



Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #13

Meeting Summary

date of meeting: 1/31/02

location: SFCTA

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
Paul Epstein
Becky Evans
Gloria Fontanello
Vera Gates
Joan Marie Girardot
Tony Imhof
Redmond Kernan
Michael Marston
James Maxwell
Ronald Mulcare
Norman Rolfe
Jackie Sachs
Jack Spring
Patricia Vaughey

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

Gene DeMartini
Leo Paul Koulos
Roger Peters
Kate Sears

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Leroy Saage
Paul Ward

Other Participants

Dick Tilles, Presidio Trust
Rick Foster, NPS
Michael Spiegel
Zachary Chop, Caltrans
Namlin Shichin, Caltrans
Francisco DaCosta, Muweka Ohlone Tribe
Maria DaCosta
Emeric Kalman, Greater West Portal Neighborhood Assn.

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Dina Potter
Susan Killen
Scott Danielson
Gary Kennerly

Public Affairs Management

Kay Wilson
Kristy Ranieri
Samantha Calamari

DKS Associates

Joe Story

summary:

I. Meeting Purpose/Agenda Review and Meeting Summary Approval

Lee Saage, SFCTA, introduced Paul Ward, the new SFCTA Manager of Capital Programs. Mr. Ward has extensive experience with planning and project management for transportation projects. He formally worked for Caltrans.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, asked if there were any changes to the agenda. No changes were requested.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, asked if anyone had any comments or revisions to the October 2, 2001 meeting summary. No changes were requested and the meeting summary was approved.

Patricia Vaughey noted that she wanted to re-emphasize her question raised at the previous meeting regarding hydraulic flow was based on her belief that the alternatives would potentially disrupt the natural water flow through Tennessee Hollow.

Joan Girardot stated that she is still waiting for a response from the National Park Service (NPS) and the Presidio Trust regarding what legal authority they have to build a new road in a National Park. Rick Foster, NPS, said that there is no legislation that precludes NPS from building roads. Roads are built all the time to provide access to users.

II. Clarification of Dropped Alternatives

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reviewed the process by which three alternatives were dropped from further study. On December 10, 2001, SFCTA sent Subcommittee members a letter regarding the elimination of Alternatives 5, 6, and 7. In previous Subcommittee meetings, the project team had briefed the Subcommittee that this decision was pending, and the letter was a formal update of the decision to the Subcommittee.

The alternatives recommended for elimination were Alternative 5: Detour Construction, Tunnel under Halleck Street, Couplet with Signalized Marina Connector, Alternative 6 and options: Phased Construction - Tunnel under Halleck Street with Direct Marina Access or Signalized Marina Connector and Alternative 7 and options: Phased Construction - Bridge over Halleck Street with Direct Marina Access or Signalized Marina Connector.

Alternative 5 was developed based on the recommendations of a design charrette. Some positive features were identified, specifically the opportunity for views of the Palace of Fine Arts and protection of the Gorgas warehouses during construction. The adverse effects identified included impacts to historic buildings and the deterioration of the National Historic Landmark District boundary, and a reduction in traffic capacity due to increased congestion. The project team recommended eliminating this alternative since other alternatives under consideration meet the project's purpose with fewer impacts. The Parkway character associated with at-grade intersections is still being considered within Alternatives 3 and 4.

More detailed engineering analysis indicated that the Phased Alternatives (Alternatives 6 and 7) present a greater potential for disturbance of graves in the San Francisco National Cemetery and greater potential for impacts to historic structures as compared to other alternatives. Additionally, these Phased Alternatives would be significantly more expensive to construct. The Department of Veterans Affairs oversees the National Cemetery and has emphatically stated that it would not provide the easements needed to construct any of these Phased Alternatives because of the potential for cemetery impacts.

III. Overview of Remaining Study Process

Kay Wilson, PAM, provided an overview of the remaining study process and passed out a study process roadmap. The schedule serves to clarify the next steps for the environmental process and the key Subcommittee involvement activities in the upcoming months.

Jackie Sachs asked when the team plans to update the SFCTA Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Kay Wilson, PAM, noted that the team will conduct briefings after the release of the environmental document.

Joan Girardot asked for clarification on the role of the San Francisco Planning Department in the Preferred Alternative recommendation. Lee Saage, SFCTA, answered that the SFCTA is the lead agency for the City and County of San Francisco; however, the Planning Department is participating as a member of the Doyle Drive Executive Committee. The Board of Supervisors, as SFCTA Board, will approve the Preferred Alternative and certify the Final EIR.

Redmond Kernan asked when the input of NPS and Caltrans will be presented to the Subcommittee. Lee Saage, SFCTA, said that the team has not developed a process yet and there may be future workshops to provide this type of information. Redmond Kernan requested that these workshops be shown as a part of the scheduled meetings and be built into the process.

Patricia Vaughey noted that an interdepartmental meeting on a related but different project took place and the citizens were not notified. She suggested that SFCTA act as a clearinghouse to coordinate all transportation projects. Lee Saage, SFCTA, answered that the SFCTA has considered assuming the role of a clearinghouse but that presently there is no funding. He understood the concerns of the committee and will discuss them within the SFCTA management. Michael Alexander said that this is an issue that needs to be addressed outside of the Doyle Drive Subcommittee as it is not relevant to this project.

Paul Epstein said that the Subcommittee needs sufficient time for the environmental document review process. Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that the public circulation period will be 60 days to provide sufficient time for review. A more detailed process map will be distributed that outlines the process.

V. Project Status Report

Dina Potter, PB, reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) put the Doyle Drive project on its priority list in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan.

Dina Potter, PB, gave an overview of the project work to date and noted that the Draft EIS/EIS is targeted for release in summer 2002.

VI. Update on Planning and Design Guideline Concepts/Aesthetics

Susan Killen and Scott Danielson, PB, provided an overview the design guidelines framework. They noted that the framework for the guidelines is developed for the EIS/EIR and to guide actual design details during the final engineering phase.

Michael Alexander said that the potential and the existing views and vistas should be considered in the design guidelines. Max DelleSedie said that the views in the presentation are from the perspective of the Presidio rather than the neighborhoods. Susan Killen, PB, said that the team has also provided views from the neighborhood but they are not in this overview presentation. Patricia Vaughey said that neighbors have enjoyed the view since the Letterman building was taken down. The team should also include the view from Crissy Field looking south.

Max DelleSedie noted that the 'cobra-like' lamps on Doyle Drive now are not the best design choice. Michael Alexander agreed and noted that lamps were added without a great deal of sensitivity to the historic character of the Golden Gate Bridge. The team should design a light fixture that will be complimentary. Scott Danielson, PB, agreed that there has been a lot of progress in light technology. Patricia Vaughey suggested that the team work with the Berkeley School of Lighting.

Vera Gates stated that there are many design options for the Golden Gate Bridge structural steelwork. She suggested that the team not only use the existing design but rather use more tasteful design.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, said that the purpose of the guidelines is to capture the heart and soul, or the design intent, that will inform and guide the design details. It is a mistake to make the guidelines too detailed because it would limit the ultimate design.

Tony Imhoff said that the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (PTIP) process revealed a strong desire to have the Crissy Marsh Expansion taken seriously. He is concerned that the Doyle Drive alternative designs might get too far into the process without taking this into consideration. Dina Potter, PB, noted that the alternatives take the Crissy Field Marsh Expansion into consideration, however the Doyle Drive study will be completed before there are formalized expansion plans. Therefore, there will not be a defined marsh location and/or design to coordinate with. However, none of the Doyle Drive alternatives preclude a marsh extension. Lee Saage, SFCTA, reminded the group that there will be options in addition to the actual alternatives, such as mixing and matching the retrofit alternatives with the tunnel alternatives to provide Presidio access.

Joan Girardot said that if the design criteria is too vague, then it is subjective. When "minimizing harm" is a goal, there must be criteria to measure and define harm. Lee Saage, SFCTA, repeated that the criteria should not be overly specific. Susan Killen, PB, noted that the team would bring the guidelines back for review at the next meeting. After the environmental review process a separate citizen committee and design experts would develop the final design details.

VII. Update on Traffic Analysis

Joe Story, DKS Associates, presented an update on the traffic analysis that covered the following: current conditions of Doyle Drive and neighborhood traffic, change of conditions by 2030, change of conditions with alternatives and transit, and the pedestrian, bicycle and parking conditions.

Patricia Vaughey asked which PTIP alternative was included in the traffic model because the PTIP Preferred Alternative is not the worst case scenario. Lee Saage, SFCTA, said the analysis used the PTIP Preferred Alternative.

Max DelleSedie asked if the worst case scenario was taken from the PTIP, would the traffic model still work. Joe Story, DKS Associates, answered that the model would still work if the roads are not constrained. Projected 2030 increase in traffic is 5% heading toward the Golden Gate Bridge and 10% heading away from the bridge.

Michael Alexander asked if the number for the level of service is for people or vehicles. The concept for the level of service for an urban model is different for a suburban model. Joe Story, DKS Associates, answered that only cars are being counted rather than carpool or buses. Norman Rolfe said that the models should consider people rather than vehicles. Lee Saage, SFCTA, said that as traffic becomes more congested in the travel demand model, the model does incorporate the probability that people would switch to transit.

Norman Rolfe expressed concern about the number of Doyle Drive lanes and strongly stated that he does not like the addition of a slip ramp.

Becky Evans said that traffic signals in National Parks are not favored.

Max DelleSedie asked what is the design speed included in the analysis. Dina Potter, PB, answered the design speed is 50 mph and the posted speed is 45 mph which is the same as today.

Patricia Vaughey noted that she expects the users of the new Letterman and other Presidio developments will exceed the posted speed limits when they drive.

Patricia Vaughey said that she does not favor a right turn only from Gorgas Street on to Lyon Street. Max DelleSedie said that a right turn increases the traffic in front of his home.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that this concern is with just one of the alternatives. Traffic is going to increase in the future regardless of the Doyle Drive project. The team is attempting to find the best way to accommodate increased traffic by identifying the effectiveness of these alternatives.

Max DelleSadie asked the year that traffic count data was taken. Dina Potter, PB, responded year 2000.

Joan Girardot noted that she disagreed with the level of service included in the No Build Alternative, she felt it should be much greater. Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that the team is giving a broad overview of the traffic analysis results. He suggested that the Subcommittee members request a smaller group meeting to answer specific questions.

Gloria Fontanello expressed her frustration with the impacts to the neighborhoods from the increasing traffic. She would like to reduce the number of lanes on Doyle Drive and decrease the speed limit. She urged the SFCTA to improve the traffic congestion problem for the greater good of San Francisco.

Gloria Fontanello asked to know the amount of revenue collected per day on the Golden Gate Bridge.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, suggested that the traffic analysis specific questions should be answered in one-on-one meetings. If Subcommittee members want a special meeting they should request one.

VIII. Status of Project Schedule

Dina Potter, PB, reported that there are no changes to the project schedule. The Draft EIS/EIR is targeted for distribution in summer 2002.

IX. Report on Action Items

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reported that all of the action items have been completed.

X. Upcoming Meeting Dates

The next meeting date is April 30, 2002, 5:00 pm at the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

XI. Public Comments

Francisco DaCosta, a member of the Muweca Ohlone Tribe, noted that the best way to inform the public is to have a Web site. He stated that the meeting did not mention archeological site impacts on the sacred burial ground. He requested to be informed of the upcoming meetings.

ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
1/31/02	NA	NA	NA	NA

Distribution:

- All Subcommittee Members
- Leroy L. Saage
- Jose Luis Moscovich
- Dina Potter
- Susan Killen
- Kay Wilson
- Kristy Ranieri
- Michael Painter