



## Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study

### Doyle Drive Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #9

#### **Meeting Summary**

**date of meeting:** 6/14/01

**location:** SFCTA

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

#### **attendees:**

##### Doyle Drive Subcommittee Attendees:

Michael Alexander  
William Alich  
Lindy Beasley  
Max DelleSedie  
Becky Evans  
Gloria Fontanello  
Vera Gates  
Joan Marie Girardot  
Redmond Kernan  
Roger Peters  
Norman Rolfe  
Jackie Sachs  
Jack Spring  
Patricia Vaughey

##### Doyle Drive Subcommittee Absentees:

Janette Barroca  
Gene DeMartini  
Paul Epstein  
Tony Imhof  
Leo Paul Koulos  
Michael Marston  
Ronald Mulcare  
Kate Sears

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Leroy Saage

##### Other Participants

Michael Spiegel  
M. Cavalier, Cow Hollow Neighborhood  
Bob Voss, Cow Hollow Neighborhood  
Ruth Gravanis, CNPS  
Doug Kern, Urban Watershed Project  
Joe Story, DKS  
Arthur Feinstein, Golden Gate Audubon  
Emeric Kalman, Greater West Portal Neighborhood Assn.

##### Parsons Brinckerhoff

Dina Potter  
Susan Killen

##### Public Affairs Management

Kay Wilson  
Kristy Ranieri

##### MPA Design

Michael Painter

#### **summary:**

##### **I. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary**

Lee Saage, SFCTA, asked if anyone had any comments or revisions to the April 19 meeting summary. William Allich noted that he was in attendance at the April 19 meeting. The change was accepted and the meeting summary was approved.

##### **II. Project Status Report**

Susan Killen, PB, reported that the team is working on the archaeology and history technical reports. Extensive archival research indicates where archaeological resources are most likely to be discovered. The coring program shows within the various soil levels when human habitation was in evidence. The combination of these two pieces of information provides a foundation to determine the areas where subsurface investigation is most likely to result in retrieving historic and prehistoric information that would aid in determining the potential impacts of the alternatives to any of the resources. The archival research and the coring

information will be put into the technical report. In the next several months a subsurface testing plan will be developed so the team can trench in places that will answer meaningful questions about the resources in this area. For the architectural history studies, the team has performed additional historic and architectural research for the Cold War buildings not previously included in the Presidio's inventory.

Redmond Kernan recommended that the project team test extensively for archaeological resources. This will prevent work stopping during construction when an artifact is found. Susan Killen, PB, agreed that some testing will reduce the chances of this happening and noted that that the archival research focused on the corridor where impacts are most likely to occur.

Dina Potter reported that the Geotechnical Reports were circulated to the agencies for review. The initial technical report information (geology, hydrology, history, archaeology and so forth) will be part of the EIS/EIR document.

### **III. 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. The team compiled a list of information items requested by the Subcommittee at the last meeting and developed a schedule to address the issues. The schedule should serve to clarify the next steps for the study and the key Subcommittee involvement activities that will happen in the upcoming months.

Lindy Beasley noted that she appreciated the preparation of a schedule of the overall process.

A Subcommittee member asked if the Draft EIS/EIR would include a preferred alternative. Lee Saage, SFCTA, responded that the Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans have adopted a process of releasing all the alternatives without indicating a preference for one and then encouraging public comment. There will not be a preferred alternative in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Redmond Kernan added that the schedule graphic should be dated so that changes can be tracked.

### **IV. Additional Information and Refinements to Alternatives**

Dina Potter, PB, noted that in response to Gloria Fontanello's comments, the team looked at the feasibility of adding additional access to the Presidio from Lincoln Boulevard. Dina Potter gave an overview of the findings; she explained that two scenarios were developed to add Lincoln Boulevard access. The advantages and disadvantages were described and included the following:

Advantages:

- Provides direct eastbound access to the Main Post and to any future parking.
- Reduce the eastbound demand exiting at the main Presidio access.

Disadvantages:

- 300 meter weaving distance
- Requires removal of Main Post Building 105
- Provides only minimal weaving distance and limited capacity
- The weaving occurs at the entrance and transition zone for the mainline tunnel
- An increase in the number of exiting vehicles would create congestion similar to that occurring at the Golden Gate Bridge overlook area today
- The sight distance is very limited at the intersection with Lincoln
- Additional tunnel will cost approx. \$20 million

180 meter weaving distance

- Provides only substandard weaving distance with minimal traffic capacity
- All weaving would occur between the Highway 1 ramp and mainline tunnel entrance
- Provides only seven seconds to merge
- There is a high potential for congestion onto northbound to eastbound ramp and onto Highway 1
- Any increase in the number of exiting vehicles would require closure of northbound to eastbound Highway 1 ramp.
- Additional tunnel will cost approx. \$15 million

Dina Potter, PB, noted that the project engineers do not recommend either additional Lincoln Boulevard access option. Becky Evans asked why this access was needed. Dina Potter, PB said that Subcommittee members had asked that it be studied so that is why it is being discussed. She also stated that the option would provide more direct access to the Main Post. Redmond Kernan noted that the population at the Main Post is not very high and additional access is not needed.

Norman Rolfe expressed concern that drivers would make a decision in a tunnel, which is not safe. Dina Potter, PB, agreed that the access was less than desirable because several decisions would occur within a very limited space.

Michael Spiegel asked what highway speed the team is using for the design alternatives and asked if the speed can be lower. Dina Potter, PB, responded the posted speed is 45 mph and the posted limit would be lowered in the transition area between the tunnels and local streets. The team is working with Caltrans on the speed limit but the speed must be consistent with Highway 101 and Highway 1. Joan Girardot stated the tunnel alternatives might not be acceptable to the public and questioned if this design has to be 45 mph. She suggested that the posted limit be 35 mph instead.

Dina Potter, PB, noted that the team had asked for a lower design speed. Caltrans has said that this Highway 101 through this interchange will be posted for 45 mph. Rather than bringing it to the current standard, which is 60 mph. Both Caltrans and the team understand that the community want the posted speed no higher than is currently posted. The Park Presidio / Doyle Drive interchange is considered a highway-to-highway connection.

Joan Girardot stated that the community might be able to lobby Caltrans to lower the speed requirements.

Redmond Kernan asked if the speed limit was lowered, what effect would that have on the design. Dina Potter, PB, noted that a slightly lower speed limit would not make a significant difference.

Redmond Kernan stated that as part of this construction of Doyle Drive, an underground garage should be considered for Doyle Drive. Lee Saage, SFCTA, added that Michael Painter has developed a number of variations for parking under Doyle Drive. However, parking for Presidio Trust is not an objective of this project as Presidio Trust is looking to remove a significant amount of the current surface parking within Area B. Redmond Kernan stated that with the recent restoration of Crissy Field, a garage could serve visitors to the Presidio and Crissy Field.

Norman Rolfe stated that providing parking is a big mistake because it will generate more traffic and provide less incentive to use transit.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, proposed that the Subcommittee should vote on having the team conduct exploration of a parking option. Seven Subcommittee members were in favor of more study for the parking option - Bill Alich, Jack Spring, Redmond Kernan, Lindy Beasley, Michael Alexander, Roger Peters and Jackie Sachs. Six were opposed to more study of the parking option - Joan Girardot, Max DelleSedie, Norman Rolfe, Vera Gates, Becky Evans, and Gloria Fontanello; (Patricia Vaughey had not arrived yet.)

Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that if there were any consideration of an underground parking facility, it would be in the EIS/EIR.

Joan Girardot questioned the design of the tunnels and said she did not support underground tunnels. Lee Saage, SFTCA, clarified that these are cut and cover tunnels.

#### **Merchant Street Access Option**

Dina Potter, PB, then gave an overview of the Merchant Access option that was raised by the Subcommittee at the last meeting. The team examined the feasibility of this option and recommends it for inclusion in the project. Dina Potter, PB, explained that the team designed a secondary ramp from Doyle Drive for drivers coming from the city, to provide access to the visitor center without creating a weaving problem for Park Presidio vehicles also accessing the visitor center. Dina concluded that the team does recommend these plans for Merchant but they do not recommend the design for Lincoln Avenue access because of the previously described issues at the tunnel portal and Highway 1 interchange.

Michael Spiegel asked if bicycle commuters that use Golden Gate Bridge, Merchant and Lincoln are considered in these plans. Dina Potter, PB, replied that the final design of the access would need to take into account bicycle users.

Joan Girardot suggested that the signage be added to the area now so drivers know to access the Presidio. This is something that Caltrans should do now since drivers are making u-turns on Lyon Street and Marina Boulevard.

Gloria Fontanello compared the Doyle Drive project to The Embarcadero roadway as an example of a project that incorporates vistas and a lower speed limit. She commented that as a group, the Subcommittee has a chance to do something special and she thinks the group should lobby Caltrans. The Subcommittee did not give a response.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, will consider the recommendation but feels there are institutional and physical problems. He summarized that the consultants have found the Lincoln slip ramps to have difficult design constraints and safety concerns. In general, there are not many advantages to this Lincoln access point. The Merchant Street design seems workable. He suggested that the group vote. A yes vote means agreement with the consultants that the Lincoln Access option be dropped from further study. Eleven Subcommittee members voted yes, and Joan Girardot and Gloria Fontanello opposed. (Patricia Vaughey had not yet arrived.)

Lee Saage, SFCTA, asked the group to vote on the concepts of incorporating the Merchant Street access into the project for further study and on pursuing early implementation of this. All Subcommittee members present voted in favor of incorporating the Merchant Street access.

Redmond Kernan suggested a separate bike and pedestrian path should be added in this area. Dick Tilles, Presidio Trust, said that he would look into it.

#### **V. Traffic Screening Report Distribution**

Dina Potter, PB, provided a brief introduction and distributed the Final Traffic Screening Report. She reviewed the process, noting that the Final Alternatives Report identified six

alternatives to be carried forward for further study and recommended that two additional alternatives and one access option undergo screening-level traffic analysis to better understand whether they should also be carried forward. The three scenarios included the Highway 1 (Park Presidio) Alternative, Doyle Drive Boulevard Alternative, and No Marina Boulevard Connection Option. Dina Potter, PB, noted that some features of the Doyle Drive Boulevard alternative are carried forward in revised Alternative 3a, which will be discussed later in the meeting.

The Final Traffic Screening Report shows the result of that screening-level traffic analysis and summarizes the recommendation of whether to carry the three options forward.

Dina Potter, PB, noted that the baseline shows that Doyle Drive, Park Presidio, Richardson and Marina Boulevard are all approaching capacity today. If traffic is shifted, this congestion could worsen. Dina Potter, PB, then highlighted some of the improvements that would have to be made to handle the amount of traffic.

Park Presidio would need to be widened by two additional-lanes, one in each direction. Between Golden Gate and Geary, one lane would have to be added in each direction. At California and Presidio there would have to be four additional lanes in each direction. At Geary, there would have to be five additional south bound lanes and four additional northbound lanes. Furthermore, when the team ran the model at these intersections, Lombard and Old Mason at the East End of the Presidio experienced cut-through traffic. The team recommended the alternatives not be carried forward.

Max DelleSedie asked what happens if the ramp from northbound Park Presidio to eastbound Doyle Drive is eliminated. Dina Potter, PB, replied that this would move traffic to the city streets.

Joan Girardot requested that before these alternatives are dropped, the team should study eliminating the turning movement from northbound Park Presidio to eastbound Doyle Drive. Redmond Kernan stated that he opposed this suggestion as a resident of the Richmond District.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, suggested that a traffic simulation that removes the connector could possibly be performed if needed since the model would illustrate the effect.

Max DelleSedie asked that regardless of the scenario, would the alternative designs be adequate for the traffic in 2030. Dina Potter, PB, explained that the team is designing for 2030 traffic and there will be decisions made for the intersections and interchanges as to whether congestion remains the same or improves.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, clarified the Traffic Screening Report is intended to be a quick "screening" look at the three options and utilized 2020 traffic projections. It is not a final traffic analysis.

Michael Alexander asked what the process is for feedback on the Traffic Screening Report. Dina Potter, PB, answered that the team recommends that these alternatives not move forward for further study. If there are questions or major concerns from the Subcommittee, members should contact Dina Potter to discuss the issues.

Max DelleSedie asked if alternative combinations were still going to be considered. Dina Potter, PB, replied that a combination of the three screened alternatives would not be explored. Max DelleSedie stated that a combination of increased capacity on Park Presidio and Doyle Drive should be a possibility.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that the focus was on replacing Doyle Drive. The team will be committed to having the Doyle Drive design open to opportunities for improvements to Park Presidio but these improvements are not going to be done as a part of this project. The modeling that has been done to date suggests that increasing capacity on Park Presidio will increase demand on Doyle Drive. The result is counterproductive to the goal of decreased traffic through the neighborhoods.

Max DelleSedie asked for clarification on the issue of increased number of ramp lanes within the Highway 1 interchange. Dina Potter, PB, replied that the number of lanes on the various ramps would remain the same as today with improved geometry where it is nonstandard to the greatest extent possible.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that if the traffic model suggests that more than one ramp lane is needed, and then the team will explore the possibility of expansion.

Max DelleSedie noted that the eastbound and southbound ramp should be increased to two lanes. Lee Saage, SFCTA, stated that the traffic needs for that connector will be evaluated as part of the traffic analysis.

Max DelleSedie stated that the traffic model is going to be biased and that the modeler has the power to limit the throughput. Lee Saage, SFCTA, reminded the Subcommittee that the models are tools for the traffic engineers to use in analyzing the operations of the facilities.

Lee Saage, SFCTA, summarized that the three alternatives will not be considered for further analysis and the Subcommittee generally concurred. Lee Saage, SFCTA, noted that if the Subcommittee favors certain design aspects of the alternatives, they may be considered for inclusion in the alternatives going forward, but the project team will no longer focus on these alternatives.

## **VI. Introduction of Revised Alternative 3a**

Dina Potter, PB, stated that a substantial number of comments received during the April 19 Subcommittee meeting and the April 24 Executive Committee meeting related to Alternative 3 (Tunnel Under Halleck, Direct Marina Connector). All disciplines of the project team worked to make refinements to better meet the design goals for Doyle Drive to be more parkway-like.

Alternative 3a was developed to better meet the design goals for a Doyle 'parkway' and 'boulevard.' The refined alternative incorporates various components that provide more unobstructed parkland while improving visual and traffic conditions for the adjacent neighborhoods. Dina Potter, PB, presented the following features of revised Alternative 3a:

- Incorporates Doyle Boulevard/ Parkway components
- Reduces turning movements at key intersection
- Moves tunnel portal back from Lyon Street, farther east of Halleck Street
- Lessens the impact on historic buildings
- Accommodates a future Tennessee Hollow
- Creates opportunity for better transit connectivity
- Improves arrival views, near Halleck Street, improves views of the Palace of Fine Arts

Lee Saage, SFCTA, suggested the Subcommittee members review the alternative and bring questions and/or comments to the next meeting.

### **Action Item:**

- *Send copies of Alternative 3a to the Subcommittee for review.* – Dina Potter, PB

**VII. Status of Project Schedule**

Dina Potter, PB, reported that the draft environmental document (EIS/EIR) is scheduled for public comment in mid-February, 2002. The Final Environmental Document is scheduled for circulation in October 2002. A summary schedule was distributed.

**VIII. Report on Action Items**

Lee Saage, SFCTA, reported that all of the action items have been completed except for the distribution of the Letterman Noise Report and it will be supplied at the Subcommittee meeting that addresses noise impacts.

Kristy Ranieri, PAM, reported that the Subcommittee representative from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition no longer wants to serve on the Doyle Drive Subcommittee. The Subcommittee responded that a new member from this group should be appointed.

**Action Item:**

- *Contact a new representative from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition – Kristy Ranieri*

**IX. Upcoming Meeting Dates**

Lee Saage, SFCTA, urged Subcommittee members to attend the next meeting because agency representatives have been invited to participate. The next meeting date is July 31, 2001, SFCTA, 5:00 pm.

**X. Public Comments**

Gina DelleSedie asked about the status of Alternative 3a in the study process. Lee Saage, SFCTA, explained that Alternative 3a is a variation on Alternative 3. The remaining alternatives are also moving forward for additional study and there will be opportunities to make refinements to the designs.

Doug Kern, Urban Watershed Project, commented that he is pleased to see the accommodations made for Tennessee Hollow. He requested to speak with the planners for more details and the depths of the tunnels.

Susan Speewack, a resident of Cow Hollow, would like to have more information on the Subcommittee and the project process so that she can determine if public money is being well spent.

Arthur Feistein, Golden Gate Audubon Society, stated that he was concerned that the project should include Tennessee Hollow Watershed restoration. He requested more information about the biologists and hydrologists working on this project.

**ACTION ITEM TRACKING CHART**

MEETING DATE	ACTION DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETED
6/14/01	Contact a new representative from the SF Bicycle Coalition.	Kristy Ranieri, PAM	July 31, 2001	In progress
6/14/01	Send color copies of all of the alternatives with the final numbering to the Subcommittee.	Dina Potter, PB	July 14, 2001	July 9, 2001

**Distribution:**

- All Subcommittee Members
- Leroy L. Saage
- Jose Luis Muscovite
- Dina Potter
- Susan Killen
- Kay Wilson

Kristy Ranieri  
Michael Painter