



Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #15

Meeting Summary

date of meeting: 11/29/05

location: San Francisco County Transportation Authority

subject: Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

attendees:

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees:

Michael Alexander
Rich Coffin
Max DelleSedie
Paul A. Epstein
Becky Evans
Tony Imhof
Ronald Mulcare
Norman Rolfe
Jackie Sachs
Patricia Vaughey

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Lee Saage

Other Participants

Emeric Kalman, GWPNA

Arup

Michael Kaye

MPA Design

Michael Painter

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

William Alich
Janette Barroca
Lindy Beasley
Gene DeMartini
Gloria Fontanello
Vera Gates
Joan Marie Girardot
Redmond Kernan
Michael Marston
James Maxwell
Fred Rodriguez
Kate Sears

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Gary Kennerley
???

CirclePoint

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

Agency Comment Resolution Workshop

Gary Kennerley, Parsons Brinckerhoff, provided an update on the Agency Comment Resolution Workshop. He explained that a previous version of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) was reviewed and commented upon by involved Agencies including Presidio Trust, National Park Service, Veterans Administration, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD), Department of Recreation and Park (Rec and Park), and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (the Authority). The Agencies submitted a total of 840 comments, of which 600 were helpful for improving the document and 240 required further clarification. The Agency Comment Resolution Workshop was arranged to discuss and work through the 240 comments. Over the course of the three-

day workshop, Agency decision makers were able to resolve all the comments. A new version of the DEIS/R incorporating the agreed comment responses has been completed. Caltrans is conducting a final review of the updated DEIS/R before sending it to FHWA for approval. Gary stated that the DEIS/R is on schedule to be circulated to the public by the end of the year.

Norman Rolfe, San Francisco Tomorrow, inquired if the document was still open to changes regarding lane-width reductions. Lee Saage, the Authority, clarified that final configuration of the project is still open, however the geometry of the project is fairly fixed in terms of how it will be presented to the public in the DEIS/R. Lee stated that part of the purpose of the DEIS/R is to solicit public comment, and he expects to receive comments about shoulder width. Lee noted that the DEIS/R will undergo further revisions after public comments are received.

Jackie Sachs, San Francisco County Transportation Authority Citizen's Advisory Committee, inquired if removable barriers were discussed at the Agency Comment Resolution Workshop. Lee commented that GGBHTD sought assurance that the Doyle Drive Project would not preclude the future possibility of a barrier.

III. Funding Plan Update

The DEIR/S will include an update on cost estimates for all alternatives based on cost information from the Department of Transportation, which is the most accurate and recent data available. Costs have increased substantially, an average of 70%, since initial estimates in 2001. The increase is mostly due to price escalations in construction materials including steel, cement, and fuel. Funding needs are based on Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway with Diamond Option, which is an alternative that is reasonably likely to be selected. In general, the ratio of cost between projects is being maintained. Funding is expected to come from State and Federal sources, as well as local sources such as GGBHTD.

Norm Rolfe inquired if project funding has been issued. Lee clarified that all funding has been committed for the next phase, which is the design phase of the project. Complete project funding will not be committed until just prior to the construction phase. Lee explained that this is normal procedure for a project of this magnitude. Norman inquired why protocol varies between projects, specifically referencing the Transbay project. Lee commented that he is not involved in the Transbay project and cannot comment on it specifically, but he noted that the Transbay Project, unlike the Doyle Drive Project, proposes to expend substantial amounts capital to buy right-away. Additionally, the Doyle Drive Project has a funding plan that details the sources and amounts of all the funding.

Rich Coffin, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, requested clarification about funding sources. Michael Alexander, SPUR, stated that the State government, the federal government, and local sources would each provide approximately one-third of project funding. Lee elaborated that the local share has decreased slightly and is presently closer to 30%. Lee noted that contributions from Proposition K have escalated, and an additional \$85 million of funding is expected to come from a combination of GGBHTD, congestion pricing, and other sources. Tables detailing funding information are being included in the environmental document and any further questions can be directed to Lee.

IV. Update on Public Outreach for the Release of the Draft Environmental Document

Public Comment

Molly Graham, CirclePoint, provided an update on plans for outreach activities. The release of the DEIS/R will occur at the end of December. Members of the Subcommittee will receive

hard copies of the DEIS/R, CD copies of the DEIS/R, and a copy of the Citizens' Guide, which provides an overview of the project and the DEIS/R. An official public comment period will run through March 1, 2006, which will be slightly longer than sixty-days. Molly noted that all comments should be made on the contents of the DEIS/R and not on the Citizens' Guide. The same materials are being provided to Agencies and can be obtained via written request, the project website, the project email address, or by calling the Authority. Molly noted that the project team is encouraging people to request the DEIS/R in its CD format to conserve resources.

Molly noted that all comments received would be replied to in the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIR/S). Max DelleSedie, Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action, requested clarification about the comment response process. Lee Saage explained that at the end of the public comment period all of the comments are collected and organized into a database that summarizes and categorizes the comments. This information is then transferred and used by decision-makers to select a preferred alternative. Lee noted that the Subcommittee would be involved in the comment review and decision making process. Lee explained that every comment received will be included in the FEIR/S with an appropriate response. The comments provide instruction on the next steps of the project.

Michael Alexander commented that the DEIS/R does not include all of the project refinements that have been recently developed. He inquired if the public will be informed about the refinements and how they will be able to make comments on the refinements. Lee Saage replied that the alternatives described in the document are the alternatives for which the project team is seeking comments. Many of the design refinements have not yet been advanced in engineering or evaluated in detail and are not appropriate to be presented for public comment. Lee explained that the public is encouraged to ask questions at the public hearing and make suggestions. All issues raised during the public review process will be considered and, in some manner, incorporated into the FEIR/S. Design concepts that endure the public review process will be incorporated in the FEIR/S in detail.

Public Hearings

Molly Graham stated that a series of two public hearings are being tentatively planned for Wednesday, January 18, 2006 and Wednesday, February 15, 2006, at the Golden Gate Club in the Presidio. The meetings are spaced a month apart to allow adequate time to review the document. The first meeting will serve as an educational opportunity, and the second meeting will occur at the end of the comment period, once people have had more time to read and analyze the document. Molly stated that a court reporter will be present at both of the meetings to officially record verbal comments. The second meeting was originally scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 2006, but it was moved to Wednesday due to the President's Day holiday. Molly explained that dates and locations for the public hearings are currently tentative, because it is important that the Subcommittee provide input.

Michael Alexander asked what time the meetings would occur. Molly replied the meetings are expected to occur between 6:00 – 8:00 pm. Patricia Vaughey requested that the time be extended to 9:00 pm to accommodate people who work. Molly noted the suggestion.

Lee Saage inquired if there were issues with having both meetings on Wednesday nights. Patricia Vaughey inquired if one of the meetings could occur on a Monday evening. Molly explained that Monday tends to be a less convenient night in general, because it follows the weekend. Molly inquired if any of the subcommittee groups had standing meetings on the third Wednesday of the month. No conflicts were mentioned.

Norman Rolfe stated that one of the meetings should occur at a more transit accessible site and recommended the auditorium at the State Building. Lee mentioned the possibility of providing additional Presidio shuttles on the night of the meetings. Patricia Vaughey commented that additional shuttle has been provided for previous meetings and worked well.

Molly Graham stated that alternative locations would be considered and additional Presidio shuttles would be provided on the nights of the meetings. Lee Saage confirmed that one of the meetings could be held at a more transit-oriented location.

Stakeholder Outreach

Molly explained that the project team has been and will continue to conduct individual and group briefings. She noted that the project team is available to do an informational project briefing for any of the groups represented by the subcommittee. Gary Kennerley, Parsons Brinckerhoff, elaborated that the meetings typically include a summary presentation and question and answer period, and content can be tailored to meet the interests of specific groups.

V. Detailed Design Discussion

Lee Saage introduced the topic of design issues. Gary Kennerley gave a PowerPoint presentation on project options. He noted that Michael Painter, MPA Design, was available to answer questions regarding design.

Max DelleSedie asked for clarification about the No Build Alternative. Lee explained that the No Build Alternative entails scheduled maintenance and is a short-term measure that does not meet seismic standards.

Michael Alexander inquired why inside traffic barriers are necessary for Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway, which features an extensively landscaped median. Gary explained that barriers are needed for safety purposes to ensure that traffic does not cross the median. There are a variety of styles for the barriers, for example they could mimic stone walls or be covered by vegetation. Gary noted that safety regulations are detailed to the extent that trees exceeding four feet need to have protective barriers. Michael Alexander commented that it is important to remember that this roadway is in the setting and context of a National Park, and he inquired if trees could be bermed. Lee confirmed that tree could be bermed. Patricia Vaughey expressed support for the traffic barriers, because they are essential in preventing vehicles from crossing the median into oncoming traffic.

Rich Coffin inquired about noise levels. Gary replied that the continuous nature of the new structure will significantly reduce noise, because vehicles will not clatter as they pass over joints. Paul Epstein, Planning Association for the Richmond, commented that FHWA has noise standards for highways. Lee confirmed that there are FHWA noise guidelines and that the project would actually decrease the current level of noise. Detailed information regarding noise will be included in the environmental document. Michael Alexander inquired if rubberized asphalt would be included to reduce noise. Lee replied that concrete will be used, and it not clear if rubberized concrete has a long-term effect on noise.

Paul Epstein inquired if a transit hub is still planned and where would it be located. Gary explained that transit stops and transfers will be concentrated into a hub that will be on the main roadway and Golden Gate Transit will participate. Signalized crossings will allow pedestrians to access the transit hubs.

Max DelleSedie inquired if the Crissy Field slip ramp could be used to avoid the Diamond and Circle Drive Options. Lee replied that the location of Doyle Drive changes slightly and the Crissy Field slip ramp could not be used in its current location. He continued to explain that the ramp was originally intended as a temporary structure and will not be allowed to remain permanently. Max replied that traffic circulation problems are caused by tour buses that stop on the corner of Lyon and Bay Streets to let passengers on and off. The tour buses will not be easily redirected from this corner, because the roadway provides a particular view that tourists want to see. Lee inquired if there were any suggestions to avoid this issue. Patricia

Vaughey replied that suggestions would be presented at the December 8, 2005 meeting with the Marina and Cow Hollow neighborhood groups.

Rich Coffin expressed concern about pedestrian safety when crossing the diagonal intersection at Richardson. Gary clarified that the intersection will be perpendicular and not diagonal. Patricia Vaughey commented that red-light-runners are an issue and pedestrian safety needs to be considered.

Paul Epstein inquired how much of the Park Presidio Interchange is being replaced. Lee replied that the replacement of the viaduct has been considered and will not occur. Paul expressed concern about the seismic safety of the viaduct if it is not replaced up to the McArthur Tunnel. Becky Evans, Sierra Club, commented that this is an arrangement that happened a long time ago. Lee confirmed that this decision had been previously made, and he recommended that Paul submit a formal comment regarding this issue.

Continuing Design

Michael Painter presented information regarding parking and the Circle Drive and Diamond Options. Michael explained that the Mason Street warehouses would provide for additional parking. The warehouses would be bermed and out of view. Additional parking would be provided by a triangular parcel of land in the Presidio. Patricia Vaughey commented that the Presidio is not a guaranteed parking source, and she expressed concern that a decrease in parking capacity could push cars onto neighborhood streets.

Tony Imhoff inquired how many lanes are planned for the Marina connector. Michael Painter replied that two lanes would enter the Marina and one lane would exit the Marina. Tony inquired if the connector could accommodate 25,000 vehicles if the two lanes merged into one lane and then expanded into two lanes at Doyle Drive. Gary Kennerley clarified that the level of service would be maintained or improved.

VI. Public Comment

Emeric Kalman, GWPNA, inquired what improvements will be made to traffic within the City of San Francisco and if there have been any preliminary studies showing improvements to city traffic resulting from this project. Lee Saage explained the purpose of the Subcommittee is to advise on the replacement of Doyle Drive and not city traffic. Emeric commented that before the DEIS/R is released traffic impacts on the City should be studied. Lee clarified that the DEIS/R identifies all impacts within the project area. Emeric requested the inclusion of a terrorism/security study in the DEIS/R. Lee replied that security is being addressed in the DEIS/R.

ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
11/29/2005	Identify alternative location for one of the public hearings.	Molly Graham	ASAP	12/6/2005
11/29/2006	Adjust graphic of Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway to represent the intended landscaping and barrier.	PB	Next Meeting	
11/29/2005	Clarify if the level of service for Marina Boulevard will be maintained or improved.	PB	Next Meeting	

Distribution:

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