



Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #10

Meeting Summary

date of meeting: 7/31/01

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

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

Vera Gates
Leo Paul Koulos
Roger Peters
Kate Sears

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Leroy Saage

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Dina Potter; Chris Subrizi; Scott Danielson

Public Affairs Management

Kay Wilson; Samantha Calamari

MPA Design

Michael Painter; Jacques Overhoff

Executive Committee Members

Caltrans: Bob Baxter, Don Reynolds, Nidal Tuqan, Nadini Shridhan
Federal Highway Administration: Bill Wong
National Park Service (NPS/GGNRA): Rick Foster
Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transit District: Alan Zarahdnik
Presidio Trust: Dick Tilles
San Francisco Department of Recreation and Parks:
Robert McDonald

Other Participants

Joe Story, DKS
Jim Maxwell, Marina Merchants Assc.
Paola Caballaro
Michael Strusky
Jean Strusky
Ric Borjes, National Park Service
Cherilyn Widell, Presidio Trust
Sharon Farell, Presidio Trust
Tamara Williams, National Park Service
Terri Thomas, Presidio Trust
Emeric Kaumeru, GWPW
Mrs. DelleSedie

summary:

I. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

Lee Saage, SFCTA, asked if anyone had any comments or revisions to the June 14 meeting summary. Norman Rolfe stated that his name was spelled wrong. The change was accepted and the meeting summary was approved.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, introduced the new representative from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC), Rich Coffin. The former representative could no longer serve on the Subcommittee and the SFBC appointed a new member to represent them.

II. Overview of Remaining Study Process

Kay Wilson, PAM, provided an overview of the remaining study process and passed out a study process diagram or "roadmap".

III. Project Status Report

Dina Potter, PB, reported that the team has been working on refining the alternatives and is compiling all the input data for the cost estimates. For the environmental process, the Archeological and the Historical Committees have reviewed the initial archeological report. Additional information was added to finalize the archeological testing procedures. The team is reaching consensus as to what fieldwork needs to be done. The team has also been working with the Department of Veterans Affairs to understand the restrictions of going underneath the gravesites. Computer simulations and animations are being produced.

Patricia Vaughey asked if the Subcommittee would have the opportunity to view these reports. Dina Potter, PB, stated that all of the reports will be part of the Draft EIS/EIR documentation.

IV. Summary of Corridor Resource Constraints

Dina Potter, PB, introduced Terri Thomas from the Presidio Trust to speak about the natural resources along the Doyle Drive corridor.

Terri Thomas, PT, stated that Doyle Drive could impact three main areas: Tennessee Hollow drainage, Crissy Field Marsh and the Coastal Bluffs. A restored Tennessee Hollow could support riparian communities. This type of system is becoming rare in California and Tennessee Hollow restoration will establish elements of historical interpretation. An overhead Doyle Drive replacement would increase the shaded area and a tunnel replacement could potentially restrict the groundwater flow interrupting the ground water and surface water interaction.

Crissy Field Marsh needs to expand as soon as possible. Doyle Drive replacements could reduce the available space for an expansion.

The Coastal Bluffs have wetland vegetation and a very diverse animal population because of the connected fractures in the bluff. A possible Doyle Drive tunnel could potentially impact the eastern flow in the as yet unknown fractures.

Terri Thomas, PT, added that there is a great amount of public support for these projects. Presidio Trust released an implementation plan that included the concepts for these natural resource expansions.

Paul Epstein said he felt like the presentation was focusing on what can not be done instead of what can be done to improve the roadway.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that the speakers are presenting the constraints because that is the information the Subcommittee had requested.

Norman Rolfe asked if there is a difference between impacts for a drilled tunnel versus a cut and cover tunnel.

Tamara Williams, GGNRA, replied that the drilled tunnel would allow for the maintenance of natural resource growth. Dina Potter, PB, added that originally the team looked at the drilled

tunnel but that type of construction is not appropriate for this project because the tunnels will be too shallow.

Redmond Kernan asked how are these issues going to be factored into the designs and how can the environmental and design aspects meet the same goals. Lee Saage, SFCTA, answered that the questions will be explored in the Draft EIS/EIR. The environmental document will provide a detailed evaluation of how each of the alternatives effects various aspects of the environment. The goal of the meeting is to provide an overview of the types of constraints that have to be addressed.

Patricia Vaughey asked if it is feasible to put a tunnel on fractured rocks. Dina Potter, PB, replied that it is feasible. There are processes that can be used during construction to reduce any damage to the fractured rock and that our geologists and hydrologist believe they can ensure the water continues to feed the wetland area at the base of the bluff.

Ric Borjes, National Park Service and Cherylyn Widell, Presidio Trust, presented a discussion of Doyle Drive and Archeological and Historical points in the Presidio. Cherylyn Widell, PT, explained that in the Section 106 process, the Federal Highway Administration instructs the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service to define an Area of Potential Effect (APE) and to identify the cultural resources and the historic resources that are impacted. Ric Borjes, NPS, noted that they are planning to test the area for potential archaeological resources within that APE.

Michael Alexander asked when the archeological work would be completed. Lee Saage, SFCTA, replied the team is looking to complete the report by the end of 2001.

Jackie Sachs asked how the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (PTIP) and other proposed redevelopment will affect this process. Ric Borjes, NPS, answered that PTIP and the Doyle Drive Project are working together and the agencies are trying to keep the studies coordinated. Additionally, PTIP is an overall plan and does not detail specific improvements of projects.

Joan Girardot noted that there has not been a lot of information about Highway 101 and Highway 1. She stated that some Subcommittee members would like to see a two-lane southbound ramp that would take 12 feet of park property. She asked if this is a possibility. Staff stated that the Park and Presidio Trust management should review this matter. Dina Potter, PB, stated that there has been no indication that two lanes are needed, but that the traffic operations analysis will inform that decision.

Patricia Vaughey asked what the impact would be on the environmental resources in proposed Tennessee Hollow restoration area from an exit on Girard Street.

Joan Girardot asked the representatives to identify the buildings that would be impacted by Doyle Drive. Ric Borjes, NPS, answered the Batteries and buildings 106, 204, 201, 230, 1063, the back of two warehouses, the YMCA and the pool near Gorgas.

Joan Girardot noted that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) states that plans such as PTIP should be included in the study. However, the environmental impacts are in the future. She asked for clarity on the process.

Bill Wong, Federal Highway Administration, replied that the agency is trying to give consideration of future plans and is trying not to preclude their plans by the Doyle Drive project. However, this study is not required to determine impacts to those future plans.

Gloria Fontanello said that her view is that returning to the Doyle Drive blueprints and only retrofitting may be in the best interest of all parties.

Joan Girardot asked if Federal Highway Administration will accommodate the Presidio Trust's plans without considering the cost. Bill Wong, FHWA, answered that NEPA requires that the agency study an alternative that fulfills the purpose and need of the project and cost will be part of it.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, added that state and federal agencies require participating agencies to account for the impact to the current condition. This includes projects that are in the ground now and approved plans and programmed projects.

Presidio Trust staff noted that the current General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) for the Presidio is an adopted plan, and it does call for the restoration of Tennessee Hollow and the expansion of Crissy Field Marsh. Lee Saage, SFCTA, stated that the GMPA was a programmatic document and not project specific and further clarified that the team is designing alternatives that will not preclude the development of these projects in the future, if they continue forward

Joan Girardot asked who is responsible for paying the added cost for accommodating these approved plans. Bill Wong, FHWA, answered if there is not enough funding to construct the entire project, the team will consider alternatives that do not require as much money.

Patricia Vaughey asked if there has been a discussion about the impacts to the Lombard and Marina corridors, specifically how Doyle Drive will effect the neighbors and the merchants. Dina Potter, PB, answered that the team is assessing all the impacts and that the traffic analysis will shed much more clarity on the issue.

V. Presentation of the Transit Center Concept

Dina Potter, PB, reviewed the transit center concept history, goals, the existing transit service, and the number and transit types of facilities, potential routes, and design principles.

Patricia Vaughey stated that the transit center plans only accommodate the Presidio Trust, not the residents. Dina Potter, PB, replied that MUNI and Golden Gate Transit have said that this location is the best for their additional route changes.

Alan Zarahdnik, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transit District, replied that because of the constraints of the Golden Gate Bridge area, the district wanted a project that proposed a new transit center in the vicinity of the Park Presidio interchange, but this option is not possible.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, added that the team recommends that a transit facility be located at the Golden Gate Bridge area. The current land uses and area constraints do not provide room at the toll plaza without developing a master plan for the entire toll plaza area.

Redmond Kernan commented that there is an opportunity to put this transit center in place in the same timeframe as the Doyle Drive project.

Patricia Vaughey asked why MUNI and San Francisco Parking and Traffic representatives were not present at the meeting.

Norman Rolfe suggested that there should be further discussion of the transit and the time transfer issues.

Michael Marston asked why ferry service has not been considered. Alan Zarahdnik, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transit District, replied that the GGBHTD is not doing anything with ferry service at this time.

Joan Girardot asked if the buses traveling westbound on Richardson Avenue, would turn left into the Presidio. Dina Potter, PB, replied that the buses would turn left into the Presidio.

Michael Alexander asked that if this is just how the transit would work for Alternative 3a. Dina Potter, PB, replied that this scenario is just for Alternative 3a. The team also has simulations of all the alternatives.

Michael Alexander asked the Presidio Trust historic staff to clarify, other than the building impacts that involved structural changes, what are the impacts of potential reuse of these buildings. Ric Borjes, NPS, replied that buildings could be used as transportation hubs. The bigger problem is not the loss of the historic structures but the potential for historic boundary erosions.

VI. Further Discussion on Alternative 3a

Michael Alexander motioned that the Subcommittee defer discussion of this item because of time constraints. Lee Saage, SFCTA, suggested that the team receive comments from the Subcommittee individually outside of the meeting. The Subcommittee agreed to provide comments directly to staff.

VII. Architectural Design Options

Chris Subrizi, PB, and Scott Danielson, PB, gave an overview of the four bridge design options developed for any structures in a Doyle Drive replacement. Chris Subrizi, PB, gave an overview of the option that presented the least impact on the ground.

Michael Painter and Jacques Overhoff, MPA Design, presented an overview of the tunnel portal alternatives. Michael Painter, MPA Design, stated that the original design goals of the tunnels were related to the geometry of Presidio National Park, Golden Gate Park and the Palace of Fine Arts, to develop graceful structures, to ascetically integrate the alternative with the natural landscape and roadway and to make them user-friendly. Jacques Overhoff, MPA Design, also explained the structural aspect of each tunnel alternative.

Redmond Kernan asked what the experience would be above the tunnel and is it possible to reduce the amount of wall. Michael Painter replied that it is possible to cover walls in greenery. Lee Saage, SFCTA, added that these designs can be applied to any of the alternatives.

Redmond Kernan asked if there will be ventilation structures. Dina Potter, PB, replied that the team is proposing jet fans in the tunnel; however, two ventilation structures would defuse some of the air at the tunnel entrances and they would run on electric power. Chris Subrizi, PB, added that fans can be turned on and off depending on the traffic so the demand for energy usage can be decreased depending on the amount of cars running through the tunnel. Patricia Vaughey asked where would the electricity come from if the Presidio Trust cannot provide the amount of electricity needed. Dina Potter, PB, replied that the ventilation would have its own electrical service.

Redmond Kernan raised the point that the tunnel design should consider the history of the area and all of the tunnels should have a similar identity or have a look particular to where they are located. Michael Painter, MPA Designs, replied that there are very different landscapes in the location and that the tunnel should have a separate identity. Redmond Kernan requested a regular update on the designs.

VIII. Status of Project Schedule

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reported that there have been no changes made to the project schedule. The Draft EIS/EIR is scheduled to be released to the public in February 2002. Patricia Vaughey asked if the Subcommittee would be able to review the report before it is released. Dina Potter, PB, replied the Subcommittee will not review the Administrative Draft EIS/EIR but

that the Subcommittee would be briefed on the major findings of the EIS/EIR prior to its release. Redmond Kernan asked how many days will the report be available for review. Lee Saage, SFCTA, replied 60 days.

IX. Report on Action Items

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reported that all of the action items from the June 14th meeting have been completed.

X. Upcoming Meeting Dates

Lee Saage, SFCTA, stated that there is a conflict with the upcoming meeting in September. The team will be proposing a new date to the Subcommittee in a separate mailing. The November 27 meeting date was agreeable with the Subcommittee members.

Action Item:

- *Distribute the date for next Subcommittee meeting-PAM*

XI. Public Comments

Emeric Kaumeru, GWPWL, asked for the cost estimates of the Doyle Drive alternatives. Lee Saage, SFTCA, replied the cost information and the community impacts will be included in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Mike Strusky, Richardson Avenue Resident, asked how many total eastbound lanes are coming either into or out of San Francisco and are the number of lanes increasing. Dina Potter replied that there are three east- and 3 westbound lanes

ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
7/31/01	Distribute the date for next Subcommittee meeting	PAM	8/20/01	8/20/01

Distribution:

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