

Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #19

DRAFT Meeting Summary

date of meeting: 06/22/06

location: San Francisco County Transportation Authority

subject: Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

attendees:

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees:

Michael Alexander
Lindy Beasley
Rich Coffin
Max DelleSedie
Gene DeMartini
Paul A. Epstein
Gloria Fontanello
Joan Marie Girardot
Tony Imhof
Redmond Kernan
Ronald Mulcare
Jackie Sachs
Patricia Vaughey

Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

William Alich
Janette Barroca
Becky Evans
Vera Gates
Michael Marston
James Maxwell
Fred Rodriguez
Norman Rolfe
Kate Sears

Executive Committee

Rick Foster
Mark Helmbrecht
Daniel LaForte
Nidal Tuqan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Lee Saage
Trinity Nguyen

Other Participants

Emeric Kalman, GWPNA
Jan Blum, Presidio Environmental Council
Joe Story, DKS

Arup

Eugene Lam

MPA Design

Michael Painter

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Gary Kennerley
Katie Eastham

CirclePoint

Molly Graham
Lauren Karp
Jane Kruse
Kay Wilson

summary:

I. Meeting Purpose/Agenda Review

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reviewed the meeting purpose and agenda. He noted that the purpose of the subcommittee meeting is to inform the members about comments received on the DEIS/R and provide an overview of the current status of the Alternatives. The June meeting will help prepare the subcommittee members for the July meeting when they will be asked to recommend a preferred alternative. The recommendation will be shared with decision makers for consideration in identifying a preferred alternative.

II. Project Purpose & Need

Lee Saage reviewed the project purpose and objectives. He noted that the project is primarily a transportation project to address the critical need to replace Doyle Drive, and noted that the project is unique because it is located within a historic landmark district.

III. Summary of Preferred Alternative Selection Process

Kay Wilson, CirclePoint, handed out a process graphic and outlined the key outreach activities, environmental milestones and the decision making process to select a preferred alternative. She noted that the 22 member subcommittee will vote to recommend a preferred alternative on July 18. If members are unable to attend a vote may be cast by absentee ballot. The subcommittee recommendation will be forwarded to the SFCTA CAC for their consideration and approval on July 26. In addition, the 7 voting members of the Doyle Drive Agency Committee are expected to provide a preferred alternative recommendation on July 25. Other agencies that may take formal action include the Presidio Trust, the GGBHTD and the GGNRA. The overall goal is for the SFCTA Board of directors to hear all recommendations and identify a preferred alternative by the end of summer.

Jackie Sachs, Subcommittee Member, inquired as to whether the project team had met with Nathaniel Ford, Muni's new Executive Director, regarding rerouting bus traffic. Gary Kennerley replied that the team has met with Muni in the past, but has not yet met with Mr. Ford. He noted that agency coordination will continue and a traffic management plan will be part of the project.

Patricia Vaughey requested the names of the SFCTA CAC members.

IV. Overview of Comments Received

Gary Kennerley, Parsons Brinkerhoff, gave a PowerPoint presentation to provide a summary of the comments received on the Draft EIS/R and an update on the status of project alternatives. He reported that approximately half of the comments focused on the various design alternatives, and the remaining comments were regarding technical information presented in the resource sections, including cultural mitigation, biology, noise, air quality, traffic analysis and storm water treatment.

Biological Resources

The project conducted a workshop with multiple interested parties. Three biological experts reviewed the environmental document, focused on the potential shading impacts to Tennessee Hollow/Crissy Marsh restoration. General comments received stated that the document is adequate and the project team should continue to work with the Presidio and GGNRA to coordinate the design of the marsh.

Noise

Most of the noise would be in the construction corridor with no significant change in traffic beyond construction limits. The project will be working with FHWA and Caltrans once the preferred alternative is selected regarding noise abatement.

Air Quality

New pollution regulations were noted. The project will use the most up-to-date air quality standards.

Traffic Analysis

The comments received fell in to four general categories: requests for analysis of neighborhood impacts, requests for traffic management plan, desire to maintain existing traffic balance and a request to include more transit operations in the final environmental document.

Paul Epstein, Subcommittee Member, stated the importance of including the reconstruction of Highway 1 from Park Presidio interchange to the MacArthur tunnel as part of the project. Gary Kennerley stated that the section of roadway mentioned had been part of a seismic retrofit project and the safety index did not currently meet the requirements for replacement. Paul requested a technical response regarding the condition and the useful life of the facility. The project team will respond and provide information regarding the existing condition and the cost of improvements on this section of the road.

Storm Water

Michael Alexander, Subcommittee Member, inquired as to where storm water gets treated. During a weak storm, storm water goes to the southeast treatment plant. During a heavy storm, storm water will go to the North Point treatment facility.

Joan Girardot, Subcommittee Member, inquired about who will monitor the flow and who will pay for treatment. Gary Kennerley responded that payment has not been determined and the project team will continue to coordinate with the SFPUC. The current arrangement between the SFPUC and the Presidio Trust could be used as a model.

There were general inquiries regarding whether the storm projection models took global warming/tsunami/flood levels into consideration.

Paul Epstein inquired about the next steps of the process now that the comments have been submitted. Gary Kennerley responded that the major themes and additional technical work would be identified. Then, the final document would be updated with the preferred alternative, its impacts, and any additional analysis. There will be an appendix in the final environmental document with responses to comments received.

Selection of a Preferred Alternative

Comments received indicated strong support for Alternative 5 and the hook ramp. The majority of agencies and private citizens favor the Diamond option; however, several stakeholder groups, lead by SPUR, preferred the Circle Drive option.

Key Issues & Design Refinements

Gary Kennerley provided a status update on Alternative 5 including design refinements in response to key issues raised. A memo was provided explaining the design refinements to Alternative 5 to address biological resources, cultural resources, bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic issues including; additional studies, traffic split between Marina Boulevard and Richardson, connection to Marina Boulevard, connection to Lyon Street from the Presidio, and traffic calming. For details, see the handout summary regarding Key Issues and Design refinements.

Lindy Beasley, Subcommittee Member, requested that the graphics contain a distance scale for reference in the future.

Cultural Resources

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) will address the potential relocation of three historic buildings. Presidio Trust and GGNRA are discussing how this will be determined and whether relocation may require additional analysis.

There were general inquiries about the tunnel length and historic bluff/batteries. Raising the profile of the southbound roadway reduces impacts to the bluff (less ground disturbance). Michael Alexander asked if raising the profile of Doyle Drive would block the view of from the Presidio. Michael Painter noted that raising the grade (dropping steepness from 4.2% to 3.2%) could potentially create a better view, waste less energy, and reduce construction costs.

Traffic

Joan Girardot requested that additional traffic analysis in the FEIS/R include the intersections of Bay/Van Ness and Bay/Laguna. She requested input from people regarding what intersections to study. Patricia expressed concern regarding the potential for traffic noise to echo into Cow Hollow.

Rich Coffin inquired whether bicycle lanes would be included on Girard Road. The project team expects to include bike lanes on Girard Road, consistent with the Presidio Trust plans.

Tony Imhoff expressed concern regarding the future impact on traffic patterns if the Bus Rapid Transit project proceeds on Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard. He noted the potential for increased demand on Marina Boulevard to/from Doyle Drive if Van Ness loses capacity to bus traffic. The project team has proposed reserving ROW for a second lane along Girard Road to accommodate a future widening of the connection from Marina Boulevard if required.

Joan Girardot inquired about traffic volumes going into the Presidio and whether the future increase in trips from Presidio development was taken into account. Lee responded that traffic forecasting uses a statistical model based on land uses and trips generated. Gary Kennerley noted that the traffic operations report is on the website and that the model looks at land uses/trip routes to get a statistical average. Joe Story, DKS, noted that all intersections were analyzed and he can provide more information on traffic forecasting.

V. Decision Making Process

Molly Graham, CirclePoint, discussed the Decision Tree which explains the decision making process for selecting a preferred alternative at the July 18 meeting. The subcommittee will be provided with a booklet outlining the various proposed alternatives and the process to select a preferred alternative. The booklet will address how each design element of the various alternatives addresses the project purpose and need. The booklet will be distributed prior to the next meeting on July 18.

VI. Public Comments

Patricia Vaughey noted that she would like to make sure that consultants are not lobbying for one alternative versus another.

Ruth Gravanis, Alliance for a Clean Waterfront, inquired as to what contribution the project would have to the number and volume of Combined Sewage Overflows that go into the bay. Lee Saage noted that the treatment plan would be better than the current situation, and there are on-going discussion regarding treatment details.

Joan Girardot announced that she and Gloria Fontenella were not notified of the March 15th and April 20th workshops or the March 22nd meeting. Lee apologized for the administrative oversight. Molly acknowledged that there was an oversight and some of the recent workshops were primarily noticed by email and the website. Molly stated that all members without email addresses would receive phone calls for future meetings.

Joan inquired about accessing the project files. Lee responded that many project documents are available on the website and requests for specific documentation could be submitted to the Authority.

Ron Mulcare stated that the agenda of the March meeting was not sufficient because it did not mention that design refinements would be discussed, and therefore he did not attend. He was concerned that comments may have been one-sided and people who might have other opinions were not at the meeting. Kay noted that subcommittee members were not expected to attend all of the previous meetings and workshops. The subcommittee meeting is intended to bring everyone up to speed and give a thorough overview of the project progress, evolution of design and receive input from committee members. The meeting in July is intended to address the preferred alternative recommendation.

VI. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on July 18, 2006.

ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
6/22/06	Circulate names of the 11 members of the CAC to the Citizens' Subcommittee	Molly Graham	Prior to next meeting	7/13/06
6/22/06	Prepare memo for Paul Epstein that details the safety of Hwy 1/Park Presidio Interchange to MacArthur Tunnel, and discusses how much it would cost to improve it. Mr. Epstein would like a technical response.	Gary Kennerley/Caltrans	In progress	
6/22/06	Perform traffic analysis on critical intersections, including Bay/Laguna & Bay/Van Ness	Joe Story	For FEIS/R	
6/22/06	Provide preferred alternative recommendation booklet to Subcommittee/Executive committee prior to meeting on July 18 th	CirclePoint/PB	Prior to next meeting	7/10/06
6/22/06	Include scale on future plans/drawings/etc	All	On-going	On-going

Distribution:

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