



Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #15

DRAFT Meeting Summary

date of meeting: 9/27/05

location: San Francisco County Transportation Authority

subject: Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

attendees:

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees:

Michael Alexander
William Alich
Janette Barroca
Lindy Beasley
Rich Coffin
Max DelleSedie
Gloria Fontanello
Vera Gates
Joan Marie Girardot
Tony Imhof
Redmond Kernan
Michael Marston
Ronald Mulcare
Norman Rolfe
Jackie Sachs
Patricia Vaughey

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Lee Saage

Other Participants
Nidal Tuqan, Caltrans
Emeric Kalman, GWPNA

Arup
John Karn

MPA Design
Michael Painter

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

Paul Epstein
Becky Evans
Gene DeMartini
James Maxwell
Roger Peters
Fred Rodriguez
Kate Sears

Parsons Brinckerhoff
Gary Kennerley

CirclePoint
Kay Wilson
Molly Graham
Lauren Karp

summary:

I. Meeting Purpose/Agenda Review

Lee Saage reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose.

II. Update on the Public Outreach for the Release of the Environmental Document

Timeline for the Environmental Document and the Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative
Kay Wilson, CirclePoint, reviewed upcoming milestones for the environmental document and the selection of a locally preferred alternative. She provided an update of the environmental review process, and highlighted the upcoming opportunities for the subcommittee to contribute their comments. Kay noted that in November the subcommittee is scheduled to meet again prior to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR. She stated the Draft EIS/EIR is targeted for release in December, after which there will be a formal public review and comment period. At the conclusion of the formal review period a public hearing is planned, and the project team will collect and summarize the major issues addressed during the review period and at the hearing. Kay stated that the subcommittee will make a recommendation of a locally preferred alternative in the spring. She noted that the project team is available to provide informational presentations to groups represented by the subcommittee and other interested organizations in advance of the release of the Draft EIS/EIR and during the comment period.

Jackie Sachs, San Francisco County Transportation Authority Citizens' Advisory Committee member, requested that Lee Saage, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, or Kay Wilson provide information at the November/December Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting. Kay replied that Lee Saage is scheduled to present information to the CAC.

Redmond Kernan, At-large, recommended extending the sixty-day formal review period to a ninety-day period. Redmond commented that it is difficult for organizations to coordinate an appropriate review of the material and submit comments during the holiday season. Lee Saage noted the suggestion.

Funding

Tony Imhof, Cow Hollow Association, requested an update on the funding status of the project. Lee replied that the Authority has not yet acquired all the necessary funding, but they have made significant progress. Funding has been earmarked by local, state, and federal sources and each is expected to contribute approximately one-third of total project costs. The state has nearly met its obligation, the local portion will be close to complete after contributions from the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District and Marin County, and the Federal portion is still in progress. The Authority is confident that funding will be available when the project is ready to move forward. Lee explained that at present there is almost enough to cover the cost of the least expensive alternative, Alternative 2: Replace and Widen. Lee commented that there is still a shortfall of funding and José Luis Moscovich and Bijan Sartipi of Caltrans are aware of this issue and are meeting over the next month to begin developing a detailed strategy to meet funding needs.

Bill Alich, Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association, commented that much of the federal funding is reliant upon the transportation bill and asked for a review of federal funding sources. Lee replied that the Authority maintains close coordination with the Congressional delegation and is making efforts to protect project funding. Lee stressed that funding is not expected to disappear or to be diverted to other transportation projects.

III. Developments Since Last Meeting

Gary Kennerley, Parsons Brinkerhoff, reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS, the alternatives that are included for consideration within the Draft EIS/EIR, and the technical and environmental studies.

Alternative 2: Replace and Widen

Michael Alexander, SPUR, inquired about the necessary elevation of the road for the no-detour option. Gary informed the subcommittee that this option would be six-feet higher to avoid the need for a detour. Michael asked if the visual impact for the higher structure would be included in the Draft EIR/EIS. Gary confirmed that visual impacts are included and that all of the design options and a description of their impacts will be included in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Redmond Kernan asked how much additional time and money would be needed for the with-detour option for Alternative 2: Replace and Widen. Gary explained that they anticipate the with-detour option will require 18 additional months of construction and approximately \$80 million more than the with-detour option. Gary stated that the roadway is currently 67-feet wide and Alternative 2 will widen the road to 120-feet.

Norman Rolfe, San Francisco Tomorrow, requested that the proposed design with 10-foot shoulders be reduced to 8-foot shoulders to prevent the possibility of converting the shoulder to lanes in the future. Lee Saage explained that 10-foot shoulders are standard design for a California highway and suggested that this comment be submitted during the formal review period. Max DelleSedie, Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action, noted that the subcommittee has not met recently and there have been many changes to the designs. He did not recall previous designs including four shoulders.

Gloria Fontanello, Marina Neighborhood Association, inquired if the Golden Gate Bridge lane configuration would become three-lanes traveling in each direction to meet Doyle Drive without merges and weave conflicts. Gary explained that currently on the Golden Gate Bridge four-lanes travel eastbound in the morning and three-lanes travel westbound in the evening, but given current traffic projections it is likely that the configuration will shift to three-lanes traveling in each direction in the future. Gary explained that the fixed barrier, proposed in Alternative 2, will end 1000 feet before the physical toll plaza to allow enough roadway for cars to exit the toll plaza and merge into appropriate lanes. Gloria noted that lane merging is dangerous, especially for tourists and those unfamiliar with local traffic patterns.

Joan Marie Giradot, Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association, commented that shoulders do not have to be continuous for the length of Doyle Drive. Gary Kennerley explained continuous 10-foot shoulders are a Federal Highway Administration standard and must be included in the design if the Draft EIR/EIS is to be approved.

Rich Coffin, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, expressed concern that Alternative 2, although undesirable, is still an option in the Draft EIR/EIS and could be selected as the locally preferred alternative. Ron Mulcare commented that decision makers could choose to pursue Alternative 2, because it is significantly less expensive than Alternative 5.

Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway

Gary Kennerley explained the design options for Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway. Lee Saage commented that the project team has focused their efforts on Alternative 5, which is the design concept that originated from the Task Force and has continued to be developed by Michael Painter. The project team has worked with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration to ensure the parkway character of the design. There have been approximately 100 design exceptions, such as reduced lane and shoulder widths, decreased speed, and diminished curvature, which have been approved because of the parkway characterization. Lee noted that this alternative has been developed to be best suited for the Presidio.

Michael Alexander requested clarification about the loop ramp option and if it will be visible from Crissy Field. Gary explained that the option includes an additional loop and it may cause minor visual impacts to the view from Crissy Field. Redmond Kernan inquired if the purpose of the loop ramp is only to avoid impacts to nearby stables, or if it allows for better traffic merging. Gary explained that the primary reason for the loop-ramp alternative is to maximize the distance of construction from the stables and there are no major impacts on merging activities.

Gloria Fontanello commented that there are no bike lanes in the design. The original task force recommended bike lanes and walking paths to reduce traffic speed. Gary responded that there are bike lanes throughout the Presidio that are far superior to any bike lanes that could be included along Doyle Drive.

Norman Rolfe expressed concern that shoulder continuity and width could enable additional lanes in the future. Lee Saage explained that the Parkway Alternative would be extremely difficult to widen because of tunnels and its close proximity to historical structures. He stated that the design includes continuous shoulders that are 10-feet wide on the outside and 3-feet wide on the inside. He noted that this is a compromise with Caltrans, who preferred 10 foot wide inner and outer shoulders. Norman mentioned that the original design featured discontinuous shoulders. Lee replied that after providing for entrance and exits to shoulder lanes and landscaping access, there was very little area of roadway without shoulders. He noted that shoulder width is an important concern for Alternative 2.

Gloria Fontanello commented that the original Doyle Drive Task Force intended for Alternative 5 to be an opportunity to calm traffic speeds, reduce accidents, and accommodate

pedestrian and bicycle use. She expressed concern that these original goals are being overlooked and the project is accommodating increased traffic.

IV. Presidio Parkway- Context Sensitive Solutions

Agency Coordination and Process for Design Refinements

Lee Saage provided information about Agency coordination activities. He explained that after updating technical studies a series of Agency workshops were held. The workshops were an interactive format for Agencies to provide input about design issues. As a result of the meetings a number of design refinements were incorporated into Alternative 5.

Gloria Fontanello inquired if members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors or the Mayor's office have reviewed the Draft EIS/EIR. Lee clarified that the Draft EIS/EIR has not yet been circulated. The project has been reviewed at the staff level and will be made available to Agency decision making boards at the same time that it is made available to the public. The Mayor's Office has been briefed periodically but does not regularly participate in meetings.

Michael Alexander reviewed design refinements. He explained that the transportation agencies agreed to reduce the inner lanes in each direction from the State standard of 12 feet to 11 feet, and the outer lane, which carries bus and truck traffic, remains 12 feet. He reviewed traffic calming measures including superelevation. He explained that road curvatures were altered to reduce traffic speed and capacity metering was considered to control traffic during off-peak hours. He noted pedestrian and bicycle safety were important issues and exit ramps were successfully narrowed to calm traffic before entering pedestrian areas. Michael Alexander stressed that he represented the opinions and concerns of the subcommittee, and all refinements were made in accordance with the general goal of enhancing the parkway character of the road.

Patricia Vaughey, At-large, inquired why SPUR was involved in agency meetings and the Subcommittee was not. She requested that future meetings include Subcommittee representatives. Lee replied that the Authority extended an invitation to SPUR due to their instrumental role in bringing forth the Parkway Alternative. He stated that the subcommittee could schedule similar workshops to review design details if members were interested. Joan Marie Giradot asked what documentation is available from Agency meetings and who should be contacted to request information. Lee commented that meetings are summarized but not public and that he is the contact person for these documents. Patricia inquired about what the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic (SFDPT) has recommended, and Lee replied that the SFDPT is involved in the project but has not stated a major position.

Gloria Fontanello commented that there should be increased bicycle and pedestrian access on Doyle Drive. Lee expressed that this issue had been discussed with the bicycle community and all agreed that the Presidio provided safer and more enjoyable access to the Golden Gate Bridge. Rich Coffin commented that the bicycle community is more concerned with increasing accessibility and safety on surface roads in the Presidio and has not pursued bicycle access on Doyle Drive.

Patricia Vaughey expressed concern about speeding traffic at the merge of Doyle Drive and Richardson entering the city as well as Marina Boulevard. She commented that speeding and red light running is a problem. Joan Marie Giradot asked why there are two lanes entering the Marina, when there had been previous agreement to have one lane entering and one lane exiting the Marina. Michael Painter clarified that there will be two lanes leading into the Marina from Doyle Drive and one lane heading out of the Marina. Gary Kennerley explained that traffic speed will reduce as it reaches the Marina, and an additional lane is needed to accommodate the same traffic capacity at slower speeds.

Context Sensitive Design

John Karn, ARUP, presented information about specific design elements of Alternative 5 that augment the parkway characterization of Doyle Drive.

John Karn explained that there would be a landscaped median that would block the view of oncoming traffic. He noted that the dimensions of the inside barrier would change depending on the height of the landscaping. Michael Alexander noted that there is a 6-foot wide turf area requested by Caltrans to allow access for their landscape vehicles. He expressed that it is important to determine who is responsible for maintaining the landscaped median, because the design should reflect their access requirements.

Joan Marie Giradot inquired about the status of Mason and Halleck streets. She noted that the Task Force intended for Halleck to be a pedestrian street. Gary Kennerley explained that under the Parkway Alternative, no changes are planned for Mason Street. However Halleck Street will be reconstructed following the historic alignment and will continue to be the primary route for transit, pedestrians and bicycles.

V. Future Design Developments

Process for Future Design Refinements

Redmond Kernan inquired which agency will execute the project and its design. Lee replied that the Transportation Authority is currently listed as the lead Agency for the project and they intend to remain as the lead.

Crissy Marsh Conceptual Design

Michael Painter, MPA Design, reviewed design refinements to the eastern end of the project. Gary Kennerley noted that these refinements have not yet been incorporated into the environmental document but are intended to be reviewed for operational functionality and eventually included.

Patricia Vaughey expressed concern that reduced parking capacity around the Palace of Fine Arts and paid parking in the Presidio would push cars onto neighborhood streets. Michael Painter explained that the same number of parking spaces will be made available for parking around Palace Drive. An underground parking lot is being considered and all involved Agencies intend to maximize the number of free parking spaces available on city land.

ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
11/29/2005	Provide information about project funding and costs.	Lee Saage	Next Meeting	
11/29/2005	Provide a side by side comparison of the Loop Ramp Option and the Hook Ramp Option for Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway.	PB	Next Meeting	

Distribution:

- All Subcommittee Members
- Leroy L. Saage
- Jose Luis Moscovich
- Gary Kennerley
- John Karn
- Kay Wilson