



Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #11

Meeting Summary

date of meeting: 10/2/01

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

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees

Gene DeMartini
Leo Paul Koulos
Michael Marston
Ronald Mulcare
Roger Peters
Kate Sears

San Francisco County Transportation Authority Leroy Saage

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Dina Potter, Scott Danielson, Chris Sibrizi

Public Affairs Management

Kay Wilson; Kristy Ranieri

Other Participants

Dick Tilles, Presidio Trust (PT)
Rick Foster, National Park Service (NPS)
M. Cavalier, Marina Resident
Emeric Kaumeru, GWPWA

summary:

I. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

Lee Saage, SFCTA, introduced new member James Maxwell who will represent the Marina Merchants Association.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reviewed the primary goals for the meeting and asked if anyone had comments or revisions to the July 31 meeting summary. One change on page 5 was noted, change the word "ascetically" to "aesthetically." The meeting summary was then approved.

II. Project Status Report

Susan Killen, PB, reported that the team has completed the initial coordination with the agencies regarding the technical reports. Noise measurements are being taken in October and the testing will be completed before the holidays.

III. Alternatives Review and Update

Dina Potter, PB, reported that the Phased Alternatives (6a, 6b, 7a and 7b) are in the process of being removed from further analysis. The phased alternatives go under the National Cemetery and the Department of Veterans Affairs has voiced strong opposition to this

alignment. Dina reported that Alternative 5 (Detour Construction Tunnel under Halleck, Couplet with Signalized Marina Connector) may also be removed from consideration because of its impacts to the Battery buildings.

Dina Potter, PB, then provided an overview of the distinguishing characteristics of the other alternatives to help the Subcommittee members further understand the different alternative qualities. The distinguishing characteristics were identified as follows:

- Alternative 1 (No Build): no improvements other than scheduled maintenance, high and low viaducts (no tunnels), maintains historic batteries, no shoulders, and no barrier.
- Alternative 2 (Retrofit and Widening): similar to existing alignment, high and low viaducts (no tunnels), maintain historic batteries, no direct Presidio access, and a fixed or moveable barrier.
- Alternative 3a (Tunnel Under Halleck): medium tunnel (Cemetery to east of Halleck), Doyle and ramp tunnel under Halleck and Tennessee Hollow, Marina tunnel access (Presidio Intersection), continuous park (Cemetery to Tennessee Hollow).
- Alternative 4a (Bridge Over Halleck): short tunnel (Cemetery to the Main Post), short bridge over Halleck and Tennessee Hollow, ramp tunnels under Halleck and Tennessee Hollow, and Marina tunnel access (Presidio Intersection).
- Alternative 3b (Tunnel Under Halleck): long tunnel (Cemetery to area of Exploratorium), tunnel under Halleck, Tennessee Hollow and Girard, combined Marina/Presidio access (interchange), removal of YMCA and pool and a depressed roadway to Lyon.
- Alternative 4b (Bridge Over Halleck): short tunnel (Cemetery to Main Post), long bridge over Halleck, Tennessee Hollow and Girard, combined Marina/Presidio access (interchange), removal of the back portion of two Gorgas warehouses, and at-grade roadway west of Lyon Street.

Redmond Kernan asked if an alternative does not meet one of the project goals, how can it be an acceptable alternative. Dina Potter, PB, noted that the alternative can meet a combination of the project goals but may not meet all of the goals.

Jackie Sachs asked how the alternatives work with the bus routes. Lee Saage, SFCTA, replied that the Locally Preferred Alternative will accommodate the current transit routes.

Norman Rolfe commented that he would be in favor of mixing and matching alternatives. However, he is concerned about the possibility of underground collisions in the tunnel alternatives.

Michael Alexander stated that a connection to Mason Street should be maintained. He asked that a study be done to determine what might be achieved if Mason Street is moved farther to the south. Dina Potter, PB, said that NPS and Presidio Trust are not planning to move Old Mason Street and the project team cannot change this.

Michael Alexander asked if the final Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (PTIP) changed the baseline, would the Doyle Drive designs change as well. Lee Saage, SFCTA replied that it was too early to determine if a changed PTIP would have an impact and that it really depends on the timing. The team's objective is to have a full range of alternatives and the background of the project is always changing. Michael Alexander suggested that this should be looked at now to get a baseline. Dick Tilles, PT, added that the Presidio Trust has taken a preliminary look at this issue since there is an interest in connecting the Crissy Field Center directly to the

Crissy Field Marsh. This would not be complicated. The best solution would be to move forward on Doyle Drive and then adapt Mason Street.

Michael Alexander suggested that Girard Street should be extended. If Mason Street is designated for bike and pedestrian traffic, it would be easier to expand the wetland. He asked if this is something the team has studied. Redmond Kernan noted that this street is not part of the Doyle Drive project.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, thanked the Subcommittee for their comments. He noted that the team will meet with NPS and PT to evaluate the options and report back to Subcommittee.

Bill Allich commented that Alternatives 3b and 4b have a large above ground structure.

Lindy Beasley asked if Alternatives 3b and 4b impact the Gorgas warehouses. Dina Potter, PB, replied that the alignments would touch the backs of the warehouses but the street side would remain intact.

Max DelleSedie suggested that the tunnel in Alternative 3b be moved farther north towards the Golden Gate Bridge. Dina Potter, PB, replied that when you move the tunnel back the alternative becomes Alternative 3a.

Joan Girardot asked what is the legal authority that the NPS and the Presidio Trust have to create a new road in a National Park. The discussion about the extension of Girard and the use of Old Mason Street is upsetting. Marina residents would like a change to Gorgas Street. Rick Foster, NPS, replied that there are no objections to extending Girard Street. He noted that Gorgas is a historical street, if it is changed to a freeway, there will be a significant impact. Dick Tilles, PT, added that the goal of the Presidio Trust is to create less concrete in the Park.

Patricia Vaughey stated that at the Halleck Street intersection, there will be 14,000-20,000 cars because the Lombard Gate will not be able to handle the volume. She added that the PTIP numbers in the Presidio Trust EIR should be checked.

Vera Gates asked why Alternative 3b is still being considered since it is aesthetically unacceptable; there are no spectacular views. Lee Saage, SFCTA, replied that there are a series of alternatives that are expected to be studied in the overall study. If an alternative is unreasonable or not feasible then it can be removed. Vera Gates added that she does not favor Alternative 3b. Dina Potter, PB, reminded the group that every alternative has pros and cons.

Michael Alexander said that the options are to have a medium length tunnel that exits just east of Halleck Street or have a longer tunnel like Alternative 3b, which will lose the view of the Palace of Fine Arts. He asked what are the issues that determine the location of the tunnel portals at those sites. Dina Potter, PB, answered the elevation of the ground and the elevation of the portals is the deciding issues. The portals are determined by how quickly the roadway can meet existing ground.. Michael Alexander asked if the Gorgas warehouses are the constraints. Dina advised that they are a constraint for Alternative 3B because the portal must be located just east of the warehouses in order to allow them to be replaced after construction of the project.

Gloria Fontanello stated that the alternatives will create a big mess and loud traffic. There should be two entrances to the Park. Lee Saage, SFCTA, reported that the preliminary traffic data shows that a single access point will sufficiently handle the Presidio access traffic. In fact, multiple access points create substandard weaving conditions along Doyle Drive to the east of the Park Presidio Interchange.

Patricia Vaughey stated that the tunnels will allow the Presidio Trust to build more buildings on top.

Rich Coffin commented that as a recreational user, he would prefer only one access point into the Presidio. If there is too much congestion, people will not drive anyway.

ACTION ITEM:

- *Schedule a meeting with NPS and PT to discuss the possibility of extending Girard Street and designating Mason Street for pedestrians and bikes and will report back to the Subcommittee- Dina Potter, PB*

IV. Alternatives Visual Simulation

Scott Danielson and Chris Sibrizi, PB, provided an overview of the seismic retrofit that Caltrans did for Doyle Drive and of the Doyle Drive Retrofit and Widening Alternative.

Chris Sibrizi, PB, discussed the Doyle Drive high-viaduct. The Doyle Drive high-viaduct structure needs a major rehabilitation. The Caltrans seismic retrofit improved the structural integrity of the subsection, but the deck has not been replaced since 1936. To make the retrofit more effective the high-viaduct needs to be repainted, the rivets need to be replaced with bolts and the bottom needs to be strengthened.

Gloria Fontanello suggested that rather than building Doyle Drive, the team should consider ferry transit. Dina Potter, PB, answered that ferry transit could not accommodate the volume of users.

Scott Danielson, PB, provided an overview of the various architectural design elements being considered for Doyle Drive. He showed six options for a new high-viaduct: 1) new truss, 2) steel arch, 3) steel box girder, 4) haunched segmental concrete box, 5) segmental concrete boxes and, 6) standard Caltrans box girder (spiderwalk).

Paul Epstein noted that exposed steel will need to be repainted. The different maintenance requirements should be taken into consideration. Chris Sibrizi, PB, stated that the contemporary truss is the most durable deck. The steel box girder would require the most maintenance and the Caltrans box girder would require the least maintenance.

Redmond Kernan asked about the noise impacts of each option. Chris Sibrizi, PB, stated that all of the alternatives would have a concrete deck and therefore, have the same level of noise. The contemporary truss would have less joints so it may be quieter.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, stated that the advantage of the Retrofit and Widening Alternative is historic preservation, however it would be the most expensive alternative.

Chris Sibrizi, PB, discussed how the structure options would respond in an earthquake. The steel arch is the most expensive and it would provide stability in one direction but on the other side it could tip over.

Michael Alexander thanked the team for providing a range of alternatives and structure options. He said whatever bridge is built, the level of maintenance will not reach the standards needed. From a historical perspective and design, the steel arch option is a fussy design that breaks up what should be more open. He does not like the steel arch or the Caltrans box girder option. From a historical perspective, the team should pursue the truss option to reflect the character of the Golden Gate Bridge. It is more flexible and not as imitative. Chris Sibrizi, PB, added that the truss can also be built with concrete.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, asked the Subcommittee to provide their preliminary thoughts on the favored high-viaduct options. Thirteen members supported the new truss option, ten supported the haunched segmental concrete box option, 10 supported the segmental concrete box option and two were in favor of the Caltrans box girder option. The steel arch, the steel box girder and the Retrofit options received no support.

Redmond Kernan commented that the only reason for favoring the Retrofit and Widening Alternative was because of the historic value.

Scott Danielson, PB, discussed the options for the low viaduct. He showed the quality of the visual impact of the new aerial structures.

Michael Alexander asked what the width of the roadway would be. Dina Potter, PB, answered, the road is 100 feet wide.

Redmond Kernan stated that the low-viaduct creates a hill where there is the need to have a light and airy open space and therefore, it does not seem like a good option. Lindy Beasley noted that hills were added to the Crissy Field design.

Michael Alexander said that by making the connection to Tennessee Hollow and the existing marsh, it would be possible to expand the existing marsh by ten acres. The hill would be situated in the place where the expansion is planned. Michael Alexander noted that the short viaduct is more open and has the least visual impact on the Marina.

Patricia Vaughey asked how the hydraulic needs would be accommodated because it will stop the natural water flow. Scott Danielson said that drain material can be placed around the tunnel. Dina Potter, PB, added that NPS is working with the team to address these issues.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, explained that the team wanted to show the Subcommittee some of the visual characteristics and options that will be developed for the alternatives.

Dina Potter, PB, presented visual simulations of some of the alternatives.

Michael Alexander suggested that other viewpoints be considered for the visual simulations.

Paul Epstien said that the visual simulations will provide a picture of how the high viaduct and low viaduct options would look.

Michael Alexander said that the portals will have an impact when the driver enters. The approach and sloping walls will have a greater impact.

A Subcommittee member said the Golden Gate Bridge color band for the structure option is favored. Another member stated that the concrete superstructure should not introduce color. Other Subcommittee members thought linear strips of color would be preferred.

Gloria Fontanello said that she is not in favor of color. Lindy Beasley said that the structure color would reflect the color of the Presidio rooftops and this would look nice. Redmond Kernan said that lighting of the structure may add to the experience. Michael Alexander recommended color only on the high-viaduct structure. Currently, the use of color bands is no longer being considered and may be analyzed in the final design phase.

V. Overview of Remaining Study Process and Status of Project Schedule

Kay Wilson, PAM, provided an overview of the remaining study process and passed out a study process diagram or "roadmap." She also announced that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report EIS/EIR would be released in June 2002.

Redmond Kernan asked that the team study the feasibility of an underground parking garage in the Main Post area. He added that the garage could be built at the same time as Doyle Drive. Since the garage is under the Main Post, the team should evaluate this timing to decide if it makes sense. Lee Saage, SFCTA, answered that the parking garage is not a part of the Doyle Drive study.

Redmond Kernan asked how many parking spaces will be eliminated by the alternatives. Dina Potter, PB, answered that this information will be in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report.

VI. Report on Action Items

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reported that all of the action items from the July 31 meeting have been completed.

VII. Upcoming Meeting Dates

Kay Wilson, PAM, reported that the team will not have the traffic information needed by the November 27 meeting date. Therefore the November 27 meeting will be cancelled and the next meeting will be in January 2002. A notice of the January meeting date will be circulated in November.

The Subcommittee noted that Thursday is a preferred date for the meetings.

ACTION ITEM

- *Reschedule next meeting for January 2002- PAM*

VIII. Public Comment

Jackie Sachs asked if the September 11 terrorist attacks would jeopardize funding for the Doyle Drive project. Lee Saage, SFCTA, answered no, he did not think it would.

ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
10/2/01	<i>Schedule a meeting with NPS and PT to discuss the possibility of extending Girard Street and designating Mason Street for pedestrians and bikes and report back to the Subcommittee</i>	<i>Dina Potter, PB</i>	<i>PB, NPS and PT are in the process of scheduling a meeting for the first week of February.</i>	<i>Targeted for early February 2002.</i>
10/2/01	<i>Reschedule next meeting for January 2002</i>	<i>PAM</i>	<i>November, 2001</i>	<i>10/30/01</i>

Distribution:

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