



## Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

### Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #15

#### **Meeting Summary**

**date of meeting:** 11/17/03

**location:** San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**subject:** Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

#### **attendees:**

##### Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees:

Michael Alexander  
William Alich  
Janette Barroca  
Rich Coffin  
Paul Epstein  
Becky Evans  
Gloria Fontanello  
Vera Gates  
Joan Marie Girardot  
Tony Imhof  
Redmond Kernan  
Ronald Mulcare  
Norman Rolfe  
Jackie Sachs  
Patricia Vaughey

##### Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

Lindy Beasley  
Max DelleSedie  
Gene DeMartini  
Michael Marston  
James Maxwell  
Roger Peters  
Fred Rodriguez  
Kate Sears

##### San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Lee Saage  
Paul Ward

##### Other Participants

Dick Tilles, Presidio Trust  
Rick Foster, NPS  
Joseph Mihelarakis, Caltrans  
Andrew Fremier, Caltrans  
Michael Spiegel  
Emeric Kalman  
Gloria Root  
Andrew Boreman  
Francisco DaCosta

##### Arup

John Eddy  
Ignacio Barandiaran

##### MPA Design

Michael Painter

##### Parsons Brinckerhoff

Gary Kennerley

##### Public Affairs Management

Kay Wilson  
Molly Graham  
Kassie Wilner

#### **summary:**

##### **I. Meeting Purpose/Agenda Review and Minutes**

Lee Saage reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose, and presented the minutes from the September 23, 2003 meeting. No revisions were made.

##### **II. Update on the Parkway Alternative Final Feasibility Report**

John Eddy, Arup, provided an update on the feasibility report for Alternative 5.

Joan Marie Girardot suggested that an overlay showing the existing conditions with the proposed improvements for the Tennessee Hollow restoration would be helpful. Redmond Kernan supported the suggestion and added that an overlay would be helpful to show all planned improvements for the Parkway Alternative.

Norman Rolfe asked how the Transit Center is being addressed in Alternative 5 and asked if it would be served by Golden Gate Transit. Dick Tilles, Presidio Trust, said the Presidio transit center would be used by Muni and the Presidio Shuttle. John Eddy said that the Doyle Drive project will provide closely-spaced stops to allow interconnection of Muni, Golden Gate Transit and the Presidio Shuttle and would be more of a transit stop or plaza. There was discussion about the primary traffic pattern changes from existing conditions. Michael Alexander explained that the significant changes to the onramp from Park Presidio Boulevard to Doyle Drive traveling east were made to decrease the impact to Calvary Valley, improve the view corridor and improve safety and visibility for merging traffic.

Norman Rolfe asked if the 7<sup>th</sup> lane of the Parkway Alternative could be eliminated. John Eddy said that the option would be evaluated.

Rich Coffin asked about planned changes to Lincoln Boulevard and the duration of the closure during construction. John Eddy said that detours will be in effect but specific details about the length of time are still being evaluated. Michael Alexander said that Lincoln Boulevard would be returned to the current alignment and serviceability in the Parkway Alternative. It was stated that there are some problems with the existing alignment, and consideration should be made to improve the alignment instead of returning it to the current condition.

After discussion about the Parkway Alternative concepts it was noted that details might remain open for discussion and input. Lee Saage suggested the possibility of holding a design charett for neighbors, engineers and traffic consultants to discuss solutions to the five-way intersection at Marina Boulevard, Mason Street and Girard Avenue.

Redmond Kernan suggested that meetings should be held for the public to review the alternatives. John Eddy said a public meeting would be planned for February of 2004.

Gloria Fontanello noted that Lombard Street and Marina Boulevard are the only places that are used for through commuter traffic. The problem for traffic on Marina Boulevard has not been solved with Alternative 5.

Rich Coffin suggested that traffic could be reduced by decreasing parking spaces to discourage driving, similar to Copenhagen.

Patricia Vaughey commented that the traffic counts in the handout do not seem current.

### **III. Review of Alternatives Recommended for Deletion from Further Consideration Within the Draft EIS/EIR**

Gary Kennerley, PB, reviewed the alternatives that the lead and cooperating agencies had provisionally approved for deletion from further consideration within the Draft EIS/EIR. Lee Saage added that these recommendations were provisional pending review of the traffic analysis prepared for the Parkway Alternative and conducting a public meeting. Lee Saage stated that public meeting would likely be held in February of 2004.

Michael Alexander asked if there is concern regarding the legalities of dropping the alternatives. Gary Kennerley said that as long as the public is informed and a process is followed, then there should not be legal ramifications.

It was noted that there has not been much support for the other alternatives.

Vera Gates said that she does not support Alternative 2 - Replace and Widen and thinks it should also be deleted. Lee Saage said this alternative needs to be included in the environmental document because it is the least expensive to build and would provide a facility closer in character and configuration to that which exists now. It affects fewer historic resources and avoids more complex underground construction. A number of transportation officials do not believe that the no-build alternative can be selected due to the deteriorating

condition of Doyle Drive and that Replace and Widen Alternative needs to remain as an alternative for comparison.

Joan Marie Girardot asked if the project received legal advice about dropping these alternatives. She added that the project has spent a lot of time and money studying the other tunnel alternatives and is confused why they are now being dropped. Lee Saage explained that the previous tunnel alternatives were developed considering a number of constraints that resulted in deeper, longer tunnels with greater impact and cost. The engineering and environmental work done in developing Alternatives 3 and 4 provided the background and understanding necessary to be able to craft a feasible Parkway Alternative.

Redmond Kernan commented that he is glad that the team has arrived at this conclusion and he moved to delete Alternatives 3a, 3b, 4a and 4b from further detailed study and focus on refining and improving Alternative 5, and continue to study Alternative 2, Replace and Widen, and the No-Action Alternative. Michael Alexander seconded the motion and added that the SPUR goal in designing Alternative 5 was to determine how to make it work with all the requirements.

Norman Rolfe asked if variations for Alternative 5 would be evaluated. Gary Kennerley replied yes, they would be studied. Norman Rolfe asked if the elimination of the 7<sup>th</sup> lane would be studied. Gary Kennerley replied yes, it would be studied.

Bill Alich commented that the 20-foot retaining wall in Alternative 5 is a visual barrier that needs to be evaluated.

Lee Saage called for a vote on the motion and the motion passed. (8 yes (Coffin, Epstein, Gates, Imhof, Kernan, Rolfe, Sachs, Vaughey) 3 no (Fontanello, Girardot, Mulcare), 1 abstention (Barroca), and 3 absent at time of vote (Alexander, Alich, Evans).

**IV. Consideration of Whether to Replace an At-Large Member of the Subcommittee**

Kay Wilson, PAM, explained that recently an at-large member of the subcommittee resigned. The project team recommends not replacing this member.

The committee voted nine to three not to replace the member with three members absent at the time of vote.

**V. Next Subcommittee Meeting**

Lee Saage said that the next subcommittee meeting would be scheduled in the first quarter of 2004, after the public meeting.

**VI. Public Comments**

A member of the public commented that it is important to keep the public informed about the project. They stated their concern about the impacts to archeological resources, grading and water flow issues. They also stated concern about the overall impacts from the Lucas Digital Center.

**ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART**

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
11.17.03	Provide printed copies of the PowerPoint presentation from this meeting and the last meeting to Subcommittee members	PB	Prior to next meeting	TBD

**Distribution:**

All Subcommittee Members  
 Leroy L. Saage  
 Jose Luis Moscovich  
 Paul Ward  
 Susan Killen  
 Kay Wilson