13 Filbert, are getting inundated with diverted traffic.
14 And this isn't fair to the entire neighborhood. Thank
15 you.

16 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

17 Jackie Sachs is our next speaker, please.

18 JACKIE SACHS: Good evening, Panel. I'm also on
19 the citizens advisory committee. I have a few questions
20 regarding transportation and traffic.

21 First of all, regarding traffic, near the
22 Palace of Fine Arts, how will this construction impact
23 the parking at the Palace of Fine Arts? -- for the
24 simple reason that you will not only have people taking
25 public transit, you will have tour buses, you will have

1

1 cabs wanting to drop people off and pick people up, you
2 will have MV vans with senior and disabled individuals.
3 You might even have some handicapped buses, bus loads of
4 people that are handicapped

5 And I was just wondering, how will this new --
6 how will the -- will there be enough -- and you may even
7 have limousines as well. How will all of this impact
8 the parking at the Palace of Fine Arts? That's question
9 number one.

10 Question number two, as you know, there are
11 currently two bus lines that go through the Presidio,
12 the 28 and the 43. Once the construction is started,
13 how are you going to re-route those buses, and what are
14 you going to do with the 18-wheelers that get off the
15 Golden Gate Bridge, and they want to go down to the
16 Marina? How in the world -- how -- they'll have to go
17 down -- they may have to -- how are you going to
18 accommodate those 18-wheelers that have to make
19 deliveries down at the Marina? And that's about it.

20 KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you. First question is
21 for traffic near the Palace of Fine Arts, how will
22 construction impact parking at the Palace?

23 GARY KENNERLEY: What we're looking at doing there,
24 for during the construction period, we've been working
25 with the Presidio Trust on the parking study; we had to

2

3

1 analyze. There will be some lesser parking in that
2 area. We're looking at -- working with the Presidio
3 Trust with their spaces, to manage it. The Palace of
4 Fine Arts, specifically we're looking at, if necessary,
5 providing shuttle buses to other areas of parking to
6 maintain that access.

7 KAY WILSON: The second question -- and I don't
8 know if we have this one available tonight -- bus lines,
9 how will buses be rerouted, and what about 18-wheelers?
10 Are we at that level of detail yet?

11 JOE STORY: I can address the bus issue.

12 KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

13 JOE STORY: But not the 18-wheeler issue. That's
14 probably a Gary issue.

15 KAY WILSON: Okay.

16 JOE STORY: Because this is a design study and it's
17 not a transit routing study, we are not at liberty to
18 redirect local bus routes within San Francisco. So we
19 basically have assumed that the local routes would
20 generally follow the paths that they do today.

21 Having said that, we did relocate the bus stops
22 in the Parkway alternatives and -- at the intersection
23 of Francisco, north of Richardson -- and created enough
24 room for the buses to pull out of the line of traffic,
25 in closer to the Palace of Fine Arts from where the

1 current Richardson stops are today.

2 But we did not reroute the 43. That's a
3 decision that Muni would make themselves. But that
4 would affect the 28.

5 JACKIE SACHS: What about the follow-up to that?
6 What about the transit hub that they're planning on
7 putting into the Presidio? Would the construction in
8 any way affect the transit hub that they want to put
9 near where Letterman -- well, where Lucas is now?

10 JOE STORY: As I understand it, the transit hub is
11 not part of the scope of these alternatives. So it's
12 actually not in the right-of-way of the Doyle Drive
13 corridor as it is. There is going to be enough room for
14 these stops on Richardson that will be able to
15 accommodate the buses, as I mentioned earlier.

16 KAY WILSON: Thank you, Jackie. And we'll have to
17 answer that other one in the final analysis.

18 JACKIE SACHS: Thank you.

19 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

20 Any other yellow cards, please? We'd love to
21 hear from some more people. If you don't have a yellow
22 card, raise your hand, and Lauren will bring you one.

23 Do you have a card?

24 MALE IN AUDIENCE: No, I don't.

25 KAY WILSON: Oh, well, we'll get you one. That's

4

1 easy.

2 Raise your hand if you would like a yellow
3 card, and we'll run them around.

4 Okay. Are you ready to come on up?

5 RICHARD COVERT: My name is Richard Covert. I'm a
6 long-time resident of San Francisco and a former
7 assistant chief counsel of CalTrans legal. And I was
8 retired, but I had occasion to have been interested in
9 some Doyle Drive litigation.

10 But I have a question, a specific question
11 about the land-use alternatives on Page 11 on your
12 handout, for Alternative 5, the Parkway. And under the
13 temporary impacts, it's got, "Construction staging will
14 require use of the parking lot at the Post Exchange."
15 And that's now, I believe, a Sports Basement.

16 So as I understand it, under Alternative 2, you
17 would be putting that Sports Basement temporarily out of
18 business for an extended period of time during
19 construction, which would obviously have an impact on
20 revenues to the City.

21 On the other hand, Alternative 2, which is to
22 Replace and Widen, has significantly less construction
23 costs than Alternative 5, for obvious reasons. You'd
24 have it two times. So that would obviously increase
25 construction costs of the Parkway over the

1 Alternative 2.

2 My specific question is, what analysis -- and I
3 also note under the Parkway alternative, you're not
4 going to be impacting the Sports Basement during
5 construction. So it could stay open. So we don't have
6 that severe impact, economic impact, on the Presidio
7 under the Parkway alternative that you do under
8 Alternative 2.

9 And I'm wondering what specific studies have
10 been made in right-of-way costs, which it would appear
11 you would have under the Parkway alternative because you
12 don't have to close the Sports Basement, which I would
13 think would generate a very significant revenue for the
14 Presidio. Under that Parkway alternative, you don't
15 have to close it up, whereas under Alternative 2, you do
16 have to close it up.

17 KAY WILSON: Okay. Gary, do you have any input on
18 that?

19 GARY KENNERLEY: Very quickly. One thing, all
20 alternatives will actually be using a portion of that
21 parking lot for staging. However, that parking lot has
22 greater capacity than the Sports Basement actually
23 needs. So the detour alternative under Alternative 2
24 would actually require the removal of that building;
25 otherwise it could stay in operation.

1

1 RICHARD COVERT: I wasn't calling on the detour so
2 much as on the -- the way I read this, and this is on
3 Page 11, is even without the detour, you're going to
4 have -- under Alternative 2, you're going to have
5 construction staging that's going to take out that
6 parking lot for significant periods of time, which
7 would, obviously, affect the liability.

8 GARY KENNERLEY: As I say, it wouldn't take out the
9 whole parking lot. It would leave enough. But
10 basically, to answer your question on the right-of-way,
11 generally we have taken square footage of buildings,
12 typically projected in-line, sort of building-use work
13 in the Presidio, and applied typical commercial rates to
14 those square footages to generate anticipated
15 right-of-way costs.

16 RICHARD COVERT: Thank you.

17 KAY WILSON: Thank you. Any more yellow cards?

18 We'll collect that one.

19 And Lewis?

20 LEWIS LEM: Hi. I just have a quick question. I'm
21 Lewis Lem. I work for AAA of Northern California. I
22 was just starting to look at the documents, but I have
23 one question just about the data on the highway safety
24 and level of service, and as somebody familiar with
25 that, just a very simple question. Maybe not too

1 simple; we'll see.

2 As I read it, basically, on the highway
3 segments between -- comparing between Replace and Widen
4 and the Parkway options, other than Richardson, there's
5 really no difference in level of service. There's
6 difference in volumes of traffic carried. That's what
7 it appears to be. But it doesn't look like, other than
8 Richardson, the level of service for the segments of the
9 highway are any different with this scenario, Replace
10 and Widen --

11 KAY WILSON: Can you confirm that, Joe?

12 JOE STORY: I don't have the -- I don't have the
13 tables in front of me, so I couldn't say exactly what it
14 says.

15 I will say that the term "level of service" is
16 a qualitative term that's based on some quantitative
17 analysis. I would expect level of service is based upon
18 the density of traffic, which is, if you -- how many --
19 how close together are the cars, how tightly packed or
20 loosely packed in are they? And it's created like your
21 school report cards: A, is very little congestion, and
22 F is over-saturation.

23 Having said that, because it is a replacement
24 project, from the no-project to the project, we're
25 essentially looking at carrying, roughly, about the same

1

1 amounts of traffic. There may be nuances within that
2 traffic of 100 vehicles or 200 vehicles that might
3 change a letter here or there just because of where the
4 line is drawn when we calculate things.

5 But certainly the whole project as a
6 replacement project does not create a major regional
7 attractiveness to the roadway or away from the roadway.

8 LEWIS LEM: Is there a way we can just check and
9 get an answer?

10 KAY WILSON: Yes. Maybe after the meeting, we can
11 get the document out and go over the tables.

12 LEWIS LEM: I just think that's a relatively
13 important question when you're comparing the Replace and
14 Widen with the Parkway. Basically, as I read it, other
15 than Richardson, there's no difference in terms of the
16 level of service. But I wouldn't presume to have the
17 answer to that question because I could be wrong.

18 JOE STORY: I would need to check the technical
19 reports one more time.

20 KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

21 The next yellow card that's been submitted is
22 by Jan Blum. And she's asked that I read these
23 comments:

24 "How far off the ground will the Parkway be in
25 elevation to the marsh expansion area?" Gary?

1

1 GARY KENNERLEY: Off the existing ground?

2 KAY WILSON: Yes, that would be my guess.

3 GARY KENNERLEY: Basically, it would vary from
4 pretty much being -- as it comes out of the Main Post
5 tunnel, it will be pretty much at-grade. And as it goes
6 over where the Halleck Street connection would be, it
7 would be about three meters -- ten feet above the
8 existing ground.

9 KAY WILSON: And then the next few questions I
10 believe pertain to the height of the Parkway:

11 "What is the maximum height in feet? What is
12 the minimum height in feet?"

13 GARY KENNERLEY: The minimum is zero. When you say
14 "height in feet," again, I would assume -- are we
15 talking height off the ground, or absolute --

16 KAY WILSON: Yes. I'm getting a nod "yes."

17 GARY KENNERLEY: At the high viaduct, it is
18 approximately about 35 meters above -- it's the same
19 place as the existing structure is, about 35 meters off
20 the ground.

21 KAY WILSON: And in feet?

22 GARY KENNERLEY: Which is about 100 feet.

23 KAY WILSON: Thank you. Okay.

24 Michael Levin?

25 And please raise your hand if you've got some

2

1 more yellow cards to give us.

2 MICHAEL LEVIN: Thank you. I'm Michael Levin. I'm
3 not too well prepared for this, but you're soliciting
4 comments, so I thought, well, why not. And I have a lot
5 of reading to do. I know we're supposed to be
6 commenting on the thoroughness of the Draft EIR/EIS, but
7 maybe my questions are at least partly answered in the
8 report.

9 But first of all, you mentioned that a few
10 historic buildings that, in the case of Alternative 2,
11 would have to be temporarily relocated and, in the case
12 of Alternative 5, the Parkway, would be lost, as I
13 understand it. Again, I don't know if there's more
14 thorough discussion on exactly what these are in the
15 report, but maybe you could say something more about
16 that, what these buildings are, their significance.

17 There are a lot of historic structures in the
18 Presidio. And I think every one of them should be
19 treasured. That's why they were designated historic
20 structures.

21 But on the other hand, maybe the loss would be
22 mitigated by the benefit of this new parkway. As
23 someone who's lived here all my life, is very used to
24 Doyle Drive -- although it's certainly negative on the
25 environment through most of its length, it's something

1

1 that we're used to. And I sure would like to think that
2 in my lifetime I would be able to see something that's
3 less harmful to the environment, that's an improvement,
4 a significant improvement over what's there now.

5 So I'm hoping that one of these alternatives --
6 and it sounds like the parkway would be it, would be
7 that type of change. But again, I have more reading to
8 do.

9 Also, I just thought I'd mention, with regard
10 to the bus lines, the previous speaker mentioned the 43
11 and the 28. There's also the 29 bus, which takes just
12 an amazing scenic route through the Presidio which I've
13 often traveled. And it's one of the best bus rides in
14 the city. And I'm hopeful that that will remain in
15 place. And I'm wondering if there's going to be any
16 significant impact to that. I know you've already said
17 it's up to Muni whether they'll be rerouting any buses.

18 But riding that bus will give me a chance, I
19 hope, to see this project when it's actually under
20 construction. Anyway, thank you for listening to my
21 comments.

22 KAY WILSON: Okay.

23 Jared, do you want to respond?

24 JARED GOLDFINE: Yeah, I would need to respond --
25 can you just -- here. Thanks.

2

1 There is a difference in the number of
2 buildings. But first of all, the Presidio is part of a
3 national historic landmark district. And the
4 alternatives do take varying numbers of buildings within
5 the Presidio. As we worked towards selecting a
6 preferred alternative, we were working with the advisory
7 council and the State Historic Preservation officer to
8 devise some means of addressing the adverse effects
9 resulting from the loss of those historic buildings.

10 KAY WILSON: And anybody on Muni Line 29?

11 JOE STORY: Yeah. There's certainly -- you know,
12 there's nothing in any of the alternatives that would
13 preclude having to change the 29 in the current
14 situation. There may be issues with the 29 during
15 construction periods, so we would need to address that
16 in the final EIR.

17 MICHAEL LEVIN: If I could just follow up with --
18 regarding historic structures -- could you clarify a
19 little bit more what you meant by what's being addressed
20 with that, how you're working this out with the other
21 agencies?

22 JARED GOLDFINE: Of course, we're working with the
23 Presidio and the National Park Service because the
24 Presidio Trust is the landowner. And so we're trying to
25 develop ways to record loss of historic buildings. And

3

1 if we can relocate historic buildings back into their
2 existing locations, how we can do that, so a program
3 of -- a program in order to address the effects on those
4 historic buildings.

5 Some of those buildings will be lost. And so
6 to the extent that we lose those, we will have to do
7 recordation of those.

8 LEE SAAGE: We often get so caught up in agonizing
9 over the loss of a building -- as we should -- but
10 sometimes we forget to mention that we've worked very
11 hard in designing the project to try to miss as many
12 buildings as possible. And in fact, both the Parkway
13 and Alternative 2 have been very, very carefully
14 designed to thread their way through that maze of
15 historic structures as carefully as possible.

16 And we have been watched like hawks by the
17 cultural resources both at the Presidio and the State
18 Historic Preservation officer. And I can assure you,
19 they have held our feet to the fire on that and that we
20 are doing everything humanly possible to minimize the
21 impact. And it's only with great reluctance that we
22 have concluded that a few of those buildings will be
23 lost. And that is detailed within the environmental
24 document.

25 MICHAEL LEVIN: Thank you.

1 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

2 Dee Hermann has submitted a card, and she'd
3 like me to ask this question:

4 "In light of the diamond interchange option,
5 does Section 4F preclude the selection of the circle
6 drive option under Parkway alternative?"

7 Jared?

8 JARED GOLDFINE: No, it does not preclude the
9 selection of the circle drive option. We need to
10 develop that decision, hearing a variety of factors.
11 And of course, the input, the comments that we get
12 during the public review period will help us make that
13 decision. But 4F does not preclude that.

14 As it happens, by virtue of engaging in this
15 project, we are having an effect on 4F resource. So --
16 no matter how we slice it. But what we're trying to do
17 is minimize that effect. And gravitating on what Lee
18 said earlier, we have attempted to do that throughout
19 this project by reducing impacts on recreational
20 resources within the Presidio and historic resources.

21 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

22 Any more people that would like to address
23 this? Any comments? Love to have them.

24 Anybody else? Going once. Going twice.

25 Okay. Looks like we've heard from everybody

1

1 tonight. I really thank you all for working with us
2 with our guidelines and getting us some good questions.
3 Please submit any other written comments that you have
4 by the close of the comment period, which is 5:00 p.m.
5 on Wednesday, March 1st. And thank you very much. Have
6 a good evening.

7 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded
8 at 8:09 o'clock p.m.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF MARIN) ss.

3 I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand
4 Reporter of the State of California, duly authorized to
5 administer oaths pursuant to Section 8211 of the
6 California Code of Civil Procedure, do hereby certify
7 that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a
8 disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under
9 my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct
10 transcription of said proceedings.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
13 foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way
14 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
15 caption.

16 Dated the 10th day of February, 2006.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
IN PARTNERSHIP WITH
CALTRANS, FHWA, GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE HIGHWAY AND
TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
IN COOPERATION WITH THE PRESIDIO TRUST, THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS

DOYLE DRIVE DRAFT EIS/R
PUBLIC HEARING
GOLDEN GATE CLUB - SAN FRANCISCO PRESIDIO
135 FISHER LOOP
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2006
7:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cow Hollow Neighborhood Merchants (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Modeling is conducted based on the MTC Regional Transportation Model and SFCTA and Caltrans criteria. These criteria examine projected traffic volumes based upon future population and employment changes predicted in San Francisco and across the Bay Area. The mathematical principles of travel forecasting are found in the San Francisco County Transportation Authority documents, including Chapter 10 of the 2006 Congestion Management Program (http://www.sfcta.org/Publications/documents/Chapter10_000.pdf). In addition, the Authority hosted a workshop to describe the modeling process and principles to interested parties on February 21, 2006.	1046
2	Traffic volumes on Lombard in the future are predicted to be similar in the No Project and Preferred Alternatives. No additional impacts are anticipated from the Preferred Alternative, so no additional mitigations are appropriate.	1047
3	Additional local intersections were studied in the Refined Presidio Parkway alternative on these streets, and no additional delay to create a level of service problem was identified for those streets. Although the Authority supports traffic calming, an area wide traffic calming study, as requested by the neighborhood, is beyond the scope of this project.	1048
4	As stated in Section 2.5.1, the Preferred Alternative maintains Palace Drive as a two-way street and incorporates the modifications proposed by the San Francisco Department of Recreation and Parks. Based on comments from area residents, the alternative will maintain Lyon Street as a two-way street with connection to Bay Street.	1049



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Sachs (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	There would be a loss of 258 parking spaces in the Palace of Fine Arts Area during construction. Replacement parking at the Parade Grounds augmented by the existing shuttle service was proposed. Parking will be coordinated with the Presidio Trust.	1050
2	Routing of 28 and 43 will not need to change during or after construction. Muni may choose to reroute the bus as part of a different effort.	1051
3	18-wheeled trucks are not allowed on the remainder of Marina Boulevard. This project does not propose any procedural changes in regards to trucks.	1052
4	This project is designed for bus service on Doyle Drive. No elements of this project would preclude a Presidio transit hub.	1053



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: R. Covert (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Community Impact Assessment (August 2005) (pages 4-15 - 4-18) describes the initial right-of-way assumptions and results; final right-of-way will be agreed upon between the FHWA and the Presidio Trust.	1054
2	Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway Alternative, has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Replacement parking at the Parade Grounds has been proposed to address any project-related impacts during construction. Details pertaining to the proposed mitigation would be developed in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1055



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Lem (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1056



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Blum (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The project description is enhanced in the FEIS/R.	1027
2	The minimum height of the structure is zero. The maximum height at the high viaduct is approximately 35 meters or 100 feet above the ground, about the same as the existing structure.	1848



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Levin (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The text explaining the process for preserving structures was enhanced in the FEIS/FEIR.	1028
2	Muni Route 29 would not be affected upon completion of any alternative. The route may need to be temporarily relocated during construction when Halleck Street is closed, and the bus would be able to use McDowell. This would not be a significant impact to the project.	1029
3	Comment noted. The EIS/R adequately addresses these concerns, since "landscape," as the term is used by biologists, comprises natural habitats and plant communities.	1030



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Hermann (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Circle Drive option was not selected as the Preferred Alternative for the project.	1031

Reviewers	Page	
	Comment Letter	Responses
Public Hearing February 15, 2006		
Alexander, M.	218	276
Chappell, J.	221	277
Kernan, R.	223	278
Widman, G.	225	279
Hermann, Diane	227	280
Bogatay, L.	229	281
Bulter, J.	231	282
Rowe, D.	232	283
Barry, D.	235	284
Tilles, D.	236	285
Hayward, W.	238	286
Orre, K.	240	287
Solomon, E.	242	288
Strunsky, M.	243	289
Chang, S.	244	290
Ream, J.	245	291
Coffin, R.	24	292
Keck, M.	249	293
Boland, M.	251	294
Foster, R.	253	295
Vaughey, P.	255	296
Nicholson, G.	257	297
Brooke, L.	258	298
Kern, D.	259	299
Perez, E.	260	300
Bancroft, D.	262	301
Hathaway, E.	262	302
Harrison, A.	262	303
Caramatti, J.	264	304
Brooke, J.	265	305
Figone, J.	269	306

Public Hearing February 15, 2006	Comment Letter	Responses
Betsy	271	307
Blum, J.	272	308
Marston, M.	274	309
<i>Reviewers listed in order from transcripts</i>		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

---o0o---

A P P E A R A N C E S

KAY WILSON
Moderator

MYRNA VALDEZ
GARY KENNERLEY
Parsons Brinckerhoff

MICHAEL PAINTER
MPA Design

JARED GOLDFINE
California Department of Transportation

LEE SAAGE
San Francisco Transportation Authority

JOE STORY
DKS Associates

P U B L I C S P E A K E R S

Michael Alexander	Richard Coffin
Jim Chappell	Michael Keck
Redmond Kernan	Michael Boland
Gary Widman	Rick Foster
Diane Hermann	Patricia Vaughn
Lucia Bogatay	Doug Kern
Joseph Butler	Eugena Perez
Diane Barry	Ann Harrison
Dick Tilles	Jean Caramatti
Winchell Hayward	John Brooke
Eric Solomon	Joseph Figone
Michael Strunsky	Betsy
James Ream	

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS READ FROM CARDS FOR:

Diane Row	Lori Brooke
Kristofer Orre	David Bancroft
Sue Chang	Elaine Hathaway
Monica Dantas Absent	Jan Blum
Gretchen Nicholson	Michael Marston

---o0o---

1 Chappell, and Michael Marston.

2 MICHAEL ALEXANDER: Good evening. I'm Michael
3 Alexander, Chair of SPUR's Doyle Drive Task Force and
4 Vice Chair of the Board of Supervisors' Doyle Drive Task
5 Force in 1993.

6 SPUR strongly supports Michael Painter's
7 Presidio Parkway. The parkway is the only alternative
8 which meets the objectives of the project. A parkway
9 design was called for by the San Francisco Board of
10 Supervisors in 1993, the National Park Service in 1994,
11 the Doyle Drive Intermodal Study in 1996, and the
12 Presidio Trust in 2002.

13 Alternative 2 is a freeway, taller and twice as
14 wide as what we now have. It ensures that increasing
15 numbers of people who drive to work, live, or play in
16 the national park will be forced to use neighborhood
17 streets to access the park, as they do today.

18 The parkway, by contrast, has direct access to
19 the Presidio.

20 The Presidio Parkway is the result of years of
21 work to accommodate the needs of neighbors and agencies.
22 Michael Painter's goal has been to make this necessary
23 roadway much better -- better for drivers, better for
24 park users and visitors, and better for the Presidio's
25 neighbors.

1

1 SPUR supports the hook ramp option at the
2 Highway 1 Interchange. We do not support the slip ramp
3 to the Bridge parking lot, which adds roadway width at
4 the project's widest point, removes residences and
5 trees, and adds over \$10 million in costs.

6 Legitimate concerns have been raised about the
7 Parkway's impacts to natural and cultural resources. We
8 asked Michael Painter to do sun and shadow studies on
9 the impact of the Parkway over an expanded marsh and the
10 Tennessee Hollow restoration. They show that the
11 shading impact is a small fraction of the shading of the
12 freeway alternative.

13 While marsh expansion and creek restoration are
14 not part of this project, the Presidio Parkway has been
15 designed to accommodate them. We urge the Presidio
16 Trust and the National Park Service to accelerate
17 designs for those projects because excavation
18 coordinated with Doyle Drive's construction would save
19 tens of billions.

20 We've examined carefully the legitimate
21 concerns of some historic groups about impacts of the
22 Main Post tunnel on the bluff edge and Halleck Street,
23 which are historic landscape elements. We're convinced
24 they can be mitigated so the Main Post and Crissy Field
25 can be reunited for the first time in 70 years. Where

1 today you stand at the Main Post and watch trucks
2 roaring by, you will be, instead, looking at the bay and
3 never hear the traffic.

4 The Parkway also restores the historic
5 alignment of Halleck Street.

6 Finally, the Parkway needs modern
7 traffic-management features, including video monitoring,
8 as called for in the Doyle Drive intermodal study. They
9 will also increase the Bridge's security. Remember, if
10 Doyle Drive is closed, so is the Golden Gate Bridge.
11 The deadline for including that in the regional plan for
12 national security funding is March 1st.

13 Give us a parkway through the national park,
14 moving traffic at moderate speed that is worthy of being
15 the southern approach to the Golden Gate.

16 Thank you.

17 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

18 Jim Chappell, with SPUR.

19 JIM CHAPPELL: Jim Chappell, President of SPUR.

20 Good evening. Getting the eastern end of Doyle
21 Drive right has always been the project's greatest
22 challenge. At the eastern end, there are two great
23 sites: the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio National
24 Park. People want to see and enjoy both of them, but
25 for 70 years, Doyle Drive has been a physical and visual

1 barrier between them.

2 Before that, the Presidio and the Palace were
3 united as sites of the 1915 Panama Pacific Exposition.
4 That unity was foremost in the mind of the great
5 landscape architect and National Medal of Honor winner
6 Lawrence Halprin when he recently created the stunning
7 new park, sweeping towards the Palace from Letterman
8 Digital Arts Campus. But Halprin could do nothing about
9 the intervening Doyle Drive. We can.

10 SPUR's objectives have been to reunite the
11 Presidio and the Palace, to lessen impacts on the
12 Palace, to provide a magnificent Presidio entry, and to
13 minimize traffic in the neighborhoods and the park.

14 There are two options for the Presidio access,
15 circle drive and the diamond. Each has advantages and
16 disadvantages. SPUR believes that the circle drive best
17 meets these objectives.

18 The diamond takes cars borne for the Presidio
19 on a freeway-style off-ramp past much of the length of
20 the Palace. This adds the equivalent of nearly two
21 lengths of road width and extends the third northbound
22 lane 700 feet farther north. The result is to bring
23 traffic closer to the Palace and to create a dangerous
24 weave between buses entering Doyle Drive and exiting
25 cars.

1

1 Circle drive separates Palace and Presidio
2 traffic at the Palace's south end. It removes between
3 17 and 45 feet from Doyle Drive's width along its most
4 constrained area.

5 The diamond uses a freeway-style off-ramp,
6 visually signaling to drivers that they're entering a
7 freeway instead of a moderate-speed parkway. Circle
8 drive provides a more gentle exit which visually says
9 you're entering a national park.

10 We think about 500 of the 1500 cars going to
11 Letterman will be coming from San Francisco. Under the
12 diamond design, each of those hundreds of cars a day
13 will have to make a nearly half-mile-long loop to the
14 north in order to enter the Letterman garage.

15 Circle drive brings them to the garage almost
16 directly. However, circle drive means removal of
17 Building 1151, the pool, which was built in the very
18 last year of the Presidio's 169-year period of historic
19 significance. Removal must require compliance with
20 historic preservation regulations and that the Doyle
21 Drive project pay for the replacement of the building
22 and its use elsewhere in the Presidio. We think a new
23 aquatic center near the main Presidio YMCA more
24 convenient and cheaper to operate.

25 The visual result of circle drive will be a

1 truly spectacular reconnection of the Presidio and the
2 Palace of Fine Arts. It will also provide an entry to
3 the Presidio that will draw visitors through a historic
4 area and then lead them to a natural area with a
5 stunning scenic vista. And I recommend people to our
6 Web site, spur.org, for further information.

7 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

8 Michael Marston.

9 Michael Marston?

10 Redmond Kernan.

11 REDMOND KERNAN: Good evening. I'm a SPUR board
12 member, and I did want to append to the SPUR
13 presentation that SPUR did today at their board meeting,
14 recommend a 60-day extension with conditions that it
15 didn't harm the project in terms of its funding. So --
16 just so you're aware of that.

17 So I would like to speak today from the Fort
18 Point & Presidio Historical Association, and we ask that
19 the comment period be extended from March 1 to May 1.

20 Alternative 2 has the least environmental
21 effect, the least cultural effect, and the least cost.
22 It is therefore attractive to many people.

23 I believe it is not the most desired
24 alternative from an aesthetic point of view and from the
25 point of view of a national park.

1

1 Alternative 5 is much recommended. And it has
2 a greater environmental and historic impact. But those
3 can be alleviated. And it's a question of how they're
4 alleviated. Right now the alternative is the entire
5 Alternative 5 -- without sub-options to look at the Main
6 Post, how could buildings be preserved, what are the
7 options in terms of where they might be relocated.

8 To some preservationists, relocating a building
9 is not a good thing, and you might as well get rid of
10 it. I don't agreed with that. I think relocating is an
11 option that should be explored.

12 So there's a process that you're required to go
13 through because not only is the Presidio a national
14 park, it is, in fact, a national historic landmark. And
15 you're required to go through the 106 process for
16 landmark status as well as a memorandum of agreement.

17 We don't have the results of that. That
18 process lags the environmental process. And if we knew
19 the mitigation measures that might be applied, that
20 would help in being able to make a decision or
21 recommendation to you. Right now, we lack that.

22 The mitigation measures in the draft DEIS could
23 be simply to record, photograph, put in a file, document
24 the building that was there but remove it entirely with
25 no evidence that there was ever a building there. We

2

3

1 find that unacceptable.

2 We therefore ask that this additional time be
3 used to study sub-options for the areas that are
4 troublesome in terms of historic preservation. And that
5 is not only the building but the bluff itself, which is
6 a topographic feature. So we urge you to have the
7 extension and let us work together to find options that
8 add the historic preservation to what is otherwise under
9 consideration.

10 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

11 Next three speakers: Gary Widman, Diane
12 Hermann and Lucia Bogatay.

13 GARY WIDMAN: I'm Gary Widman, President of the
14 California Heritage Council. And I have to say that I
15 agree with virtually everything that you just heard from
16 Redmond Kernan, who is also one of our members as well
17 as being on the Fort & Point Presidio Historical
18 Association.

19 I'm concerned that, if the objectives of the
20 project were to call for a parkway in 1993, there is
21 really only one parkway alternative that's described.
22 And it seems that a process should produce more than one
23 alternative that meets the project objectives.

24 We're also concerned for historic preservation
25 of the structures, including the swimming pool. We note

3
cont

1

1 that the concerns -- two of the slides that listed
2 concerns did not mention historic preservation or
3 historic issues, although they did mention cultural
4 resources on its list of concerns. But historic
5 preservation and interpretation should be a concern as
6 well.

2

7 So we believe that the comment period should be
8 extended for 60 days, as Mr. Kernan just suggested, and
9 those 60 days put to the use of developing
10 sub-alternatives to 2 and 5 that could better preserve
11 the historic properties involved and still produce the
12 optimum structures for everyone.

3

13 We think that one should consider that, as one
14 drives into the Presidio from the north and exits to
15 Marin County -- exits San Francisco for Marin County,
16 that a great many people's aesthetic values will be at
17 stake as they drive through that area. And it's not
18 just the aesthetic concerns of the people that are
19 walking along the shoreline that should be considered
20 here but the aesthetic concerns of the people who are
21 driving the freeway need to be considered as well.

4

22 And to that end we do recommend the extension
23 and greater attention to the historic resources.

24 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

25 Diane Hermann.

1 DIANE HERMANN: Good evening. Tonight I would like
2 to focus on a lack of full and fair disclosure in the
3 DEIS of the adverse effects of the Parkway Alternative
4 as currently proposed on the Presidio as a national
5 historic landmark district. As required by the National
6 Historic Preservation Act, a document called "Finding of
7 Effect," which is almost as thick as the DEIS, was
8 recently issued for the Doyle Drive project but has not
9 been distributed to the public with the DEIS.

1

10 The Finding of Effect does contain full
11 disclosure of the adverse effects on historic buildings,
12 features, and cultural landscapes. But its most
13 revealing points are ignored or given only passing
14 attention in the DEIS. Three examples include the
15 following.

16 First, the Finding of Effect states that the
17 presence of a continuous bluff to the north of the Main
18 Post is a character-defining feature of the Presidio and
19 explains why the bluff's removal or even its alteration
20 would lessen the public's understanding of the
21 development of the Presidio over time.

2

22 In contrast, the DEIS states only that the
23 bluff, quote, "influenced the pattern of development of
24 the Main Post," end of quote.

25 Second, the Finding of Effect notes that

3

1 Halleck Street is a character-defining circulation
2 characteristic of the lower Main Post. It discusses how
3 the Parkway Alternative's creation of a man-made hill
4 under Halleck Street will destroy the visual connection
5 between the Main Post and the water's edge and will
6 lessen the integrity of setting, association, and
7 feeling of this part of the Presidio. The DEIS
8 discussion of the adverse effect of the Parkway
9 Alternative is limited to the bare statement that
10 historic Halleck Street will be realigned.

11 Finally, the Finding of Effect discusses
12 cumulative adverse impacts on the NHL, for example, the
13 removal, since the Army's departure from the Presidio,
14 of dozens of historic buildings near Doyle Drive,
15 including the demolition of 39 historic buildings for
16 the Crissy Marsh project. That discussion underscores
17 why the demolition of three of the very few remaining
18 historic buildings in the quartermaster's district
19 should be avoided. The DEIS does not discuss these
20 cumulative impacts.

21 We therefore respectfully request that the
22 comment period be extended 60 days so that the public
23 can be given a fair opportunity to review the full
24 nature and depth of the project alternatives' relative
25 impact on the national historic landmark district and

3

4

1 its historic buildings, features, and cultural
2 landscapes.

3 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

4 Lucia Bogatay.

5 LUCIA BOGATAY: Good evening. I'm Lucia Bogatay,
6 an architect member of the Fort Point & Presidio
7 Historical Association and long-time advocate for
8 preserving and interpreting history of the Presidio. I
9 believe the design, as many of the previous speakers,
10 for Alternative 5 must be reconsidered in the sensitive
11 area closest to the Main Post.

12 The four historic structures slated for
13 demolition should be retained. Buildings 204 and 201
14 date from 1896, just before the Spanish-American War.
15 One of them has an important design role in defining the
16 west edge of Halleck Street, which is the original route
17 to the wharf. And given what happened to this route to
18 the wharf next to the marsh, it definitely needs to be
19 preserved all the more.

20 The circle drive, in my opinion, is not worth
21 the sacrifice of Building 1151, which was -- although it
22 was built at the last possible year, it could be
23 preserved. It was important to the rehabilitation of
24 the wounded following World War II. And in the spirit
25 of sustainability, which is supposed to motivate this

1

2

3

1 park, not tearing it down would prevent having to
2 rebuild it.

3 Second, the DEIS does not give proper weight to
4 the damage to the cultural landscape, which would be
5 caused by burying the bluffs at the foot of the Main
6 Post.

7 The Secretary of the Interior's guidelines for
8 treatment of cultural landscapes call for beginning the
9 resource preservation effort by, quote, "...identifying
10 those landscape features and materials important to the
11 landscape's historical character and which must be
12 retained." The guidelines list as the important
13 character-defining features of a cultural landscape,
14 quote, "...its spatial organization and land patterns,
15 features such as topography, vegetation, and
16 circulation."

17 The bluffs and Halleck Street are such
18 character-defining features. And altering or destroying
19 them should be avoided at all costs. And its impacts
20 are avoidable thanks to Red's idea of drafting one end
21 of Alternative 2 to the majority of Alternative 5.

22 In any case, it's somewhat ironic to think
23 that, after watching Crissy Field disappear under the
24 dirt from the first marsh project, that we will have to
25 watch the bluffs disappear under the dirt from the

3
cont

4

4
cont

1 second marsh project. And you can bet I will be there,
2 standing by the bulldozers.

3 In any case, I do think that additional time
4 would give a possibility for coming up with a better
5 solution, and I applaud the possibility that that could
6 happen.

7 Thank you.

8 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

9 Joseph Butler.

10 JOSEPH BUTLER: Good evening. My name is Joseph
11 Butler. I'm an architect here in the city and chair of
12 the San Francisco Preservation Consortium.

13 Today I'd like to echo the comments of Diane
14 Hermann and support the notion of a 60-day extension for
15 the purpose of looking at whether Buildings 201 and 204
16 that define Halleck Street and speak to the history of
17 the Presidio from the latter part of the 19th century
18 could be conserved or preserved with a roadway scheme
19 that's similar to the Parkway but one which moves
20 further north and allows the Parkway to come to grade
21 and even perhaps go below grade as it passes the base of
22 the Main Post.

23 It was mentioned that the Main Post should be
24 reconnected to Crissy Field. But I think the purpose of
25 the siting by the Spanish was the attraction of the

1

2

1 bluff and the disconnect that it made between the beach
2 and the main post that they were establishing for
3 defensive purposes above the bluff. To eliminate this
4 cultural landscape as part of this project seems too
5 high a price.

2
cont

6 And while the Parkway is greatly preferred to
7 the Alternative 2, which environmentally as a roadway
8 has fewer attributes, the better part of 2, its lighter
9 foot, if you will, on the cultural and landscape
10 resources, should be carried through in the Parkway
11 Option 5 so that Parkway option, which is aesthetically
12 preferable, could also be culturally and
13 landscape-resource preferable as well. Thank you.

3

14 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

15 I have a card submitted by Diane Rowe. And she
16 asked me to read her comments.

17 "The DEIS includes two project objectives that
18 appear to be impossible to meet in the Repair and Widen
19 alternatives, number one, to design the Doyle Drive
20 corridor using a parkway concept, and two, to improve
21 intermodal and vehicular access to Presidio which is the
22 Girard Road exit/entrance ramps in the Parkway
23 Alternative.

24 "I have two questions: One, why isn't there an
25 additional parkway alternative that would avoid or

1

1 minimize adverse impacts on the national landmark
2 district?"

3 Second question, "Why don't all build
4 alternatives contain an exit/entrance ramp into the
5 Presidio?"

6 Does anyone have any response to those
7 questions?

8 The first one was, "Why isn't there an
9 additional parkway alternative that would avoid or
10 minimize adverse impact to the national landmark
11 district?"

12 LEE SAAGE: I can try.

13 The alternatives that were eliminated from the
14 study in 2004, Alternative 3 and Alternative 4, were
15 actually developed in response to the notion of a
16 Parkway Alternative. So in a sense, those were part of
17 the collection of early parkway alternatives.

18 In fact, in trying to achieve the two goals of
19 those alternatives -- one to avoid impact to historic
20 resources and to -- and to maintain or create the
21 opportunity to reconnect Crissy Field with the upper
22 portion of the Post, we wound up with the very long
23 tunnels that were associated with those alternatives.
24 It turns out that, with those alternatives, the attempt
25 to, if you will, save cultural resources wound up having

1
cont

2

1 such adverse effect on natural resources, it drove the
2 cost of the project up to the point that it simply
3 wasn't tolerable. It just became a challenge that
4 couldn't be met.

5 The alignment that's associated now with the
6 Parkway Alternative is really confined by the
7 constrained features of the Presidio. It would be very
8 difficult to find an alternative that was materially
9 different in terms of its alignment or its primary
10 characteristic.

11 It's certainly possible to make adjustments or
12 changes to the alternative with regard to precise length
13 of tunnels or location of tunnels or even how many
14 tunnels there are. And that's something that we're
15 hearing comments on tonight and something that can
16 certainly be looked at.

17 In terms of alternatives, particularly
18 Alternative 2, not meeting all the objectives of the
19 project, there are a number of objectives that were
20 established for the project. And none of the
21 alternatives have met all of the objectives in exactly
22 the same way. If they did, we'd only have one
23 alternative.

24 So that's kind of a part of the process, that
25 each alternative meets the various project objectives to

1 a greater or lesser degree. And part of the evaluation
2 process is to try to make judgments about which
3 alternatives, overall, do the best job.

4 Alternative 2 in part was developed to be sort
5 of the minimum cost, minimum replacement project that
6 would meet purpose and need. And it does do that.

7 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

8 Diane Barry, Dick Tilles, and Winchell Hayward.

9 DIANE BARRY: I just have to say that, to the
10 extent I support any alternative, it would be
11 Alternative 2, the Replace and Widen without a detour.
12 I think it's the superior environmental alternative, and
13 I think it provides certainly a reasonable and prudent
14 alternative to taking out the pool. I think we should
15 retain the historic Letterman Pool and reject the circle
16 drive option under the Parkway Alternative.

17 And during construction, I would ask that you
18 retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for
19 Letterman Pool.

20 I'd also like to request an extension of the
21 comment period for 60 days. I am a user of the pool.
22 And in trying to drum up support for people to come and
23 speak here tonight, the YMCA, on February 6th, put out a
24 statement telling the people who use the pool that they
25 were not asking for support and that there were some

1

2

3

1 project options that would result in an elimination of
2 Buildings 1151 and -52, which is not correct. And they
3 stated -- and I would like to submit this statement to
4 you -- that they were not asking their YMCA members to
5 rally against the project at this time, until they have
6 more substantive information about the project and their
7 options.

8 Certainly they don't have the information that
9 I have. And I'm just a regular citizen. They are a
10 tenant of the Presidio Trust. So because of that, I
11 would ask for an extension -- at least a 60-day
12 extension of the comment period so that the Y can be
13 educated. And I'd like to submit this to someone.

14 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

15 Dick Tilles.

16 DICK TILLES: Thank you, Kay.

17 I'm speaking here as a private citizen,
18 although someone who's been involved with the project
19 for many years.

20 I want to say I do support the Parkway
21 Alternative, and I thank the SPUR, Michael Painter, and
22 our consultants for making it a reality when we thought
23 it might be dead for a while. I also support the
24 diamond option and do not believe that the Merchant Road
25 slip ramp is necessary. I think we can accomplish just

1

1 about all that the Merchant Road slip ramp does by
2 adding a stop sign for cars going to the Bridge from the
3 Presidio and by eliminating a couple of toll booths,
4 which should be done one of these days if the Bridge
5 District gets their act together.

1
cont

6 My main concerns for the project, though, are
7 really during the construction period. It's pretty
8 important. It's going to be five years, about the time
9 the Presidio Trust needs to meet its financial goals.
10 And it's five years in a national park.

11 I have two primary concerns. One is that the
12 connection between Route 1 and Doyle Drive eastbound or
13 southbound not be maintained during construction. There
14 are a number of reasons for that. There's good
15 alternative routes that exist between the Marina and
16 Richmond and the Sunset -- Geary, California Street. So
17 we don't really need this connection. The project would
18 be built faster and for a lower price if we did that.

2

19 It would also reduce traffic on Doyle and help
20 move traffic along during the construction period.
21 There will be detours. The lower amount of traffic we
22 have on Doyle during that period, the better.

23 Traffic from the Bridge needs to use Doyle
24 Drive. Traffic coming from the Richmond and Sunset does
25 not. So it shouldn't be -- that connection should not

1 be made during the construction period.

2 Secondly, I'm very concerned about what the EIS
3 says about connections between the Main Post and Crissy
4 Field during the construction period. Basically that
5 there's no north-south access between Lyon Street and
6 McDowell Street, quite a distance. Access really does
7 need to be maintained, both for vehicles and pedestrians
8 and bicycles during that period. So I'm hoping that
9 there will be a traffic-management plan that comes out
10 very soon that addresses that issue.

11 Thank you very much for your time.

12 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

13 Winchell Hayward.

14 WINCHELL HAYWARD: Good evening. My name is
15 Winchell Hayward. I'm a long-time resident of San
16 Francisco and of various historic preservation groups
17 [sic]. I am speaking in support of Alternative 2
18 because -- for several reasons. Number one, the traffic
19 lanes are somewhat wider. Alternative 2 has six 12-foot
20 lanes, whereas Alternative 5 only has four 11-foot lanes
21 and two 12-foot lanes. Why there's a difference, I
22 don't know. But it adds up to a difference in the
23 overall width. Alternative 2's overall width is, from
24 shoulder to shoulder, 124 feet. And Alternative 5 is
25 148 feet. I might be off a foot or two either way, but

3

1

1 it's a significant difference.

2 Now, both alternatives would modify that Park
3 Presidio Interchange. One of them, Alternative 5,
4 proposes a 270-degree turn. But I suspect that's going
5 to be eliminated, but that's very expensive.

6 Another thing, too, is that the Alternative 2
7 only removes the one building. That's if you use the
8 no-detour option, only one building would disappear. **2**
9 But if you use Alternative 5, you're going to lose 13
10 buildings, according to the DEIS. And I'm not sure -- I
11 think that figure may have been changed, but that's
12 what's printed in the book: 13 buildings would be lost
13 if Alternative 5 is adopted.

14 Now the -- of course, one of the most
15 significant things, at least in my book, is the huge
16 difference in cost between Alternative 2 and Alternative
17 5. Alternative 2, without the detour, is about
18 \$553 million. Alternative 5 with the Merchant Road
19 access is \$710 million, give or take a few thousand. **3** So
20 that's a 28 percent increase of Alternative 5 over
21 Alternative 2, \$157 million.

22 I think as taxpayers, we have to open our eyes
23 and ask ourselves, is it really worth -- that 257
24 million [sic], is that worth the environmental
25 enhancement? It's really -- to my way of thinking, it's

1 not. But others may think differently. But bear in
2 mind that significant difference of cost.

3 The book did not indicate a total construction
4 time. I suspect there's some difference between the
5 time of each of these, but it's not indicated.

6 Also, to the grades, the grades are somewhat
7 different. It's a constant grade, essentially, for
8 Alternative 2, whereas Alternative 5, there's a little
9 bit of a dip up and down. And I suggest that that's not
10 necessary.

11 And is this enough for me?

12 Okay. One more sentence? Alternative 5 is
13 going to erase some parking spaces at Palace of Fine
14 Arts.

15 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

16 Kristofer Orre has asked that I read a couple
17 of comments. The first one is, "Have you considered the
18 incorporation (present or future) of a rail system
19 and/or bike paths along the Doyle Drive corridor?"

20 The second is, "How will you mitigate for not
21 only the loss of threatened/endangered species but also
22 the loss of native habitat? What specific actions will
23 be taken, and for how long after the completion of the
24 project will they be carried out?"

25 Lee, did you want to comment on the alternative

4

5

1

2

1 light rail that's going to be considered?

2 LEE SAAGE: The primary purpose of the project, as
3 indicated in the purpose and need statement, is to
4 replace the existing Doyle Drive. And the existing
5 Doyle Drive is a highway facility, so we did, during the
6 early scoping process, look at a number of options
7 including rail. But for a variety of reasons, looking
8 at rail only associated with Doyle Drive, it didn't seem
9 to be a reasonable thing to do because there's nothing
10 to connect it to on either end.

11 With regard to the question concerning
12 endangered species, I think we can probably ask our
13 environmental expert from CalTrans to comment on that.

14 KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

15 Jared?

16 JARED GOLDFINE: Yeah. The short answer to that is
17 that there are no threatened and endangered species that
18 would be affected by the project.

19 There are habitats that would be affected, and
20 we will be mitigating those, but in terms of federally
21 or state-listed species, none will be affected.

22 KAY WILSON: Is there a guideline in terms of how
23 long mitigation will be in place after the project is
24 carried out?

25 JARED GOLDFINE: Those are detailed in the

1 environmental document, how they'll be mitigated.

2 KAY WILSON: Okay, thank you.

3 Next three speakers: Eric Solomon, Michael
4 Strunsky, and Sue Chang.

5 ERIC SOLOMON: Yeah, very quickly -- I think you
6 ought to save the swimming pool. Yes. I think enough
7 stuff has happened to veterans of our wars who need
8 rehabilitation, not to do a symbolic smash in their
9 faces at this time or at any time.

10 Number two, I get sense that the mapping and
11 the whole discussion tonight is based on a world where
12 something ends at Richardson or the Palace of Fine Arts.
13 There is more, you know. There's Lombard Street. There
14 are all the side streets.

15 I happen to live on Filbert. I deal with
16 megavolts [sic] every day now, helping the Presidio. So
17 I'm a contributor.

18 But I do not grasp why you haven't discussed
19 what the hook is, what the circle is, and what the
20 lights are, or how many lanes are going -- is it going
21 to be the same? Is it going to be different? What will
22 be the traffic implications? Will people want to take
23 every possible side street to escape what this highway
24 is going to do?

25 And, finally, I want to thank the various SPUR

1

2

1 people who I've never seen in action before, because I
2 think they've made a very sensitive and interesting
3 suggestion.

4 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

5 Michael Strunsky.

6 MICHAEL STRUNSKY: Thank you for this very
7 interesting presentation.

8 My comments are based upon the fact that my
9 home is almost exactly at the eastern end of this
10 project. And I would like to just ask the design team
11 to be very critical and assure the accuracy, in
12 particular, of its traffic studies.

1

13 The last gentleman before me talked about the
14 impact away from the project. And I just want to
15 reinforce that. It is very hard for me to understand or
16 believe the traffic studies that show the rather
17 circuitous way of getting to Marina Boulevard is going
18 to function [sic].

2

19 And I point out the major construction project
20 that existed at the eastern end of the Bay Bridge which,
21 if any of you have tried to get on or off the Bay Bridge
22 in heavy traffic times, it's just a disaster of waiting
23 in traffic and so forth.

3

24 Don't let that happen here. If it takes
25 another 60 days, as many people have recommended, to

4

1 look again at this, look again also at your traffic
2 studies because they are very hard for me to believe
3 that they are correct.

4 Marina Boulevard seems to be forgotten in this.
5 Don't let political pressures of the nice fancy houses
6 there ruin the rest of San Francisco. Do it right,
7 please. We only have one chance. Thanks.

8 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

9 Sue Chang.

10 Okay. She wrote a comment down, so I'll read
11 it.

12 It says, "Please combine 2 and 5 and offer a
13 beautiful Alternative 2 if possible."

14 Okay. The next three speakers -- and when you
15 come up, stand back just a little bit from the
16 microphone, and maybe we'll get rid of a little bit of
17 that ringing.

18 James Ream, Richard Coffin, and Michael Keck.

19 JAMES REAM: My name is James Ream. I'm a member
20 of the SPUR's advisory council, although I'm speaking
21 tonight for myself and not for the council.

22 Once in a great while, a city -- and in this
23 case a city and park -- has an opportunity for
24 greatness. And Michael Painter's parkway scheme has
25 given us that opportunity. And I'm absolutely convinced

1 that we're going to proceed in that direction.

2 Michael's vision and 15 years of work with this
3 project and everybody else who has helped him along the
4 way have brought us to this point. I think it's a great
5 moment for the city, and I applaud everybody who has
6 been involved with it.

7 I'd like to also address the concerns for the
8 historic preservation that have been brought up here
9 tonight, and I'm sure that your panel has given a lot of
10 time and attention to. And I speak to that as a past
11 vice president of the San Francisco Preservation
12 Advisory Board and past president of the Foundation for
13 San Francisco's Architectural Heritage. So I care about
14 these matters.

15 Too often, the concerns for preserving pieces
16 of history have stood in the way in this city of
17 projects from which we could all greatly benefit and
18 which could increase the livability and enjoyability of
19 this city.

20 A rational society will take a look at what
21 might be lost in the way of historic structures and
22 compare that to what will be gained by doing a worthy
23 project in the best possible way. And I'd like to urge
24 everybody connected with this project to stay in there,
25 weigh these alternatives, and make a decision in favor

1

1 of the optimum Presidio parkway system.

2 Michael, I'd also planned to ask this audience
3 to join me in a round of applause for the work that
4 you've done, but that's against the rules. So what I'm
5 going to do is just applaud you myself as I've always
6 wanted to do.

7 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

8 Richard Coffin.

9 RICHARD COFFIN: Good evening. My name is Rich
10 Coffin and -- let me raise this up.

11 Okay. I get ten more seconds now.

12 I'm here on behalf of the 5,000 members -- over
13 5,000 members of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition.
14 We want to thank you, first of all, for allowing us to
15 serve on the citizens advisory committee. And we've had
16 input over the last three years on a lot of issues on
17 the project. We appreciate that.

18 We'd also like to say we favor Alternative 5
19 for the aesthetic values that it offers, for the reduced
20 footprints, and especially for the options to allow
21 better interface with city streets. I think Michael
22 Painter did an excellent job with that. I think there's
23 a lot of work to still be done with that, but I think
24 there's a lot more potential in Alternative 5 than there
25 is in Alternative 2.

1 We also ask that, if the boulevard alternative
2 is selected, that Girard Street have bike lanes on it.
3 They're not currently shown in the design. There's been
4 talk about alternate routes on old Mason to Halleck.
5 But the more we've looked at the situation, it's
6 definitely a desirable route for bicycles that would
7 want to go from Lyon and Marina into the Main Post. And
8 we think bike lanes could be accommodated really easily
9 on that stretch and safely with crossover lanes and new
10 techniques. So we ask for that.

2

11 We also ask that, in light of the fact that
12 there are no bike facilities in a some 6- to \$700
13 million project, that some other mitigation measures be
14 considered, such as improvements to Marina -- check my
15 notes -- to Crissy Boulevard -- Crissy Field Avenue from
16 Mason Street up to Lincoln Boulevard, and also that a
17 multi-use path be installed from the top of Crissy Field
18 Avenue up to Vista Avenue along the stretch from the
19 Golden Gate Bridge. That's a heavily used bicycle and
20 pedestrian corridor. I know the Presidio pathway plans
21 have some improvements designed for that already. We'd
22 like to see those implemented as part of mitigation for
23 this project.

3

24 Furthermore, we'd like to consider the fact
25 that, since there are no bicycle lanes or pedestrian --

4

1 in fact, we're losing a pedestrian path on Doyle
2 Drive -- that money, perhaps, get applied from this
3 project to the west span of the Bay Bridge and -- for
4 the new maintenance and pedestrian path and bicycle path
5 on that project, so....

6 Again, I want to thank you for including us in
7 this process, and we hope that we can work with you in
8 the future to develop a world-class parkway alternative.
9 Thank you.

10 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

11 Michael Keck.

12 MICHAEL KECK: My name is Michael Keck. It's
13 K-E-C-K.

14 KAY WILSON: My apologies.

15 MICHAEL KECK: That's okay. I've had other
16 versions thrown at me.

17 I think this project is about 30 years too late
18 in coming. I've looked at the history that you've put
19 forth in the program here. And you've tried it several
20 times. I come from a very unique perspective that I'd
21 like to address to you, something that Mr. Kennerley
22 touched on, which is I am a survivor of a head-on on
23 Doyle Drive, July 26th, 2003, just about outside this
24 window.

25 One of the things that you have failed to give

1 the public -- and I've heard some questions so far as,
2 "Why are you going to 12-foot lanes? Why are you making
3 it so wide?"

4 Mr. Goldfine can certainly verify, one of the
5 facts is that CalTrans sets forth regulations when you
6 build highways and freeways here. The minimum lane
7 width that they feel is acceptable for safety is 12
8 feet. But the bottom line is that ten feet, there's no
9 room to get out of an accident. And if somebody changes
10 lanes and sideswipes you, you all of a sudden find
11 yourself on the other side of the roadway where you
12 don't belong. And whatever you do, cars aren't going to
13 save you; air bags aren't going to save you.

14 I was incredibly fortunate. Unfortunately, the
15 young lady that was on her way to a birthday party for
16 her best friend was not, and she was killed.

17 But I hear, "More time. More time. Let's
18 talk. Let's study." How many more people are going to
19 die in that passage of time?

20 Mr. Goldfine of CalTrans can probably run the
21 numbers for you because CalTrans keeps track of all the
22 accidents on its highways. They keep statistics. And
23 they're pretty cold. They know which roadways are
24 dangerous because they have more accidents.

25 That road out there is one of them. The sooner

1

2

1 you can change it is not soon enough. But one of the
2 things that you should provide these people as they're
3 making their decisions about aesthetics and animals and
4 marshes and buildings -- how many lives is it worth? It
5 wasn't worth the life of that young lady that died two
6 and a half years ago. I'm here to tell you about it.
7 And I've got some issues. I'm still walking. I've just
8 had my third surgery.

9 But people can live. You need to move this
10 forward with all speed. I can't tell you which life
11 you'll save, but I can guarantee you, you're going to
12 save lives. Do it now.

13 KAY WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Keck.

14 Michael Boland, followed by Rick Foster and
15 Monica Dantas.

16 Excuse me. That last one I'll read.

17 MICHAEL BOLAND: Thank you. My name is Mike
18 Boland. I'm director of planning for the Presidio
19 Trust. I'd like to thank everyone for organizing a
20 wonderful event tonight, and an opportunity for us all
21 to see the incredible work that's gone into the Doyle
22 Drive project.

23 The release of the Doyle Drive EIS, I believe,
24 is really a milestone, something that's been coming for
25 a long time, a long time in the making. I think Doyle

1 Drive has been waiting a long time for the right
2 solution. And I think that the process has finally
3 closed in on that proper solution for the future of this
4 place.

5 The Presidio Trust and National Park Service
6 are in the process of transforming the Presidio into a
7 21st-century national park. We're trying to turn this
8 into a place that's a model of innovative design, of
9 resource management, heritage preservation, and
10 community stewardship.

11 Because of its size and scope, the
12 reconstruction of Doyle Drive obviously has an enormous
13 effect on our ability to accomplish this mission.

14 The old Doyle Drive carried civilians over the
15 Presidio to the Golden Gate without letting them touch
16 down in the Presidio, without giving them an opportunity
17 to enjoy the wonders of this place. We believe that a
18 new Doyle Drive can and should reflect the Presidio's
19 new life as a national park and as a public resource by
20 engaging the public in the landscape of this place in a
21 way that the old Doyle Drive does not and cannot because
22 of its design.

23 As a result, we believe the Parkway Alternative
24 best achieves our vision of the Presidio as a wonderful
25 public place. We think that the Parkway Alternative

1

1 better meets the objectives of the Presidio Trust
2 management plan, which is our land-use management plan
3 that guides all of our actions here in the Presidio, in
4 Area B. And we think that the Parkway Alternative
5 better achieves the objectives for the Doyle Drive
6 project as stated in the EIS and, you know, the
7 objectives that have guided this process thus far, that
8 it really creates a roadway that responds in a very
9 contextual way to the Presidio and to its future as a
10 national park.

11 We applaud the fact that the Parkway re-creates
12 a direct connection between Crissy Field, a wonderful
13 new public resource that the citizens of this city and
14 the nation can enjoy, to the Main Post, which in PTMP we
15 imagine as the other great public site in the Main Post
16 of the Presidio, to create together a really world-class
17 ensemble along the northern waterfront of the Presidio.
18 We think that the Parkway Alternative allows this to
19 happen in a way that the retrofit and widen would not.

20 Lastly, we really believe that the Parkway
21 Alternative will set a new standard for highway design
22 in this region and that it will endure as a model for
23 how civic-mindedness can drive us to achieve greatness
24 in the transformation of the landscape. We don't see
25 any of these benefits in retrofit and widen alternative.

1
cont

2

3

1 We're extremely pleased with the progress
2 that's been made thus far. We're also pleased that the
3 design team has been so open to our comments as it
4 incorporated so many of them as we've worked together on
5 this project. We look forward to our continuing
6 collaboration as the project alternatives are refined,
7 based on the feedback you receive on your draft EIS.

4

8 Our goal maintains the goal we began with: To
9 minimize the impacts of this roadway to parkland and to
10 the park's resources and to maximize park benefits by
11 creating a world-class roadway that we think is worthy
12 of this world-class park site.

13 For that, I thank you.

14 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

15 Rick Foster.

16 RICK FOSTER: I'm Rick Foster with Golden Gate
17 National Recreation Area. Brian O'Neill, our
18 superintendent, was unable to participate in tonight's
19 meeting. But he asked me to convey his enthusiastic
20 support for the Parkway Alternative, Alternative 5.

1

21 GGNRA first endorsed replacing Doyle Drive with
22 a parkway rather than a freeway in the general
23 management plan for the Presidio in 1994. We've
24 participated in the draft environmental impact statement
25 for Doyle Drive for the past six years and have worked

2

1 closely with the transportation agencies and consultants
2 in an effort to help them gain a better understanding of
3 the recreational, cultural, and natural resources in the
4 national park.

5 Through this effort, project-specific design
6 guidelines have been developed for Doyle Drive for the
7 Parkway that have resulted in a narrower, slower roadway
8 that responds to its unique setting in a national park.
9 We appreciate the efforts that Michael Painter and SPUR
10 have contributed to this effort, and also for the
11 efforts from Federal Highways, CalTrans, and especially
12 the Transportation Authority in support of the many
13 design exceptions that they've championed in an effort
14 to keep the Parkway vision for Doyle Drive alive.

15 Thank you.

16 KAY WILSON: Thank you, Rick.

17 Monica Dantas.

18 Is Monica still here?

19 Okay. We're making very good progress through
20 our cards. I appreciate everybody's cooperation. We're
21 getting through the stack. If anybody does want to turn
22 in a card, please raise your hand now, and Lauren will
23 collect them. Over there? Thank you. And we'll keep
24 going.

25 Patricia Vaughny.

1 Patricia?

2 PATRICIA VAUGHY: Patricia Vaughny. Can you guys
3 hear me? I'm going to have to do it like this.

4 KAY WILSON: Let us lower the mike. Just a second.

5 PATRICIA VAUGHY: Well, the 5 plan looks pretty.
6 And I think it has some good merits. I don't think that
7 anybody ever looked at the traffic patterns of the
8 Marina-Cow Hollow and of the Richmond. And I think that
9 these counts may be off. And what I'm more disturbed
10 about is neighborhood meetings where the establishment's
11 supposed to be asked, the Transportation Authority, and
12 people from outside neighborhoods coming in and
13 interfering. That really bothers me.

14 The Marina-Cow Hollow is a very, very, very
15 tight neighborhood. We may have associations that
16 squabble, but we will come together for a solution. And
17 right now I am saying everything don't -- into the
18 middle part of the Marina and into the side streets of
19 Cow Hollow.

20 And I feel very, very, very sad that -- the
21 counts that are missing from the EIS. I would
22 particularly like for that 60-day extension so that we
23 can do a better study.

24 Yes, people have been killed. But we have an
25 accident every two days almost at the corner of

1

2

1 Francisco, Alhambra, and at Lyon. We don't have police
2 protection. When we call for somebody after an
3 accident, the State comes, the City comes. They argue
4 for 30 minutes which one has the territory. And there's
5 a lot of things that are happening.

6 I am sorry that SPUR did not include people of
7 Marina-Cow Hollow in their plan because I think that we
8 could have gotten a plan through better and faster had
9 they been included. And I'm very sorry about that. I
10 have not be able to find anybody from the area that is
11 on that committee that actually speaks with authority,
12 and I'm sorry.

13 The other thing is, I would like to have a more
14 open dialog with the Department. I feel that, when we
15 go to the CAC meetings, that people from SPUR get 30
16 minutes to speak, and we get to speak two minutes and we
17 get cut off. And I think that we really desperately
18 need to have more input on this, and I think we can come
19 up with a win-win solution. But right now I'm not
20 seeing it.

21 I'm hearing more and more people, because of
22 these -- 30 seconds? Great.

23 I really think right now we should look at
24 No. 2, but I would like to look at No. 5 when we can
25 find solutions. But right now I'm not seeing it.

3

4

1 And I will not support anything being put next
2 to the neighbors at Lyon and Bay. There is no reason
3 for that phase of the circle or that phase of the
4 diamond project. The circle and diamond, you can go up
5 and use them up on the Parkway. But you don't need them
6 up against people's houses.

7 Thank you.

8 KAY WILSON: Thank you, Patricia.

9 Gretchen Nicholson has asked that I read this,
10 representing herself and YMCA members. And she writes
11 as follows:

12 "As a member of the Presidio YMCA and frequent
13 user of the former Letterman Pool (Building 1151), I
14 deeply oppose the circle drive option of Alternative 5,
15 Presidio Parkway.

16 Since the purpose of converting a former
17 military facility to public cultural, recreational use
18 is to foster and promote and serve such uses, it makes
19 no sense to destroy the Letterman Pool to widen a road
20 when there are other alternatives. The pool is heavily
21 used by families, the elderly and the disabled for
22 educational, health and rehabilitative type and
23 recreational purposes, which is what this national park
24 should be supporting and not destroying."

25 Okay. We have a comment from Lori Brooke

5

1

1 that's representing the Cow Hollow Association, asked me
2 to read as follows:

3 "How does traffic get onto Doyle Drive from
4 Marina Boulevard heading west?" That's the first
5 question.

6 "Does this cause a greater delay from the
7 current configuration?" Joe? Gary?

8 JOE STORY: It would be easier to show with a map.

9 KAY WILSON: "How does traffic get to Doyle Drive
10 from Marina Boulevard heading west?"

11 JOE STORY: That's good. There we go.

12 This is the famous five-points intersection up
13 here, which is where Lyon and Old Mason and Marina meet.
14 And this, of course, is the current corridor that the
15 viaduct from Marina Boulevard currently is in place now.
16 There is still two lanes at this intersection. And
17 traffic is obviously stopped, controlled here before it
18 gets onto Doyle Drive.

19 In the Parkway option, the traffic would move
20 through this and go up to the next intersection here,
21 where we're envisioning having a yield sign and a right
22 turn sign, essentially a free right, that would then
23 continue up and get onto the mainline of Doyle Drive.

24 In terms of the actual additional travel time
25 required, I don't have every single number of the

1

1 traffic study in my head. I believe it will probably
2 take about another eight or ten additional seconds to do
3 that. There's not an additional signal that somebody
4 heading west will have to go through.

5 I may also point out that the Richardson
6 corridor is also going to be designed with some
7 super-elevation modifications and such to encourage
8 traffic not to achieve a fast speed on Richardson as
9 well, but certainly, unlike today where you have the
10 loop that loops up and back, there will be a slightly
11 shorter path on Richardson.

12 KAY WILSON: Thank you. I've been asked to make an
13 inquiry in the group -- are there people that are
14 planning to use the Presidio Shuttle at the end of the
15 meeting? If we could have a show of hands -- because if
16 not, they may send the driver home. But if there's
17 people that want to use it, they may keep it.

18 Thank you.

19 Doug Kern.

20 DOUG KERN: Hello. Good evening. I'm Doug Kern.
21 Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

22 On behalf of ten environmental and community
23 organizations, I'd like to respectfully request a 60-day
24 time extension so that we can respond to this document.
25 Most of our organizations have been involved in the

1

1 process for six to ten years, and we appreciate the
2 substantial amount of work and effort that's been
3 expended on this document.

4 While we are keenly aware of your desire to
5 keep a steady momentum with the project, our
6 organizations are still wading through the voluminous
7 documents and supplementary documents that accompany the
8 DEIS. We need additional time to prepare coordinated
9 responses to many of our technical concerns regarding
10 the Doyle Drive impacts to marsh expansion and wildlife
11 corridors. Thanks for considering our request.

12 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

13 Eugena Perez.

14 EUGENA PEREZ: Thank you. I -- in Spanish
15 (speaking Spanish)

16 I would like to address a tiny little line
17 under circle drive option that would have a significant
18 effect on a large part of the population. And that is,
19 it says, "Would require the removal of the YMCA swimming
20 pool."

21 Such a little line for a resource that's so
22 valuable. And as somebody who is an immigrant, it
23 really shocks me that we treat a huge valuable resource
24 as this pool -- you know, it goes along with having to
25 throw away my fax machine because nobody will fix it, or

1

1 using disposable razors.

2 This Letterman Pool is a large beautiful pool.
3 And I'm a psychologist. And I'm particularly concerned
4 about removing this resource from two specific
5 populations. It teaches swimming to a great many
6 children from infants to teens. And we know that there
7 is a huge obesity problem in this country. And we have
8 children learning from very early, establishing habits
9 that will help them with that problem. And we're
10 destroying the pool.

11 And most of the population are seniors, of whom
12 I happen to be one. And I use the pool for aqua-fit to
13 maintain my physical and mental health. And I know that
14 there are many, many seniors for whom this resource
15 prevents depression and, in many cases, their health.

16 So I would urge you to look for an option that
17 would not include destruction of this very valuable
18 resource.

19 Thank you.

20 KAY WILSON: Please raise your hand if you didn't
21 submit a card so we can collect them all. Lauren is out
22 there to collect and hand them back. Anybody in the
23 front? Like to get all of the cards in.

24 Okay. The next one is from David Bancroft who
25 asks that I read the following comment:

1
cont

1 "With respect to Alternative 5, what
2 justification is claimed for" -- sorry.

3 "What justification is claimed for dealing with
4 the very heavy traffic coming off the Golden Gate Bridge
5 otherwise getting onto Marina Boulevard by, one,
6 reducing the number of lanes from two to just one; two,
7 most importantly, interposing two new four-way
8 intersections and presumably stoplights; and three,
9 providing the number of lanes" -- "reducing the number
10 of lanes going north?"

11 Okay. Another card from Elaine -- I cannot
12 read the last name, a concerned citizen, "Save the pool
13 for the people."

14 And the next speakers are Ann Harrison and Jean
15 Caramatti.

16 ANN HARRISON: Hi. Good evening, everyone. Good
17 evening, all of my neighbors. I'm a resident here in
18 the Marina District. I love our community here in San
19 Francisco. I think that we have a beautiful town, and
20 we want to keep it so it's beautiful. People come here
21 from all over the world just to be here. They come here
22 for a number of reasons.

23 I'm not a professional speaker, by the way.

24 Also, I would like to let you know that I think
25 Alternative 2 is the better alternative for our

1

1

1

1 community. The reasons are the following: The cost is
2 less than -- between 165- and \$200 million than
3 Alternative 5.

4 Alternative 2 provides us with less disruption
5 to existing buildings in the Presidio, San Francisco
6 wildlife. It's not destroyed -- and the trees. Fewer
7 historic buildings are destroyed also.

8 On Doyle Drive, with Alternative 2, views of
9 the San Francisco National Cemetery are left intact as
10 well as the San Francisco Bay as you commute in and
11 outside of our beautiful city.

12 On Doyle Drive views give drivers visual and
13 emotional relief, so road rage is not encouraged, and we
14 have open sky throughout. The traffic flows would be
15 about the same in and out San Francisco with
16 Alternative 2.

17 But traffic is diverted more to Lombard and to
18 Richardson with Alternative 5, so you'd have increased
19 noise. And with Alternative 5 you also increase the
20 growth in the Presidio. The Presidio is our park, is
21 our heritage. I have children that live here in San
22 Francisco. They want to stay here living in San
23 Francisco. I want San Francisco to stay as this
24 beautiful community that we have. I want it to be there
25 for them to enjoy our parks, not only for us but for

1
cont

1 future generations.

2 Alternative 2 is better because, if there is a
3 terrorist attack, an open existing Alternative 2 will be
4 the least amount of risk to family and friends trapped
5 in tunnels than Alternative 5 is being considered [sic].

6 Alternative 2 has the feel of a relaxed, cozy
7 existing community commute to and from San Francisco.

8 The construction time for Alternative 2 is less
9 than a minimum of 2 years. Can you image what it's
10 going to be like if we go for Alternative 5? It's not
11 going to look like the Marina anymore. It's not going
12 to look like the beautiful approach when you come across
13 from Marin and you come across the Golden Gate Bridge.
14 Alternative 2 allows us to keep the feel that we have
15 currently in place intact.

16 Thank you very much for your appreciation and
17 consideration. And I hope that the committee will
18 consider the needs and the wants of the local community
19 here.

20 And I appreciate the opportunity to talk
21 tonight. Thank you so much.

22 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

23 Jean Caramatti.

24 JEAN CARAMATTI: Just a couple of comments. I'm
25 completely opposed to the stoplights that you're

1
cont

1

1 considering placing getting onto Marina Boulevard. I
2 believe, as do many residents in the area, that it will
3 shift traffic onto Richardson much in the same way that
4 it did when the stop signs were placed on the boulevard.

1
cont

5 Second, I'm disappointed that you find it
6 acceptable to tunnel under the Presidio to protect the
7 cemetery, but you aren't giving the residents of this
8 neighborhood the same consideration. I think it's very
9 important that you start considering the residents in
10 this area because I think we're being left out of this
11 loop here.

2

12 And finally, I do support a 60-day delay in the
13 comment period. Thank you.

3

14 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

15 Last call for speaker cards. Please raise your
16 hand. Lauren is in the back, and she'll collect them.

17 Okay. John Brooke.

18 JOHN BROOKE: Hi. Thanks for the presentation
19 process tonight.

20 I think the Parkway is a very attractive
21 alternative; it seems to meet many of the objectives
22 that were set out. But it also seems to have an
23 objective that wasn't said up there, and that's to push
24 the traffic off Marina Boulevard and onto Lombard.

1

25 The projections that you gave, Mr. Kennerley,

1 indicated that 37,000 cars, vehicle traffic, per day
2 with -- I think it was the expanded Alternative 2. And
3 now it's going down to 25- with Alternative 5. So
4 that's a 30 percent reduction. That seems like there's
5 a new objective here that wasn't stated in the
6 PowerPoint slide presentation, moving traffic onto
7 Lombard Street.

1
cont

8 I have a couple of questions and -- let me
9 finish with this. I urge you guys to reconsider that to
10 balance the alternatives to look at leveling traffic
11 flow, and I think -- the percentages, the ratios to what
12 there is today so that there isn't a seeming other
13 objective for Alternative 5 versus Alternative 2.

14 Back on your level-of-service charts, it
15 indicates that, today, Richardson -- the intersection of
16 Richardson and Broderick is considered AAA. That's -- I
17 think best of -- best operation of flow. But Marina
18 Boulevard, Divisadero and Marina intersection, and
19 Marina Boulevard and Broderick intersection is FFF.
20 There's clearly a different rating standard there.
21 Maybe you guys can explain that.

2

22 Question number two, the presentation indicated
23 that flow to Marina Boulevard was nearly identical in
24 the Alternative 5 scenario as it is today, but yet it
25 showed a 30 percent reduction in traffic. Can you guys

3

1 explain that?

2 Thank you very much.

3 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

4 Joe can you -- the first one was about
5 Richardson and Broderick, AAA and --

6 JOE STORY: Yeah.

7 Certainly, the definition of "level of service"
8 is something that's a nationally developed standard over
9 a number of years. It's used widely across the country
10 and recognized by basically CalTrans and most of the
11 public agencies. What it does is it actually grades the
12 performance of traffic. There's different methodologies
13 for signalized and unsignalized intersections and for an
14 intersection with what we call two-way stops and
15 intersections that are all-way stops.

16 So what ends up happening is an intersection
17 like the one on Broderick, which is signalized, this one
18 methodology does not -- every car has to stop and go
19 through; if the light's green, the car keeps going. But
20 on the other hand, cars that go from the all-way stop
21 like the ones on Marina Boulevard -- every car has to
22 stop or go through that. Well, eventually that just
23 creates more and more delay. And according to the
24 national standards, that means that the average car is
25 going to have a higher level of delay to get through

1 that intersection.

2 KAY WILSON: Okay. And then explain the 30 percent
3 reduction.

4 JOE STORY: Yeah. The 30 percent reduction on
5 Marina Boulevard is a situation that happens --
6 basically the traffic on Richardson is the controlling
7 point of the system. And as you may know, all of San
8 Francisco traffic signals, wherever possible, have a
9 fixed time and control so that pedestrians will have
10 enough time to get across the street.

11 Sometimes you take your life into your own
12 hands when you do that, but basically what ends up
13 happening in our analyses is that if there is no
14 traffic, people prefer to take Lombard Street, and so in
15 the increases in -- or I'm sorry. So what ends up
16 happening is, when you actually open up the additional
17 access from Girard Road which then cuts through the
18 Presidio to the Presidio Gate, it actually opens up a
19 little bit of a relief valve.

20 Well, because the preferred route is still
21 Lombard Street, the traffic -- some of the traffic
22 shifts from Marina Boulevard to Lombard. Some of the
23 traffic shifts from Lombard Street over to Girard Road.
24 So the net result is a reduction of traffic incurred on
25 Marina Boulevard.

1 KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

2 Did you have a follow-on?

3 JOHN BROOKE: Just that second answer on that
4 seemed to be a little bit inconsistent when the traffic
5 on Richardson was a little over 80,000. So it doesn't
6 seem to be -- at or less than the same capacity, it
7 doesn't seem like we'd be reducing traffic on Marina
8 Boulevard.

9 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

10 I have two more speaker cards, and two that
11 I'll read at the end.

12 Joseph Figone.

13 JOSEPH FIGONE: Thank you for the opportunity to
14 speak. I'm a 44-year resident of the Marina District.
15 I've seen this area in almost every way you can imagine,
16 growing up here. I've seen many cars wrapped around the
17 corner of Richardson and Francisco. I think right now
18 our biggest thing is safety. Safety means that we
19 probably would need a parkway. And that would be one of
20 our best alternatives. Of course, my biggest concern,
21 also, is the neighborhood and the neighbors and their
22 concerns, traffic and our streets. That needs to be
23 looked at and addressed.

24 With the Parkway, I understand there's to be
25 demolition, possibly, of Letterman Pool. I used that as

1

1 a toddler learning how to swim. And I used it when I
2 became a charter member of YMCA. Things need to be
3 changed after awhile. And there's a swimming pool that
4 was built on Third Street for \$9 million dollars -- or
5 what was it -- I forgot the exact figure. I think it
6 was 9 million.

7 Why couldn't we replace that pool eventually
8 with something else in that nearby facility of the
9 Presidio?

2

10 I also have a question of, with Bay Area rapid
11 transit and all that, when things are built, different
12 counties pay and assist in all this. The majority of
13 users of Doyle Drive of the Marina infrastructure right
14 there come from Marin County.

15 Why is it that one third comes from local, one
16 third from the state, and one third from the federal
17 government? Why doesn't Marin County, since they're
18 pushing over a hundred thousand of their cars from there
19 to here? That's about all I have to say. But I do
20 support the Parkway, and I've been living here all my
21 life.

3

22 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

23 Betsy?

24 BETSY: Just a quick -- oops. Just a quick
25 comment. To me, I am a fifth-generation San Franciscan,

1 and I feel very passionate about this city. And I feel
2 very passionate about this project. I look at San
3 Francisco as an internationally recognized city for its
4 beauty and for its vistas from different elevations
5 around town.

6 As I review Alternative No. 5 here on the
7 screen, I am extremely disturbed by its likeness to the
8 web of freeways in Los Angeles. It is quite a weaving
9 of pavement, circling around. And I think once it's up,
10 it will be, really, a blight on the beauty of the Marina
11 District.

12 In addition, I feel the Presidio is a unique
13 area, needing unique attention, that it's crucial to
14 protect and preserve the heritage of the Presidio. It's
15 a landmark status to the State of California and very,
16 very important to those of us who are natives to
17 California and to San Francisco. Once this massive
18 structure is up, it becomes a permanent part of San
19 Francisco.

20 The traffic flow is of tremendous concern to
21 me, both in the neighborhood and the approach to the
22 bridge, across the bridge. All of it is needing of a
23 tremendous amount of discussion and attention. And I
24 think it has some concerns when you think of how
25 California is exploding in population. Tonight on the

1

2

3

1 news, they talked about the farm disappearing in
2 California to make way for people who need homes.

3 There's no way that traffic, it seems like,
4 will ever be reduced. It is a major, major part of this
5 freeway. And it is going to be an impact to the
6 neighborhood around it.

7 Therefore, I am advocating an additional 60-day
8 time extension, please. Thank you.

9 KAY WILSON: Thank you.

10 Do I have everyone's cards?

11 Okay. I've got two more to read.

12 Jan Blum submitted a card. And it says: "When
13 will the public know a 60-day extension will be
14 granted?"

15 Lee, do you have any insight on that?

16 LEE SAAGE: We'll certainly take it under
17 advisement. The only thing I can commit to is if the
18 Transportation Authority, in cooperation with the
19 Federal Highway Administration and CalTrans decides that
20 the extension is appropriate, the extension will be
21 announced prior to the close of the comment period.

22 KAY WILSON: Okay. And I have one last submittal
23 that I've been asked to read. And the submittal is from
24 Michael Marston on behalf of the Presidio Heights
25 Association of Neighbors. And I have in my hand a

4

1

1 letter he has submitted that is signed by Charles
2 Ferguson, President. And I've been asked to read
3 certain portions.

4 "Dear Mr. Saage, historically, the Presidio
5 Heights Association of Neighbors has supported Michael
6 Painter's Presidio Parkway now designated as Alternative
7 5. We believe it to be superior to all other
8 alternatives that we've seen over the years. The PHAN
9 board unanimously supports these positions. PHAN
10 supports Alternative 5. PHAN supports circle drive.
11 PHAN supports contact-sensitive design refinements.
12 PHAN does not support the hook ramp option at the Park
13 Presidio Interchange. PHAN opposes the Merchant Road
14 slip ramp. PHAN remains concerned by the
15 Lyon-Marina-Mason Street intersection.

16 "Credit for work done by Michael Painter:
17 Finally, we are very surprised that we weren't able to
18 find either print or mention of Michael Painter,
19 visionary designer of the Presidio Parkway, in the Draft
20 EIS/EIR. Thus we strongly request that his work, much
21 of it pro bono, be properly credited in the final
22 document."

23 Just to clarify, for the record, I believe
24 Mr. Painter is listed as part of the team, as a
25 contributor to the project. But it's a big book, and it

1

2

1 might have been hard to find.

2 On that note, I'd like to thank you all for the
3 time and attention you've given us and for cooperating
4 with us to get through submitting your comments. Please
5 be advised, to remind you, you have until close of
6 business on Wednesday, March 1st to submit your
7 comments, that being 5:00 p.m., unless there's an
8 announcement that the comment period has been extended.

9 Thank you, and good evening.

10 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 9:21
11 o'clock p.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF MARIN) ss.

3 I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand
4 Reporter of the State of California, duly authorized to
5 administer oaths pursuant to Section 8211 of the
6 California Code of Civil Procedure, do hereby certify
7 that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a
8 disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under
9 my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct
10 transcription of said proceedings.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
13 foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way
14 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
15 caption.

16 Dated the 22nd day of February, 2006.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR (M. Alexander (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1060



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR (J. Chappell (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 with the Circle Drive option noted.	1061



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR (R. Kernan (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was already extended an additional month.	1062
2	Building removal is negotiated with the Presidio Trust. The relocation of buildings will be detailed in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) which was developed with input from participating agencies as outlined in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11. The PA is provided in Appendix I of the FEIS/R.	1063
3	This was addressed as part of the PA and treatment plan process. The resolution of adverse effects associated with the project is provided in the PA (see Appendix I of the FEIS/R). Mitigation measures are outlined in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion of Section 3.2.11.	1064



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: California Heritage Council (G. Widman (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Through the alternative screening process the modified Parkway Alternative (Alternative 5) was selected as the Preferred Alternative.	1065
2	This was addressed as part of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) and treatment plan process. The resolution of adverse effects associated with the project is provided in the PA (see Appendix I of the FEIS/R). Mitigation measures are outlined in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion of Section 3.2.11.	1066
3	The comment period was already extended an additional month. Discussions with the Presidio Trust resulted in the PA presented in Appendix I of the FEIS/R.	1067
4	The visual analysis does consider the visual effects to motorists traveling on Doyle Drive, see Section 3.2.10 of the FEIS/R. Also viewpoint 13 in the Visual Impact Assessment specifically addresses the motorists view while traveling on Doyle Drive.	1068



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Hermann (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Discussion was expanded to address these concerns. See discussion of Permanent Impacts in Section 3.2.11.	1069
2	Discussion under Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway in Section 3.2.11 was expanded to address these concerns.	1070
3	Discussion under Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway in Section 3.2.11 was expanded to address these concerns.	1071
4	See Section 5.6.4 for the discussion of cumulative impacts to cultural resources.	1072



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Bogatay (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Design workshops were held to modify Alternative 5 to enhance its features which resulted in the creation of the Preferred Alternative (See Section 2.5.1). Those measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigation impacts associated with the project are presented throughout Chapter 3. In addition, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) was prepared which presents those avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures for impacts to cultural resources (see Section 3.2.11 and Appendix I).	1073
2	The Presidio Trust has determined that the top floor of Building 201 will be retained along Halleck St. Building 204 will be deconstructed and materials salvaged for preservation and/or reuse.	1074
3	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1075
4	Cultural Resource preservation discussions to minimize impacts and possibly preserve the bluff similar to 1920's photo were held prior to the FEIS/R, see the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11.	1076



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Bulter (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was extended an additional month. The issues stated in the comment can be addressed during final design of the preferred alternative. Measures to mitigate impacts to cultural resources are outlined in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) prepared for this project (see Section 3.2.11 and Appendix I of the FEIS/R)..	1077
2	Cultural Resource preservation discussions to minimize impacts and possibly preserve the bluff similar to 1920's photo were held prior to the FEIS/R. As stated in Section 2.5.1, the refinements make for the Preferred Alternative reduce the disturbance of the existing bluff.	1078
3	The profiles of Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 are independent. Great effort has been spent to minimize impacts to resources.	1079



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Rowe (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	While a considerable effort has been spent to minimize impacts to resources, not all resources can be avoided with the Parkway Alternative.	1080
2	The intent of Alternative 2 was to replace the existing facility to meet the project purpose of traffic, seismic and structural safety. The current facility does not provide an exit to the Presidio.	1081



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Barry (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted. In July 2006, the Presidio Parkway (Alt 5) with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would retain the YMCA swimming pool.	1082
2	Comment noted. Detailed design of parking facilities affected by the project would take pedestrian circulation, traffic safety, and parking access into consideration. Such design will be developed as part of the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1083
3	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1084



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Tilles (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted. In July 2006, the Presidio Parkway (Alt 5) with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Merchant Road slip ramp is not an element of the Preferred Alternative.	1085
2	Comment noted. The management of traffic during construction will be finalized as part of design to minimize impacts. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared as part of the project which will include strategies to minimize potential pedestrian, bicycle and traffic impacts during construction of the project. See Appendix K for the draft TMP.	1086
3	A detailed Transportation Management Plan will be developed during final design that will address access during construction.	1087



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: W. Hayward (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1088
2	Preference for Alternative 2 noted. The Preferred Alternative would result in the permanent removal of 8 buildings, see Section 3.2.6 of the FEIS/R.	1089
3	Preference for Alternative 2 noted. Updated project cost information is presented in Section 2.7 and Exhibit 2-38 of the FEIS/R.	1090
4	Correct, construction time would vary by alternative but was estimated to take approximately 5 years. Modifications to Alternative 5 and the construction staging proposed may reduce the construction time to approximately 3.5 years for the Preferred Alternative.	1091
5	Design of the alternatives, including grades, was to provide the proper safety features while minimizing impacts to the surrounding environment.	1092



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: K. Orre (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The project does not preclude the extension of light rail into the Presidio or hinder the implementation of the Presidio Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan.	1093
2	Comment noted. The EIS/R mitigations are clear on these points. Mitigation for wetlands, probably the most productive of the habitats present, is discussed at length in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of Section 3.4.2; avoidance of sensitive habitat areas and their revegetation (where avoidance is not possible) in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of Section 3.4.3. Generally, restoration actions are begun as soon as possible after construction, and monitoring continues for a period of five years.	1094



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Solomon (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006 Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will be preserved.	1095
2	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S - see the discussion under the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8. However, as this project is to replace an existing transportation structure increases in transportation impacts based solely from this project is not anticipated to occur.	1096



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Strunsky (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1097
2	Comment noted.	1098
3	Comment noted.	1099
4	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1100



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: S. Chang (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The modified Alternative 5 which was selected as the Preferred Alternative incorporated several elements from Alternative 2 to enhance overall design and to reduce the construction period.	1101



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Ream (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1102



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: R. Coffin (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1103
2	Current Presidio Trust Bike and Trail plan proposed bike lanes on Girard Road.	1104
3	The restoration of the project area, including bike paths will be coordinated with the Trust and their Bikeways and Trails Master Plan.	1105
4	This project does not impede the existing Presidio Trust Bikeways and Trails Master Plan.	1106



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Keck (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The roadway is being designed to meet all safety standards.	1107
2	Comment noted and as Commenter stated, increased safety is one of the elements of the Purpose and Need for this project.	1108



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Trust (M. Boland (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1109
2	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1110
3	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1111
4	Positive comment regarding the management of the project.	1112



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA (R. Foster (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1113
2	This comment contains the reasons why the GGNRA gave its support to Alternative 5 in comment #1113.	1114



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: P. Vaughey (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1115
2	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1116
3	The EIR is not related to how SPUR developed their plan.	1117
4	Following the circulation of the DEIS/R, there were a series of workshops and meetings with interested parties to develop a consensus for the preferred alternative. The project team has made the commitment to continue an open dialog throughout the completion of this project.	1118
5	Comment noted.	1119



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: G. Nicholson (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1120



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Brooke (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	There is no additional delay associated with traffic in this direction as one unsignalized lane can accommodate the traffic volumes for this stretch; there is a lower speed limited in Alternative 5 for this portion of the project as the transition zone between city streets and the highway is moved westward.	1121



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Kern (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1122



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Perez (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1123



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Bancroft (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	There is no additional delay associated with traffic in this direction as one unsignalized lane can accommodate the traffic volumes for this stretch; there is a lower speed limited in Alternative 5 for this portion of the project as the transition zone between city streets and the highway is moved westward.	1124



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Hathaway (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1847



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: A. Harrison (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1125



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Caramatti (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted; the proposed intersections meet project design requirements and would also include signal coordination.	1126
2	Numerous opportunities have been provided throughout the life of the project for public involvement. Public meetings and workshops were held and a Citizen Advisory Council, consisting of representatives from the neighborhoods, has been involved from the beginning to provide recommendations on the project.	1127
3	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1128



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Brooke (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Project alternatives do result in less traffic on Marina Boulevard. This is a consequence, not an objective of the project.	1129
2	The Refined Presidio Parkway Alternative achieves a much closer balance of traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue.	1130
3	The Refined Presidio Parkway Alternative achieves a much closer balance of traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue. The traffic decreases in the original alternative were in the off-peak direction.	1131



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Figone (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Preferred Alternative is being designed to improve safety throughout the corridor. The proposed facility will have increased curvature to enhance traffic calming and provide a transition zone starting at the Main Post tunnel in order to reduce vehicle speeds prior to entering city streets.	1132
2	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1133
3	Marin County residents pay sales taxes which results in the funds available from state and federal sources, so the Marin residents are paying into the project. The Marin residents who use the facility are traveling to SF where they most likely work, shop, and spend money which generates sales taxes for SF City/County.	1134



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Betsy (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1135
2	An enhanced description of the process for building preservation and other historic preservation efforts is included in Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R.	1136
3	Traffic projects are based upon population and employment forecasts as established by ABAG in order to meet requirements set forth by FHWA and CTC. Marin County and Richmond District populations are not forecast to experience "exploding" growth.	1137
4	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1138



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Blum (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1139



Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Marston (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 with the Circle Drive option noted.	1140
2	Mr. Painter is credited in the FEIS/FEIR as a participant in this process.	1141

