



## **Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study**

### **Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #3**

#### ***Meeting Summary***

***date of meeting:*** 7/27/00

***location:*** SFCTA

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

#### ***attendees:***

##### Doyle Drive Subcommittee

Michael Alexander  
Janette Barroca  
Max DelleSedie  
Gene DeMartini  
Paul Epstein  
Gloria Fontanello  
Joan Marie Girardot  
Jennifer Gridley  
Anthony Imhof (Alternate)  
Redmond Kernan  
Leo Paul Koulos  
Ronald Mulcare  
Roger L. Peters  
Norman Rolfe  
Jackie Sachs  
Patricia Vaughey

##### San Francisco Transportation Authority

Lee Saage, Andrew Nash

##### Parsons Brinckerhoff

Dina Potter, Susan Killen

##### Montoya Communications

Pilar Montoya

##### Public Affairs Management

Kay Wilson, Kristy Tyndall

##### MPA Design

Michael Painter

##### Other Participants

Gina DelleSedie  
Michael Spiegel  
Robert Pender  
Carina Trowbridge  
Cameron Ockes  
Nahdini Saridanar

#### ***summary:***

##### **I. Workshop Introduction and Format**

Pilar Montoya began the workshop with a short clarification of the goals. She said the project team's goal is to provide the Subcommittee with an informal and interactive meeting to discuss design concepts and answer questions. She emphasized that the project team also hopes to receive input from the Subcommittee.

##### **II. Alternatives Design Workshop**

Dina Potter, PB, gave an overview of the complete list of alternatives that were considered in the screening process and then mentioned the alternatives that were recommended to be screened out and eliminated from further study. The discussion then turned to the alternatives that are moving forward for more study. A partial list of the alternatives discussed were as follows: No-Build, Retrofit without Widening, Retrofit with Widening, Park Presidio, Doyle Drive Boulevard, In-Corridor – Parallel Construction (At-Grade), In-Corridor-Parallel Construction (Tunnel), In-Corridor-Detour Construction (At-Grade), In-Corridor-Detour Construction (Tunnel). Dina clarified that at this meeting the purpose was to informally discuss the pros and cons of the design concepts that have been developed and at the next meeting, the Subcommittee will be asked to formally concur in the alternatives screening process. As the alternatives were discussed, the following questions and comments were raised:

## **Questions & Comments**

*How can the Park Presidio alternative be considered if it is not located in the original study area?* The alternative will remain on the list until the traffic analysis is complete. It is expected that the traffic analysis may screen the alternative out. However, if it remains for future study then the public outreach program will be expanded to include the new project areas.

*Would the retrofitting of the structure include giving additional supports to Doyle Drive? Is the retrofitting being done for seismic reasons?* The retrofit would be for seismic purposes and would entail adding additional piles, columns, and jacketing the columns. Doyle Drive would be denser under the structure but would look generally the same.

*What happens to Tennessee Hollow in the Doyle Drive Boulevard alternative?* The Doyle Drive structure would be a low viaduct with just enough clearance for water to pass underneath.

*Where will the transit center be placed?* The transit center has not yet been defined. The project team would like the transit system to provide transfers between GGT, MUNI, and the Presidio Shuttle. Until the transit analysis is complete and we are able to determine how to maximize transit usage, it does not make sense to discuss the placement of the transit center.

*In the Park Presidio alternative would there be a matching tunnel to the MacArthur tunnel that is there now?* Although we do not have the traffic analysis yet, the assumption is that Park Presidio would have to be widened in order to rebuild it to the standard.

*Would Park Presidio have one lane of traffic going in either direction so that it would avoid head-on collisions?* Yes.

*Who wanted the Park Presidio alternative and did Caltrans support this alternative?* The National Park Service introduced the Park Presidio alternative and Presidio Trust supported it. Caltrans is not generally a supporter of the alternative. Caltrans wants the project team to make sure that the alternative is documented so that the impacts caused by the widening are understood.

*What does in "In-Corridor" refer to?* This means the alternative is near the existing Doyle Drive structure and corridor.

*What are the constraints of bringing the tunnel back up at Lyon Street?* Because the widening would impact properties and access adjacent to the roadway, this extension of the tunnel was eliminated. It impacts properties because the construction for the approach to the tunnel can not go underground as it needs a full approach to the tunnel and Richardson Avenue is not wide enough.

*There is clearly interest in extending the tunnel as far east as possible – can we acknowledge that this interest exists and then have you help us look at the broader picture?* Lee Saage, SFCTA, responded to the question by confirming that in the examination of this alternative a range of portal locations can be investigated extending as far east as can be done and that the assessment will look at the property acquisitions.

*This looks like a freeway, is it designed to freeway standards?* No, it is designed for 50-mile per hour design speed or a 45-mile per hour posted speed. We are referring to it as a 'parkway' so that we can reduce the speed.

*Can we post a 35-mile per hour?* Caltrans has been working well with the project team on this issue, however they can not make any decisions on speed until we are further along in the process, when we have traffic numbers to demonstrate that the speeds are safe.

*Can you show us what the difference is to go from 45-, 35-, or 25-miles per hour?* Dina Potter, PB, answered that the difference is not that great but she will bring the information to the next meeting.

*Will the new Doyle Drive structure accommodate truck traffic as well as the Golden Gate Bridge traffic?* Yes, unless the city designates the road for 'no trucks allowed.' This would be unlikely and the design already allows for truck traffic.

*Are you considering modifying the ramps from Highway 101?* Yes, the ramps are substandard.

*A citizen noted that a lot of commuter traffic is coming from the Fairfield, Vallejo area. It is coming across the Richmond Parkway over the San Rafael Bridge, down Highway 101 and across the Golden Gate Bridge. Are there statistics for the traffic using this corridor?* No, we do not have origin destination studies, and they are very expensive because they entail a survey that must be validated and documented.

*The existing Doyle Drive structure has two defects. It changes grade frequently and the shape is a 'broken back arch.' In the In-Corridor Parallel, No-Detour Alternative, when you build with parallel construction do you follow this arch?* The design is not a series of broken back curves but rather it is a tangent with one curve, and it is smoother.

*What is the rationale for extending Girard Street?* To get an additional crossing over Doyle Drive to improve the access to the park.

*From Doyle Drive, it appears that most Presidio traffic will turn right and Marina traffic will turn left. Why should you provide two separate parallel routes across Crissy Field?* Until the traffic modeling numbers are completed, this design cannot be confirmed. The present numbers point to the fact that too many cars are making the left turn. When there are 2,000 vehicles within an hour that want to get from Doyle Drive to the Marina it is too great a number to accommodate on a combined route.

*Where does the extended tunnel stop and start in the In-corridor, Tunnel alternative?* It starts at the high viaduct and then stays in a tunnel until it starts coming out near the Palace of Fine Arts to be at-grade at Lyon Street.

*The westbound ramp is not a good design. How do you get to the Main Post or Lucas off the highway going westbound?* The driver would go across Girard Avenue and make a left or he/she would need to cross Halleck Street and go back.

*Several Subcommittee members noted that the vertical alignments seem as if there is a very significant visual impact on Crissy Field that will also cause noise impacts from traffic. We prefer not to compare the existing structure as the standard and would prefer to have no visual impacts. What benefit do you gain with the vertical alignment when you compare it to the existing Doyle Drive structure?* You gain two things, you are able to keep Halleck Street grade separated so it can function as it does today and you provide an area for the Tennessee Hollow restoration.

*Will the tunnel require ventilation?* Yes, much more elaborate ventilation than the two short tunnels.

*What happens if there is an accident in the tunnel?* There would be a traffic management system for the tunnel so that if there were an accident in the tunnel there would be an early warning system.

*We are concerned with accidents in the tunnel and how emergency vehicles would access the accidents. What is the length of the longer tunnel? What is the width of the*

*tunnel?* The length of the tunnel is over 3,000 feet long and the width would be slightly wider than an at-grade road to allow for sufficient sight distance underground.

*Will the vertical alignment for the Doyle Boulevard be at-grade because it seems that you need some separation from Tennessee Hollow?* Yes, very slightly to allow a hydrological connection.

### **Comments**

If you are concerned about the impact on the historical streetscape on Halleck Street, then placing a 10 foot high, 6 lane wide roadway at the foot of Halleck Street is clearly an impact on that historic streetscape.

Park Presidio should not be studied as an alternative but rather for its importance as a main feeder into the Golden Gate Bridge. Therefore, the intersection of Park Presidio with Doyle Drive should be reconstructed to meet the current standards. The problem is in the fact that we will have a new highway built to current standards connecting with another highway built to the 1930s standards and safety. Both the tunnel and the viaduct will have modern safety standards and if we can extend the project area to look at the intersection with Park Presidio that will be useful or else you will have to revisit the intersection in the future.

The vertical design is much better, especially from a driving point of view. The 'roller coaster' structure where you go up to an elevated structure and then down underground creates a visual negative that need not be there. The smooth tunnel vertical design allows you to drive more smoothly and it also allows the Presidio to be uninterrupted going over it and then down to the park part of the Presidio, so it opens up enormous opportunity, even if there is some vent structures it is better than having the whole structure.

Several Subcommittee members noted that there is a clear preference for the tunnel with vertical alignment because it improves the noise impacts. This is the optimal design that matches the standards that the Doyle Drive Task Force was trying to achieve in minimizing the impacts to the National Park.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, commented that parts of the tunnel alternative may appeal to many people, but the Subcommittee should keep in mind that it is a very expensive alternative. This alternative may be the challenge that we will all struggle with because we may end up liking it a lot.

The vertical alignment is not as positive as the tunnel but it is far superior to the 'camel's hump,' for the In-Corridor alternatives. The most preferable is the In-Corridor-Tunnel alternative; the next preferable is the Doyle Boulevard alternative and the least acceptable is the In-Corridor –Parallel Construction At-grade alternative.

It was recommended that the project team should contact Alan Jacobs at the Berkeley School of Architecture. He was the director of the San Francisco Planning Department for years and could provide the Subcommittee with a good slide show about rotary design.

The advantage of the "split interchange" access is that it takes traffic through many routes. The disadvantage is it creates a lot of highway. There are too many roadways near the Palace of Fine Arts and it is beginning to look like the entrance to San Francisco International Airport. Also of concern is the left exit onto Marina Boulevard because it encourages traffic to use Marina Boulevard and it allows traffic to speed from the highway onto Marina Boulevard.

Gloria Fontanello said that when we were on the Doyle Drive Task Force, we thought we were going to move as many entrances toward the Golden Gate Bridge and possibly to Lincoln Boulevard. We also thought we would open the Burger King area for the Transit

Center. The congestion from the access points discussed today will send car emissions into the neighborhoods of Cow Hollow and the Marina. This makes it a 'Los Angeles' design that puts the freeway right near the neighborhoods. We worked so hard to get it up towards the Golden Gate Bridge and Lincoln Boulevard, up near 25<sup>th</sup> Street and maybe we went as far as Halleck Street. Lincoln Boulevard is a wide and natural entrance into the Presidio and any part of Lincoln Boulevard works. *Is this design the influence of Lucas?* Dina Potter, PB, answered - No, when you analyze the access to the Main Post and Letterman area it shows that the bulk of the traffic is going to this area. There is nothing wrong with moving the access but part of the reason it is there is because the project team is working with the Presidio Trust's future planning goals. The access should be compatible with their plans.

The Doyle Drive Task Force did examine carefully the possibility of moving the interchange farther to the west, but essentially concluded that as you moved the interchange farther to the west, the roadway came into conflicts with the vertical and horizontal changes because there was not enough merge opportunity from 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Michael Alexander said some of us wished that we could move it west at the time, but we found the engineering constraints prevented it.

Some Subcommittee members commented that the amount of 'spaghetti' or roadway on the In-Corridor Alternatives with interchanges is very overwhelming. The In-Corridor Tunnel Alternative is better but some still expressed concern about the double-tunnels, portals and roadways that come off eastbound that are just another strand of spaghetti that could be combined to reduce the visual impact.

Patricia Vaughey noted that Lincoln Boulevard came up when we were working to divert tour busses away from the Marina and Cow Hollow. It was suggested that tour buses should be directed behind the Exploratorium, and then go down Mason Boulevard and up to the Golden Gate Bridge. The issue we learned from this is that Lincoln Boulevard could be used and for this reason, the Doyle Drive Boulevard is fascinating. There should be more access into the Presidio so that we can diminish the traffic coming onto Marina Boulevard or Lombard Street. People that are going to work at Letterman or visiting the park should be diverted before they travel through our neighborhoods.

**Action Items:**

- Dina Potter, PB, will bring information that describes the difference in speed limits (45,35 and 25 miles per hour) to the November meeting.

**III. Future Meeting Dates**

The project team and Subcommittee agreed on the upcoming meeting dates. The next Doyle Drive Subcommittee meetings will be held as follows:

- Tuesday, August 15, 2000 from 5:00 to 7:00 pm at the SFCTA  
(Topic: Alternatives Screening Report)
- Thursday, November 9, 2000 from 5:00 to 7:00 pm at the SFCTA  
(Topic: Technical Studies Update)
- Tuesday, January 30, 2001 from 5:00 to 7:00 pm at the SFCTA  
(Topic: Environmental Impacts)
- March 2001 (Date To Be Determined) from 5:00 to 7:00 pm at the SFCTA  
(Topic: Review the DEIS/DEIR)

**IV. Public Comment**

The meeting was opened up to receive public comments and no comments were volunteered.

***distribution:***

All Subcommittee Members  
Lee Saage  
Andy Nash  
Dina Potter  
Susan Killen  
Bob McFarland  
Pilar Montoya  
Kay Wilson  
Michael Painter

*File Location: e/pi/projects/1050/doc/citizens subcommittee/4-Meeting August 15/meeting summary 7-27-00*

**Doyle Drive Subcommittee  
of the Citizens Advisory Committee**

**ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>ACTION DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DATE DUE</b>	<b>DATE COMPLETED</b>
7/27/00	Dina Potter, PB, will bring information that describes the difference in speed limits (45,35 and 25 miles per hour) to the November meeting.	Dina Potter, PB	11/09/00	pending