

Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study**Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #21*****Meeting Summary******date of meeting: 11/09/06******location:*** San Francisco County Transportation Authority***subject:*** Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting***attendees:***Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees

Michael Alexander, SPUR
 Janette Barroca, At-Large
 Lindy Beasley, Presidio Residents & Tenants
 Max DelleSedie, Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action
 Paul A. Epstein, Planning Association for the Richmond
 Becky Evans, Sierra Club
 Gloria Fontanello, Marina Neighborhood Association
 Joan Marie Girardot, Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association
 Tony Imhof, Cow Hollow Association
 Jackie Sachs, SFCTA, CAC Member

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

William Alich, Fort Point & Presidio Historical Association
 Rich Coffin, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
 Gene DeMartini, At-Large
 Vera Gates, At-Large
 Redmond Kernan, At-Large
 Michael Marston, Neighborhood Association for Presidio Planning
 James Maxwell
 Ronald Mulcare, At-Large
 Fred Rodriguez, GGNRA Advisory Commission
 Norman Rolfe, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Kate Sears, Marin Commuter
 Patricia Vaughney, At-Large

Executive Committee Members

Rick Foster, GGNRA/NPS
 Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Lee Saage, P.E.

Other Participants

Chloe Good, SPUR

MPA Design

Michael Painter

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Gary Kennerley
 David Shelton

CirclePoint

Kristina Chu
 Jane Kruse
 Kay Wilson

summary:**I. Call to Order and Agenda Review**

Lee Saage, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (the Authority), reviewed the agenda. Joan Marie Girardot, Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association, had a correction on the minutes from the July 18, 2006 meeting. She noted that on page 4, paragraph 2, she didn't suggest that Mason Street should be the primary access to the Presidio and requested that the comment be deleted.

II. Report on Identification of the Preferred Alternative

Lee Saage reviewed the process for selecting a preferred alternative. He noted that in September 2006 the Board adopted the recommendations for the refined Alternative 5 to be identified as the preferred alternative in the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/R). The FEIS/R is expected to be released in early 2007.

Lee reminded the Subcommittee that the FEIS/R is the document that informs the Record of Decision (ROD). After the approval of the FEIS/R, a ROD will be issued to identify specific mitigations for the project. This document serves as a commitment on behalf of the FHWA to execute mitigations identified in the FEIS/R. In addition, the Authority Board, as the lead CEQA agency, will certify the FEIS/R and issue a Notice of Determination.

Becky Evans, Sierra Club, inquired about the process for identifying mitigations and whether it currently involves stakeholders. Lee explained that the DEIS/R identified the ranges and alternatives for mitigations, and that the FEIS/R identifies the actual proposed mitigations. He noted that public and stakeholder input are included in the process to determine mitigations.

Michael Alexander, SPUR, announced that he will be out of town until February, and introduced Chloe Good, SPUR, who will represent SPUR during his absence.

III. Introduction to the Process to Develop a Sustainable Project

David Shelton, Parsons Brinckerhoff, presented an overview for developing a sustainable project. David described the definition of sustainability as enhancing how a facility interacts with the natural environment and natural resources. A sustainable highway project must meet functional requirements and foster environmental stewardship. The purpose of a sustainable program is to study the sustainability in design, construction and operations, while identifying milestones for success. Developing the program includes conducting sustainability workshops, implementing the process, and compiling a sustainability checklist. The final stage in a sustainable project is to assess the outcomes.

Tony Imhof, Cow Hollow Association, inquired about the negative impacts of using existing or recycled materials on the project. Gary Kennerley, Parsons Brinckerhoff, replied that the project team will use recycled materials where appropriate (i.e., curbs), and high quality materials for important structures.

Lindy Beasley, Presidio Residents & Tenants, inquired about recycled roadway, and wondered if pollutants from the previous roadway are taken into consideration when assembling recycled materials for new roadways.

Michael Alexander expressed appreciation for developing the sustainability process and indicated that SPUR was pleased with the effort. He asked whether California uses American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards for sustainability. Gary replied that the state highway system utilizes the Caltrans Highway Design Manual and that AASHTO standards are used for city/local streets. Lee reiterated that project has specific design criteria that are used in conjunction with the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. In the case of variance, the project team has to identify and defend reasoning. Michael Alexander hopes that the project can push the standards of sustainability to a higher level.

Michael Alexander encouraged the project team to look at emerging standards for sustainability to see how they might be incorporated into the project. Lee noted that Caltrans strives to set high standards and looks forward to working with Caltrans to develop a sustainable project.

IV. Overview of Value Analysis/Cost Reduction Concepts

Gary gave an overview presentation on the value analysis and cost reduction concepts. The project team was tasked with reducing construction costs by over \$100 million. This has been achieved by improving construction access, increasing safety by minimizing traffic shifts, and reducing construction duration. The construction staging phase would include extended weekend closures, temporary at-grade roadways, long term closures of local movements, and simplify the staging scheme from 5 stages with 19 phases to 3 stages. There have been many

ideas proposed in the Value Analysis Study that were not included in the current cost reduction analysis, and deferred savings for these ideas could be incorporated into the preliminary design stage.

Paul Epstein, Planning Association for the Richmond, asked who has jurisdiction to adopt these new staging concepts. Lee responded that the new staging concepts are a collaboration of concurrence with cooperating agencies and committees, and that ultimately Caltrans and the Authority will make the final decision.

Paul requested clarification on the long-term road closures. After clarification, Lee informed the committee that workshops are being scheduled for agencies to discuss the construction staging. He noted that subcommittee members are welcomed to attend these workshops.

Paul requested clarification about the necessity of a short detour road, and the project team confirmed that one would be necessary to accommodate traffic.

Lee explained the process that went into developing value analysis and cost reduction concepts. He explained that there were brainstorming sessions for cost reduction ideas, and then a level of feasibility analysis was completed. The feasible ideas were recommended for implementation in the final report. It is worth noting that some of the issues raised in the report require additional analysis.

Michael Alexander inquired about the status of the reconfiguration of Main Post Tunnel and Lee confirmed that the idea is still under consideration. Lee noted that the state of the design now is more like a covered roadway, and much less massive than the original concept.

Michael Alexander noted concern about the temporary at-grade road to the north and the impact on the Crissy Field Center. Gary replied that the new staging has less impact on Crissy Field than the prior one. Lee noted that if the project impact is too great, the Crissy Field Center operations can be temporarily relocated. Gary added that the Center will still have parking access.

Michael Painter inquired about the on-grade roadway and Gary informed him that it helps reduce noise in comparison to the prior scheme.

Paul Epstein applauded the efforts to reduce the timeframe of construction.

Lindy Beasley requested clarification of the term "deferred design." Lee responded that it generally means to defer design to the engineering stage of a project, which is about to start for Doyle Drive. Lindy requested that sustainability ideas be included in the deferred design phase.

Becky Evans asked if there were other projects that would impact the proposed parking plan. Gary answered that the project is looking at parking options based on projected uses of buildings and expected parking need for the following timeframes: current use, 2010 midpoint of construction and 2030 design year. Becky voiced concern about the parking deficit and Gary noted that the parking technical study is in the DEIS/R and will be updated in the FEIS/R.

Michael Alexander asked the project team to consider other Authority projects in the development of Doyle Drive. In particular, he suggested potential overlap with the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, and requested the Authority look into how these projects could be timed to help people use public transit during the construction of Doyle Drive. Lee commented that it makes sense to do a traffic analysis study of the BRT to see if there would be some sort of benefit during construction.

V. Update on Public Outreach

Kay Wilson, CirclePoint, invited the Subcommittee to the Construction Staging Workshop on Monday, November 13, 2006. Lee added that there may be more workshops on construction staging scheduled depending on the outcome of the initial workshop.

Kay reported that the project team is finalizing the FEIS/R and suspects that the next Subcommittee meeting will occur during early 2007 to discuss to the FEIS/R and the sustainability process.

Becky Evans requested that the next subcommittee not be held on the second Thursday of the month so that it does not conflict with the Transit Effectiveness meeting that is held at the same time. Lee responded that the subcommittee meetings are held on a consensus basis, but that the project team will look into alternative dates.

Lindy Beasley remarked that she would like to see the idea of "Better Than Before" incorporated into the Doyle Drive project.

VI. Public Comment

None.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

Distribution:

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