SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

DOYLE DRIVE

VOLUME III

Appendix L
Comments on DEIS/R and Responses

Order of comments presented in this appendix:

Agencies

Groups and Organizations

Public Hearings

Individuals

Doyle Drive Project

Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report
and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

Reviewers	Page	
AGENCIES	Comment Letter	Responses
United States Environmental Protection Agency	3	9
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	11	17
Golden Gate National Recreation Area	22	37
Presidio Trust	49	56
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	60	65
San Francisco Recreation and Parks Dept	66	67
The Transportation Authority of Marin	68	70

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

March 1, 2006

REC'D MAR 03 2006

Gene Fong
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
650 Capitol Mall Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Doyle Drive Project – South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco, CA (CEQ #20050545)

Dear Mr. Fong:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Based on our review, we have rated the proposed project as Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information (EC-2). 1

We recognize the importance of addressing the seismic, safety, and structural improvement needs for Doyle Drive and commend the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on a well-prepared Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Given the project's location within the Presidio and its proximity to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, cultural institutions, and residential areas, we are concerned about potential adverse impacts to cultural and historic resources and traffic in neighboring communities. 2 We are also concerned about potential human health impacts from construction-related emissions. We recommend that FHWA avoid and minimize these impacts to the maximum extent possible, and commit to specific mitigation measures in the Final EIS and Record of Decision. Please see the enclosed detailed comments. 3

EPA appreciates the opportunity to review this Draft EIS. When the Final EIS is released for public review, please send two copies to the address above (mail code: CED-2). If you have questions, please contact me at 415-972-3988 or Nancy Levin, the lead reviewer for this project. Nancy can be reached at 415-972-3848 or levin.nancy@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Connell Dunning

for Duane James, Manager
Environmental Review Office
Communities and Ecosystems Division

Printed on Recycled Paper

Enclosures:
Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
Detailed Comments

cc: Leroy. L. Saage, San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Jared D. Goldfine, Caltrans
Brian O'Neil, National Park Service
Craig Middleton, The Presidio Trust
James Metcalf, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize EPA's level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the EIS.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

Category 1" (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

"Category 3" (Inadequate)

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which should be analysed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, "Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment."

EPA DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR DOYLE DRIVE PROJECT – SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE, SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CA, MARCH 1, 2006

Cultural and Historic Resources

The proposed project extends from the south end of the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco, through the Presidio of San Francisco, to the Palace of Fine Arts. This area is rich in historic and cultural significance. The Presidio is designated as a National Historic Landmark District (NHLD). As stated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), both build alternatives would have an adverse effect on the Presidio NHLD and its contributing elements, individual historic properties, and the cultural landscape found on the Presidio (pages 3-113 to 3-116). Other historic properties in the area include a prehistoric archaeological site, historic viaducts, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the Palace of Fine Arts. According to the Draft EIS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has begun consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (page 3-107). The Draft EIS states that a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and a variety of mitigation plans will be developed as part of the Section 106 consultation process (pages 3-116 to 3-120).

Recommendations:

Given the magnitude of potential impacts to cultural and historic resources, we recommend that the Final EIS include a more detailed discussion of mitigation measures and design guidelines to avoid, minimize and compensate for adverse impacts. We recommend that these measures be adopted in the Record of Decision (ROD). 4

Include in the Final EIS the completed Section 106 MOA and mitigation plans. Alternatively, discuss the process and timeline for completing the Section 106 consultation process. 5

Traffic and Transportation Impacts

The Draft EIS recognizes that the project could adversely affect traffic patterns on local roadways during construction and operation. Project construction will require short-and long-term roadway closures (page 2-61) that could increase traffic in some areas, reduce travel speeds, and divert traffic through neighborhood streets. New or modified access points may also affect pedestrian and bicycle operations.

The Draft EIS briefly discusses strategies to accommodate traffic during construction (page 3-68), and states that a "Transportation Management Plan" will be developed to minimize these traffic impacts. The Transportation Management plan will encourage use of alternative routes, use of transit, overall trip reduction, and interactive traffic monitoring to alleviate bottlenecks (page 3-90). The Draft EIS also states that the Transportation Management Plan will not be developed until after the preferred alternative is selected and during the final design, and that affected agencies would be consulted to develop the Plan (page 3-65).

Recommendations:

Include in the Final EIS a draft Transportation Management Plan with specific measures to minimize adverse traffic impacts to neighborhoods as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project. 6

Include in the Final EIS specific measures to encourage the use of transit as a means of alleviating construction-related congestion. 7

In addition to soliciting transportation and transit agency feedback on the Transportation Management Plan, include in the Final EIS a commitment to consult with local residents, businesses, and other affected users (including bicyclists and pedestrians) of the Presidio and Golden Gate National Recreation Area in developing the Plan. 8

Construction-related Emissions

We commend FHWA for describing available dust control measures in the Draft EIS and encourage FHWA to commit to these measures in the Final EIS and ROD. 9

Construction emissions from the proposed project may result in human exposure to diesel exhaust, which includes particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5). Older adults, people with heart and lung disease, and children are particularly sensitive to fine particle exposure. Studies have shown a significant association between exposure to PM2.5 and adverse health outcomes, including asthma, respiratory disease, and premature death. Given the adverse health effects for PM2.5 and diesel exhaust exposure, EPA recommends that the Final EIS include mitigation measures for these construction emissions. 10

The project's Air Quality Study (November 2004) identifies residential areas in and around the project study area that would be sensitive to air quality impacts of the project. The Final EIS should also specify the locations of schools, hospitals, open space/recreational areas (in addition to Crissy Field), and convalescent homes, if any, that could be affected by construction-related emissions. 11

Recommendations:

Identify in the Final EIS sensitive receptors in the project area, including children, elderly, infirm, and athletes, and minimize impacts to these populations. 12

Include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan for fugitive dust and diesel PM (DPM) in the Final EIS and adopt this plan in the ROD. EPA recommends the following mitigation measures be incorporated in the Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan, where feasible and appropriate, in order to reduce impacts associated with emissions of PM10, DPM, and air toxics from construction-related activities: 13

- Establish an activity schedule designed to minimize traffic congestion around the construction site.
- Utilize EPA-registered particulate traps and other appropriate controls to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.
- Locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors such as children and the elderly as well as away from fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners. 14
- Use low sulfur fuel (diesel with 15 parts per million or less).
- Reduce trips and unnecessary idling from heavy equipment.
- Lease newer and cleaner equipment (1996 or newer).
- Periodically inspect construction sites to ensure construction equipment is properly maintained at all times.

Other Comments

- Section 3.3.4 Air Quality references the 2001 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Since the project is identified in the Draft EIS as being part of a conforming 2005 TIP, it is unclear why the 2001 TIP is referenced (page 3-161). This should be clarified or updated in the Final EIS. 15

- The project impact summary tables (Exhibits S-7 and S-8) include only permanent impacts of the project to the human and physical environment. We recommend that the summary table also include temporary impacts, so that the tables provide a complete summary of potential project effects. 16

- In accordance with Executive Order 13112, EPA recommends that the Final EIS identify proposed methods to minimize the spread of invasive species and utilize native plant and tree species where re-vegetation is planned. 17

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: United States Environmental Protection Agency

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1210
2	Please refer to Responses 4 and 5.	1211
3	Please refer to Responses 4 and 5.	1212
4	The Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion found in Section 3.2.11 was updated to provide additional information.	1214
5	The Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion found in Section 3.2.11 was updated to provide additional information.	1215
6	A summary of the draft TMP is included in the FEIS/R, see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.8 and Appendix K. The detailed TMP would be finalized during the final design phase of project.	1216
7	Transit would be an integral part of the TMP. A summary of the draft TMP is included in the FEIS/R, see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.8 and Appendix K. The detailed TMP would be finalized during the final design phase of project.	1217
8	The Authority has made the commitment to continue an open dialog with all project stakeholders throughout the completion of this project. This will include agency and citizen advisory committees, public meetings, living room briefings, project website, and published media.	1218
9	The construction mitigation measures for reducing dust emissions that are identified in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures section of Section 3.3.4 of the FEIS/R are those required by the BAAQMD. In addition, those mitigation measures geared to reduce exhaust emissions from construction equipment, and that are identified in the same section, are required by Federal Regulations for construction activities that will occur on this project. The project commits to implementing the measures.	1219
10	The FEIS/R identified mitigation measures for reducing diesel particulate matter (PM 2.5) by adopting measures similar to those indicated in the Comment. The FEIS/R stated that these measures are required by the Federal Tier 4 emission regulations for diesel engines (See Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.4).	1819
11	The Community Facilities discussion in Section 3.2.4 of the FEIS/R discussed sensitive receptors in the area. These would include schools, hospitals, and residences. The mitigation measures identified in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of the Air Quality Section (Section 3.3.4) of the FEIS/R are those required by BAAQMD Guidelines to reduce construction impacts at sensitive receptors to less than significant levels.	1220

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: United States Environmental Protection Agency

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
12	See response to Comment 1220	1221
13	The mitigation measures identified in the comment are part of the FEIS/R, see the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.4. Because they are either required by BAAQMD regulations or by Federal regulations, the mitigation plan will automatically be part of the ROD.	1222
14	See response to Comment 1222	1223
15	The text referred to in the comment has been dropped in the FEIS/R, see Regulatory Setting of Section 3.3.4. It is an old narrative that was written before the 2005 TIP was released. The previous paragraph of the DEIS/R was intended to replace it.	1224
16	This information was covered in the text, see the discussion of Temporary Impacts throughout Chapter 3. Temporary impacts are also be covered in the mitigation monitoring plan if mitigation is deemed appropriate.	1225
17	See response to comment 1180. The EIS/R also does this by referencing BMPs, see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures in Section 3.4.5. The source of standard BMPs is clarified in the response to comment 1792.	1226

March 20, 2006

GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

Lee Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Comments on Doyle Drive DEIS/R**

Dear Mr. Saage:

On behalf of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District staff, I submit the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation for Doyle Drive, South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge, December 2005. Comments are presented in the order they occur in the document.

Summary

Page v – The footnote at the bottom of the page explains why HOV lanes were eliminated from further consideration and not carried forward into project alternatives. Since the time of preliminary alternatives screening, GGBHTD staff has been working with SFCTA on plans for Bus Rapid Transit on Geary Blvd. and Van Ness Avenue. Please confirm that these plans do not foresee extensions to Doyle Drive via Park Presidio Blvd. or Lombard Street. Otherwise, HOV lanes on Doyle Drive could be effective and merit further consideration as an element of the project. 1

Page vi – The description of the No-Build Alternative references interim repairs and ongoing maintenance as requirements to keep the roadway in service. However, it also notes that a weight restriction could be designated without appropriate maintenance. Please clarify whether weight restrictions will be required for this project alternative. If weight restrictions are required, the rerouting of heavy vehicles (such as buses) should be addressed in the document. If weight restrictions are not required, is there a maintenance cost associated with this alternative that should be reflected in Exhibit S-6? 2

Page viii – The description of the Replace and Widen Alternative references access to the Presidio via on and off ramps to Merchant Road at the GGB Toll Plaza. It should be clarified that these ramps lead to Lincoln Blvd. and the Presidio via roads that service GGBHTD facilities such as its maintenance shops, the administration building, and Bridge visitor areas. Merchant Road and other GGBHTD service roads are not designed to provide access to the entire Presidio. 3

Page ix – The description of the Presidio Parkway Alternative should clarify whether the design option for a new slip ramp (Merchant Ramp) between northbound Doyle Drive and the GGB east parking lot is included in the project and should be consistent with Exhibit S-6, where this ramp is shown, and Exhibit S-7. 4

Page xiii – Exhibit S-7, Traffic and Transportation, should show public transit impacts. 5

1011 ANDERSEN DRIVE • SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901-5381 • USA

Chapter 1

Page 1-9 – Description of existing condition of Doyle Drive suggests that, even with repair and maintenance, Doyle Drive could be closed or restricted. Please reconcile these statements with later descriptions of the feasibility, cost and other impacts of the No Build Alternative. 6

Page 1-10 – Please clarify that the ramps at the GGB Toll Plaza do not provide "direct" access from Doyle Drive to the Presidio. The ramps are located in the Toll Plaza area and connect to Merchant Road on the west and GGB service roads on the east, which then connect to Lincoln Blvd. Access between Doyle Drive and the Presidio is currently "indirect" via these roads located within the Toll Plaza area. It should be noted that lack of direct Presidio access also impacts GGBHTD facilities. 7

Page 1-14 – The footnote at the bottom of Exhibit 1-7 refers to bridge tolls and value pricing as sources of other local funds for the project. Please clarify that Golden Gate Bridge tolls are not committed to funding this project. 8

Chapter 2

Page 2-2 – Please revise Exhibit 2-1 to show the Toll Plaza area extending south to just north of Lincoln Blvd. The Merchant Rd. ramps are located within the Toll Plaza area. 9

Page 2-24 (and Exhibit 2-7) – Please clarify that in addition to the Transit Exclusive Alternative there was consideration of HOV lanes and general traffic lanes on Doyle Drive. As stated in the above comment regarding Page v of the Summary, this option was eliminated due to apparent ineffectiveness recognizing that there are no plans for continuing HOV lanes to the north or south of Doyle Drive. However, we ask that this assumption be confirmed relative to recent efforts by SFCTA and MUNI to study BRT along Van Ness Avenue and Geary Blvd. Specifically, is SFCTA considering extending transit preferential improvements along Park Presidio or Lombard Street? 10

Page 2-27 – This page contains further statements regarding the infeasibility of the No Build Alternative that should be reflected in characterizing the impacts of this alternative elsewhere in the document. 11

Page 2-30 – The next-to-last sentence of the discussion of a Moveable Barrier is not consistent with the conclusion stated in the last sentence. 12

Page 2-31 – As noted before, Doyle Drive does not have direct access to Presidio at Merchant Road. These ramps are located within the GGB Toll Plaza area. 13

Pages 2-32 to 2-37 – As noted before, No Build Alternative should be revised to provide required maintenance to avoid weight restrictions that would require buses and trucks to take other routes and to provide appropriate seismic response. Otherwise, this alternative should be described as being infeasible or unacceptable. 14

Page 2-43 – The description of Alternate 5 includes a statement about parking the District's future Moveable Median Barrier machine in the median of Doyle Drive. This statement should also appear in the description of Alternate 2. 15

Page 2-49 – The description of the slip ramp option should be revised to explain that the ramp would provide direct access from westbound Doyle Drive to the Presidio and the GGB East 16

Parking Lot as an improvement to the existing condition. It should also note that the existing weaving section between Doyle Drive, Veterans Blvd. and the exit ramp is substandard in its length in addition to being congested. District requests that the slip ramp be incorporated into the basic design of Alternative 5 rather than being carried forward as a design option since it is germane to the project purpose and objectives related to improving traffic safety and functionality as an approach to GGB. 16 cont

Page 2-49 – The description of the eastern end access should include references to new bus stops and pedestrian pathways that provide inter-modal access improvements directly associated with this project and responsive to the project objectives. 17

Page 2-50 and 2-51 – As stated before, the No Build Alternative should be represented as being infeasible or unacceptable. Otherwise, the full maintenance and rehabilitation cost of this alternative should be provided. 18

Pages 2-51 through 2-63 – District is very concerned about construction staging and traffic-related impacts to GGB and GGT operations as well as to concurrent GGB construction projects. Any temporary and long-term closures of Lincoln Avenue near the GGB and of the ramps in the Doyle Drive/Veterans Blvd. interchange as shown on Exhibits 2-36 and 2-37 could negatively impact the GGB. Construction timing should also be coordinated with GGB construction work. 19

Chapter 3

Page 3-2 – It should be noted that the GGB along with its support facilities and visitor areas is being considered a recreational land use within the project study area in addition to being a transportation facility. The affect of the alternatives on use and enjoyment of the GGB by visitors is addressed in Section 3.2.2. In particular, on Pages 3-28 through 3-31, the District is concerned about temporary impacts of construction and construction detours that could increase traffic through the visitor areas east of the Toll Plaza. As stated before, the service roads within these visitor areas are not designed to accommodate high volumes of through traffic. The project should avoid, minimize and/or mitigate negative impacts. 20

Page 3-13 – Description of "Temporary Impacts" should note whether impacts are expected to existing transit services (GGT and MUNI) that currently use Doyle Drive. 21

Page 3-14 – As stated before, the No Build alternative should be clarified as being infeasible or unacceptable unless it includes adequate maintenance and rehabilitation to avoid weight restrictions and to address seismic response. Such maintenance and rehabilitation should be included in the project description and environmental evaluation. 22

Pages 3-22 and 3-31 – It should be noted what impacts (if any) the Diamond and Circle Drive Options for the Parkway Alternative will have on the north- and southbound bus stops at Richardson and Lyon streets. 23

Page 3-23 – It should be noted that the Merchant road slip ramp would provide direct access between Doyle Drive and the Fort Scott area of the Presidio, as well as to the GGB visitor area and NPS Area A without entering the Toll Plaza area. 24

Page 3-28 – DEIS' description of the East Parking Lot location should be described as "east" of the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza, not "south". 25

Page 3-32 – As stated before, the No Build Alternative should be consistently clarified as including or excluding adequate maintenance and rehabilitation to be either feasible and fully evaluated or not. 26

Pages 3-64 and 3-65 – The Veterans Blvd. to south of Merchant Road segment should also note that deficient service levels, lane changes and weaving are associated with accessing the Presidio in addition to GGB and its viewing areas. 27

Page 3-68 and 3-89 – It should be noted that traffic reduction strategies proposed for the Transportation Management Plan could adversely affect GGB toll revenue generation. Toll revenues are needed to fund bridge operations and capital projects, and to subsidize public transit services. The proposed 5 to 10 percent traffic reduction spread over four to five years of construction could have significant impact on the District's ability to maintain services to the public. District requests that the project consider this possibility and mitigate the financial impact. 28

Pages 3-68 and 3-91 – DEIS should note whether the Transportation Management Plan will consider potential negative impacts to existing bus transit operations as part of the "narrower lanes, alignment adjustments or more restrictive turning radii" anticipated during project construction. 29

Pages 3-69 through 3-72 – As stated before, District is very concerned about road closures that would increase traffic on the service roads around the GGB and affect District operations and the use and enjoyment of the GGB by visitors. The Transportation Management Plan is cited as the avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation for construction-related impacts. Since construction could go on for 5 years and since alternate routes may not be designed to accommodate higher traffic volumes, the cost of implementing the TMP could be significant. Does the project estimate this cost and is this cost included in the project costs? 30

Pages 3-84 and 3-85 – As stated before, District requests the Merchant Road slip ramp be included in the basic configuration of Alternative 5 rather than as a design option since it is needed to address the inadequate weave condition identified. 31

Page 3-88 – As stated before, the No Build Alternative should be consistently clarified as including or excluding adequate maintenance and rehabilitation to either be feasible and fully evaluated or not. In this case, it appears that the evaluation assumes adequate maintenance and rehabilitation is provided to maintain existing functionality. What are the maintenance and rehabilitation costs associated with this assumption and why are they not attributed to the cost of this alternative? 32

Page 3-88 – As stated before, impacts (temporary or permanent) to existing public transit services should be presented. 33

Page 3-89 – Discussion of Alternative 5 implies that the Merchant Road slip ramp is a contributing element of the project rather than an option. 34

Page 3-90 – It should be noted that GGT services are assumed to operate at Year 2000 service levels consistent with the choice of Base Year 2000 GGB traffic levels since more recent experience reflects a downturn in traffic and transit ridership associated with the post-2000 economic recession. 35

Pages 3-91 and 3-92 – It should be noted that temporary re-routing of buses can be more difficult and costly than detours for general traffic because of operating characteristics of buses, need for bus stops and advance notification to passengers. Duration, avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation for construction impacts on transit services should be included in the TMP. 36

Page 3-91 – As stated before, the No Build Alternative should be clarified consistently. In this case, there is no mention of weight restrictions that could result in bus route changes. 37

Pages 3-91 and 3-92 – There is mention of transit stops on Richardson associated with Alternate 5, but no explanation is provided. Please elaborate on the differences between alternatives associated with transit-related elements of the project. Does the project contain inter-modal improvements benefiting public transit? 38

Page 3-99 – The Merchant Road slip ramp would serve the GGB facilities, visitor areas and areas of the Presidio such as Fort Scott and Battery East. Please change these descriptive references to clarify the purpose of this Alternative 5 design feature here and in other parts of the report. 39

Chapter 4

Pages 4-3 and 4-14 – District disagrees with conclusion that there would be no significant temporary impact to GGB operations and use and enjoyment of visitor areas under CEQA resulting from construction detours required by the build alternatives. As stated before, the roads serving these GGB areas could experience significant increases in traffic with proposed closures of roadways in the Park Presidio/Veterans Blvd/Doyle Drive interchange and other locations. The road under the Toll Plaza, for example, bisects visitor areas that have significant pedestrian, bicycle and tour bus activity. Consistent with the NEPA section, the CEQA section should include reference to a Transportation Management Plan, developed in coordination with the District and funded by the project, to minimize traffic impacts during construction. 40

Page 4-14 – Description of the No Build Alternative understates the impact on the environment by not considering the long-term maintenance and rehabilitation that would be necessary to maintain its existing function as the south approach to the GGB. 41

Page 4-14 – Insert the word "and" between "Plaza" and "via" in the fourth line of the last paragraph. 42

Page 4-15 – The new slip ramp may be best described as improved access to the Presidio via a direct connection from northbound Doyle Drive to Lincoln Avenue which would avoid the Toll Plaza. 43

Chapter 5

Page 5-7 – Description of GGB Seismic Retrofit should reference Phase 3 as well. Description of GGB Moveable Median Barrier should reference a storage area for the operation of the transfer machine in the median of Doyle Drive. 44

Page 5-7 – Description of Highway 101 widening having a reversible HOV lane is not correct. 45

Page 5-9 – Description of temporary delays due to construction should be revised to include a Transportation Management Plan developed for the project. Also, please elaborate on what is meant by "measures that would be implemented … such as … increased transit service." 46

Page 5-10 – As stated before, the description of the No Build Alternative understates its impacts by overlooking the maintenance and rehabilitation that would be required to maintain its function. 47

Pages 5-15 and 5-18 – Please remove reference to the Golden Gate Bridge Public Safety Railing Project as an ongoing project. This project was implemented in 2004. 48

Page 5-19 – Please remove reference to the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza Redesign. There is no such project of the District. 49

Chapter 7

Page 7-6 – As stated before, please revise the description of the Merchant Road slip ramp. 50

Page 7-38 – As stated before, please revise the description of the Transit Exclusive Alternative. 51

Page 7-44 – Results of analysis of ramp metering and elimination of Veteran's Blvd. on-ramp should add that there would be negative impacts on recreational uses of the GGB visitor areas. 52

Page 7-46 – Description of temporary road closures due to construction should acknowledge the impacts of increased traffic on alternate routes that would negatively affect use and enjoyment of GGB visitor areas. A Transportation Management Plan is required to adequately address traffic impacts resulting from the construction of the project. 53

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Please contact me or Denis Mulligan, District Engineer, if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Alan R. Zahradnik
Director of Planning

ARZ/kmp

c: Celia Kupersmith
Denis Mulligan
Janet Tarantino
David Miller
Kary Witt
Maurice Palumbo

H:\P\G\BRIDGE\Doyle Dr DEIS comments.doc

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGBHTD

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	BRT in this corridor is currently not a priority of the SFCTA and is beyond the scope of this project.	1689
2	Weight restrictions are not required as part of the build project alternatives. Weight restrictions were contemplated under the no-build scenario since ongoing maintenance and repairs are unscheduled and minimal.	1690
3	The changes to the description of the Replace and Widen Alternative, as appropriate, were made in Section S.4 of the FEIS/R.	1691
4	The changes to the description of the Presidio Parkway Alternative, as appropriate, were made in Section S.4 of the FEIS/R.	1692
5	The summary table show in Exhibit S-9 was updated to include Transit and indicate that there are no significant changes to anticipated future transit conditions for any alternative.	1693
6	Both Section 1.4.2 Structural Degradation and 2.4.1 No-Build Alternative indicate that without extensive maintenance, the facility could have weight restrictions.	1694
7	The changes to the description of the Vehicular Access into the Presidio, as appropriate, were made in Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS/R.	1695
8	The changes to the footnote of Exhibit 1-7, as appropriate, were made in the FEIS/R.	1696
9	The changes, as appropriate, were made in the FEIS/EIR.	1697
10	BRT in this corridor is currently not a priority of the SFCTA.	1698
11	The No-Build Alternative does not meet the project need, purpose and objectives but is included to provide the baseline for existing environmental conditions and future travel conditions against which all other alternatives are compared. The impacts of a No-Build scenario are described in Section 1.4.2 Project Need, of the FEIS/R.	1699
12	The changes to the discussion of the Moveable Barrier in Section 2.3.4, as appropriate, were made.	1700
13	The FEIS/R clarifies that Presidio access is through Toll Plaza area.	1701

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGBHTD

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
14	Caltrans is executing an interim rehabilitation project of the high-viaduct for FY 2006/07 that plans to remove the existing paint system, remove and replace various steel elements and connection rivets due to sectional loss, and repaint the steel truss spans and the steel approach spans. This project is intended to extend the service life of the high-viaduct by ten years, until the facility is replaced. The interim repairs are expected to maintain the current level of safety and do not constitute a retrofit or rehabilitation. Maintenance funds are not steady and are programed pending other priority needs within the District. Since the maintenance funds necessary to keep the existing facility to current standards are not guaranteed, the No-Build does not meet the purpose and need of the project.	1702
15	The statement regarding parking a Moveable Median Barrier Machine in the median was added to the discussion of Alternatives 2, 5 (Section 2.4) and the Preferred in Section 2.5.	1703
16	The description of Alternative 5 was updated for the FEIS/R in Section 2.4.3. Weaving issues were covered in Traffic Section (see discussion of Segment Weaving under Permanent Impacts in Section 3.2.8). It was determined that the slip ramp will not be carried forward as part of the preferred alternative for the project (see Section 2.5.1)	1704
17	The following text was added to the description of the Presidio Parkway Alternative in Section 2.4.3 of the FEIS/R: Included in both the Diamond and Circle Drive options are extended bus bays on both sides of Richardson Avenue which will accommodate up to four buses each and improved crosswalks to provide safer and enhanced pedestrian circulation in the area. The extended bus bays will keep the buses out of the main flow of traffic during stops, provide safer merging capability for the buses and will facilitate transfers between Golden Gate Transit, Muni and PresidioGo vehicles.	1705
18	Maintenance funds are not steady and are programmed pending other priority needs within the District. Since the maintenance funds necessary to keep the existing facility to current standards are not guaranteed, the No-Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.	1706
19	Preliminary construction staging activities for the Preferred Alternative are described in Section 2.9.1. The TMP developed for this project will involve the GGBHTD to ensure coordination with any GGB construction activities. The TMP will also acknowledge possible detours for GGT bus routes when detours are necessary, especially with weekend closures. Detouring needs to be coordinated with GGT to minimize impacts on operations and riders. The draft TMP will be included in Appendix K.	1707
20	During the construction period all efforts will be made to minimize traffic related impacts to the GGB visitor area. Details will be provided in the Traffic Management Plan to be prepared before the start of construction. Development of the TMP will include coordination with the GGBHTD.	1708
21	The discussion of temporary impacts to transit service is discussed in the Temporary Impacts section of Transit Section 3.2.9. Text was added to this section that temporary bus route detours would be necessary during the two full weekend closures.	1736

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGBHTD

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
22	Caltrans is executing an interim rehabilitation project of the high-viaduct to extend the service life of the high-viaduct by ten years, until the facility is replaced. The interim repairs are expected to maintain the current level of safety and do not constitute a retrofit or rehabilitation. Maintenance funds are not steady and are programmed pending other priority needs within the District. Since the maintenance funds necessary to keep the existing facility to current standards are not guaranteed, the No-Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.	1709
23	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will include extended bus bays on both sides of Richardson Avenue and improved crosswalks in the area. The extended bus bays will provide safer merging capability and facilitate transfers between various services. The project team will continue to work with GGBHTD to develop the TMP and minimize impacts.	1737
24	The text under the discussion of Fort Scott for the Presidio Parkway Alternative in Section 3.2.1 was revised.	1710
25	The edits were made in the description of the East Parking Lot in the Affected Environment of Section 3.2.2 of the FEIS/R.	1738
26	Maintenance funds are not steady and are programed pending other priority needs within the District. Since the maintenance funds necessary to keep the existing facility to current standards are not guaranteed, the No-Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.	1711
27	In the discussion of the Existing Traffic Conditions in Section 3.2.8, it was clarified that the Presidio access is through Toll Plaza area (Golden Gate Bridge Viewing area).	1712
28	While the TMP will incorporate elements to encourage commuters to use other modes during construction, the facility will still be available for automobile commuters. It is anticipated that the complete closure of Doyle Drive east of the Park Presidio Intechange would occur on two weekends, however the GGB would still be open and accessible from other routes. The TMP will include a plan to address anticipated impacts of the extended closures including any proposed mitigation.	1713
29	The transit section (Section 3.2.9) of the FEIS/R was enhanced. However, the buses are currently operating in lanes narrower than the proposed lanes.	1739
30	Cost to implement the TMP is included in the total project cost. Costs are currently estimated. However, the exact cost associated with the TMP will not be availble until final construction staging is determined with the plan to mitigate and minimize these impacts. While the TMP will incorporate elements to encourage commuters to use other modes during construction, the facility will still be available for automobile commuters. It is only anticipated that the complete closure of Doyle Drive east of the Park Presidio Interchange would occur on one (possibly two weekends) however the GGB would still be open and accessible from other routes. With the refinement of the proposed staging of consruction, it is anticipated that the construction time will be reduced to less than four years.	1714

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGBHTD

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
31	The Merchant Road slip ramp was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Section 2.5.1 for details regarding the screening of this element and development of the Preferred Alternative.	1715
32	Maintenance funds are not steady and are available pending other priority needs within the District. Since the maintenance funds necessary to keep the existing facility to current standards are not guaranteed, the No-Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.	1716
33	Any temporary or permanent impacts from the project will be mitigated and presented in the Transportation Management Plan and the enhanced Transit section of the FEIS/R, see Section 3.2.9.	1740
34	This text was removed from the description of Alternative 5 in Section 3.2.8.	1717
35	Comment noted	1718
36	Text was revised as suggested in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures section of 3.2.9.	1719
37	Caltrans is executing an interim rehabilitation project of the high-viaduct. This project is intended to extend the service life of the high-viaduct by ten years, until the facility is replaced. The interim repairs are expected to maintain the current level of safety and do not constitute a retrofit or rehabilitation.	1720
38	The discussion under Travel Time in the transit section (Section 3.2.9) of the FEIS/R was expanded to include the new transit stops on Richardson. Description of the transit stops are also provided in the description of both Alternative 5 (Section 2.4.3) and the Preferred Alternative (Section 2.5.1).	1721
39	The text under Permanent Impacts to Alternative 5 in Section 3.2.10 in the FEIS/R is revised as follows: The Merchant Road Slip Ramp Option which would serve the Golden Gate Bridge facilities, visitor areas and areas of the Presidio such as Fort Scott and Battery East, would require the removal of a row of trees along the north side of Doyle Drive, as well as the removal of the road of apartment builds along Armistead Road.	1722
40	The criteria for impacts under CEQA vary from the impact analysis under NEPA. Based on the significance criteria applied to Traffic/Transportation, it has been determined that there are no significant impacts under CEQA. Mention of the TMP has been included in the CEQA discussion.	1723
41	Maintenance funds are not steady and are available pending other priority needs within the District. Since the maintenance funds necessary to keep the existing facility to current standards are not guaranteed, the No-Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.	1724

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGBHTD

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
42	The edit was made.	1725
43	The edit was made.	1726
44	The description of GGB Seismic Retrofit was updated in Section 5.5 of the FEIS/R to reference Phase 3. However, the moveable median barrier is not part of this project though current plans would not preclude its addition in the future.	1727
45	At the beginning of the project study, a reversible HOV was under consideration for Highway 101 in Marin county. This alternative has since been dropped. The description in Section 5.5 of the FEIS was updated to reflect the current description.	1728
46	As stated in Section 5.6.1 a Transportation Management Plan will be developed prior to construction of the project. The level of impact will be difficult to determine until the construction plans are finalized.	1729
47	Comment noted.	1730
48	The edit was made in Section 5.5 of the FEIS/R.	1741
49	The reference was removed from the FEIS/R.	1731
50	The EIS/R text was revised as follows: The Merchant Road Slip Ramp Option which would serve the Golden Gate Bridge facilities, visitor areas and areas of the Presidio such as Fort Scott and Battery East, would require the removal of a row of trees along the north side of Doyle Drive, as well as the removal of the road of apartment builds along Armistead Road.	1732
51	BRT in the corridor is currently not a priority. The description of the Transit Exclusive Alternative stands as is pending further consideration by SFCTA.	1733
52	Ramp metering and elimination of the Veteran's Blvd on-ramp is not part of the Preferred Alternative, therefore there would be no negative impacts on the recreational uses of the GGB visitor area.	1734
53	The impacts of the temporary road closures are described under the Preferred Alternative throughout Chapter 3 in the FEIS/R. The Transportation Management Plan would be finalized during detailed design and will address the traffic impacts resulting from the construction of the project.	1735

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123

IN REPLY REFER TO:

A88 (GOGA - PLAN)

MAR 31 2006

José Luis Moscovich
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 25th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Moscovich:

Subject: Golden Gate National Recreation Area Comments on Doyle Drive Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) would like to express our appreciation to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority for the leadership it has provided during the preparation of the Doyle Drive Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EISI/R) and to the spirit of creativity and openness that it has sustained among the complex team of cooperating agencies and the public. Replacing Doyle Drive within the boundary of a National Park and National Historic Landmark District is a challenging and complicated task with great public and private interest. We salute your efforts to correct the unsafe conditions on Doyle Drive while causing the least possible harm and disruption to the natural, cultural and recreational resources of the Presidio.

Doyle Drive serves a critical role in the performance of our mission to preserve and enhance the natural environment and cultural resources of the coastal lands north and south of the Golden Gate for the inspiration, education, and recreation of people today, and for future generations by linking park sites to the north and south of the Golden Gate Bridge. Improving the unsafe conditions that currently exist on Doyle Drive is one of our highest transportation priorities.

For the past 6 years, GGNRA, acting in its capacity as a Cooperating Agency for the Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study has participated in support of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's (SFTA) efforts to correct the unsafe conditions that currently exist on Doyle Drive, the south access to the Golden Gate Bridge. We are committed to the project and have devoted significant resources to the preparation and review of the Environmental Impact Statement/Report and the technical studies that analyze project impact on the National Park and neighboring areas.

Prior to the conversion of the Presidio of San Francisco from an Army Installation to a National Park on October 1, 1994, GGNRA prepared The Presidio of San Francisco General Management Plan Amendment (July 1994) which established the following five objectives for the replacement of Doyle Drive. All of these objectives have been adopted in the Doyle Drive DEIS/R.

- To redesign the Doyle Drive corridor as a parkway rather than a freeway
- To respect the Presidio of San Francisco's status as a national historic landmark district in redesign options
- To minimize the effects of noise and other pollution from the parkway on natural areas and recreational qualities at Crissy Field and other areas adjacent to the highway
- To improve the Presidio of San Francisco entrance and circulation features as part of the Doyle Drive redesign
- To maintain the functions that the Doyle Drive corridor serves as part of the regional and city transportation network

The parkway concept was intended to blend the roadway into the sensitive setting of the Presidio, a National Historic Landmark District, by breaking up the mass and scale of the roadway. This lighter-handed approach was also intended to result in a traffic calming effect underscoring that motorists are no longer on a freeway but rather within the boundaries of a National Park and in a transition zone between the freeway that ends at the Golden Gate Bridge and the urban streets that begin at Richardson Avenue. Natural, cultural and recreational resource specialists from GGNRA staff have worked closely with the transportation agencies and consultants to share with them our knowledge of the Presidio's unique resources to insure that every possible effort was being taken to minimize harm to the National Park while implementing the National Park's vision for the transformation of Doyle Drive from a freeway to a parkway.

These efforts have resulted in Alternative 5, the Parkway Alternative, which achieves our vision for Doyle Drive and achieves the objectives outlined in the project's statement of Purpose and Need. GGNRA supports the Parkway Alternative's the Hook Ramp Option over the Loop Ramp Option because of the Loop Ramps greater impacts to natural resources and visual impacts from Crissy Field and the San Francisco Bay. 1

We also support the Diamond Option which preserves the YMCA pool rather than Circle Option which would require demolition of the pool. We do not see that the traffic improvements that result from the Merchant Road Slip Ramp Option are worth its construction cost or its impacts to the National Park. Therefore, we do not support including it in the Doyle Drive project. 1 Cont

The application of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Context Sensitive Design philosophy to Doyle Drive and the development of planning and design standards in response to the sensitive setting of the Presidio, a National Historic Landmark District (NHLD) has resulted in a narrower, slower parkway that responds to its surroundings and minimizes harm to National Park resources. Numerous exceptions to Caltrans design standards have been applied for and granted that have helped move the roadway away from the Cavalry Stables and narrow Doyle Drive's width between the National Cemetery and Batteries Blaney, Sherwood and Slaughter so that these coastal defense batteries that are contributing elements to the NHLD could be preserved. Efforts to modify Caltrans' design standards have continued beyond release of the Draft environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) in support of design refinements that would curve and separate the elements of causeway over Tennessee Hollow, proposed in the Parkway Alternative, to allow the maximum possible level of light under the structure in an effort to insure the viability of the proposed restoration of a functioning riparian corridor and freshwater marsh transition to Crissy Marsh and the expansion of "three habitats that are disappearing statewide - riparian, freshwater wetland, and tidal wetland' General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA, p.38). These modifications to Caltrans design standards to preserve and protect park resources has resulted in a narrower, more curvilinear parkway that will help slow down drivers as they approach the city streets to the east of the Presidio.

The tunnel components of the parkway reestablish links within the Presidio that were severed when Doyle Drive was constructed. The link over the tunnel adjacent to the National Cemetery will give park visitors an opportunity to experience the Coastal Defense Batteries sited on the serpentine bluffs above Crissy Field. The coastal batteries protected San Francisco from military invasion from this prominent position with commanding views over San Francisco Bay. Pedestrian links over the tunnel will reconnect this area which is virtually inaccessible to visitors today to the National Cemetery and the Main Post allowing them to experience the batteries, spectacular views of San Francisco Bay and The Golden Gate Bridge, as well as the unique habitat along the coastal bluffs.

Our comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Report and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation are attached. We hope that our comments will contribute to the production of Final EIS/R that fully assesses the environmental impacts of the Doyle Drive replacement project on the Presidio of San Francisco, a National Park and National Historic Landmark District with unique cultural, natural and recreational resources. It is evident that considerable effort has been taken to adapt the alternatives in ways that are intended to minimize harm to the National Park.

The DEIS acknowledges unavoidable adverse effects to recreational, natural and cultural resources to include adverse effects to the NHLD. We are confident that the ongoing workshops to further reduce project impacts on park resources will continue to improve the project as it moves from planning into design. We look forward to continuing our participation in these efforts to minimize harm to the National Park and to develop design treatments that render the Parkway Alternative compatible with the surrounding National Historic Landmark District and to develop of measures and treatments to mitigate adverse impacts to recreational, natural and cultural resources.

We would like to express our appreciation for the efforts taken by the project's Cooperating Agencies, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR) and the transportation consultants who have all worked tirelessly to help achieve our mutual goal of replacing Doyle Drive with a parkway. We would also like to recognize the efforts of Michael Painter whose concept for a Parkway through the National Park exceeds even our own vision for a dramatic approach to the Golden Gate Bridge and a magnificent entrance to San Francisco and the National Park.

As a cooperating agency under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the GGNRA will continue to work with the transportation agencies in developing solutions that achieve all project goals. If you have any questions or concerns, please call Rick Foster, NPS Doyle Drive Project Liaison, at (415) 561-4472.

Sincerely,

Brian O'Neill
General Superintendent

Doyle Drive Draft EIS Comments March 29, 2006

Comment Number	Page Number	Comment Description	Initials	
1	Vi	The overall width of the parkway is not stated		2
2	xiii	It appears that the Circle Option increase the number of buildings removed to 14. Please confirm.		3
3		The burial of natural topography at the eastern end of the bluffs (over the tunnel) is not included.		4
4	xvii	The shade cast by the causeway could effect the movement of low-flying avian species through the wildlife corridor that links Crissy Marsh with Tennessee Hollow.		5
5		Tunnels – Include the need for careful evaluation of subsurface conditions during construction for design and installation of hydrologic conveyance system. In addition to the pre-design geotech work, a careful evaluation of subsurface conditions would also need to be done during construction to inform and refine the actual installation of the drains.		6
6	Section 3.2.1	The shade evaluation should be more thoroughly addressed in this section as it will have different impacts to the ability to successfully revegetate areas under the different alternatives. Shade discussion should include light amounts under structures.		7
7	3.2.1	Permanent Impacts for shade analysis not adequately assessed. We suggest that the analysis look at light intensity levels for different alternatives and what plants might be prevented from growing, particularly in relation to the gradient of habitats that would be a part of Tennessee Hollow and Marsh restoration projects: woodland, willow riparian, freshwater marsh, brackish marsh, and tidal marsh. The vegetation that can be established, as well as the gaps between the vegetation will partially determine the impacts to a restored corridor from Tennessee Hollow to Crissy Marsh.		8
8	3.2.1	The impacts to the corridor the causeway were not adequately assessed, in that there was not much differentiation among the alternatives described in the text. The assessment seemed largely based on generalizations for taxa based on professional judgment. Also, the impacts were not assessed using any sort of quantitative measure (such as the height/width ratio) or based on impacts to important plant or animal species that would be the focus of restoration efforts. The impacts should be assessed on the basis of the height and width of the causeway or viaduct structure, the light levels that would be expected below the structure, and the vegetation that could be established below the structure, as well as resultant gaps in		9

		vegetation. There is a basis in the scientific literature for the inclusion of all these variables as criteria in determining how great an impediment a raised highway structure is to wildlife movements. The impacts to the corridor need to be properly assessed to assist in weighing differences in the alternatives, and to guide the design of mitigations to reduce impacts to the corridor. The assessment should include impacts to habitat and vegetation under the corridor. Lack of vegetation and/or large gaps in vegetation may prevent some animals from moving under the structure. The analysis should consider a gradient of habitats for the proposed restoration efforts including woodland, willow riparian, freshwater marsh, brackish marsh, and tidal marsh. Two or three key plant species for each habitat type should be selected for impact analysis that could examine plant vigor, density, areal coverage, and gaps in vegetation. In addition, a few key animals that we would expect to be targets of the restored corridor from the marsh to Tennessee Hollow should be considered. Some possibilities would be salt marsh common yellowthroat, yellow warbler, black-crowned night-herons, and belted kingfishers. No Build Alternative: The existing structure would impede some wildlife movements. However, this structure is the highest and least wide of the alternatives. This structure would provide for the most light and establishment of vegetation within the Tennessee Hollow—Crissy Marsh corridor. This alternative would be the best for wildlife passage. Replace and Widen: This structure would be the same height as existing, but would be nearly twice as wide. This structure would have a height to width ratio ½ that of the no build, indicating lower value for wildlife passage. There would be more shade, but the possibility of establishing some shade tolerant species, including trees and shrubs. This structure could still provide passage for wildlife due to the height of the viaduct and vegetation underneath. The greater width of the structure would make it a greater impediment to wildlife movements than the No Build. Parkway Alternative: This structure is the lowest and widest, and has the lowest height to width ratio, indicating it could be the worst for wildlife passage. It has been assessed that vegetation would probably not establish under the causeway. As such, this alternative provides the greatest impediment to wildlife movements. We probably would only have wildlife that routinely use culverts passing under this structure. This structure would probably preclude the movements of birds between the marsh and Tennessee Hollow. The Split Parkway design may improve the wildlife corridor underneath the causeway by allowing for more light and some vegetation in the spaces between sections of the causeway, but there still would be concern with the height of the viaducts that should be assessed for designated focal species of plants and animals.		9 Cont
9	3.2.1	The vision for Tennessee Hollow in the GMPA included a pedestrian trail to link Tennessee Hollow with Crissy Marsh. Please demonstrate whether this is feasible in both alternatives. Would the Parkway		10

		Alternative allow for human passage under the causeway?		10 Cont
10		This only addresses the light pollution with respect to people. The impact on darkness for wildlife should also be addressed.		11
11	3-39	Paragraph 2 states that "All build alternatives would involve standard construction techniques and require large scale construction of the proposed equipment and labor intensive activities. Yet, construction related noise impacts to Crissy Marsh are dismissed stating that "implementation of the measures specified in the **avoidance and minimization measures section** of this document will reduce negative noise effects. The effects on the Marsh of standard construction techniques were not evaluated. The document also suggests that "noisy construction activities **might** be completed using nighttime construction so that day time activities at the Crissy Center would not be disturbed." Since most construction activities listed on page 3-178 create noise levels greater than 5 dBA over the ambient noise levels at Crissy Center, a permit for night construction may be required. If it is not granted, night time construction activities **might not** be allowed. In that case address the impact of standard construction techniques, "noisy construction activities" on Crissy Center. The impact of standard construction impacts on the Crissy Center has not been fully addressed for the alternatives in Section 3.2.4 Community Impacts. We suggest meeting with Crissy Center Staff to get a better understanding of their transportation access needs during construction and the impacts of standard construction activities on their operations during construction. Unless the EIS makes a definite commitment to full implementation of all of the measures specified in the **avoidance and minimization measures** section of the document, to include a discussion of retrofitting windows with high sound transmission class (STC) windows, standard construction impacts need to be addressed for all of the alternatives.		12
12	3-47	The evaluation of parking impacts during the construction period does not identify a loss of parking in the Mason Street Warehouse Area. Can Alternative 2 with Detour be constructed without the loss of parking in this area?		13
13	3-47	Impacts on the recreational parking at East Beach that may result from the loss of 619 parking spaces in the Crissy Field-PX/Commissary area, 368 spaces in the Palace of Fine Arts area and other parking losses during construction have not been evaluated. Increased use of East Beach Parking by area A visitors and employees during the construction period could result in reduced visitor satisfaction and the need for additional enforcement of parking restrictions in the area and a requirement for increased manpower to provide this accelerated level of enforcement.		14

14	3-49	The Parking evaluation groups the Crissy Center in the Crissy Field-PX/Commissary area in exhibits 3-9 and 3-10 which indicate that the current requirement for parking in the area is 218 and that only 76 of those spaces will be available during the construction phase of the project. It is not clear in the EIS how close these spaces will be to the Crissy Field Center or how the loss of parking will impact programs at the Center. Please clarify.		15
15	3-51	Alternative 5 straightens the northern section of Halleck Street, shifting it to the east into the 108 space parking lot that was constructed for the Crissy Center. The spaces that remain after construction will be on the same side of Halleck as the center and visitors will not have to cross a busy street to enter the center. As mitigation for the loss of parking by the relocation of Halleck to the east. We recommend expanding the parking lot to the west into the current location of Halleck Street as soon as Halleck Street is reopened in its new alignment.		16
16	3-52	The document now states that it is not known if the removal of buildings 1182, 1183, 1184 and 1185 will be temporary or permanent. Permanent removal of these buildings has never been discussed or agreed to. Removal would only be allowed if it could be assured that they would be returned to their original location in the final phase of construction.		17
17	3-59	The document states here that "Operational as well as construction noise impacts during the construction phase of the proposed project could be minimized by management at the Crissy Center and the construction contractor. Together, they could aid in reducing or eliminating potential noise impacts through careful coordination between noisy construction activities and noise sensitive activities at the Crissy Center." However, page 3-9 Paragraph 2 states that "All build alternatives would involve standard construction techniques and require large scale construction of the proposed equipment and labor intensive activities. The document also suggests that "noisy construction activities **might** be completed using nighttime construction so that day time activities at the Crissy Center would not be disturbed." Since most construction activities listed on page 3-178 create noise levels greater that 5 dBA over the ambient noise levels at Crissy Center, a permit for night construction may be required. If it is not granted, night time construction activities **might not** be allowed. . The impact of standard construction impacts on the Crissy Center has not been fully addressed in Section 3.2.7 **Environmental Justice** for Alternatives 2 and 5. The document states on page 3-59 "Operational as well as construction impacts during the construction phase of the proposed project could be minimized by management of the Crissy Field Center and the construction contractor." Address the options that will be available to minimize standard construction noise impacts on the Crissy Center. We suggest meeting with Crissy Center Staff to get a better understanding of the noise		18

		sensitive activities at the Crissy Center, transportation access needs during construction and the impacts of standard construction activities on their operations during construction. Unless the EIS makes a definite commitment to full implementation of all of the measures specified in the **avoidance and minimization measures** section of the document, to include a discussion of retrofitting windows with high sound transmission class (STC) windows, standard construction impacts need to be addressed for all of the alternatives. • .		18 Cont
18	3-88	Alternative 2 states that "additional spillback from westbound Lombard Street would occur unless the Richardson northbound slip ramp to Marshall is maintained. Page 2-43 states "The current Presidio access for northbound traffic at the east end of Doyle Drive can not be accommodated due to geometric constraints and concerns for traffic safety. If the slip ramp can not remain, the impact of the spillback on local streets and intersections should be described in greater detail, to include how far the spillback will back up on Lombard Street and how cut through traffic will impact local streets and intersections.		19
19	3-99	Alternative 2. No-Detour Option raises the low viaduct structures more that 6 feet and doubles its width. This significant increase in the mass and scale of the roadway significantly increases the visual and physical separation between the upper and lower post that was created along the bluffs between the National Cemetery and Halleck Street when Doyle Drive was first constructed. The boundary, created by the bluffs, marks a functional separation between the urban functions of the upper post and the industrial functions that occurred in the lower post. Alternative 2's mass and scale covers such a vast expanse along the bluffs that this character defining element of the Presidio will be obscured.		20
20	3-114	Add to Para 4 discussion of Alt 2 No-Detour--The significant increase in the mass and scale of the low viaduct that results from raising its elevation by more that 6 feet and doubling its width significantly increases the visual and physical separation between the upper and lower post that was created along the bluffs between the National Cemetery and Halleck Street when Doyle Drive was first constructed. The boundary, created by the bluffs, marks a functional separation between the urban functions of the upper post and the industrial functions that occurred in the lower post. Alternative 2 No-Detour covers such a vast expanse along the bluffs that this character defining element of the Presidio will be obscured.		21
21	3-115	Alt 5 Para 1. Please clarify how will this section be modified to include the recommendations of the DEIS review meeting to relocate rather than demolish buildings 204 and 230, to raise the elevation of building 228 and to leave the portion of building 201 that can be saved in place. This discussion should note that building 204 was moved from its original location when Doyle Drive was first constructed. A portion of		22

		building 204 was also removed at some time in the past.		
22	3-119	Relocation: Please clarify how will this section be modified to include the recommendations of the DEIS review meeting to relocate rather than demolish buildings 204 and 230, to raise the elevation of building 228 and to leave the portion of building 201 that can be saved in place. This discussion should note that building 204 was moved from its original location when Doyle Drive was first constructed. A portion of building 204 was also removed at some time in the past.		23
23	3-106	Regulatory Setting Para 2 line 7 change as to an		24
24	3-106	Regulatory Setting Para 4 line 8 change included to include		25
25	3-114	Last Para states Mason Street Warehouses are expected to be replaced to their original location. It should say "will" be put back if removed. This comment was made on the Admin DEIS. If this change is not to be made please provide clarification on this decision. It is not in the current comment matrix showing Authority responses to Admin DEIS comments).		26
26	3-115	Alt 5 Para 2 line 8 add Marshall Street		27
27	3-116	Preparation of Historic Structure Reports. We suggest referencing the standards established in "Preservation Brief 43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structure Reports," by Deborah Slaton, published by Heritage Preservation Services, National Park Service, 2005.		28
28	3-117	Archaeology Monitoring, Discovery, Evaluation and Treatment Plan. Please include a discussion of any plans to conduct further consultation with Ohlone tribes and individuals as planning and design proceed.		29
29	3-118	The last sentence of the 1st Para "Efforts to comply with NAGPRA will also be included as will also be described." Is confusing.		30
30	3-125	Para 4 line 6. Change "involved in" to "planning for" -- the public process hasn't started yet.		31
31	3-137	Text refers to an Exhibit showing contaminated sites, but the Exhibit is not in the document		32
32		2nd bullet under Flood Protection from Extreme Tidal Events – The below ground parking north of the Gorgas warehouse mentioned here is not fully characterized and evaluated throughout the document. It would be useful to see this evaluation and determination. If the potential impacts to hydrology and groundwater resources associated with the proposed single-level underground parking structure at the Gorgas Warehouses were evaluated and determined to be less than significant, the analysis should be presented in the EIS/R.		33
33		Maintenance of Hydrologic Conditions at the Main Post Tunnel – It would be helpful to include a cross		34

		section of this tunnel. It is not clear from the illustrations that there are no seeps or springs that could be affected by this structure. There is no new cross section of the fill on the face of the low bluff.		34 Cont
34		Exhibit 3-35 The proposed tunnel should be shown as a cut-and-cover tunnel.		35
45		1st partial paragraph, last two sentences – these statements contradict one another. Clarify why the groundwater table would rise. Note that the topography will be changed dramatically here by the placement of fill. This needs an illustration. The discussion of groundwater in fill is confusing.		36
36	3-137	Managing Water Quality from Construction Dewatering – 2nd paragraph – include discussion of the remediation sites in the project area.		37
37	3-140	Hydrology, Water Quality and Storm water -- Regulatory Setting – add brief discussion of relevant NPS policies (similar to that for Air Quality.) NPS Policies 2001, Section 4.6, Water Resources management should be referenced here.		38
38	3-146	New Exhibit 3-43 shows "soil" and "bedrock" which is a common way to differentiate for the purposes of ease of excavation; it should be clarified that much of the "soil" included here appears to be Colma. The differences between the volumes on Exhibit 2-31 and 3-43 should be clarified.		39
39	3-178-179	**Noise Impacts to Crissy Field Center** The EIS/R states "To minimize construction noise impacts during the construction phase of the project, management of the Crissy Field Center and the construction contractor can aid in reducing or eliminating potential noise impacts by careful coordination between noisy construction activities and noise sensitive Center Activities. An example might be that the noisy construction activities **might** be completed using nighttime construction so that day time activities at the Center would not be disturbed." Since most construction activities listed on page 3-178 create noise levels greater that 5 dBA over the ambient noise levels at Crissy Center, a permit for night construction may be required. If it is not granted, night time construction activities **might not** be allowed. In that case what is the impact of daytime "noisy construction activities" on the noise sensitive educational programs at Crissy Center? Alt. 2 Detour constructs, operates and demolishes a detour structure approximately 15 feet from the back of the Crissy Center. The impact of these activities appears to be different from the noise impacts associated with Alt 2 No-Detour and Alt 5; yet, the document states that the temporary impacts for the three alternatives are generally the same and they are discussed as one impact. The discussion of retrofitting windows with windows with a high sound transmission class (STC) did not include the Crissy Center.		40
40	3-148	The discussion should emphasize that Alternative 5 takes out 5 times more material (Exhibit 2-31) or 15 times more native soil and rock (Exhibit 3-43).		41

41	3-178	**Noise Impacts to Crissy Field Marsh** Page 3-39 Paragraph 2 states that "All build alternatives would involve standard construction techniques and require large scale construction of the proposed equipment and labor intensive activities. However, Section 3.3.5 page 3-178 states that implementing the measures specified in the avoidance and minimization measures section of this document will reduce negative noise effects on Crissy Field Marsh. However in the **Measures to Minimize Construction Noise.** Page 3-196. EIS/R does not commit to any of these measures except to say that to the "extent feasible, the contractor will ensure that these measures are taken." Unless the document can make an official commitment to implement the measures to minimize construction noise, the impact of standard construction practices referenced on page 3-39 on Crissy Marsh and the Crissy Field Center must be included in the EIS /R. These standard construction technique noise impacts should be evaluated for both day time and night time construction activities.		42
42	3-179 through 3-181	The information presented for each plant community type is unbalanced in terms of the amount of information provided for each plant community.		43
43	3-195	The Crissy Center should be included in the discussion of noise insulation and retrofitting windows.		44
44	3-196	**Measures to Minimize Construction Noise** This section of the EIS/R does not commit to any of these measures except to say that to the "extent feasible, the contractor will ensure that these measures are taken." The noise levels generated by the measures proposed in this section should be provided and compared with the noise levels presented in Exhibit 3-52.		45
45	3-205	Energy – Include energy consumption estimates for construction for each of the alternatives.		46
46	3-215	Non-native Introduced Forest paragraph – clarify that the pine, cypress, and eucalyptus, where they occur within the Historic Forest Management Zone, are designated as a cultural resource in the Presidio VMP, but where they occur within the Native Plant Zone of the PVMP, they are considered invasive non-native species.		47
47	3-215	In addition to the direct impacts to skunkweed and gumplant that have been called out, other species with unique value and potential habitat for various plant species will be lost as a result of the loss of varying amounts of natural community types under each alternative. For example, the following special status species will lose potential habitat within the construction corridor: Franciscan thistle (Cirsium andrewsii), Presidio manzanita (Arctostaphylos hookeri ssp. ravenii), Presidio clarkia (Clarkia franciscana), and Marin		48

		dwarf flax (Hesperolinon congestum). In addition, significant propagule collection sites for red and blue elderberry will be impacted under all build alternatives.		48 Cont
48	3-217	Northern Foredunes Community Description should include statement indicating that The Crissy Field dune community is identified as a Special Ecological Area (SEA) by NPS. Also supports many special status plants. This information should be included here		49
49	3-217	Why are the northern foredune, central dune scrub and freshwater wetland communities at Crissy Field lumped under the description for the "restored marsh and associated wetlands". This is inconsistent with how other community types are presented. All of these communities should be described individually; each supports special status plant species. The freshwater wetland (dune swale) east of Crissy marsh is an area of very high plant diversity, and provides nesting habitat for red-winged blackbirds. This area should be identified.		50
50	3-218	Text should be added to refer the reader to a standard source book on BMPs. e.g., Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual (2003).		51
51	3-218	Under "Non-native vegetation", add text to indicate other types of measures that may be implemented to reduce erosion and weed establishment. Contractor should work with Presidio natural resources staff to ensure adequacy of weed control methods.		52
52	3-225	Wetlands and other Waters… National Park Service and Presidio Trust Plans and Policies – This paragraph belongs in Section 3.4.1 or 3.4.3. Replace it here with NPS/PT wetland policy statement. Move paragraph from p. 3-225 to p. 3-210, and add NPS Wetland policy statement		53
53	3-229	Exhibit 3-68 – The Tennessee Hollow Corridor should be represented as it is on other illustrations. Add Crissy Marsh Expansion Study Area boundary.		54
54	3-229	Exhibit 3-68 incorrectly depicts the USACE jurisdictional wetland at Dragonfly Creek as larger than the Cowardin wetland. As a rule, the Cowardin wetland polygons should always be as large as or larger than the USACE jurisdictional wetlands.		55
55	3-229	Exhibit 3-68 may cause confusion between the USACE and Cowardin wetlands. All wetlands that are depicted as USACE wetlands should also be depicted as Cowardin wetlands. For example, wetland W-2 is shown as blue, when it should be classified as both a USACE and Cowardin wetland; in this case the polygons are identical.		56
56	3-231/2	The discussion of impacts to wetlands is limited to wetlands within the construction corridor. Need		57

		discussion of impacts to wetlands in project study area.		57 Cont
57	3-235	Biological Resource Monitoring Program referenced here, as described in previous section was a construction monitoring program and would not be adequate to assess efficacy of mitigation measures.		58
58	3-238	Add VMP to list of NPS and Trust Plans and Policies at top of page .		59
59	3-239	2nd paragraph under “Special Status Species”: Change to Crissy Field Marsh and Dunes.		60
60	3-246	3rd paragraph, any seed mixtures or hydro seed used must first be approved by NPS and Trust NR.		61
61	3-253	Snowy plovers have shifted from “rare” to “regular” visitors in the Presidio.		62
62	3-254	See comment on wildlife corridor under 3.2.1. In addition, the wildlife corridor over the tunnel to the west of the causeway is not the same in terms of habitat value. There probably would be different species using the corridors between Tennessee Hollow and Crissy Marsh and the habitat over the tunnel. The habitat over the tunnel does not adequately mitigate for the loss of habitat connectivity under the causeway in the Parkway alternative.		63
63	General	Total number of wetland acreage listed in text does not agree with that shown in Exhibit 3-63. Please check for consistency throughout.		64
64		5th paragraph, 1st sentence: Modify to read, “most of the …wetlands, with the exception of the restored wetlands at Crissy Field… “.		65
65		Hydrology, Water Quality, Storm Runoff; and Wetlands– Presidio Parkway Impacts (permanent, temporary, and cumulative) – modify all 6 statements to read “Significant; less than significant with successful mitigation.”		66
66	4-6	Add Marshall Street to the first sentence at the top of the page		67
67	4-10	Para 2 line 5 delete "and vary little between alternatives"		68
68	5-11	The discussion of cumulative impacts on hydrology should be more comprehensive.		69
69	5-16	Add Marshall Street to line 5 of Para 2.		70
70	C-1	The discussion of Replace and Widen No-Detour Option in the last paragraph does not address the visual		71

		impact of raising the low viaduct by 6 feet and doubling its width. This impact in not shown clearly in the visual simulations nor is it described adequately in the document.		71 Cont
71	C-2	Para 1 Lighting. The reduction of fugitive light from cars and light fixtures on the roadway in areas where the Parkway is in tunnel has not been identified as a positive aspect of the Parkway Alternative. This type of fugitive light as well as noise from the roadway will be greatly reduced if not eliminated in portions of the Parkway that are in tunnel.		72
72	C-10	Add to Para 4 discussion of Alt 2 No-Detour--The significant increase in the mass and scale of the low viaduct that results from raising its elevation by more that 6 feet and doubling its width significantly increases the visual and physical separation between the upper and lower post that was created along the bluffs between the National Cemetery and Halleck Street when Doyle Drive was first constructed. The boundary, created by the bluffs, marks a functional separation between the urban functions of the upper post and the industrial functions that occurred in the lower post. Alternative 2 No-Detour covers such a vast expanse along the bluffs that this character defining element of the Presidio will be obscured.		73
73	5-20	Under Historic Resources, the No Detour Option, and the two Parkway options should also be described as Potential Adverse Effects. That's what the narrative on the preceding pages says.		74
74	7-48	**Interpretive/Educational Materials and Popular Report Interpretive** signage and interpretive material will be needed during construction to explain the Doyle Drive construction project to National Park visitors. Signage and interpretative material will also be needed to show how elements of the cultural landscape and contributing structures have been moved, demolished or altered.		75

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for the Hook Ramp Option and Diamond Drive Option noted. In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1742
2	The width of the parkway was included in the FEIS/R, see discussion under 2.4.3 for the Presidio Parkway Alternative and 2.5.1 for the Preferred Alternative.	1743
3	The Circle Drive option would require the permanent removal of 10 buildings.	1744
4	The natural topography (1875 topography) has already been altered in this area as described in the discussion of Topography and Natural Features in Section 3.3.2.	1745
5	The discussion under Wildlife Corridor in Section 3.4.4 of the FEIS/R noted this impact: "Passage under raised structures and causeways would be difficult for some bird species." The EIS/R does provide an analysis of shade, using best available information (see the Plans and Policies Section under the PTMP discussion of Section 3.2.1) and is available as part of the Community Impact Assessment technical document. Developing a mitigation program for shade effect is part of the "Mitigation Prospectus" also included in Appendix K. Mitigations will be formalized as part of the Record of Decision and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. A binding Memorandum of Agreement or Understanding between the lead agency and the NPS and Trust will be prepared to ensure the implementation of the wetland mitigation measures. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the GGNRA and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Quarter Master Reach during final design. The text clearly states that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1746
6	These activities will occur as part of the pre-design phase of the project.	1747
7	The EIS/R does provide an analysis of shade (in the Plans and Policies section under the PTMP discussion of Section 3.2.1) using best available information and is available as part of the Community Impact Assessment technical document. Developing a mitigation program for shade effect is part of the "Mitigation Prospectus," also included in Appendix K. Mitigation measures will be formalized as part of the Record of Decision and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. A binding Memorandum of Agreement or Understanding between the lead agency and the NPS and Trust will be prepared to ensure the implementation of the wetland mitigation measures. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the GGNRA and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Quarter Master Reach during final design. The text was revised to clearly state that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1748

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
8	The EIS/R does provide an analysis of shade (in the Plans and Policies section under the PTMP discussion of Section 3.2.1) using best available information and is available as part of the Community Impact Assessment technical document. Developing a mitigation program for shade effect is part of the "Mitigation Prospectus," also included in Appendix K. Mitigation measures will be formalized as part of the Record of Decision and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. A binding Memorandum of Agreement or Understanding between the lead agency and the NPS and Trust will be prepared to ensure the implementation of the wetland mitigation measures. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the GGNRA and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Quarter Master Reach during final design. The text was revised to clearly state that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1749
9	The discussion of the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor connection to Crissy Marsh in Section 3.2.1 was enhanced with more detailed discussion of each alternative alignment in the area and includes graphics depicting the area of restoration which will be available under each alternative. Information regarding the shade issue is included in the Plans and Policies section under the PTMP discussion of Section 3.2.1 of the FEIS/R. Conclusions are correctly interpreted but somewhat qualitative. Further detail of the shade analysis is available in Appendix B of the Final Community Impact Assessment (August 2006) which is included on CD with DEIS/R, additional copies available on request. The EIS cannot effectively model or predict complex suites of plant and animal responses to the project, except to conclude that, overall, this is not significant in the context of the existing environment. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the NPS and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Tennesse Hollow restoration during final design. The text was revised to clearly state that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1750
10	The discussion of the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor connection to Crissy Marsh in Section 3.2.1 has been enhanced with more detailed discussion of each alternative alignment in the area and includes graphics depicting the area of restoration which will be available under each alternative. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the NPS and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Tennesse Hollow restoration during final design. The text has been revised to clearly state that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1751

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
11	The topic of impact of night lighting is discussed in Section 3.4.4: "Night construction would require lighting, which adds another type of impact beyond the effects of noise discussed above/elsewhere in this FEIS. There are current sources of night lighting in the project area and to some degree it is part of the existing environment. However, construction lighting is expected to be considerably brighter. This raises the possibility of light as an attractant, especially for migratory birds, a phenomenon observed by Reed et al. (1985). This would be an adverse impact but one for which an assessment of degree would be difficult to determine. The same study found that shielding lights to prevent upward radiation decreased attraction by nearly 40 percent. The NPS/Trust have made a determination that the effects may be potentially considerable; therefore the reduction of upward radiation by the best available and feasible means (for example, downward-pointing lights, side shields and visors) as agreed upon by the NPS and Trust will be used at Doyle Drive, and would be considered part of the project. In order to insure the use of best available current data, a Lighting Plan will be developed as part of final design to mitigate fugitive light to the maximum extent practicable. Other methods of impact reduction (large screens, for example) would have their own impact on night flying birds and bats and would not be used."	1752
12	During final design, construction noise abatement details will be developed and included as part of the construction contract documents. The contract documents will contain the appropriate controls to meet the all applicable state and local requirements. This would include noise specifications for the operation and maintenance of equipment, noise screening and/or use of noise-reducing features on equipment and vehicles, haul routes and noise monitoring. Although construction noise impacts to the human environment at Crissy Field Marsh are not anticipated, construction noise monitoring will be included as part of the Construction Noise Plan. While Crissy Field Marsh is located at a substantial distance from the construction site and is not expected to be adversely affected by construction noise, the construction noise monitoring will provide reasonable assurance that noise impacts to Crissy Field Marsh will be minimized. Since nearly all of the usage of Crissy Field Marsh is influenced by the existing traffic noise from Mason Street and the environmental sounds dominated by the winds off of the Bay, the potential of adverse impacts on the human environment are minimal. The FEIS/R identifies noise (as well as vibration) impact minimization efforts that are practical for the Preferred Alternative (noted in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5). After considerable efforts to identify a method to minimize or eliminate the potential impacts at the Crissy Center from the TCD, it has been determined that practical methods to accomplish this is very limited. Therefore, based on the concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Crissy Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location.	1753
13	Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway Alternative, was identified as the Preferred Alternative (see Section 2.5). Replacement parking at the Parade Grounds has been proposed to address any project-related impacts during construction. Details pertaining to the proposed replacement parking would be developed in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1754

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
14	The proposed replacement parking at the Parade Grounds augmented with the existing shuttle service should address the identified parking impacts during construction. Details pertaining to the proposed replacement parking would be developed in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project. Parking will be coordinated with the Presidio Trust. The concern of a change in parking conditions in the East Beach area during construction is legitimate. Parking will continue to be monitored especially during the construction period, and mitigations may be modified accordingly to address impacts.	1755
15	Based on the Addendum to the September 2004 Final Parking Impact Analysis Technical Report which was prepared following the selection of the Preferred Alternative and using the revised building use assumptions and parking supply conditions, it was determined that sufficient parking supply would be provided to meet the demand within the PX/Commissary Area (where the Crissy Field Center is located) during construction. Although some existing parking would be eliminated during the construction period, enough replacement parking would be provided near the Crissy Center near the site of Building 605 following its removal.	1756
16	Based on the Addendum to the September 2004 Final Parking Impact Analysis Technical Report which was prepared following the selection of the Preferred Alternative and using the revised building use assumptions and parking supply conditions, it was determined that sufficient parking supply would be provided to meet the demand within the PX/Commissary Area (where the Crissy Field Center is located) during construction. Although some existing parking would be eliminated during the construction period, enough replacement parking would be provided near the Crissy Center near the site of Building 605 following its removal.	1757
17	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Buildings 1182, 1183, 1184 and 1185 will remain intact.	1758
18	During final design, construction noise abatement details will be developed and become part of the construction contract documents. The contract documents will contain the appropriate controls to meet the all applicable state and local requirements. This would include noise specifications for the operation and maintenance of equipment, noise screening and/or use of noise-reducing features on equipment and vehicles, haul routes and noise monitoring. Although construction noise impacts to the human environment at Crissy Field Marsh are not anticipated, construction noise monitoring will be included as part of the Construction Noise Plan. While Crissy Field Marsh is located at a substantial distance from the construction site and is not expected to be adversely affected by construction noise, the construction noise monitoring will provide reasonable assurance that noise impacts to Crissy Field Marsh will be minimized. Since nearly all of the usage of Crissy Field Marsh is influenced by the existing traffic noise from Mason Street and the environmental sounds dominated by the winds off of the Bay, the potential of adverse impacts on the human environment are minimal. The FEIS/R identifies noise (as well as vibration) impact minimization efforts that are practical for the Preferred Alternative (noted in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5). After considerable efforts to identify a method to minimize or eliminate the potential impacts at the Crissy Center from the TCD, it has been determined that practical methods to accomplish this is very limited. Therefore, based on the concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Crissy Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location.	1759

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
19	Alternative 2 and the Slip Ramp were not carried through as the locally preferred alternative.	1760
20	The text under the discussion of Permanent Impacts to Alternative 2-Replace and Widen of Section 3.2.10 has been revised to include the points raised in the comment. The visual effects sited in the comment are consistent with the findings in the EIS and Visual Impact Assessment and provide additional examples of why Alternative 2- No Detour Option was found to result in an adverse impact to viewpoints at the Main Post.	1761
21	The analysis for Alternative 2 adequately reflects the impact of the project on the Presidio NHLD.	1762
22	The analysis now reflects the Presidio Trust's decision to demolish Buildings 204 and 230, retain the upper story of Building 201, and leave Building 228 at its current elevation.	1763
23	This comment was addressed as part of the development of the Programmatic Agreement and treatment plans and a summary is provided in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R.	1764
24	Text has been revised as suggested	1765
25	Text has been revised as suggested	1766
26	Putting the buildings back as mitigation is not part of the project description. In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore the Mason Street Warehouses will not be removed and will remain intact.	1767
27	Text has been revised as suggested	1768
28	This reference was included in the discussion under Preparation of Historic Structures Reports in Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R.	1769
29	Text regarding the consultation with the Ohlone tribe was included in the discussion under Archaeology Monitoring, Discovery, Evaluation and Treatment Plan in Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R.	1770
30	Text regarding the NAGPRA under Archaeology Monitoring, Discovery, Evaluation and Treatment Plan in Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R has been revised.	1771

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
31	The text under Existing Watershed Basins and Drainages in Section 3.3.1 has been modified as requested. The text has been changed to read as follows: "The Trust, National Park Service, and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy are currently planning for a public planning/NEPA process for the Crissy Marsh expansion project...."	1772
32	The exhibit showing hazardous material sites within the study area is included as Exhibit 3-54 in Section 3.3.3 of the FEIS/R.	1773
33	The underground parking option referred to by the comment is no longer a component of the project.	1774
34	A cross section of this tunnel is included in the Hydrology and Water Resources Technical Report (which is incorporated into the DEIS/R by reference). No wetlands were identified in the vicinity of the Main Post Tunnel fill area, and therefore no important springs on the bluff are known to be present. The lack of springs and wetlands in this area was confirmed by consultation with the biology team.	1775
35	It appears that the commenter is referring to Exhibit 3-49 in Section 3.3.1, which shows the tunnel through the bluff area. This figure has been modified to show that geologic material over the completed tunnel would be backfill, not native formation.	1776
36	The text under Alteration of Surface and Near Surface Hydrology at the Main Post Tunnel in Section 3.3.1 has been changed to clarify the description of groundwater conditions. A cross-section of the tunnel through this area is also included, see Exhibit 3-49.	1777
37	The text under Groundwater of Section 3.3.1 has been modified to include the following statement: "Discussion of hazardous materials and remediation sites is provided in Section 3.3.3 Hazardous Waste/Materials of this document."	1778
38	The text under Regulatory Setting of Section 3.3.1 has been modified to include the following discussion of policies: National Park Service and Presidio Trust Water Resources Policies - The National Park Service (NPS) and the Presidio Trust provide additional emphasis on water resources. While there are no existing national or state water standards that are specific to the Presidio or national parks, the following lists the titles of existing NPS policies set forth in its Director's Orders and Executive Orders which provide general policy direction in promoting floodplain and wetlands management: Executive Order No. 11988 - Floodplain Management, Executive Order 11990 - Protection of Wetlands.	1779
39	Note was added to clarify that much of the soil will be the Colma Formation. The difference between the volumes will be clarified. Exhibit 2-37 in Section 2.6 includes all soil/rock removed and fill placed; Exhibit 3-53 in Section 3.3.2 only includes native soil/rock.	1780

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
40	During final design, construction noise abatement details will be developed and become part of the construction contract documents. The contract documents will contain the appropriate controls to meet the all applicable state and local requirements. This would include noise specifications for the operation and maintenance of equipment, noise screening and/or use of noise-reducing features on equipment and vehicles, haul routes and noise monitoring. Although construction noise impacts to the human environment at Crissy Field Marsh are not anticipated, construction noise monitoring will be included as part of the Construction Noise Plan. While Crissy Field Marsh is located at a substantial distance from the construction site and is not expected to be adversely affected by construction noise, the construction noise monitoring will provide reasonable assurance that noise impacts to Crissy Field Marsh will be minimized. Since nearly all of the usage of Crissy Field Marsh is influenced by the existing traffic noise from Mason Street and the environmental sounds dominated by the winds off of the Bay, the potential of adverse impacts on the human environment are minimal. The FEIS/R identifies noise (as well as vibration) impact minimization efforts that are practical for the Preferred Alternative (noted in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5). After considerable efforts to identify a method to minimize or eliminate the potential impacts at the Crissy Center from the TCD, it has been determined that practical methods to accomplish this is very limited. Therefore, based on the concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Crissy Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location.	1781
41	Exhibit 2-37 in Section 2.6 has been revised to include the volume of soil/rock excavated and then placed as fill. The analysis is based on a comparison of build alternatives to the existing condition and hence presented in total volumes.	1782
42	During final design, construction noise abatement details will be developed and become part of the construction contract documents. The contract documents will contain the appropriate controls to meet the all applicable state and local requirements. This would include noise specifications for the operation and maintenance of equipment, noise screening and/or use of noise-reducing features on equipment and vehicles, haul routes and noise monitoring. Although construction noise impacts to the human environment at Crissy Field Marsh are not anticipated, construction noise monitoring will be included as part of the Construction Noise Plan. While Crissy Field Marsh is located at a substantial distance from the construction site and is not expected to be adversely affected by construction noise, the construction noise monitoring will provide reasonable assurance that noise impacts to Crissy Field Marsh will be minimized. Since nearly all of the usage of Crissy Field Marsh is influenced by the existing traffic noise from Mason Street and the environmental sounds dominated by the winds off of the Bay, the potential of adverse impacts on the human environment are minimal. The FEIS/R identifies noise (as well as vibration) impact minimization efforts that are practical for the Preferred Alternative (noted in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5). After considerable efforts to identify a method to minimize or eliminate the potential impacts at the Crissy Center from the TCD, it has been determined that practical methods to accomplish this is very limited. Therefore, based on the concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Crissy Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location.	1783
43	The plant community discussions are appropriately proportional, since communities simpler in structure merit less description.	1784

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
44	During final design, construction noise abatement details will be developed and become part of the construction contract documents. The contract documents will contain the appropriate controls to meet the all applicable state and local requirements. This would include noise specifications for the operation and maintenance of equipment, noise screening and/or use of noise-reducing features on equipment and vehicles, haul routes and noise monitoring. Although construction noise impacts to the human environment at Crissy Field Marsh are not anticipated, construction noise monitoring will be included as part of the Construction Noise Plan. While Crissy Field Marsh is located at a substantial distance from the construction site and is not expected to be adversely affected by construction noise, the construction noise monitoring will provide reasonable assurance that noise impacts to Crissy Field Marsh will be minimized. Since nearly all of the usage of Crissy Field Marsh is influenced by the existing traffic noise from Mason Street and the environmental sounds dominated by the winds off of the Bay, the potential of adverse impacts on the human environment are minimal. The FEIS/R identifies noise (as well as vibration) impact minimization efforts that are practical for the Preferred Alternative (noted in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5). After considerable efforts to identify a method to minimize or eliminate the potential impacts at the Crissy Center from the TCD, it has been determined that practical methods to accomplish this is very limited. Therefore, based on the concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Crissy Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location.	1785
45	During final design, construction noise abatement details will be developed and become part of the construction contract documents. The contract documents will contain the appropriate controls to meet the all applicable state and local requirements. This would include noise specifications for the operation and maintenance of equipment, noise screening and/or use of noise-reducing features on equipment and vehicles, haul routes and noise monitoring. Although construction noise impacts to the human environment at Crissy Field Marsh are not anticipated, construction noise monitoring will be included as part of the Construction Noise Plan. While Crissy Field Marsh is located at a substantial distance from the construction site and is not expected to be adversely affected by construction noise, the construction noise monitoring will provide reasonable assurance that noise impacts to Crissy Field Marsh will be minimized. Since nearly all of the usage of Crissy Field Marsh is influenced by the existing traffic noise from Mason Street and the environmental sounds dominated by the winds off of the Bay, the potential of adverse impacts on the human environment are minimal. The FEIS/R identifies noise (as well as vibration) impact minimization efforts that are practical for the Preferred Alternative (noted in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5). After considerable efforts to identify a method to minimize or eliminate the potential impacts at the Crissy Center from the TCD, it has been determined that practical methods to accomplish this is very limited. Therefore, based on the concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Crissy Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location.	1786
46	Energy consumption estimates are in Section 3.3.6 and in Exhibit 3-77.	1787

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
47	Text has been revised under the discussion of Non-native Introduced Forest and Ornamental Wildlife Habitat in Section 3.4.1: "Where these species occur within the Historic Forest Management Zone, they are designated as a cultural resource in the NPS's Vegetation Management Plan."	1788
48	The FEIS/R discusses all of these species beginning under the discussion of Federal or State Listed or Potentially Listed Plants in Section 3.4.3. Explicitly: "None of the five federal or state listed plants are present in the construction corridor. The serpentine soil located in the northwestern portion of the project study area does not support Presidio manzanita, Presidio clarkia or Marin dwarf flax." Minimization of indirect effects to sensitive plants is discussed in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.4.3. The NEPA/CEQA process does not normally deal with habitat not occupied by a species of concern ("potential habitat"), except where impacts on native plant habitats are discussed more generally (as vegetation communities). See Section 3.4.1.	1789
49	Text under Northern Foredune in the Affect Environment of Section 3.4.1 was changed in response to this comment to include mention of the SEA.	1790
50	In the interest of a more concise document, the EIS/R only provides this level of detail only for communities subject to impact.	1791
51	There is now an added reference to revised chapter: Department of Transportation, State of California. 2003. Storm Water Quality Handbooks, Project Planning and Design Guide Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual.	1792
52	There is now an added reference to: Department of Transportation, State of California. 2003. Storm Water Quality Handbooks. Project Planning and Design Guide Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual. See the introduction of Section 3.4.	1793
53	National Park Service and Presidio Trust Plans and Policies information has been moved to the Regulatory Setting of Section 3.4.3.	1794
54	Exhibit 3-82 in Section 3.4.2 of the FEIS/R displays water associated features. In Tennessee Hollow, these are underground (at present) and this is what the dashed blue lines are intended to convey. While the EIS/R should incorporate information from any approved restoration plans provided by the NPS, Exhibit 3-82 is not intended to show future wetlands.	1795
55	There are some minor inconsistencies in the Exhibit 3-82, a result of different data sets being incorporated at different times. A footnote has been added under the Affected Environment discussion in Section 3.4.2: "As a mapping convention, polygons on Exhibit 3-82 are marked differently for Cowardin wetlands and Corps jurisdictional waters. However, the Cowardin system includes all Corps waters as well."	1796
56	There are some minor inconsistencies in the Exhibit 3-82, a result of different data sets being incorporated at different times. A footnote has been added under the Affected Environment discussion in Section 3.4.2: "As a mapping convention, polygons on Exhibit 3-82 are marked differently for Cowardin wetlands and Corps jurisdictional waters. However, the Cowardin system includes all Corps waters as well."	1797

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
57	There are no impacts to wetlands outside the construction corridor. The study area is a larger zone which allows the NEPA/CEQA analyst to consider indirect impacts.	1798
58	Comment noted. The basic purpose of monitoring is to ensure that mitigation measures are followed. In the construction phase, it will be staffed with professionally qualified biologists, and the program has the authority to stop or modify construction as necessary if impacts are occurring which were not analyzed in the DEIS/EIR. The commenter may be referring to post project "restoration" - type mitigation. As stated in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.4.2 : "Monitoring will occur during .... post-construction. Wetland mitigation monitoring will begin after the plants are installed on the site, and continue for a period of five years or until the plantings demonstrate successful establishment and the performance criteria have been met."	1799
59	The Vegetation Management Plan was listed at under the Regulatory Setting at the beginning of Section 3.4.1 as well as Section 3.4.3 of the FEIS/R.	1800
60	The text under Special-Status Species in the Affected Environment of Section 3.4.3 was revised as suggested.	1801
61	Text under Revegetation of Temporarily Disturbed Areas in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.4.3 of the FEIS/R states that all revegetation is carried out with NPS and Trust oversight.	1802
62	The text was modified as suggested.	1803

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
63	The EIS/R is limited by the analytical framework of NEPA and CEQA documents. The intent is to identify and mitigate potentially significant impacts and to make a full and public disclosure of these topics. The Doyle Drive project, under these procedures, would not normally be required undertake actions which redress the effects of less-than-significant impacts, or to develop elaborate and speculative discussions of what these effects might conceivably be. Any topic of natural history study is complex, expensive and time-consuming and the outcomes not necessarily definitive, nor are there mitigations which can reliably meet performance expectations when working beyond the limits of best available data and professional judgment. Many comments, beginning with this one dealing with invasive species, are of a similar type, and appear to recommend that the project take responsibility for many long-term land management issues that, while worthy, are beyond what such a project would normally do. However, the lead agency recognizes that the environment of the Presidio has special natural values that transcend the "normal." Therefore, as part of this process, a separate document has been prepared that expands the Project commitments outside the NEPA/CEQA process. This "Doyle Drive Project Wetland and Wildlife Corridor Mitigation Prospectus" is presented as an attachment in Appendix K of the FEIS/R. The FEIS/R concludes that given the existing conditions -- the impediments to wildlife movement already encountered by Presidio fauna -- and the ability of most animals to make their way under roadways where the passageway is of sufficient size, the impact is considered adverse but minor. The Mitigation Prospectus (see response to comment 1185) attempts to resolve some of the continuing controversy over wildlife movement by studying the problem further, as a joint effort by project and NPS/Trust biologists. Since this effort will reduce impacts already considered less than significant, it will be carried out separately from the NEPA/CEQA process. Mitigation measures will be formalized as part of the Record of Decision and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the NPS and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Tennesse Hollow restoration during final design. The text clearly states that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1804
64	The inconsistency was explained in the explanatory note in italics at the bottom of Exhibit 3-85.	1805
65	The text under NPS and Trust-Protected Cowardian Wetlands in the Affect Environment of Section 3.4.2 was modified as suggested.	1806
66	The project team was instructed by Caltrans and FHWA to remove the term “significant” from the discussion of impacts in Chapter 3 of the FEIS/R as the only place that language can be used is in the CEQA analysis (Chapter 4).	1807
67	Marshall Street has been added to the sentence.	1808
68	The text was revised as suggested.	1809

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
69	The discussion of cumulative impacts on hydrology was expanded in the FEIS/R.	1810
70	The text was revised as suggested.	1811
71	The text under the discussion of Permanent Impacts for Alternative 2 (Section 3.2.10) has been revised to include the points raised in Comment Number 1761. The visual effects sited in the comment are consistent with the findings in the Draft EIS and Visual Impact Assessment and provide additional examples of why Alternative 2- No Detour Option was found to result in an adverse impact to viewpoints at the Main Post. We concur with the comment that while the visual simulations provide an accurate depiction of the project from specific viewpoints, they do not clearly show the increased scale and massing of Alternative 2 - No Detour Option that would be apparent to a wide range of viewers in the Main Post and Crissy field areas.	1812
72	The comment is correct that light and glare from automobile headlights would be reduced by placing a portion of the roadway in a tunnel section.	1813
73	The text under the discussion of Permanent Impacts to Alternative 2 in Section 3.2.10 has been revised to include the points raised in the comment. The visual effects sited in the comment are consistent with the findings in the Draft EIS/R and Visual Impact Assessment and provide additional examples of why Alternative 2- No Detour Option was found to result in an adverse impact to viewpoints at the Main Post.	1814
74	Comment noted. The comment is correct assuming the initial assessment of the adverse impact was correct.	1815
75	Stablization/ Monitoring/ Security During Construction in Section 3.2.11 includes a discussion of the development of intrepretive and education materials. The Programmatic Agreement prepared as part of the project and included as Apendix I of the FEIS/R also includes those mitigation measures for impacts to cultural resources.	1816
76	Text under Land Use for Permanent Impact discussion of Alternative 5 was revised as suggested (see Section 3.2.1).	1817
77	Text was revised as suggested.	1818

REC'D MAR 31 2006

March 31, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage, PE
Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 25th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Doyle Drive Draft EIS/EIR

Dear Mr. Saage:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) for the Doyle Drive replacement project. The Presidio Trust (Trust) has jurisdiction over the project area, and as a cooperating agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) may adopt the FEIS in making decisions relative to the proposed project. Presidio Trust staff have devoted considerable time towards participation in the NEPA process, from the scoping period to the present day, and have developed additional information and provided critical staff support.

The Trust recognizes the public policy imperative inherent in seismic retrofit projects such as Doyle Drive, as well as the benefits to traffic safety and accessibility that will accrue as a result of the proposed project. Beyond the critical life safety benefits of a new roadway, we believe that the successful transformation of Doyle Drive is crucial to the ultimate success of the Presidio as a national park and public asset. We urge SFCTA, Caltrans, and FHWA to aggressively complete the necessary environmental and historical compliance, to expedite the engineering and design required to finalize the roadway design, and to quickly secure necessary funding to rebuild this critical artery. The Presidio Trust is ready and willing to do our part to meet this challenge.

We recognize and applaud the substantial effort that is evident in the document forwarded for our review. Numerous "big picture" comments are provided in this cover letter, along with more specific comments within the attached matrix. We request that these comments be addressed through revisions/additions to the document and additional improvements to the proposed alternatives prior to publishing the FEIS, which will

34 Graham Street, Post Office Box 22052, San Francisco, California 94129-0052
415/561-5300 Fax 561-5315 presidio@presidiotrust.gov

ultimately form the basis for a record of decision by the Trust, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and other agencies involved.

Identification of a Preferred Alternative. The Trust looks forward to assisting in the identification of a preferred alternative, and subsequent actions to follow. The Trust believes that the Parkway Alternative with the Diamond Interchange and Hook Ramp options best meets the purpose and need of the project. The Trust does not believe the Merchant Slip Ramp sufficiently improves the project to justify the impacts to park property and believes that the weaving issues could be mitigated in other less damaging ways within the Golden Gate Bridge District's control. 1

The Trust's decision to support the Parkway is based upon our involvement in the preparation and subsequent evaluation of the DEIS. The Parkway meets the objectives of the Presidio Trust Management Plan (the Trust's land use policy plan for Area B of the Presidio), better meets the stated objective to replace Doyle Drive within the context of the Presidio and its function as a national park, provides more "park land" when the areas over the tunnels are considered, improves access to the park, and is designed to better fit into the landscape of the Presidio. The Trust believes there are no park benefits from the Replace and Widen alternative. The Replace and Widen Alternative simply attempts to limit direct impacts to specific park resources by design while increasing the impact (shading, mass and scale, light, noise, visual) from an elevated freeway to a wider area of the park.

Agency Roles. As the document shifts to an FEIS, the authors need to recognize that the Trust is the federal agency with jurisdiction over Area B of the Presidio that includes virtually the entire project area. The document needs to remain mindful of the Presidio Trust Act and Presidio Trust Management Plan and make explicit the Trust's resource protection mandate as well as its imperative to achieve financial self-sufficiency by 2013 through revenue-generating use of the Presidio's built environment. Where the proposed project conflicts with these authorities, these conflicts should be identified and resolved in favor of the Trust's controlling authorities or avoided. Where impacts cannot be so resolved or avoided, comprehensive, specific mitigation measures should be developed. 2

Context Sensitive Design/Solutions. The Trust's past design comments have been used to improve the action alternatives. By continuing to work cooperatively and in the spirit of CSD/S, project engineers may address continuing concerns to refine project alternatives and minimize use of parklands (see below). The questions the Trust will seek to answer in reviewing the FEIS are whether the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm, including deviation from otherwise applicable design standards, and whether the above-ground transportation facilities proposed have an aesthetic more fitting to a national park than a conventional highway facility. The Trust will continue ongoing discussion with the project proponents regarding design, use, and control of the land over the tunnels. It will be unacceptable to the Trust that control of the land over the tunnels following completion of the project not lie with the Trust. 3

The alternatives as proposed continue to present negative impacts that could be controlled or eliminated with further refinements. Project engineers should continue to refine the proposed alternatives, and reduce the width or "footprint" of all proposed facilities, including the interchanges and main line portions. Unless these (and other) impacts can be avoided, the Trust will expect full compensation for financial impacts and mitigation of impacts to historic, natural, scenic, and recreational resources. 4

Right of Way Impacts and Financial Self Sufficiency. The current analysis does not adequately assess impacts to the Trust due to lost revenue during and following construction. Fulfillment of the Presidio Trust Act's mandates requires that buildings be leased to generate the revenue required to fund all annual operating expenses (estimated at between $40 and $52 million annually) by 2013, and to fund all capital improvements (estimated at $589 million) required to preserve Area B of the Presidio as a national park site in perpetuity. Significantly, the proposed alternatives would 5

- utilize up to ten percent of the land area under Trust jurisdiction for a construction period of five years or perhaps longer,
- impact access to the Presidio for visitors, residents, tenants, and tenants' clients and business associates,
- temporarily restrict use of an undisclosed number of buildings,
- permanently remove up to nine buildings totaling over 240,000 square feet,
- permanently use an additional 23,000 square foot building for an operations and maintenance center, and
- displace parking that serves some of the Trust's most marketable buildings.

These actions would dramatically affect the Trust's ability to generate revenue, potentially affecting achievement of financial self sufficiency by 2013 and/or substantially lengthening the time required to complete planned capital improvements. These potential effects of the project should be assessed with specificity, reduced to the maximum extent feasible, and fully mitigated.

Financing Plan. A detailed financing plan is needed for the FEIS to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed alternatives. Available funding itself (Exhibit 1-7) should be updated and described in more detail. A strategy needs be described for securing the additional required funding. 6

Construction Period Effects and Project Timing. Specific construction staging for the proposed alternatives needs to be provided in the FEIS, along with substantial additional detail regarding construction period impacts. Effects that cannot be avoided will need clearly defined mitigations. 7

Physical and socioeconomic effects assessed in the EIS will require reevaluation prior to construction, since construction is likely to begin three or more years in the future. Specifically, pre-construction reevaluation will be needed in order to determine changed circumstances that may result in new impacts, or may increase the severity of impacts already identified. For example, several of the technical reports need to remain living documents (CIA, parking, etc.) and will need to be updated for the FEIS and prior to 8

construction. Since the Trust intends to continue the pursuit of leasing of buildings in the project vicinity, the assessment of land use and displacement impacts will have to be reviewed, an updated assessment of relocation costs will be required, as will an updated estimate of costs associated with compensation for facilities impaired, damaged, or eliminated and lost revenue.

"Use" Under Section 4(f). The Draft 4(f) analysis provides neither a qualitative nor adequate quantitative analysis of effects on the NHLD or the parkland under Trust jurisdiction. In addition to omitting discussion of impacts to the Trust's revenue that may affect preservation of the Presidio as parkland (see above), the Draft 4(f) analysis fails to address effects on parkland due to the substantial impairment of open space and buildings immediately adjacent to the proposed facilities. These effects will include impacts to the historic setting of the cavalry stables, potential noise increases affecting the stables, houses on Pilots Row and Ruckman Ave., the Crissy Center educational facility, the Gorgas Avenue warehouses, and other buildings, along with visual impacts throughout the corridor, and taking of parkland and associated resources like recreational facilities and trees. Working with the Trust, the project proponent should continue to refine the alternatives to minimize harm to 4(f) resources to the maximum extent feasible. 9

Mitigation. A comprehensive and coherent mitigation program for the proposed alternatives needs to be developed in consultation with Trust staff during the preparation of the FEIS. Mitigation should include measures to minimize loss of parking and disruption during construction, maximize access to the Presidio, and ensure maximum protection of natural, cultural, and water resources. Mitigation needs to include measures to address financial impacts including loss of revenue and revenue generating potential. The Trust expects an enforceable agreement regarding implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures. 10

Trust staff would be happy to meet with you and discuss any of these comments or those within the attached matrix.

Sincerely,

Michael Boland
Director of Planning and Park Projects

cc. Gary N. Hamby, Division Administrator, FHWA
Bijan Sartipi, Caltrans
Presidio Trust Board of Directors
Craig Middleton
Brian O'Neill

Chap.	Page #	Trust Comment	ADEIS reference #	
3	27	Affected Environment - The portion of Mountain Lake Park managed by the city and county of San Francisco is not located within the Presidio boundaries. The rest is inside the Presidio.	460	11
3	47 and 48	The parking analysis presented does not match the September 2004 Parking Impact Analysis Report. See Trust's previous comments of Technical Report as the Trust still has issues with the analysis. Tech report will need to be updated for FEIS and prior to construction.	470	12
3	122	Caltrans, not the Trust, should be responsible for any stormwater management plan required for this proposed action. Recommend replacement of reference in first full paragraph with the following: "Caltrans, in coordination with the Presidio Trust, will prepare a stromwater management plan and comply with other provisions of this permit.	701	13
3	131-133	Listing the elevation of the Richardson conform and Halleck Tunnel portal seems important in the Flooding section.	575	14
3	133	Top paragraph of this section discusses slopes around the tunnels. There has been some discussion about recreating the "bluff" appearance between the Main Post and Crissy Field, this should be discussed here in the FEIS once decided through the CSS/S process. The Trust has a rendering that the Project Proponent may find useful to change the thinking about how the bluff will eventually be recontructed.	600	15
3	159	Coordinate Construction with Ongoing Remediation Actions: The Trust expects to **only** be responsible for certain previously-identified remediation sites. The Trust expects that many potential remediation costs will be the subject of future negotiation with the project proponents and possibly other parties. The revised text does not go far enough to state that the Trust's responsibility is limited.	605	16
3	209	paragraph under the bullets for Biological Environment - The language you use to incorporate the NES technical study should be used throughout the document in these opening paragraphs to incorporate the other technical studies. In other places you use less clear language that the technical studies are incorporated.		17
3	213	Exhibit 3-64 does not identify a number of native vegetation areas within the project study area. Update using map provided during ADEIS review process.	633	18
3	224	Discussion of wetlands should also include that wetlands are important habitat for wildlife.	643	19
3	225	Under NPS and Trust policies, please include that the Trust protects all USFWS wetlands.	644	20
3	226	Affected environment/ACOE and Cowardin wetlands – please clarify at the beginning of this section that a) the Trust protects both ACOE and Cowardin wetlands, and b) that all ACOE wetlands are also defined as Cowardin wetlands. In various places, the text implies that the Trust policies do not protect ACOE wetlands. This implication is particularly true in the first several paragraphs on page 194.	686	21
3	228	Second paragraph – total acreage for wetlands is different than the total acreage in Table 3-67. Fifth paragraph states that NPS and the Trust place high value on wetlands because they "may provide habitat for common wildlife species". Please modify this sentence; it is well understood that wetlands do (not may) provide habitat for a variety of wildlife species; these species are not limited to "common" wildlife.	645	22

Chap.	Page #	Trust Comment	ADEIS reference #	
3	231	Please explain what "temporary" impacts are.	646	23
3	233	First paragraph states that groundwater flows in the vicinity of the tunnels "can be increased or decreased" through equipment incorporated into the project. Please expand the discussion to better identify how the groundwater flows can be adjusted, the implications for vegetation and hydrology in doing so, and what entity would be responsible or able to "adjust" flows. The hydrologic implications for this should also be included in the hydrology section of the EIS. Exhibit 3.68: Please indicate which wetlands are impacted.	648	24
3	234	Second to last paragraph – clarify that the .07 hectare is <u>in addition</u> to the wetlands defined as ACOE. Please clarify this also in the last paragraph on page 197.	652	25
3	235	Compensation measures – first sentence, change "may include" to "will include".	654	26
3	238	The *Vegetation Management Plan (VMP)* should be included in the list of documents.	659	27
3	250	Coyote and grey fox should be included in the Exhibit 3.74.	671	28
3	257	Second paragraph identifies an affect to the forest and arroyo willow wetlands from construction of the project. Coastal scrub is also found in the construction corridor. This habitat community should also be included in the discussion.	673	29
3	257	The discussion of impacts to nesting birds correctly notes the potential to "briefly abandon a nest". The discussion should also include that with ongoing disturbance, birds may permanently abandon nests, decreasing their reproductive success.	674	30
3	258	This discussion of avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures regarding wildlife protection is inadequate. While some mitigation measures may be situation specific (particularly relative to nesting birds), the EIS should identify the mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce harm to wildlife. For example will the project include work at night? The impacts to nesting wildlife may be greater than work only during day.light hours. How will the project provide at least some corridor for wildlife in a north.south direction (i.e., phasing of the project?)?		31
3	259	Invasive species: Discussion under Affected Environment should also include disturbance to willow riparian habitat.	676	32
3	260	Again, the discussion regarding the "highly disturbed" nature of the forest understory needs to account for the remnant native plant populations.	677	33
7	46	The Trust believes that a broader analysis and consideration of the Project's effects upon the Trust's financial situation (and the concomitant impacts on the Presidio) is mandated by section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. As the DEIS points out at page 7-1, where parkland must be used for a transportation project because there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land, then the sponsoring agencies must insure the project "includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park…or historic site resulting from the use." While compensation is briefly referenced in section 7.7.4 as a minimization measure, the Trust believes that section 4(f) requires an expansive view and discussion of this compensation. Change the first sentence of section 7.7.4 to read, "The Trust, as the land managers, would be compensated as applicable by law for the damage or removal of buildings, resources, or other loss."	732	34

Chap.	Page #	Trust Comment	ADEIS reference #	
7	49	Second paragraph under 7.8 Coordination - Remove the sentence, "NPS also has an interest in the management of natural and historic resources within Area B." NPS has no legal authority over either of these areas of management which is what this sentence implies. If you choose to leave the sentence, then list all of the other agencies and organizations with an "interest" in Presidio natural and historic resources.		35
General	General	Removal and replacement of the Mason Street Warehouses. The EIS/EIR says is various places that the Mason warehouses will be temporarily removed and then replaced (p 2-60), that they will be removed without confirming that they will be replaced (i.e. 3-52, 3-114, 3-119). During the development of the first screening criteria and early alternatives, removal was only considered by the NPS and PT if in conjunction with replacement. Permanent removal will cause boundary erosion of the north east boundary of the Presidio and therefore present an unacceptable adverse effect. The concept of removal and not returning the buildings is inconsistent with the FOE and Section 106 consultation underway. Retention of these buildings was a key component of the original Crissy Marsh Section 106 consultation that allowed removal of approx. 40 historic buildings.Unless it can be determined that these buildings will (commitment of the project proponent) be replaced on their foundations following removal of the Detour, the Trust will continue to oppose the Replace and Widen alternative with Detour Option.	482	36
	General	Consider how shade impacts of the alternatives can be improved in the future Crissy Marsh/Tennessee Hollow corridor. Seek to improve a) plant establishment including extent, density, and diversity of vegetation expected, and b) the wildlife use of the Crissy Marsh/Tennessee Hollow corridor resulting from improved vegetation cover. Seek to improve the range of habitat likely under restoration of the corridor – upland, woodland, willow riparian, freshwater marsh, brackish marsh, and tidal marsh.		37

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Trust

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 with Diamond Interchange Option and Hook Ramp noted. Opposition to the Merchant Slip Ramp noted.	1420
2	All efforts have been made to avoid to the greatest extent possible the built and natural environments of the Presidio. As part of the FEIS/R, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan will be developed to document and track the successful implementation of proposed mitigation measures. The mitigation summary document is provided in the Appendix K of the FEIS/R.	1421
3	The project will continue to work cooperatively with the Presidio Trust and in the spirit of CSDIS through the final design. The area over the tunnels will be returned to the Presidio Trust.	1422
4	Appropriate compensation will be determined once impacts are assessed and level of compensation as applicable by law is determined. The lead agencies have commited to continued involvement of the cooperating and responsible agencies throughout detailed design and construction.	1423
5	Compensation based on impacts will be determined once impacts are assessed and level of compensation as applicable by law is determined. The following sentence was added to the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of FEIS/R Section 3.2.6, "The compensation will be determined and implemented as part of the right-of-way acquisition process."	1424
6	The updated funding plan for the project is provided in Section 1.7. The SFCTA is currently studying the feasibility of a toll facility to off-set the project costs. A discussion of tolling status has been added to Section 1.7. Updated project cost estimates are provided in Section 2.7 of the FEIS/R. Under SAFETEA-LU guidelines, the Initial Financial Plan should be submitted and approved by FHWA before authorization of Federal-aid funding for mainline project construction.	1425
7	Construction activities and proposed staging for the Preferred Alternative are presented in Section 2.9 of the FEIS/R. Construction impacts to individual resources are described under the Temporary Impacts section of the each resource in Chapter 3.	1426
8	Technical Addendums were produced for the Traffic, Noise & Vibration, Natural Resource, Cultural Resource and Parking studies. Additional work was compiled for the Energy and Cumulative impact sections. These elements are incorporated into Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the FEIS/R. As noted by the commenter the relocation portion of the CIA and Parking technical reports will need to be revised periodically as the prevailing conditions change.	1427
9	The Final Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 7 of the FEIS/R) contains a thorough discussion of the issues raised by the commenter. Precise compensation based on impacts will be determined once impacts are assessed and level of compensation as applicable by law is determined.	1428
10	A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan is a required element of this project and will be developed in consultation with the Presidio Trust and NPS. Text was revised as suggested to read "An enforceable mitigation plan is a required element...."	1429

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Trust

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
11	The text was revised to clearly state that the portion of Mountain Lake Park managed by the City and County of San Francisco is not located within the Presidio boundaries while the rest of the park is inside the Presidio.	1430
12	An addendum to the September 2004 Final Parking Impact Analysis Technical Report has been prepared subsequent to the selection of the Preferred Alternative based on the recently revised building use assumptions and parking supply conditions; the FEIS was updated accordingly.	1431
13	The stormwater data report is complete and will be refined during final design. Caltrans is responsible for the plan for the facility, however, the Trust will need their own plan for the area which the project team will comply. It is acknowledged that the Presidio Trust considers the routing of first flush storm flows to the SFPUC collection system for off-site treatment.	1432
14	The elevation of the proposed Richardson conform is 4.5 meters (14.7 feet) and elevations of the proposed roadways at the Halleck Tunnel portals are in the range of 2.0-2.5 meters (6.6 -8.2 feet) and are listed in Section 3.3.1, Permanent Impacts, Alternative 5, Flooding of the FEIS/R.	1433
15	The area referenced in the comment was studied in the Visual Impact Assessment and visual simulations of the tunnel area between the Main Post and Crissy Field were prepared (viewpoints 7 and 8). The VIA concludes that removal of the low viaduct under the Presidio Parkway Alternative and replacing it with a grassy hill would improve the intactness and unity of the area. Additional treatment of the hill and slope areas around the tunnel section to recreate the bluff would further improve the overall visual quality of the area.	1434
16	The text under 'Coordinate Construction with Ongoing Remediation Actions" in Section 3.3.3 was revised to include language regarding the existing agreements between the Army, Presidio Trust and NPS; to reflect the ongoing remediation efforts by the Presidio Trust; and to note the coordination of future remediation with Caltrans and SFCTA.	1435
17	The NES is referenced in Section 3.4 of the FEIS/R.	1436
18	Exhibit was revised to reflect the native plant resources in the project area.	1437
19	The text "Wetlands support high wildlife diversity as well as a water source for species associated with upland habitats" has been added to the introduction of Section 3.4.2.	1438
20	Bullet text in Section 3.4.2 was revised to read "... U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetlands according to the Cowardin classification system (Cowardin et al. 1979) that are protected, along with Waters of the United States, by the National Park Service". The Presidio Trust's and NPS' specific policies are stated in the NES in Section 3.5. The NES is incorporated in the EIS/R by reference.	1439

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Trust

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
21	Text and wetland exhibit was revised accordingly.	1440
22	Text has been corrected in response to both comments.	1441
23	Temporary is used in the conventional sense of the word, i.e. limited in time. As a practical matter, temporary impacts are those which do not permanently change land cover into part of the built environment and which can therefore be restored. The Project will implement a program for "Revegetation of Temporarily Disturbed Vegetation," described for example in Section 3.4.3, Plant Species. The EIS/R considers that full restoration will take approximately five years.	1442
24	See Response to Comment #1804. Refer to Hydrology section (3.3.1) regarding hydrologic issues. Temporarily affected wetlands have been stated in the exhibit.	1443
25	It has been stated in the document where the totals in the wetland types are different and where the wetlands are co-located.	1444
26	Text was changed as requested.	1445
27	The Vegetation Management Plan is listed at the beginning of Section 3.4.1	1446
28	Coyote and Gray Fox were added to the exhibit.	1447
29	Understory coastal scrub is in included in the discussion of Northern Coastal Scrub (Section 3.4.1) and is part of the impact acreage.	1448
30	Text was changed to read "temporarily or permanently abandon" the nest.	1449
31	The project will have an adverse effect on wildlife, as is clearly stated in the EIS/R. Much of it is practically unavoidable. Mitigation and minimization measures are not intended to apply to all species and to all types of impacts identified, but to those impacts which would be considered significant in the absence of such measures. Overly comprehensive mitigation sometimes defeats its own purpose, and the commenter offers a good example of this. Building the project in phases to allow for wildlife movement would mean a longer construction period or an inefficient and awkward mobilization of equipment, or both, with arguably a net increase in disturbance.	1450

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Trust

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
32	The discussion in Section 3.4.1 does include this subject, in the third paragraph under "Affected Environment."	1451
33	The discussion of the affected environment is not intended to be exhaustive, and each vegetation community is described according to its most salient characteristics, i.e., those most important for the analysis. Native plant communities are identified and considered where their presence defines a specific area. Exhibit showing Native Vegetation will be revised to reflect the native plant resources in the project area.	1452
34	The project team continues to work with the stakeholders regarding opportunities to minimize or avoid impacts to parkland and appropriate mitigation for significant impacts. The text in Section 7.7.4 was modified to: ....would be compensated as applicable by law for the removal or permanent removal of buildings. The compensation would be determined and implemented as part of the right-of-way acquisition process.	1453
35	Text in Section 7.8 was revised to accurately depict respective areas of jurisdiction.	1454
36	The FOE was revised and included in Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R. Project team will continue to work with the Trust regarding building preservation, movement, and removal.	1455
37	The discussion of the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor connection to Crissy Marsh in Section 3.2.1 was enhanced with more detailed discussion of each alternative alignment in the area and includes graphics depicting the area of restoration which will be available under each alternative. Information regarding the shade issue is included in the Plans and Policies section under the PTMP discussion of Section 3.2.1 of the FEIS/R. Conclusions are correctly interpreted but somewhat qualitative. Further detail of the shade analysis is available in Appendix B of the Final Community Impact Assessment (August 2006) which is included on CD with DEIS/R, additional copies available on request. The EIS cannot effectively model or predict complex suites of plant and animal responses to the project, except to conclude that, overall, this is not significant in the context of the existing environment. The Summary section of the FEIS/R highlights the project commitments including working with the NPS and Trust to find the most feasible solution for accomodating the Tennesse Hollow restoration during final design. The text clearly states that the commitments are binding. It also includes a reference to Appendix K for more details on potential mitigation.	1456

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Wastewater Enterprise

April 4, 2006

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Richard Sklar
President

Ann Moller Caen
Vice President

E. Dennis Normandy
Adam Werbach
Ryan L. Brooks

Susan Leal
General Manager

Leroy L. Saage,
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue
25th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Doyle Drive Draft EIS/EIR

Dear Mr. Saage:

This letter comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/R) concerning the renovation of Doyle Drive in the San Francisco Presidio south and east of the Golden Gate Bridge. Our comments are on behalf of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), which is responsible for the management of the city's combined sewer system, and which collects and treats sanitary wastewater and stormwater flows in San Francisco. The SFPUC is concerned that the environmental review has not included sufficient analysis to fully evaluate the potential impacts of the new wastewater flows proposed to be introduced into the city's combined sewer system. The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) (the project lead agency) should provide more information in the EIS/R to characterize the potential impacts of increased flows and increased pollutant loads to the city's combined sewer system. Our specific comments are as follows: 1

1. New Flows to City Combined Sewer System: Any new flows introduced into the city's combined sewer system from construction dewatering and stormwater runoff – either directly or from the Presidio's sanitary sewer system – could negatively impact the SFPUC's compliance operations for the city's combined sewer system. The proposed discharges in the project would flow into the Bayside portion of the city's combined sewer system, which is regulated by a permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Board permit stipulates the average annual combined sewer system discharge events that can occur in any given area of the city. The environmental review for the proposed project should thoroughly examine the effects of any increased flows to the city's sewer system and the SFPUC's compliance operations for the combined sewer system, and should propose the means to mitigate those effects. The SFPUC is not in a position to accept new flows in the sewer system unless analytical information indicates that the new flows would not have any adverse impact. We believe moving 2

adverse impacts downstream, into our system, is neither mitigation nor is it appropriate. 2 Cont

2. Existing Hazards (pp. 125-127)/Flood Protection (p. 135): FEMA is revising the flood hazard map to include storm surge hazard areas. The City and County of San Francisco will be included in the revised hazard map. The Project Agencies should consider whether the revised FEMA flood hazard map zone would affect the project. In addition, the city may need to revise its planning and building requirements based on the new flood hazard zones, which could potentially impact the project. 3

3. Groundwater Extractions in the Marina Basin (pp. 128-131): The lagoon at the Palace of Fine Arts is a surface exposure of the Marina Groundwater Basin. Groundwater extractions from this basin may result in drawdown of the lagoon levels. The city routinely augments the lagoon with the city's potable water during summer months to maintain lagoon levels and water quality. Unless the SFCTA can demonstrate that dewatering in the Marina Basin will have no impacts on the lagoon based on distance, depth and extraction rate of dewatering, the SFPUC likely will require the Project Agencies to reimburse the SFPUC for any additional water necessary over the current average summer demand. The lagoon summer augmentation program is currently not metered so the SFPUC likely will require the Project Agencies to fund metering of summer demand prior to the beginning of planned dewatering activities. The SFCTA should consult with the SFPUC Groundwater Program Manager to conduct any analyses and mitigation of potential impacts to the lagoon. 4

4. Construction Dewatering (p. 129): Although the EIS/R discusses the potential for pollutants to be present in the extracted groundwater, it does not clearly discuss the fate of the groundwater. The EIS/R should include an evaluation of the groundwater extraction rates, duration and timing in order to fully assess any potential impacts to the combined sewer system. In addition, while the SFPUC may ultimately permit the discharge of the groundwater into the combined sewer system, the SFPUC Pretreatment Program may require pretreatment of that groundwater prior to discharge. 5

5. Permanent Impacts (pp. 130-131): In Alternative 5, twenty-five per cent of the project would be underground and thus that portion would not generate storm water runoff. Please clarify whether the Caltrans stormwater NPDES permit is or would be applicable to the 6

whole project area or only to that portion of the project that would be subject to storm water runoff. 6 Cont

6. Permanent Impacts (pp. 130-131): Alternative 5 states that a reduction in pollutant loading would occur because a portion of the project would be underground. This statement appears to be based on the dubious belief that a portion of nonpoint source pollutants from road runoff would be transferred to the city's sewer system. The SFPUC disagrees this approach mitigates for the potential impacts of stormwater runoff in the project and may not allow it.

7

The portion of the project area in tunnels would have nonpoint source pollutant loads from vehicles and other road-related constituents. The EIS/R discusses that the tunnel washdown water would drain to a sump that would discharge to the sanitary sewer system. Since the Presidio sanitary sewer discharges to the city's combined sewer system, the sump wastewater would add to the city's sewer flow and treatment demands. As stated above, we believe this is not mitigation nor is it appropriate.

Faced with increasingly stringent water quality management requirements, the SFPUC is promoting "Low Impact Development" (LID) methods (which include the use of stormwater BMPs) to capture, detain and retain runoff flow from impervious surfaces before those flows reach the city's sewer system. These methods should be applied to street runoff in new development whenever possible, as well as to tunnel washdown water. LID methods provide greater cost-efficiency for the management of nonpoint source pollutants in urban runoff generated by cars and road runoff. In addition, using LID methods for the tunnel segments would be consistent with the Mayor's Better Streets Program. 8

7. Managing Water Quality from Construction Dewatering (p. 137-138): The SFCTA should be aware that although the SFPUC Pretreatment Program routinely regulates the discharge of dewatering flows to the combined sewer system by permit, the discharge permit usually stipulates that the SFPUC may temporarily stop dewatering flows to minimize impact of the flows during wet weather. Any plans to discharge flows to the city's combined sewer system would need to be coordinated with the SFPUC Pretreatment Program Manager. 9

8. Storm Water Treatment (p. 138-139): *Option 1* is listed as the preferred alternative for storm water management with storm water runoff and tunnel washdown water routed to the city's sewer system, while *Option 2* has runoff and washdown water managed near the source using storm water BMPs. The SFPUC disagrees with Option 1 as the preferred plan. As discussed above, the SFPUC is facing increasingly stringent water quality requirements. Using LID methods to minimize nonpoint source pollutants at the source, as discussed in Option 2, would help to alleviate the burden of nonpoint source pollution management and treatment for the SFPUC and its ratepayers. 10

9. General Comments – Increased Flows in Presidio Sanitary Sewer System: The Presidio Trust pays the SFPUC to collect and treat sanitary wastewater from the Presidio. Any increases in flows from construction dewatering or permanent impacts could significantly increase the Trust's fees to the city. The EIS/R does not provide any information to indicate the Presidio Trust has approved the additional costs it may incur. 11

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. We are concerned about the proposal from a number of different perspectives. The SFPUC would be please to discuss these comments with you, Caltrans and any other project sponsors, as well as the Presidio Trust, to determine how this project can adequately mitigate for the potential impacts to the city's combined sewer system.

Sincerely,

William Keaney
Planning Manager

Cc: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans
Bruce Wolfe, Regional Board
Nelson Wong, DPW
Dianna Sokolove, Planning
Michael Boland, Director of Planning, Presidio Trust

bcc. Robert Hickman

Susan Glendening

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The project team has met with the PUC and Caltrans to further develop the mitigation discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS/R. It has been confirmed that there is adequate space along the alignment to treat stormwater runoff on-site, if necessary.	1374
2	The project team has met with the PUC and Caltrans to further develop the mitigation discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS/R. It has been confirmed that there is adequate space along the alignment to treat stormwater runoff on-site, if necessary.	1375
3	The current design is based on the best available information on coastal hazard wave runup elevations. It is acknowledged that new studies are in progress to further refine expected coastal hazards.	1376
4	The nearest tunnel segment (west of Halleck Street), where substantial dewatering is likely to occur, is over one-quarter-mile away from the Palace of Fine Arts Lagoon. It would be unlikely that dewatering activities at that distance would have any effect on the lagoon levels. However, the preparers of the EIS/R agree that it would be necessary to either demonstrate the lack of expected impact using detailed hydraulic calculations or, if calculations indicate an impact could occur to lagoon levels, contribute to the cost of replenishment. The following mitigation measure was added to the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.1: The project proponent shall either 1) demonstrate through detailed hydraulic calculation that project-related effects of dewatering on the Palace of Fine Arts Lagoon levels would not be substantial, or 2) enter into an agreement with the SFPUC to contribute to cost of monitoring and replenishment of lagoon levels during the dewatering operation period.	1377
5	The commenter is referred to the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.1 for a detailed discussion of how the dewatering effluent would be characterized, managed, and discharged.	1378
6	The Caltrans permit covers all Caltrans right-of-way, including non-stormwater discharges (e.g. tunnel washdown water).	1379
7	The project team has met with the PUC and Caltrans to further develop the mitigation discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS/R. It has been confirmed that there is adequate space along the alignment to treat stormwater runoff on-site, if necessary.	1380
8	The project team has met with the PUC and Caltrans to further develop the mitigation discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS/R. It has been confirmed that there is adequate space along the alignment to treat stormwater runoff on-site, if necessary.	1381
9	The comment is noted for the record. The requirements for managing dewatering effluent is presented in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.1.	1382
10	The project team has met with the PUC and Caltrans to further develop the mitigation discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS/R. It has been confirmed that there is adequate space along the alignment to treat stormwater runoff on-site, if necessary.	1383
11	Cost of mitigation is not a required component of a CEQA/NEPA analysis, as long as specified mitigation is feasible but cost is a consideration in deciding among feasible options.	1384

Name: Daniel LaForte
Organization/Agency: San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
Address: McLaren Lodge, 501 Stanyan St
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94117
E-mail: daniel.laforte@sfgov.org

Comments:
The Palace of Fine Arts was listed on the National Registry on December 5, 2005. The DEIS/R should be updated to reflect the current status. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: S.F. Recreation and Park Dept

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The text in the Affected Environment portion of Section 3.2.11 was updated to reflect the current status.	1683

REC'D MAR 0 6 2006

Transportation Authority of Marin

P.O. Box 4186
San Rafael
California 94913-4186

Phone: 415/499-6570
Fax: 415/499-3799

www.tam.ca.gov

Belvedere
Jerry Butler

Corte Madera
Melissa Gill

Fairfax
Lew Tremaine

Larkspur
Joan Lundstrom

Mill Valley
Dick Swanson

Novato
Pat Eklund

Ross
Jeanne Barr

San Anselmo
Peter Breen

San Rafael
Al Boro

Sausalito
Amy Belser

Tiburon
Alice Fredericks

County of Marin
Susan Adams
Hal Brown
Steve Kinsey
Charles McGlashan
Cynthia Murray

February 28, 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) was pleased to receive the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report for the Doyle Drive Replacement project. We extend our congratulations to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority on a good quality document that appears to meet the needs of all the partners involved. Both the many travelers that pass through Marin County as well as our own residents stand to benefit from this project passing this critical milestone, moving closer to becoming a reality. 1

We are concerned, however, about information presented in the document as related to the funding of the project. In Chapter One, Purpose and Need, Section 1.6 Funding and Programming, there is a summary of anticipated funding sources and committed and proposed funding amounts, depicted in Exhibit1-7. Entitled Proposed and Committed Funding Sources and Levels, this Exhibit 1-7 portrays the challenge of completing the funding package for the project. Under Other Local Funds, there is an amount of $125 million which is footnoted as "....sources such as bridge tolls and value pricing". The implication that Golden Gate Bridge tolls will be increased to pay for the project, or toll collection on Doyle Drive itself will be implemented has not been thoroughly evaluated nor the impacts of such a strategy disclosed. 2

Before any plan to increase tolls or implement new tolls is put into place, substantial analysis and disclosure of impacts to Marin County residents must be conducted. There must be a thorough analysis of equity in such a strategy, whether Marin residents face an undue burden related to the benefits they receive. A number of potential operational impacts must be evaluated and disclosed, including the impacts on traffic in Marin County. The diversion of trips originating in Marin and Sonoma to the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge must be assessed. Transit incentives must be considered as well, providing options for Marin travelers to utilize transit alternatives toll free. All of these impacts must be explored in broad based public outreach.

F:\TAM\05. FEDERAL, STATE & LOCAL AGENCIES\05.10 Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District (GGBH&TD)\05.10.01 General Correspondence\022806 Doyle Dr EIS-R ltr.dot

While the Environmental Document itself establishes the impacts and associated mitigations for the project footprint, TAM requests that neither the Environmental Document or associated Project Approval action adopt any strategy related to congestion pricing or tolling until a more through analysis of toll options and impacts be conducted and discussed through broad public outreach in Marin County. 2 cont

I look forward to understanding further your plans for funding the project as well as working with you in assuring Marin County is well informed regarding that effort.

Sincerely,

For Dianne Steinhauser
Executive Director
Transportation Authority of Marin

Cc: Celia Kupersmith, GGBHTD
Suzanne Wilford, SCTA
Farhad Mansourian, MCTD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: The Transportation Authority of Marin

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1208
2	The SFCTA has assessed the potential of funding the project through tolling. In the summer of 2008, the San Francisco regional partner agencies confirmed they would drop the Doyle Drive tolling project from the Urban Partnership Agreement program and look to other local funding sources and cost savings to complete the project funding plan. Depending on the actual funding sources used for the project, the impacts may need to be analyzed in a Re-evaluation/Addendum of the FEIR/EIS, or a Supplemental FEIR/EIS, as appropriate Project funding is discussed in Section 1.7.	1209

Reviewers	Page	
GROUPS	Comment Letter	Responses
Alliance for a Clean Waterfront	73	75
California Heritage Council	76	78
Council on America's Military Past - U.S.A.	79	80
Cow Hollow Association	81	85
Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action	86	91
Exploratorium	94	98
Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association	100	104
GGNP & Pt Reyes Seashore Advisory Commission	106	108
Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy	109	115
Leukemia & Lymphoma Society Team in Training	117	118
Marina – Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants	119	123
Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning	125	127
People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area	128	130
Planning Association Richmond	131	133
Presidio Environmental Council	134	143
Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors	147	150
Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund	151	152
San Francisco Beautiful	153	155
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition	156	158
San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)	159	162
San Francisco Tomorrow	163	165
Transportation for a Livable City	166	168
Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF)	169	170
Urban Watershed Project	171	174
YMCA of SF	176	177

March 31, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage, PE
Doyle Drive Project Manager
c/o SF County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Draft EIS, Doyle Drive

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Alliance for a Clean Waterfront is a coalition of 26 community and environmental organizations working toward the protection and enhancement of San Francisco's water resources. The Alliance is a project of Earth Island Institute.

One of our goals is to reduce and eliminate the combined sewage overflows (CSOs) that are discharged to the Bay and Ocean during storm events. These discharges of inadequately treated sewage and stormwater are harmful to the Bay and ocean ecosystems and pose a human health risk, especially for recreational users and for people who consume Bay-caught seafood.

We have also been working to incorporate the adoption of decentralized sewage treatment as a principle to help guide the SF PUC in the development of the monumental new Sewage Master Plan. There is no excuse for exacerbating the injustice of sending more than 80% of the City's combined flows to the Southeast Treatment Plant. Water should be treated as close as possible to its source.

The Presidio is one of few areas in San Francisco that has been developed with separate systems for sanitary sewage and stormwater runoff. With the proposed water recycling facility for treating sewage and a palette of state-of-the-art, natural-systems-based stormwater treatment facilities, the Presidio could be a leader in sustainable, low-impact, self-reliant water management.

We were surprised and dismayed to see (pp. 3-138, 3-139) that the Doyle Drive project proposes to collect the stormwater runoff from the roadway and discharge it into SF's combined sewer system. Certainly the road runoff should not be going into Crissy Lagoon or the Bay untreated, but it should be treated and reused locally.

What would be the cumulative impacts on Bay and Ocean water quality from adding Doyle Drive runoff to the PUC's combined system? How would those water quality impacts subsequently affect low-income populations that rely on the bay for food? What 1

would be the additional energy consumption required to pump these increased flows to the Southeast Plant? How would the impacts be mitigated? More to the point, these impacts should be, and can be, avoided. What studies have been done to identify on-site or near-site water treatment opportunities? Has the project team considered treatment wetlands, infiltration swales, sub-surface sand filters, detention ponds, and other "low impact development" approaches to stormwater management? Constructed treatment wetlands could also be very useful during construction – to treat groundwater from dewatering activities as well as surface runoff. 1 Cont

Sustainable water management calls for regarding water as a resource, not as a waste product to be disposed of. We call on the Presidio to find beneficial reuses for its water and not merely pay the SF PUC to make a problem go away. There is no away.

The EIS should identify ways to avoid the negative environmental impacts of increasing the burden on the City's combined wastewater system, and the project sponsors should develop an ecologically sound, environmentally just, multiple-benefit program for managing Doyle Drive's runoff. 2

Sincerely,

Jennifer Clary
Co-chairs, Alliance for a Clean Waterfront

Alex Lantsberg

Cc: Tom Franza, Assistant General Manager, SFPUC Wastewater Bureau

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Alliance for a Clean Waterfront

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Coordination is currently underway with the PUC regarding runoff. Ultimately, water management will be dealt with during the detailed design phase of the project.	1170
2	It should be noted that under the existing condition, none of the runoff from the roadway is treated prior to discharge. Therefore, under either Option 1 or 2 described in the FEIS/R, there would be a net benefit to receiving water quality because the runoff will be treated. Runoff from nearly the entire City flows into the combined sewer system and is treated at one of the City's treatment plants. The FEIS/R allows for either discharge to the sanitary sewer system or for on-site treatment measures in accordance with the Caltrans Storm Water Management Plan (which is regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board).	1171

OFFICERS
PRESIDENT
GARY WIDMAN*
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
HOWARD BILLMAN*
VICE PRESIDENTS
ARTHUR DeFEVER
ROBERT DEMLER
DAVID DIBBLE*
WINCHELL HAYWARD*
JAMES LENHOFF
JULES LEVAGGI*
BETTY ANN PRIEN*
FRANK SCHOMER
CLAIRE COLLINS SKALL
SECRETARY
DIANNE ROWE*
TREASURER
YUSUF URAIQAT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DIANNE ROWE*
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
CHAIR OF THE BOARD
JOHN J. HODGES*
ALAMEDA COUNTY
DAVID DIBBLE
DAVID HULL
WILLIAM P. WREDEN, JR.
AMADOR COUNTY
JULES LEVAGGI
BUTTE COUNTY
JAMES LENHOFF
MARIN COUNTY
HERBERT KONKOFF, M.D.
ADRIENNE MYERS
GEORGE NEWHALL
CLAIRE COLLINS SKALL
GARY WIDMAN
MONTEREY COUNTY
ALBERT SIMPSON
NAPA COUNTY
ADELE and CHRISTOPHER LAYTON
ROBERT McMAHON
JOHN RITCHIE*
NEVADA COUNTY
KATRINE WATSON
SACRAMENTO COUNTY
JANET and THOMAS A. CONOVER
ALLIE HUBERTY
SAN DIEGO COUNTY
ARTHUR DeFEVER
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY
WILLIAM and CONCHITA APPLEGATE
LOIS BEHNKE
HOWARD BILLMAN
WILLIAM FRIES, II
WINCHELL HAYWARD
JOHN J. HODGES
REDMOND F. KERNAN, III
DOROTHY and TED KITT
MAI KAI LEE
LINDA OLINGER
BETTY ANN PRIEN
DIANNE ROWE
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
VIRGINIA and ROBERT BLEWETT
SAN MATEO COUNTY
GEORGE N. PATTERSON
SANTA CLARA COUNTY
HILLES PODESTA
SOLANO COUNTY
J. REED ROBINS
SONOMA COUNTY
ROBERT DEMLER
MRS. GEORGE FRIMAN
FRANK SCHOMER
HONORARY DIRECTOR EMERITUS
HENRY I. PRIEN
ARCHITECT EMERITUS
PATRICK McGREW, A.I.A.
HISTORIAN
NEIL MALLOCH
*Executive Committee Members

CALIFORNIA HERITAGE COUNCIL
CALIFORNIA TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION
TO SAVE OUR SIGNIFICANT BUILDINGS AND SITES
Located in the historic 1907 Firehouse at 1088 Green Street in San Francisco

MAILING ADDRESS
P.O. Box 475046
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147

(415) 474-0780
FAX: (415) 441-6338

March 30, 2006

REC'D MAR 31 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage
100 Van Ness Ave. 26th Floor
San Francisco CA 94102

Re: Comments of the California Heritage Council on the DEIS/R for Doyle Drive.

Dear Mr. Saage:

Several years ago, the CHC expressed its support for Alternative #5. In light of new information and more extensive review, using current EIS documents, the CHC withdraws that position. It now takes a new position, supporting Alternative #5 ONLY with the modifications recently proposed by Michael Painter at the Feb. 22nd meeting in your offices, and ONLY with maximum safeguarding of historic structures and values, and with mitigation measures offsetting, so far as possible, the damage to the site and historic values necessarily imposed by the alternative chosen. 1

In the interest of public safety, we believe that replacement of the current, historic Doyle Drive structure, in spite of its setting in a National Park and National Historic Landmark District, (NHLD) is indeed necessary. But that replacement must proceed with only the minimum possible adverse impact on historic structures and on the Presidio NHLD. All the proposals envision a new structure with an order of magnitude twice the width of the current Doyle Drive. This will necessarily lead to a structure with adverse impacts on historic values created by its construction, its presence and its use for the life of the project- (expected to be over a century). The loss to the public, at a site central to the history of San Francisco, California, and the American West since 1776 will necessarily be devastating, even with the best of alternatives. Therefore, the project should include extensive mitigation measures for the historic values permanently lost to the public. 2

We prefer the Presidio Parkway (Alternative 5) as the design approach for this project, provided the design evolves in a manner which follows the direction indicated in Michael Painter's design presented in a meeting in your offices on Feb.22,2006. At the easterly end of the roadway the "Diamond interchange" should be selected over the "Circle Drive" option since it avoids the destruction of the historic Presidio Pool (Building 1151). We note that the project must be designed to avoid negatively effecting buildings which contribute to the NHLD. Since an alternative to the removal of the pool exists it must be selected. 3

We urge the acceleration of the section 106 process and the development of an MOA between parties. We further suggest that the concept design process be accelerated. A design process for the landscape opportunities opened up by the creation of tunnels should also be integrated into the design approach so that the visitor experience is enhanced. This should include the area above the tunnel at the cemetery and the adjacent batteries Slaughter and Blaney, as well as the area between the project and Mason Street. These design processes should parallel the project design process. 4 5

The CHC welcomes every opportunity to work with you to bring about the best possible project for this historically sensitive and uniquely important NHLD. We would especially welcome a chance to work with you in designing mitigation measure that would the public better understand and appreciate the Presidio's history, including the people and the historic decisions made there to offset the loss created by a new Doyle Drive.

Sincerely,

Gary Widman

Gary Widman
President

cc: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
Craig Middleton, Executive Director, Presidio Trust
Brian O'Neill, General Superintendent, GGNRA
Ric Borjes, Federal Preservation Officer, Presidio Trust
Michael Boland
Rick Foster, GGNRA
Craig Kenkel, Chief, Cultural Resources, GGNRA
Michael Buhler, National Trust for Historic Preservation

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: California Heritage Council

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 conditional on Michael Painter's modification's noted.	1334
2	Adverse effects to historic district will be addressed through development and implementation of the Programmatic Agreement.	1335
3	Preference for Alternative 5 noted. In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1336
4	The Programmatic Agreement process is underway and consulting parties and interested parties have been meeting to develop the terms of the PA.	1337
5	Details regarding the final design of the roadway and landscaping will be developed in the final design process. Final landscape decisions will reflect guideance from the historic treatment plan if the area is a cultural landscape and would be made in coordination with the Presidio Trust and VMP to ensure overall integration with the Presidio.	1338

President
Dale Floyd
Retired Federal Historian
Charlottesville, Va.
Immediate Past President
Gordon Chappell
Regional Historian, National Park Service
San Francisco
First Vice President
Col. Nicholas Reynolds, USMCR
Naval War College
Newport, Rhode Island
Second Vice President
MSgt. Roy Ashley, USMC (Ret.)
Upper Marlboro, Md.
Secretary and Executive Director
Col. Herbert M. Hart, USMC (Ret.)
Author, "Old Forts" Series
Springfield, Va.
703-912-6124
Treasurer
Rebecca Reynolds
36 Second St.
Newport, R.I. 02840
Membership Director
Mrs. Mary Jo Cunningham
Editor, Ellinwood *Leader*
P.O. Box 1
Ellinwood, Kans. 67526
316-564-2481
Journal Editor
Dr. Nicholas Reynolds
Newport, Rhode Island
Book Review Editor
Lt. Col. Harold Raugh, USA (Ret.)
3058 Mildred Ct.
Marina, Calif. 93933
Webmaster
MSgt. Roy V. Ashley, USMC (Ret.)
camppjamp.org

DIRECTORS (Also the Officers)
Ex-Officio (Past Presidents)
G. Read Carlock
Col. Lloyd Clark, USA (Ret.)
Brig. Gen. James L. Collins, USA (Ret.)
Rev. Barry J. Hagan, C.S.C.
Col. Herbert M. Hart, USMC (Ret.)
Col. O.W. Martin, Jr., USA (Ret.)
Maj. Gen. James A. Wier, MC USA (Ret.)
Brig. Gen. Edwin H. Simmons, USMC (Ret.)
Col. Wayne Pittman, USAF (Ret.)
Gordon Chappell

Alan C. Aimone, Newburgh, N.Y.
Ted Alexander, Antietam Battlefield
MSgt. Roy Ashley, USMC (Ret.), Upper Marlboro, Md.
Gordon Bliss, Boston, Mass.
Charles Bogart, Emergency Management Agency, Frankfort, Ky.
Brig. Gen. Philip Bolté, USA (Ret.), Union, S.C.
Kent Brandebery, Castle Rock, Colo.
Robert Burt, City Manager (Ret.), Dundee, Fla.
Gordon Chappell, San Francisco, Calif.
Mary Jo Cunningham, Editor, Ellinwood, Kans.
Dr. Emil Dansker, Emeritus Professor, Central State U. Ohio
D. Colt Denfeld, Historian, Ft. Bragg, N.C.
Marylou Gjernes, Retired Army Art Curator, Washington
Dr. Theodore D. Harris, Historian, Seal Beach, Calif.
Dr. Charles Hibbard, Ft. Douglas Museum, Utah
Col. Fred Holzbaur, NYG, G-1, New York State Guard
Maj. Stuart Lynn, AUS (Ret.), Omaha, Nebr.
Dr. Allen Millett, Director, Eisenhower D-Day Museum, New Orleans
Dr. Joy Mitchell, Historian, Treasure Island, Fla.
Mark Morgan, USAF Historian, Scott AFB, Ill.
David Percevel, Architect, Atlantic Beach, N.Y.
Amy Allen Price, President, Allen Park Corp., Salt Lake City
Dr. Nicholas Reynolds, Newport, R.I.
Jerry Rogers, Director, Southwest Support Center (Ret.), National Park Service, Santa Fe
Lt. Col. Leroy Ross, USAF (Ret.), President, Battle of San Pasqual Association, Vista, Calif.
Col. Thomas F. Royals, USAF (Ret.), Henrico, N.C
Heidi Amelia Ann Weber, Kent S[illegible]

Nominating-Elections Committee
Jim Mundie, Book Dealer, New Orleans, La. *Chairman*
Lt. Col. Steven Pahs, USAF (Ret.), Denver
Col. Donald Kington, AUS (Ret.)

Yount-Windsor Grant Committee
Col. Lloyd Clark, AUS (Ret.), Phoenix, Ariz.
Dr. Edward M. Coffman, U. of Wisconsin (Ret.)
Dr. Elaine Everly, National Archives
Dr. Warren W. Hassler, Jr., Pennsylvania State U. (Ret.)
Gen. William A. Knowlton, USA (Ret.)
Dr. Darlis Miller, New Mexico State U.
Lt. Gen. E.G. Schuler, USAF (Ret.)
Dr. Robert M. Utley, National Park Service (Ret.)

REGIONAL DEPARTMENTS
Antietam (Western Maryland)
Arizona
Arkansas
The Dakotas
Delaware Valley (Pa., N.J., Del.)
Florida
Golden West (Calif., Nev.)
The Hudson Valley (West Point area)
Illinois
Indian Territory
Minnesota
The Missouri (Kansas, Missouri)
Montana
National Capital (D.C., Va., Md., W.Va.)
New England
Old Northwest (Ohio, Mich., Ind.)
Pacific Northwest (Including Alaska)
The Platte (Nebraska)
Rio Grande (N.M., Texas West of Pecos R.)
Rocky Mountains (Colo., Wyo., Utah)
South Carolina
The Southeast (Ala., Ga., La., Miss.)
The Tennessee (Tenn., Ky.)
Texas (East of Pecos R.)

Affiliations listed for identification only

PRESERVING, INTERPRETING AND SHARING OUR MILITARY HERITAGE

Council on America's Military Past - U.S.A.

POST OFFICE BOX 1151 • FORT MYER, VIRGINIA 22211

March 30, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage, PE
Doyle Drive Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECD APR 0 3 2006

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Council on America's Military Past is a nationwide military history and military historic preservation association which has been active in preservation of military historic resources in SanFrancisco ever since we prepared a report urging the preservation of military structures on Alcatraz in 1969. We are naturally extremely interested in the preservation of historic resources at the Presidio of San Francisco, a military post established in 1776, which our membership toured extensively during our San Francisco annual conferences in 1969 and 1981.

We have studied the alternatives proposed for the Doyle Drive project with some dismay, as all of them have adverse effects to some of the Presidio's historic resources, the Presidio being a National Historic Landmark District.

However, between Alternatives 2 and 5, we find Alternative 2, "Replace and Widen," to be far preferable so long as it includes the NO detour option. (Even the temporary removal and later restoration to their original site of four of the Mason Street Warehouses could cause considerable damage to these historic buildings, and we note that historic military warehouses are far rarer structures to survive than officers' quarters, hence especially valuable). 1

Overall, this alternative is preferable because it could be accomplished at less cost to the integrity of this National Historic Landmark, and we believe that is more desirable than whatever supposed aesthetic advantages some might perceive in the "Parkway" alternative. Furthermore, the "Presidio Parkway" alternative is basically out of character with the developmental history of the Presidio and would adversely affect its historic landscape.

We therefore urge the selection of Alternative 2, "Replace and Widen," as the preferable alternative.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal on behalf of our membership.

Sincerely,

Herbert M. Hart
Colonel (Ret.) USMC
Executive Director

Founded in 1966 as the Council on Abandoned Military Posts; name changed in 1981. CAMP is a non-profit, tax-exempt corporation whose members are interested in the identification, location, restoration, preservation and memorialization of old military installations and their history and traditions. All persons sharing this interest are invited to join. CAMP has no official connection with the Department of Defense.

Annual Military History Conference (second week every May): *1967* Ft. Bowie, Ariz. *1968* Augusta, Ga. *1969* San Francisco. *1970* El Paso. *1971* Washington, D.C. and Ft. McHenry, Md. *1972* Denver. *1973* U.S. Military Academy and New York City. *1974* Leavenworth, Kans. *1975* Los Angeles and San Diego. *1976* Tucson, Ariz., and Nogales, Mex. *1977* Hampton Roads, Va. *1978* Minneapolis. *1979* Boston, Mass. and Newport, R.I. *1980* New Orleans. *1981* San Francisco. *1982* Charleston, S.C. *1983* San Antonio. *1984* Jacksonville, Fla. *1985* Santa Fe. *1986* Toledo, Ohio, and Windsor, Ont. *1987* Philadelphia, Pa. *1988* Portland, Ore. *1989* Mobile, Ala. *1990* Bismarck, N.D. *1991* Honolulu, Hawaii. *1992* Tampa, Fla. *1993* Galveston, Tex. *1994* Tacoma, Wash. *1995* Savannah, Ga. *1996* El Paso, Tex. *1997* Buffalo, N.Y. *1998* Lexington, Kentucky. *1999* Omaha, Nebr. *2000* Burlington, Vt. *2001* Rapid City, S.D. *2002* San Juan, P.R. *2003* St. Louis, Mo. *2004* Portland, Maine. *2005* San Diego, Calif. *2006* Chattanooga, Tenn. *2007* Washington, D.C.

Institutional Member: American Association for State and Local History, Preservation Action, National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Coalition for History, Historic Naval Ships Association, American Historical Association, Korean War Commemorative Community, Military, Veterans & Patriotic Organizations, CFC

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Council on America's Military Past - U.S.A.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1366

REC'D MAR 31 2006

COW HOLLOW ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 471196 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94147 TEL. 415.749.1641

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 30, 2006

Mr. Saage:

Below, please find our comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the proposed replacement of Doyle Drive. This is the official response from the Cow Hollow Association (CHA).

The CHA, bounded by Lyon, Pierce, Greenwich, and Pacific, represents approximately 1,900 residents. Our Association is dedicated to the preservation of the residential character of the Cow Hollow neighborhood. As you know the CHA has had a delegate, Tony Imhof, from our board participate in your design process. We appreciate all of the work that has gone into the project.

When the CHA board and some of its residents initially reviewed the DEIS/R, many preferred Alternative #5 (Parkway) for its aesthetic appeal. However, we cannot support this Alternative as it stands because, upon further study, many residents and members of the board have expressed the following objections. 1

Cow Hollow Association Objections

Traffic Distribution between Lombard and Marina Blvd.
As one of the closest Neighborhood Organizations to the Richardson – Lombard egress from Doyle Drive, we are extremely concerned with the ramifications of any changes in the traffic distribution between the existing major Doyle Drive access points of Marina Blvd. and Richardson/Lombard.

The DEIS/R proposes a difficult transition to Marina Blvd. which will drastically alter the ratio of the traffic using Marina Blvd. versus Lombard. This is almost certain to create further congestion along the Lombard corridor with the consequence of escaping traffic then diverting through Cow Hollow neighborhoods to get to Divisidero, Gough and VanNess. 2

The DEIS/R Parkway design, which provides a signalized looping roadway to Marina Blvd., with as many as two additional intersections to maneuver, would be a major deterrent to traffic that currently choose that route. In the draft plan, the north bound

Mar 31 06 08:35a wagner 415-474-2705 p.1

(west) entrance from Marina Blvd. to Girard/Doyle Drive (also Presidio Access) is reduced to a single lane. This, in particular, seems a formula for disaster if Marina Blvd. signage is ever to be changed to the timed traffic signals, (which we favor), and which could be required with anticipated future traffic shifts.

The DEIS/R traffic models which we have studied do show a significant increase from this downgrading of Marina egress in westbound PM traffic entering Doyle from the Lombard corridor. The extent of this increased traffic has not shown up in the Level of Service documents due to the significant modeled traffic cut -through entering Richardson/Doyle from Francisco Blvd. This traffic avoids the modeled intersections yet puts an additional 4,100 cars on neighborhood streets. 2 Cont

Short Cuts From Gorgas to Lyon

We do feel that the direct Presidio access provided by the Parkway alternative has the potential for relieving some of the traffic currently coming through our neighborhoods to access the park through the Lombard gate. It should also reroute some of that traffic using the Presidio gate to access Presidio Heights and points south. However; it distinctly appears that this new exit, linked as it is to the existing Lyon Street connector from Gorgas Ave, will funnel short-cutting traffic to our residential streets whenever there is a tie up on Doyle and Richardson. 3

Impact of Bus Rapid Transit project

Several changes currently proposed by the SF Transportation Authority could also impact the modeled traffic patterns from the Golden Gate Bridge and Doyle Drive. The Bus Rapid Transit proposals for both Geary Blvd. and Van Ness Ave. could potentially shift more Geary traffic (via Park Presidio Blvd.) to east bound Doyle and onto Lombard. In addition, the Lombard traffic will further slow down due to the reduced lane along Van Ness for the dedicated bus route. Lombard will become a parking lot. This would push additional traffic to the only alternate connection to downtown which is Marina/Bay Streets or through our neighborhoods. 4

We urge the Transportation Authority to join us in requesting an area wide transportation study to incorporate some of these issues. We should not be downsizing any of the traffic alternatives without looking at the bigger picture. 5

Suggested Design Changes

Several changes or design selections may help to reduce our objections to Alternative #5 as currently shown. These changes would not materially affect the overall Parkway design of the project but could help protect our residential streets from encroachment.

1- Maintain the current configuration of the two lanes continuing directly to and from the Marina Blvd. in combination with a dedicated off-ramp to the Presidio. We understand that this scenario requires marginally "more concrete", but the traffic delays coming into the City will be unbearable without this solution. 6

2- Only if #1 is truly an impossible solution, then a no-intersection exit ramp to Marina Blvd. should be installed. Only if that is truly impossible should consideration be given to minimizing the number of intersections along the (eastbound) Marina Blvd. off ramp. This might be accomplished by:

a- Selection of the Circle Drive option over the Diamond option for west-bound Presidio access. As we recognize the required removal of the YMCA swimming pool with this option, we would need to know what plans would be in place to rebuild it and where.

b- Eliminating the direct Gorgas / Girard 'submerged' intersection between the Gorgas east-bound off ramp and Marina Blvd. by making the Doyle Drive access to Gorgas Avenue use Birmingham Road for a connector as proposed in one of Michael Painter's design scenarios. With these two adaptations (a and b), both of the additional intersections shown on the current plan could be avoided. 6 Cont

c- To further offset the additional delays introduced to the use of Marina Blvd. and the congestion on Lombard, the stop signs on Marina Blvd must be replaced with signalized lights. *The recommendation of the Transportation Authority as part of the Doyle Drive project would be a big help in facilitating this change.*

The CHA will not support an alternative based on a, b and c without a further study being done demonstrating that it would, in fact, equalize the Marina Blvd./Richardson/Lombard traffic to their present ratio.

3- The single lane entrance to Girard/Doyle from Marina Blvd. must be expanded back to two lanes to allow timed signalization of Marina Blvd. and remove a potential westbound bottleneck. We understand that the reason for shrinking it to single lane was to avoid impacting the historic warehouses along Mason. We feel that keeping the entrance in the same position, but shrinking or eliminating the shown wide median for the short distance passing the warehouses, could have the same effect and still allow two lanes of traffic. The latest Painter drawings show that there is sufficient space to accommodate this change. 7

4- We recognize that the straight across intersection resulting from an off ramp to Birmingham Rd. could potentially encourage the previously mentioned short cut through Gorgas and onto Lyon Street. We feel that this Gorgas to Lyon connector must be removed. As part of the Presidio road system rather than the Doyle Drive plan, we realize that this is not part of your direct purview, but a direct specification in your plan would go a long way towards accomplishing its' removal.

We agree that the current design is an aesthetic improvement over the rebuild and widen (Alternative #2). However, major work must be done to ensure distribution of traffic equal to the present Marina Blvd. and Richardson/Lombard ratios, so as to thereby avoid grave congestion and resulting infiltration to City residential areas. Although the current traffic models claim only a modest projected change in Lombard traffic, several projects 8

already in the planning stage within the City could seriously alter the assumed traffic flow from those modeled. This could be severely impacted by the reduced emphasis the current plan places on Marina ingress and egress. 8 Cont

We feel that the Parkway alternative is on the right track, but the changes we have mentioned would help even out the traffic imbalance which we fear the current design would engender.

We again look forward to working with you in finalizing this important contribution to the future northern access to our City. If you have questions or require clarification of our suggested modifications, please feel free to contact me at 415-749-1841 (lbrooke@lmi.net) or Tony Imhof at 921-4657 (imhof3@sbcglobal.net).

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
President, Cow Hollow Association

cc: Michela Alioto-Pier

Mar 31 06 08:35a wagner 415-474-2705 p.4

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cow Hollow Association

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Removal of support of Alternative 5 noted.	1339
2	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S, see the discussion under the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated. In order to maintain traffic during construction, a transportation management plan will be prepared as part of final design.	1340
3	Although this short cut is not forecast to be a significant problem, the closure of this access is not precluded in Alternative 5 should the problem arise.	1341
4	All alternatives included transit elements and assumed a continuation of currently operating transit services. Bus Rapid Transit proposals were not defined or programmed during the preparation of the draft EIR. Further studies on Doyle Drive and the BRT proposals should examine potential traffic shifts as a result of the implementing of both projects.	1342
5	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1343
6	The Preferred Alternative was refined based on input received while still maintaining traffic operation LOS. The design workshops investigated many design refinements which as been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative.	1344
7	The Preferred Alternative was refined based on input received while still maintaining traffic operation LOS. The design workshops investigated many design refinements which as been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative.	1345
8	Signal timing can balance traffic flows regardless of which alternative is chosen.	1346

Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action

2742 Baker St
San Francisco, CA 94123
415-776-3191 Fax 776-6522

Patricia Vaughey - President
Nan Haynes - Vice President
Max Delle Sedie - Secretary
Argene Giorji - Treasurer

REC'D MAR 3 0 2006

March 28, 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Leroy L. Saage:

We have carefully reviewed you DEIS/R and find various objections resulting from the changes that will occur in our Marina/Cow Hollow neighborhood as a consequence of the Doyle Drive replacement project. We have summarized the major concerns into the following 4 bullets:

- The Marina Blvd. traffic patterns are to remain as they presently are. For City-bound traffic, the additional traffic light(s) included with Alternative 5, Circle and Diamond Options, will result in additional traffic trough the local side streets. For Golden Gate Bridge-bound traffic, the Marina Blvd. access to Doyle Drive must be maintained as two full lanes.
- The Presidio exit into Girard Road/Gorgas Avenue is acceptable, if and only if, the Gorgas slip ramp into Lyon Street at Francisco Street is closed. It is foreseen that commuter traffic will utilize Lyon Street and Francisco Street as a cut-through and increase neighborhood traffic. 1
- Please leave Lyon Street (north of Richardson) as-is. The Circle Drive and Diamond Options are unnecessary.
- Alternative 5 is an acceptable alternate if the above concerns are implemented. Otherwise, Alternative 2, Replace and Widen, would be the preferred alternative.

DEIS/R Comments:

1. Page 2-1: Para 2.1 "Doyle Drive Project extends, on the west, from the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza to Broderick Street on the east, and includes Richardson Avenue, Gorgas Avenue, and Marina Boulevard." As this paragraph defines the project's limits, the EIS fails to include a detailed analyses of the changes in traffic patterns, pollution, noise, and quality of life changes, 2

that would occur on the side streets as a result of the Doyle Drive Project. The side streets that have been excluded are: Lyon (west of Richardson), Francisco Street (both sides of Richardson), Baker (east and west of Richardson), Chestnut (east and west of Richardson), Lombard (west of Richardson), and Broderick at Lombard and east of Richardson. 2 Cont

2. Page 2-26: Para 2.3.1 "NO MARINA ACCESS OPTION" "..... Changing traffic patterns would increase intrusion in the residential area of Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, and the Marina by increasing local traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue". This alternative was specifically dropped because of the adverse effect it would have on the quoted residential areas. However, the access to Marina Blvd., as presented in Alternative 5, Presidio Parkway, produces the same effect for which this alternative was originally dropped. The circuitous route required for City-bound traffic to reach Marina Blvd. borders on the virtual elimination of east-bound traffic to Marina Blvd. 3

3. Page 2-43, para 2.4.3. Exhibit 2-29 shows an off-ramp exiting to Girard Road and Gorgas Ave. The EIS does not address the traffic volumes that would occur at the intersection of Gorgas Ave. and Francisco and Lyon Street. We object to this design because of the likelihood that Gorgas Avenue will become a way for commuters to cut-through into our local streets. 4

As mitigation for the cut-through traffic, the neighborhood would accept closing the slip ramp of Gorgas Ave. at Francisco/Lyon Street and modifying it to only allow bicycle, pedestrian and emergency vehicle access.

4. Page 2-43, para 2.4.3. Exhibit 2-29, the off-ramp exiting to Girard Road and Gorgas Ave. The EIS fails to address the speed limits, traffic controls, the increased traffic volumes as well as the resulting noise, pollutants, and vibration, for the streets west of Richardson Ave and defined as: Francisco Street, Lyon Street, Chestnut St., Greenwich St., Union St., and Green St. 5

What are the speed limits, pollutants, noise, vibration, and traffic counts, on the streets mentioned as a result of the off-ramp at Girard Road?

5. Page 3-91, para 3.2.9 " Temporary Impacts". ".....it is anticipated that some routes may require temporary re-routing. Sufficient notice will be given to the general public regarding new, temporary routes within the project area". The EIS identifies (Exhibit 2-36, and 2-37) which routes may require temporary closure and re-routing. Additionally, Page 3-70, identifies some traffic detours but fails to identify the effects on the local neighborhood streets in proximity to the Project. 6

What are the exact alternative routes and exact temporary rerouting routes, including the local neighborhood streets? And, what are the impacts, if any, to residents along the alternative and temporary routes.

6. Page 3-173, para 3.3.5, Affected Environment. The paragraph identifies noise sensitive receptors as: Baker Street, the south side of Marina Blvd, the east side of Lyon Street (north of Lombard), Richardson Avenue, and the Palace of Fine Arts. Based on the Project scope boundary (Toll Plaza to Broderick Street), the EIS fails to identify Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, the west side of Lyon Street, and Lombard Street. 7

Utilizing CalTrans Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model, TNM, and for each alternative, what are the expected noise levels for the mentioned, excluded, streets?

7. Page 3-175, Exhibit 3-49, Long Term Noise Measurements. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 23CFR772, requires noise level measurements be made 50 feet (app. 15 metre) from source. The tabulation presented in Exhibit 3-49 is not in accordance with FHWA's measurement requirements. Therefore, any "modeled" projected noise levels are inaccurate. Additionally, the EIS fails to include noise measurements taken along the complete project's boundary, i.e. Golden Gate Toll Plaza to Broderick Street. 8

What are the noise measurements at Richardson, both sides of Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick?

8. Page 3-178, "Residences Richardson Avenue and Marina Boulevard. These areas could be exposed to noise levels above 89 dBA during construction". According to FHWA: "When construction noise impact is anticipated at a highly complex or controversial major urban project, the FHWA requires the utilization of the computerized prediction model HICNOM. FHWA Section 772.19, Construction Noise, FAPG 23 CFR 772, specifically address this issue. The EIS fails to define what mitigating or protective measure will be taken to reduce the noise level to acceptable levels. Additionally, the EIS only mentions Richardson Avenue and Marina Blvd but fails to include both sides of Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick. 9

What are the mitigating or protective measures that will be taken to reduce noise levels to acceptable levels at Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick?

9. Page 3-190, "Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures". Further prediction of noise impacts is unnecessary since they have already been identified to exceed the FHWA or NAC requirements (Exhibit 3-49, 3-50, 3-53, 3-54, and 3-55). Each alternative requires mitigation/minimization effort. Therefore, any postponement until the preferred alternative is selected is unnecessary. For the residents of the impacted areas, Marina Blvd, Richardson Ave., Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick, 10 the only viable and acceptable mitigation/minimization is traffic management. Your "Traffic Management" paragraph, page 3-191, is unacceptable since the EIS only addresses vehicle speed and traffic volumes. Additional mitigation measures listed under 23 CFR 722 are: Prohibition of certain vehicle types, Time use restrictions for certain vehicle types, Modified speed limits, Exclusive land use designations, and Traffic control devices or combinations of

these measures. FHWA (23 CFR 722) requires compliance when the criteria are approached or exceeded. Additionally, compliance is a prerequisite for the granting of Federal-aid highway funds for construction and re-construction of a highway. 10 Cont

How do you propose to implement the traffic management required to mitigate the noise impacts for Marina Blvd, Richardson Ave., Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick?

10. Page 3-195, Alternative Paving Materials. "Using alternative paving materials such as open-graded or rubberized asphaltic concrete is another noise reducing measure." According to FHWA HIGHWAY TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS AND ABATEMENT POLICY AND GUIDANCE, Page 38 Paragraph F: "it is very difficult to forecast pavement surface condition into the future. Unless definite knowledge is available on the pavement type and condition and its noise generating characteristics, no adjustments should be made for pavement type in the prediction of highway traffic noise levels. Studies have shown open-graded asphalt pavement can initially produce a benefit of 2-4 dBA reduction in noise levels. However, within a short time period (approximately 6-12 months), any noise reduction benefit is lost when the voids fill up and the aggregate becomes polished. The use of specific pavement types or surface textures must not be considered as a noise abatement measure." (emphasis added) 11

What alternative noise reduction methods will be provided?

11. The northbound ramp from Marina Blvd. is limited to a single lane. Since Marina Blvd. is a two-lane street, the ramp towards the GG Bridge should not be constricted, and also be two lanes. 12

12. The DEIS/R makes no reference to the replacement of the portion of Veteran's Blvd. from the Doyle off-ramp to the tunnel. Why not? This portion of roadway is of the same vintage as the rest of Doyle Drive and subject to the same replacement reasons outlined for Doyle Drive (Paragraph S.2), and 1.3.2, Project Need. 13

13. Page 5-2. Para. 5.1.2, Federal Highway Administration. Your references to the FHWA memorandum and position papers are outdated. Your analyses for indirect and cumulative impacts must be based on Executive Order 13274, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, Work Group, Draft Baseline Report, dated March 15, 2005. 14

14. Page 3-191. Para. "Traffic Management". Your statement: "...implementing traffic management measures on Doyle Drive would not be a reasonable noise abatement measure because it would interfere with the purpose of the project." is irresponsible. When "noise" issues are either foreseen or exist, mitigation is mandatory whether it be trough traffic management or any other means. The FHWA requires that measures be taken even though there is no actual reduction in noise levels. Approved reduction methods can be as simple as landscaping; where the "noise" reduction is only perceived and not actually diminished. If a noise impact is identified, the abatement measures listed in Sec. 772.13(c) must be considered. 15

Additionally:
(d) When noise abatement measures are being considered, every reasonable effort shall be made to obtain substantial noise reductions.
(e) Before adoption of a final environmental impact statement or finding of no significant impact, the highway agency shall identify:

(1) Noise abatement measures which are reasonable and feasible and which are likely to be incorporated in the project, and

(2) Noise impacts for which no apparent solution is available.

(f) The views of the impacted residents will be a major consideration in reaching a decision on the reasonableness of abatement measures to be provided. (emphasis added)
(g) The plans and specifications will not be approved by FHWA unless those noise abatement measures which are reasonable and feasible are incorporated into the plans and specifications to reduce or eliminate the noise impact on existing activities, developed lands, or undeveloped lands for which development is planned, designed, and programmed.

15 Cont

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comments noted.	1499
2	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented under the discussion of the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8 of FEIR/S. Impacts associated with Noise (Section 3.3.5) and Air Quality (Section 3.3.4) are available in Chapter 3 of the FEIS/R. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1500
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1501
4	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated. In design workshops, restricting this facility has been discussed, however the extent of the restriction will not be explored until final project design.	1502
5	The project does not propose any changes to local neighborhood streets as no project impacts are identified. To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented under the discussion of the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8 of the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1503
6	The exact re-routing of traffic will not be determined until design is complete. The transportation management plan (TMP) will be finalized prior to construction to mitigate potential adverse impacts and to provide a public outreach element to announce changes in traffic routes. A draft TMP is included in Appendix K of the FEIS/R.	1504
7	The limits of construction for the project have been defined as from Merchant Road to the intersection of Richardson Avenue/Francisco Street and Marina Boulevard/Lyon Street, as noted in the December 2004 Noise Study. Areas outside of these limits are not expected to be impacted by construction activities. Operational aspects of the existing streets in this area will continue as they have prior to the project. It appears that the eastern extent to Broderick is only in the vicinity of Marina Blvd and not at the Richardson/Broderick intersection. To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The traffic study data was used to conduct additional noise analysis. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated. See Section 3.3.5 of the FEIS/R for additional information about the noise study addendum.	1505

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
8	Temporary Noise Impacts in Section 3.3.5 of the FEIS/R was expanded to include construction noise reduction options that are considered reasonable and feasible. Those measures are currently listed in Section 8.1.4 of the Noise and Vibration Study of December 2004 and includes numerous methods of noise control that can be employed. The statement that FHWA requires the use of HICNOM is not correct. FHWA does not require the use of HICNOM or any construction noise model - it merely provides them for the use of the highway agency. Specific construction noise reduction methods to be used by the Contractor will be defined in the design plans and included in the construction documents. Since the area beyond the intersection of Richardson Avenue and Lyon Street will not be within the active construction zone, no special noise controls are anticipated for those areas.	1506
10	Section 3.3.5 of the FEIS was expanded to include a discussion of all of the traffic management options that were considered. While it is true that a number of abatement options are available in terms of traffic management, the various methods of control suggested by the reviewer have been explored and found to be ineffective for this project. Further prediction of noise impacts is not warranted at this time as the project will not impact the areas in question unless a major design change occurs. For the preferred alternative a more detailed assessment of noise control options was outlined, however the final selection of noise abatement options will not occur until final design. This will follow the completion of an intensive public involvement effort to identify the desires of the impacted property owners in the vicinity. The reviewer is correct that only traffic management efforts could provide any relief to the traffic noise generated. However, due to the nature of the roadway, traffic patterns, and limited physical options, no reasonable control methods were identified. As noted by the reviewer, FHWA requires "Examination and evaluation of alternative noise abatement measures for reducing or eliminating the noise impacts." (23CFR Part 772.9 (b) (5). FHWA further states that "If a noise impact is identified, the abatement measures listed in Sec. 772.13(c) of this chapter must be considered." Consideration of abatement measures listed in this section have been considered, including the use of traffic management measures. However, as note above, the use of traffic management measures was determined not to be reasonable and feasible for the areas of concern. Therefore, further consideration of noise abatement in the form of traffic management is not warranted at this time.	1507
11	The statement by the reviewer that FHWA does not currently allow the use of paving materials as a "noise reduction option" in the prediction of future traffic noise levels is correct. This does not mean that the application of a quieter pavement surface cannot be used as a means to reduce traffic noise. It simply means that you cannot use this option as a way to predict lower future traffic noise levels. The application of a quiet pavement in states like Arizona have shown a 4 dBA or more reduction in traffic noise levels for a period of several years. The long term benefit is still unknown but at least an initial benefit can be realized. Therefore the application of a quiet pavement surface will continue to be considered as an abatement option. As noted in this section, noise barriers, absorptive tunnel lining, and retrofitting windows are three additional abatement options being seriously considered. Commitments to further assess each of these options was established in the FEIS for the preferred alternative as appropriate. Final details on the actual abatement options will be determined during the design phase of the project in concert with the impacted property owners.	1508
12	Based on traffic analysis, only one lane is needed	1509

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
13	That element was outside the scope of the project. However, the project team is working with Caltrans to address this issue. A memo regarding this issue has been provided. Structures on Route 1 have been retrofitted and have an adequate sufficiency rating.	1510
14	FHWA and Caltrans instructed the team to use this reference which is included in the EIS/R. The current cumulative impact analysis meets statutory and regulatory requirements.	1511
15	FHWA does not require the use of abatement measures that provide no perceptible noise reduction. This section of the FEIS was expanded to include a more detailed discussion of all of the traffic management options that were considered. The use of landscaping, particularly in the areas of impact along Lyon Street and similar residential areas on the eastern end of the project is not possible since there is no space to plant or maintain vegetation that would screen the traffic from view. The statement regarding FHWA requirements about abatement being considered is correctly stated. However, the provision of noise abatement is left up to the lead agency after it assesses the costs and benefits of such abatement and determines that abatement effort is reasonable and feasible for the areas of concern. This is, unfortunately, one of those locations where unavoidable impacts in the form of traffic noise levels that approach or exceed the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria for residential land use. The traffic noise levels are actually predicted to be slightly lower with the build alternative than with the no-build option, indicating that the overall noise impact will be negligible. Once again, FHWA does not require mitigation - it requires the consideration of abatement that is reasonable and feasible. If abatement is considered reasonable and feasible, then mitigation is required. Unfortunately, this is a location where noise abatement is not considered reasonable and feasible following FHWA and Caltrans requirements.	1512

March 31, 2006

Lee Saage, PE, Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Doyle Drive Project
Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Exploratorium welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report for the Doyle Drive Project. We fully support your efforts to replace the existing Doyle Drive structure and other proposed improvements to traffic and circulation in the general vicinity. We commend the Doyle Drive team for the progress to date and development of the alternatives. Our general comments on the three alternatives are as follows:

Alternative 1 – No-Build - This is not an acceptable alternative
Alternative 2 – Replace and Widen – This alternative has the lesser impact on the Palace of Fine Arts area of the two rebuild alternatives, but does little to mitigate many of the unfortunate features of Doyle Drive cutting through the Presidio
Alternative 5 – Presidio Parkway – This alternative has the greater impact on the Palace of Fine Arts area but has numerous beneficial aspects that have resulted in our recommendation of this alternative as the preferred approach. 1

Although the Exploratorium has plans in progress to relocate from the Palace of Fine Arts to another location in the San Francisco, it is possible that our relocation could occur after the construction of the Doyle Drive Project is scheduled to begin. As a result, our comments are focused on the impacts of the complex construction process on our continuing operations in the Palace of Fine Arts and in the Presidio buildings we lease along Mason Street.

Exploratorium
3601 Lyon Street
San Francisco, California 94123-1099

415.561.0370 facsimile
www.exploratorium.edu

the museum of science, art and human perception

Construction Period

Our comments on the construction impacts that we have been able to determine from the extensive DEIS/R documents are as follows:

General Comments on Construction

- Access to the Palace of Fine Arts area for visitors and staff will be seriously impacted, including automobiles, pedestrians, bicyclists, school buses, as well as for service, deliveries and emergency vehicles. 2
- Wayfinding will be complex and difficult and sufficient funds must be included in the Doyle Drive Project budget for use-specific signage and other mitigation measures, such as public information outreach. 3
- School field trips are a major aspect of Exploratorium programs and a program for management of bus unloading and loading for this purpose will need further development in the Doyle Drive planning. Shuttle busing from the Presidio Parade Ground may not be practical for school field trips. 4
- Private automobile access during construction will be very problematic. Parking in the Presidio with shuttle busing to the Palace may be possible but, will be a wayfinding nightmare for those unfamiliar with the City and the Presidio. Is funding for shuttle buses in the Doyle Drive Project budget? 5
- Public transit will be impacted and the reduced service, service delays and rerouted service routes will add significantly to our access problems. 6
- The Presidio Parade Grounds at the Main Post are mentioned frequently as a location for parking, bus staging and shuttle service. Is this planning in conflict with Presidio Trust planning for the Main Post that has been in progress for several years? 7
- Construction conditions will, in all likelihood, create a tendency for Palace visitors to park on the neighboring streets, creating a further strain on neighborhood relations. 8

Replace and Widen Alternative Construction

In addition to the above, this alternative's construction detour option will not only impact the LAIR parking lot but will also terminate use of Presidio Building 1182 which is used by a number of employees as listed in the DEIS/R, but also provides active material storage, shipping and receiving functions. 9

Parkway Alternative Construction

In addition to the above, this alternative's construction phase will take the LAIR parking lot out of use completely. 10

Schedule for Construction

There does not appear to be a detailed construction schedule in the DEIS/R. We look forward to understanding the detailed timelines better and how we may plan our activities in response to the construction impacts. 11

Palace Drive Construction

It is unclear whether the improvements to Palace Drive are in the scope of the Doyle Drive Project and in the Project budget – and when in the construction 12

schedule this work would be scheduled to occur. Is additional information available on this subject? 12 Cont

Although we understand and would expect that many of the neighboring institutions will be inconvenienced during construction by such a large project, every effort must be made to mitigate, to the extent possible, the operational and environmental impacts and sufficient funds budgeted to do so. The Transportation Management Plan to be developed will be a key ingredient in the planning and we look forward to participating in this process.

Permanent Planning

Exploratorium management is projecting that we will relocate prior to the end of the Doyle Drive construction period, however, we offer the following comments on the permanent plans in the DEIS/R as they may effect the Palace of Fine Arts complex:

Replace and Widen Alternative
This alternative, when completed, does not appear to have a major impact on the LAIR parking lot, Palace Drive or the Palace Drive/Lyon Street alignments.

Parkway Alternative
This alternative has the greater potential impact of the final two build alternatives. Recognizing that there is additional planning to be done in the area of the Palace of Fine Arts, we believe the significant impacts on this area, regardless of the tenant, are as follows:

- The proposed underground parking configuration seems very awkward and inefficient.
- Access to the underground parking as currently shown is remote, non-intuitive and the wayfinding to and from the parking is likely to be problematic. 13
- This parking scheme will be extraordinarily costly per space. Is funding for this underground parking in the Doyle Drive Project budget?
- The two alternative configurations shown for Palace Drive do not seem to be integral with the Diamond or Circle Drive options and appear to be separate Palace Drive alternatives.
- Either one-way plan for Palace Drive has certain advantages, but will create challenges in the management of automobile and bus circulation. 14
- The separation of the east end of Palace Drive from Lyon Street will be a major improvement and welcomed by the neighbors.
- Automobile drivers will be able to drop off passengers at the existing north entrance or a new central entrance, but would then have to find an auto entry to the underground parking. The closest parking entrance shown is from Girard Road and would require a left turn across the Girard traffic from Doyle Drive, assuming a left turn at that location is feasible. Pedestrians from and to the underground parking will need strategically placed access/egress locations and clear wayfinding signage to navigate the complex plan. 15
- With the Palace Drive plan shown on the Circle Drive Option, buses from the north can enter and depart from the Lyon/Marina Drive location, while all buses from the City apparently must return to Richardson through the Presidio via Gorgas Avenue. 16

- With the Palace Drive plan shown on the Diamond Option, buses from the north would travel through the Presidio along Gorgas to reach Palace Drive from Richardson, while buses from the City must return to Richardson through the Presidio via Gorgas Avenue. In this option, it appears that all buses would travel through the Presidio arriving or departing – probably not desirable from the Presidio perspective. 17
- The Pedestrian Overcrossing from the Palace to Crissey Field shown on both options seems somewhat implausible. Is this pedestrian bridge included in the Doyle Drive Project budget? 18
- The replacement of the LAIR parking lot with underground parking and the narrowing of Palace Drive will present an opportunity for extensive landscaping improvements to the west of the Palace building. Hopefully, the Doyle Drive Project, the Recreation and Park Department and the Presidio will be able to meet the challenge of funding and executing these improvements. 19

These comments are based on our interpretation of the DEIS/R documents. If there are areas where we may have misunderstood any of the material, we look forward to any clarifications that may be warranted in your responses in the DEIS/R process.

We certainly appreciate the tremendous amount of effort that has made to address this difficult and important undertaking and the opportunity to comment on the DEIS/R.

Best wishes for a successful conclusion to the EIR process and timely replacement of the existing Doyle Drive structures.

Sincerely yours,

The Exploratorium

Fred L. Foote
Project Director

Cc: Virginia Carollo Rubin, Acting Executive Director
Christina Orth, Chief of Staff

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Exploratorium

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support of Alternative 5 noted.	1273
2	The project team will continue to coordinate with the Recreation and Parks Department to ensure that access to the Palace of Fine Arts remains open during the construction period. The Preferred Alternative will maintain Palace Drive as a two-way road and incorporates the modifications proposed by SFRPD where Palace Drive connects to Lyon Street therefore access to the Palace of Fine Arts will not be hindered.	1274
3	The elements mentioned in the comment may be part of the Traffic Management Plan(TMP) used during construction.	1275
4	Details pertaining to the proposed replacement parking at the Parade Grounds during construction would be developed in coordination with the Presidio Trust.	1276
5	Any approved mitigation addressing project-related parking impacts would be considered as project costs. Details would be developed at a later stage of the project.	1277
6	No alternative assumes modifications in the vicinity of the Exploratorium. Alternative 5 transit stops will be closer to the Exploratorium entrance.	1278
7	The PTMP does call for the eventual "greening" of the Parade Grounds but currently the area is used for parking. It is a matter of timing and whether the greening would occur before or after the construction of Doyle Drive. With no definite timeline for the greening of the Parade Ground, it is anticipated that the area would still be available for parking during the construction of Doyle Drive.	1279
8	The proposed replacement parking at the Parade Grounds augmented with the existing shuttle service should address the identified parking impacts during construction. Parking will be coordinated with the Presidio Trust.	1280
9	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1182 will remain intact.	1281
10	The existing Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) now occupies the former LAIR facility and parking lot. Parking associated with LDAC will not be impacted by project construction.	1282
11	The detailed construction schedule will be developed as part of final design. The preliminary construction staging timeline is discussed in Section 2.9.1.	1283
12	The project will continue to coordinate with and accommodate the proposed plans of DRP. Improvements needed for the project are included in the estimate	1284

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Exploratorium

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
13	The underground parking structure was eliminated from this project and is not part of the Preferred Alternative. The project is coordinating with the Trust and DPR to maintain the necessary parking. Funds for replacement parking are included in the estimate.	1285
14	Comment noted.	1286
15	Comment noted. The underground parking structure was eliminated from the project and is not part of the Preferred Alternative.	1287
16	The Circle Drive Option was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.	1288
17	Comment noted.	1289
18	The pedestrian connection indicated on the drawings is an at-grade path.	1290
19	The project will continue to coordinate with and accommodate the proposed plans of DRP. Improvements needed for the project are included in the estimate.	1291

FORT POINT AND PRESIDIO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

REC'D MAR 31 2006

March 30, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage
100 Van Ness Ave. 26th Floor
San Francisco CA 94102

Re: Comments of the Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association on the DEIS/R for Doyle Drive.

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association has for over fifty years supported bringing Presidio history to the public. We support the replacement of the current Doyle Drive roadway as necessary for public safety. However, removal of the existing historic Doyle Drive and the construction of a new roadway twice as wide as the existing roadway, will have a negative effect on the Presidio as a National Park and as a National Historic Landmark District (NHLD). The design for the new roadway should avoid or minimize the effect on historic structures and features. The project should mitigate the effect of the new wider roadway by contributing to the presentation of the history represented in this NHLD in a suitable venue such as a history center or museum, as well as at locations throughout the District at sites associated with historic events, units or people. 1

We prefer the Presidio Parkway (Alternative 5) as the design approach for this project, provided the design evolves in a manner which follows the direction indicated in Michael Painter's design presented in a meeting in your offices on Feb.22,2006. At the easterly end of the roadway the "Diamond interchange" should be selected over the "Circle Drive" option since it avoids the destruction of the historic Presidio Pool (Building 1151). We note that the project must be designed to avoid negatively effecting buildings which contribute to the NHLD. Since an alternative to the removal of the pool exists it must be selected. 2

We urge the acceleration of the section 106 process and the development of an MOA between parties. We further suggest that the concept design process be accelerated. A design process for the landscape opportunities opened up by the creation of tunnels should also be integrated into the design approach so that the visitor experience is enhanced. This should include the area above the tunnel at the cemetery and the adjacent batteries Slaughter and Blaney, as well as the area between the project and Mason Street. These design processes should parallel the project design process. 3 4

P.O. Box 29163 ● Presidio of San Francisco, California 94129 ● Telephone: (415) 921-8193
Fax: (415) 921-2735 ● Email: FPPHA@aol.com ● Website: www.presidioassociation.org

We look forward to continuing to work with you and your design team to bring about a truly magnificent project that is not only safe but respects the National Park and National Historic Landmark District context. We believe that the effect of this new and wider roadway can be mitigated by preserving and presenting this historic legacy to the public. 5

Further detailed comments are included as Attachment A to this letter.

Sincerely,

Gary Widman
President

Redmond F. Kernan, III
Chairman of the Board

cc: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
Craig Middleton, Executive Director, Presidio Trust
Brian O'Neill, General Superintendent, GGNRA
Ric Borjes, Federal Preservation Officer, Presidio Trust
Michael Boland
Rick Foster, GGNRA
Craig Kenkel, Chief, Cultural Resources & Museum Management, GGNRA
Michael Buhler, National Trust for Historic Preservation

FORT POINT AND PRESIDIO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Attachment A

1. A slip ramp should not be constructed at Merchant Road unless absolutely necessary for safety reasons. It intrudes on the landscape and would cause the removal of existing residential structures. 6

2. The "hook ramp" from Park Presidio Blvd to Doyle Drive is preferable to the "loop ramp" as it would have less impact on the area and landscape. While nearer the historic stables we believe it is sufficiently removed so as not to cause a significant negative impact. 7

3. The cut and cover tunnel at the Cemetery should be shortened from what was originally shown. Its purpose we believe is to reconnect the Batteries to the upper Presidio which are now cut off by the at surface roadway. A much shorter tunnel could preform the function of providing physical and visual access by the public to the Batteries and bluff area. 8

4. The roadway as it emerges from the Cemetery tunnel should have the southerly portion (inbound to the City) raised so as to do the least alteration to the existing bluff. This will also have the effect of lessening the need for massive retaining walls in that area. Any walls that are required should be so treated so as to resemble a natural bluff. 9

5. The area to the north of the Main Parade Ground where it is proposed to build a structure over the roadway and fill over it thereby creating a covered tunnel is the most challenging and complex area. Halleck St. and adjacent or nearby structures as well as historic bluff features are negatively impacted by this design approach. This includes buildings 201, 204, and 228. The purpose of the fill over the roadway seems to be to create an assumed aesthetic treatment over the roadway. As presented the space over the roadway seems contrived, sterile, and not well thought through. The damage done to the historic context does not seem worth the small visual benefit achieved. We suggest a shorter "tunnel" with a treatment on the north side that compliments the bluff feature and perhaps provides more useable space at the lower level. Building 201 should be retained even if it must be moved and altered to allow the roadway construction to occur. Building 228 could be raised in place to the level to compliment the grade change on Halleck St. Every effort should be made to find a suitable location to move building 204 to. The alignment of Halleck St. is reestablished but the profile is so significantly altered as to compromise the sense of place. We suggest that the roadway of Doyle Drive be lowered and that Halleck St. rise in a more gradual way with buildings on either side to keep the sense of place that exists today and recalls its role as an historic connection to the Quartermaster Wharf at the beach. 10

6. Building 230 is in the path of the new roadway as currently aligned. We suggest that it be moved to a nearby location. We do believe that it is preferable to move or alter an historic or contributing structure rather than demolish it. 11

P.O. Box 29163 ● Presidio of San Francisco, California 94129 ● Telephone: (415) 921-8193
Fax: (415) 921-2735 ● Email: FPPHA@aol.com ● Website: www.presidioassociation.org

7. Gorgas Ave. as it heads west toward the new extended Girard St. gradually lowers in elevation so that Girard St. may pass under the new Parkway overhead. This creates the need for retaining walls as high as 10 feet to retain the Gorgas St. warehouses and essentially cuts them off from their frontage road (Gorgas). We believe the condition as shown is unacceptable. The further design of the area should explore ways to mitigate this condition. The off ramp to Girard could be moved to the south to align with Birmingham or Thornton rather than Girard. Even moving it slightly to the south provides an opportunity to raise the intersection and lower the grade differential. Further the entire Parkway could be raised so as not to depress Girard as much as it is. Just maintaining the Gorgas St. warehouses is not enough. If the access and context are so altered that the historic sense is destroyed they become isolated and lacking in any ability to contribute the NHLD. This can and should be avoided. 12

8. The use of sound walls to mitigate the effect of highway noise should be avoided in the Presidio as they create an unwanted visual intrusion. Any diminution of views would be contrary to the objectives of the Presidio as a National Park and would certainly not be consistent with the NLHD. In a similar vein the use of fencing and in particular, cyclone fencing, should be avoided. Instead natural barriers of height differentials, water features and landscaping should be employed. 13

9. Careful consideration should be given to appropriate signage, lighting, and fixtures that bespeak a Parkway through a very special place. Traffic calming measures are very important and should be used as much as possible. They will do much to enhance safety and enjoyment. 14

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	This comment is addressed as part of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) and treatment plans which are summarized in the FEIS/R under Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures in Section 3.2.11. A discussion of Context Sensitive Design is provided in Section 2.2.3.	1320
2	Preference for Alternative 5 noted. In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1321
3	Agreed. Coordination with the impacted parties has been an important element of this project. As stated in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11, coordination and development of the PA has involved numerous groups. The PA is included in Appendix I of the FEIS/R.	1322
4	Details regarding the final design of the roadway and landscaping will be developed in the final design process. Final landscape decisions would be made in coordination with the Presidio Trust and VMP to ensure overall integration with the Presidio.	1323
5	Coordination will continue throughout this project.	1324
6	Opposition to Merchant Road Slip Ramp noted. This Ramp was not included in the Preferred Alternative.	1325
7	Preference for Hook Ramp noted.	1326
8	The length of the Battery tunnels are controlled by the need to preserve Lincoln Ave and the National Cemetery.	1327
9	The design workshop on 3/22/06 was held to gather input from interested parties on all aspects of the design and options under consideration. A raised southbound profile was proposed and developed as part of the alternative refinement.	1328
10	Possible design refinements to preserve cultural resources were considered at the design workshops on 3/22/06 and 4/20/06. The actual mitigations for adverse effects to cultural resources including historic buildings are addressed in the PA (see Appendix I of the FEIS/R).	1329
11	This comment is addressed as part of the PA which is included in Appendix I in the FEIS/R and treatment plans .	1330
12	The design workshops held on 3/22/06 and 4/20/06 investigated ways to preserve the historic streetscape. The profile of Girard Rd was raised to reduce the height of retaining walls and Gorgas Ave was realigned to the south to preseerve the existing streetscape adjacent to the warehouses. Mitigation for adverse impacts to historic streetscapes is addressed in the PA (see Appendix I in the FEIS/R) and treatment plans.	1331

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Fort Point and Presidio Historical Association

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
13	The use of sound barrier walls within the Presidio will be considered where appropriate as noise control measures. While it is true that diminution of the views may be contrary to the objectives of the area, consideration of this form of abatement will continue into design. During the public involvement process, if the impacted property owners do not desire a noise barrier, then it will be removed from further consideration. The application of landscaping as a noise control will not be pursued since this is not an effective method of reducing traffic noise levels.	1332
14	Details regarding signage, lighting, etc. will be developed during the final design of the roadway. A discussion of context sensitive design, including traffic calming, is provided in Section 2.2.3.	1333

An Association of Former Members of

Golden Gate National Parks and Point Reyes Seashore

A D V I S O R Y C O M M I S S I O N

3260 Blume Drive, Suite 410, Richmond, CA 94806

February 28, 2006

VIA FACSIMILE (415) 522-4829

Leroy L. Saage
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECD MAR - 8 2006

Re: Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

The group which sponsors this letter, as appointees of the US Secretary of the Interior to the Advisory Commission for the Golden Gate National Parks, began planning for the Presidio in 1973 to become a part of the National Park System, and has maintained its interest in Presidio planning for more than 30 years. The Presidio is one of the two most historic locations in the United States, and is now part of the most visited National Park in the nation.

In contemplating Doyle Drive, three points stand out:

1. Currently Doyle Drive is unsafe, and ugly, and ought to be replaced.

2. Before replacing Doyle Drive, great care must be paid to a design that minimizes the effect on National Park Service land and assets.

3. While we are at it, can we do a better job for the neighbors, and for visitors to the Park.

The goal of Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway is to make this necessary roadway much better. Better for drivers, better for park users and visitors, and better for the Presidio's neighbors.

The Presidio Parkway (Alternate 5) is the only alternative which meets the objectives of the Project. Alternative 2, taller and twice as wide as what we now have, insures that increasing numbers of people driving to work, live or play in the national park, will be forced to use neighborhood streets, as they do today.

We support the hook ramp option at the Highway 1 interchange. 1

We do not support the slip ramp to the bridge parking lot which, for marginal weaving improvements, adds roadway width at the Project's widest point, removes residences and trees, and adds over $10 million in cost. 2

We have noted the legitimate concerns of some historic groups about impacts of the Main Post tunnel on the bluff edge and Halleck Street, which are historic landscape elements. The tunnel cap will mimic the bluff's slope, which is its defining character, while reuniting the Main Post and Crissy Field for the first time in 70 years. Where today from the Main Post one looks at trucks roaring by, instead we will be looking at the bay and not hear the traffic. The Parkway also restores the historic alignment of Halleck Street.

Finally, the Parkway needs modern traffic management features, including video monitoring, as called for in the Doyle Drive Intermodal Study. They will also increase the bridge's security. 3

Our heartfelt thanks go to Michael Painter, who worked for 15 years, often pro bono, to bring to fruition a design which all of us can embrace.

We strongly support Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway as the preferred alternative, with context sensitive refinements that further improve the EIS designs. 4

Thank you for your anticipated attention to the above.

Sincerely,

Richard Bartke, Chairman

Richard Bartke, *Chair* - Amy Meyer, *Vice Chair*, Michael Alexander - Susan Giacomini Allan
Gordon Bennett - Betsey Cutler - Paul A. Jones - Redmond Kernan - Yvonne Lee - Doug Nadeau
Trent Orr - Lennie Roberts - Dennis Rodoni - Fred Rodriguez - Doug Siden - Edgar Wayburn

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNP & Pt Reyes Seashore Advisory Commission

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for the Hook Ramp option noted.	1227
2	Opposition to the Merchant Road Slip Ramp option noted.	1228
3	The following text was added to the FEIS/R (see Section 2.3.4): Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) - Where possible, ITS elements will be included with the project to meet the ITS requirements of Caltrans. ITS elements may include loop detectors, close circuit cameras, and changeable message signs. ITS elements will be clarified in Final Design and may be tied to the management of the tunnels.	1229
4	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1230

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVANCY

March 29, 2006

REC'D MAR 3 0 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage, PE
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy is taking this opportunity to provide formal comments in regard to the Doyle Drive DEIS/DEIR. These comments focus on four matters: one, the choice of a "preferred alternative"; two, specific comments on the DEIS/R; three, access to Crissy Field during Doyle Drive construction; and four, our significant concerns regarding the impacts of Doyle Drive project construction upon the Crissy Field Center, and the absence of sufficient examination of those impacts in the Draft document.

In order to properly frame our comments on the DEIS/R, we will provide a brief background on the Parks Conservancy, and on the nature of the activities and operation of Crissy Field and Crissy Field Center.

Background

A. Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy ("Conservancy") is the non-profit membership organization created in 1981 to:

- Preserve the Golden Gate National Parks
- Enhance the experiences of park visitors
- Build a community dedicated to conserving the parks for the future

The Parks Conservancy is a cooperating association authorized by Congress to support and assist the National Park Service in park improvement, research, interpretation, and conservation programs. The Conservancy's work is accomplished through annual membership dues, generous contributions from individual, corporate, and foundation sponsors, as well as income earned through a variety of Conservancy-operated activities, such as interpretive tours and sales of park-related interpretive materials.

BUILDING 201, FORT MASON, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123
Tel: (415) 561-3000 Fax: (415) 561-3003 www.parksconservancy.org

Since 1981, the Conservancy has provided the Golden Gate National Recreation Area with more than $90 million in assistance, including nearly $5 million in 2005. The Conservancy has long been recognized as one the most effective park partners in the country. Beginning in 2005, our partnership with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) was augmented by a new working partnership with the Presidio Trust.

B. Crissy Field

The Parks Conservancy raised more than $34 million to restore Crissy Field (and the Crissy Field Center), which included the largest single cash gift in the history of the National Park Service. Crissy Field – 100 acres of extraordinary shoreline, which had been under military jurisdiction for more than 200 years – was dedicated in May 2001, following a fund-raising campaign by the Conservancy that brought in more than 2,400 donations.

The removal of more than 70 acres of asphalt and concrete and its replacement with a 20-acre tidal marsh, plantings of native vegetation, and a natural shoreline, have transformed 100 acres from a harsh, unfriendly, contaminated landscape to one enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of walkers, bikers, sailboarders, and bird watchers. Crissy Field extends from the Warming Hut (a café and shop) at the west end, to the Mason Street entrance at the east end, and park visitors access the entire area by foot, bicycle, automobile, and public bus service.

C. Crissy Field Center

As part of the Crissy Field project, the Conservancy created the Crissy Field Center, funded through private donations totaling $7 million. Presidio Building No. 603, which is adjacent to the tidal marsh, was converted to operate as the hub of the National Park Service (Golden Gate) community and education programs to serve urban youth who have traditionally had little or no access to National Parks. The Center has 15 on-site staff members, a fully equipped science lab, a large art room, a computer lab with 16 computers, a 100-person capacity gathering room, a resource library, community kitchen, a bookstore, a café and an outdoor orientation area.

The Conservancy operates the Crissy Field Center in partnership with the National Park Service and provides most of the $1 million annual operating budget of the Center. The Center, now in its fifth year of operation, served more than 62,000 youth and adults in 2005. More than 21,000 of these visitors were school children and youth. All programs for school children include orientation in the main floor gathering room or on the front plaza, and then walking trips to Crissy Field and other park sites; many programs currently cross under Doyle Drive to access other nearby areas for the essential first-hand park experience. The 2005 use-level of 62,000 is anticipated to increase as the Center's group programs broaden and outreach to the community increases.

DEIS/R Comments

A. Doyle Drive Preferred Alternative

The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy supports Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway. The benefits provided by this alternative to the Presidio, the Park, and specifically, to Crissy Field and the Crissy Field Center, are well documented in the DEIS/R. Accordingly, our comments are focused upon the Presidio Parkway Alternative. 1

B. DEIS/R Text Comments

1. "Community Facilities" - Page 3-35. Please note that the name of the Golden Gate National Parks Association (as stated in the DEIS/R description of Crissy Field Center) has been changed to the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy. 2

2. "Community Facilities" - Page 3-35. The Conservancy feels that the description of the Center seems to implicitly ascribe importance to the "small café and book store" rather than the functions of the NPS/Conservancy environmental education center. As the aforementioned 2005 attendance figures confirm, the primary use of the building is for its education activities. With respect to use, the bookstore and café are present to supplement and facilitate the educational activities. 3

3. "Appendix D: Cultural Resources - Potential Impacts within the APE" - Page D-9. The Conservancy believes that the matrix description set forth, indicating "No Adverse Effect" to Presidio Building No. 603 (Crissy Center) is not correct. There are only three definitions of potential impacts employed in the Appendix D discussion: one, "No Effect"; two, "No Adverse Effect"; and three, "Adverse Effect Direct (Destruction)". The Crissy Center building is not "taken" by the project, but the building would appear to be a "definitive" example of a category absent from the matrix: a building that is subject to "temporary adverse impacts". 4

The proximity of the Crissy Center to both the demolition (and pulverization) of the existing Low Viaduct, and construction of a replacement facility, clearly point to potential adverse effects. These potential effects would include the impact of flying debris, dust, noise, and vibrations during the demolition process, and noise and vibrations during the construction process.

C. Recreational Access to Crissy Field During Construction

The DEIS appears to address the importance of maintaining vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian access to Crissy Field available throughout the period of Doyle Drive construction. The importance of providing adequate information on access routes,

detours and related matters, to the thousands of weekly visitors to Crissy Field is essential to not only their safety and continued enjoyment of the Park, but also to the efficiency of the Doyle Drive construction effort. The Conservancy maintains a website (www.parksconservancy.org), and is willing to work with the Doyle Drive project by providing updated access information on the website. 5

D. Construction Impacts Upon Crissy Field Center

The Conservancy is very concerned about the level and nature of Doyle Drive project impacts upon Crissy Field Center, and we believe that the Center will not be able to operate safely and effectively during the demolition and construction phases of the project. We believe that the impacts upon the Center should be subject to greater scrutiny than is provided in the DEIS/R. We believe that a more detailed examination of the impacts will conclude that the Center operations must be temporarily closed during a period beginning with the demolition of the existing viaduct structure and ending with the completion of the construction in the area adjacent to the Center. Accordingly, the Center should be subject to the benefits of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. 6

The Crissy Field Center is located immediately adjacent to the project area, approximately 100 feet from existing Low Viaduct of Doyle Drive. The south side of Crissy Center is lined with windows and is the location of all staff offices, the science laboratory, the main gathering room of the building, and the food preparation kitchen. The only loading facilities and handicap access ramp also exist on this side of the building, and the primary entrance to the Center is on the east side, fully exposed to the nearby Low Viaduct.

Our specific concerns are summarized as follows:

1. Physical Impacts of Demolition. During the demolition process, Building 603 will certainly be subject to substantial noise and vibration resulting from the demolition of the Low Viaduct. The potential for the Building to be the target of flying debris - from the necessary hammering of the existing structure - must be recognized. Pulverization of the (demolished) Low Viaduct on-site (page 2-60, DEIS/R) will mean a lengthened demolition period and the potential for additional impacts, principally noise and dust associated with the pulverization process. 7 8

2. Air Quality Impacts of Demolition. Demolition of the Low Viaduct by hammering and cutting, and the subsequent on-site pulverization and removal of the debris will result in unknown (and undocumented) potential air quality impacts upon the immediate area, including Building 603. Demolition dust and air quality are of great concern for all park visitors especially school children. We are especially alarmed by the temporary impacts description set forth in the draft EIS (Impact Overview): 9

"Demolition of structures may expose construction workers, park visitors and nearby workers and residents to hazardous concentrations of lead and/or asbestos from nearby buildings."

Given the Crissy Field Center's immediate proximity to the work site, this declaration will establish a level of concern on the part of those using the Center that will certainly imperil normal operations. As a matter of liability, if the Conservancy and Park Service cannot assure visitors, and the parents of visitors, that safety and health standards are in place throughout the Doyle Drive project, then the viability of the Center as an educational operation is compromised. 9 Cont

3. Impact of Post Exchange Building Removal. In addition to the work on the roadway itself, the Parkway Alternative calls for the removal of the Post Exchange building, which is located only a few feet from the Center. The Post Exchange building is a substantial structure and its removal will certainly have potential adverse impacts upon the Crissy Center building. 10

4. Physical Impacts of Construction. Noise, vibration, and access impediments from construction of the replacement will also pose a potential adverse impact upon Building 603. Noise and vibration will impact Crissy Center as drill rigs and pile hammers will be required (page 2-52, DEIS/R) on the site. 11

5. Impacts Upon Access and Operations. The Parkway Alternative requires that Halleck will be closed for most of the construction period. Halleck is the principal access route to and from Crissy Center. The parking area immediately south of the main entrance is used as a loading zone. Demolition and construction activities will surely impact this area and thus the Center's operations. More than 90% of the 21,000 school children attending classes at the Center arrive by school or chartered bus. Virtually all of the 330 children who attend summer camps at the Center arrive by private automobile. It is essential that roadways to and parking for the Center be reliable and completely safe. The DEIS/R does not appear to offer this assurance. 12

6. Environmental Justice. A primary mission of the Crissy Center is to provide a unique environmental education experience to new audiences from the Bay Area's diverse communities. Approximately 70% of those attending activities at the Crissy Field Center are from minority and low-income populations. Cessation of operations at the Center, for a period of time commensurate with the Doyle Drive project construction period, would deprive thousands of children and adults with this opportunity. 13

7. Café and Bookstore Revenue. The Crissy Field Center and Café offer visitor amenities and interpretive materials to Park visitors. Revenues generated are used solely in support of the Center. Impacts of the project that discourage visitation to the Center will result in diminished revenues and will adversely affect the Center's operating budget. 14

Summary

The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy recognizes the importance of the Doyle Drive project, and appreciates the benefits that it will provide to the Presidio, the GGNRA, and to the programs and activities of the Conservancy. However, we believe that the DEI/R does not adequately address the potential impacts of the Doyle Drive construction upon the Crissy Field Center and does not offer us sufficient assurances regarding the ability of the Center to operate in a safe and effective manner. We have attempted to set forth our concerns in this regard in this statement along with a number of related comments on the DEIS/R.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Greg Moore

Greg Moore
Executive Director

Cc: Craig Middleton, Presidio Trust
Brian O'Neill, National Park Service

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1485
2	The text under Community Facilities in Section 3.2.4 was revised to reflect the new name.	1486
3	The text under Community Facilities in Section 3.2.4 was revised so the description of the Crissy Field Center as follows: "...this community environmental center conducts educational workshops and other programs for the public, including outreach to low-income and minority groups. The Center also provides a small cafe and bookstore to supplement and facilitate educational activities."	1487
4	This is a temporary impact related to use and is not covered under the definition of adverse effect. Only permanent effects are contained within the definition of adverse effects under the NHPA.	1488
5	Comment noted.	1489
6	The project team has since met with the Conservancy to discuss the potential impacts. Work will continue with them to minimize impacts during construction, however, temporary impacts are not covered under the definition of adverse impacts from the project.	1490
7	The Noise and Vibration study was revised to address minor design changes of the Preferred Alternative. If adverse impacts are anticipated during construction, appropriate measures that may reduce impacts will be discussed prior to construction.	1491
8	Based on concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Field Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location within the Presidio. The contractor will contain flying debris as required by standard construction requirements to maintain public (and building) safety.	1492
9	The construction mitigation measures identified in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.4 are designed to minimize the impacts of dust on the nearby areas. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the impacts to neighboring areas would be below levels set forth to meet health standards and would comply with BAAQMD Regulations.	1493
10	Minimizing the impacts to adjacent buildings was considered throughout the design of the alternatives. Access to all facilities, including ADA approved access to the Crissy Field Center, would be maintained during the temporary construction period and long-term operation of Doyle Drive. Text regarding the relocation of the Crissy Field Center was added to the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.7.	1494

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
11	Section 2.8.2 of the FEIS/R states that a variety of construction equipment could be used on this project but does not state that this equipment would be used in the vicinity of Building 603. In addition, concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Field Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location within the Presidio. While this may in fact be the case, the type of equipment to be used by the Contractor will depend upon the alternative selected and the conditions placed on construction methods as part of the contract documents. Therefore it is not accurate to say that pile drivers and other equipment will be used adjacent to Building 603. Detailed construction techniques and equipment will be selected by the Contractor based on the final design of the project.	1495
12	The construction description in the FEIS/R (Section 2.9) has been updated to reflect the selection of a Preferred Alternative which has a shorter construction period - approximately 3.5 - 4 years. During the periods when Halleck Street would be closed, alternate routes would be available to access the Crissy Field Center and Crissy Field area. Based on concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Field Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location within the Presidio, see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.7.	1496
13	Based on concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Field Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location within the Presidio, see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.7.	1497
14	Access to all facilities, including ADA approved access to the Crissy Field Center, would be maintained during the temporary construction period and long-term operation of Doyle Drive. Based on concerns expressed by the owners of the Crissy Field Center, it has been determined that the functions of the Center will be temporarily relocated during the construction phase to a more suitable location within the Presidio, see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.7.	1498

Greater San Francisco Bay Area Chapter
1390 Market Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94102-5306
Tel: 415.625.1100 Fax: 415.625.1159
www.teamintraining.com

The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society
TEAM IN TRAINING

FEBRUARY 6, 2006

REC'D FEB 13 2006

DEAR PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR DOYLE DRIVE EXPANSION:

MY REQUEST IS SHORT:

PLEASE, PLEASE KEEP THE LETTERMAN POOL OPEN DURING CONSTRUCTION ON DOYLE DRIVE!

1 MANY OF OUR TEAM IN TRAINING FUNDRAISING PARTICIPANTS ARE ABLE TO RECOVER FROM INJURIES AND CONTINUE THEIR TRAINING THANKS TO THE REHABILITATING THERAPY TAKING PLACE AT THE POOL. OUR ATHLETES ARE RAISING MONEY TO HELP CURE CANCER AND TO PROVIDE VALUABLE PATIENT SERVICES SO WE GREATLY APPRECIATE THE LETTERMAN POOL AS DO ALL THE SENIORS AND CHILDREN WHO TAKE WATER EXERCISE and SWIMMING CLASSES.

I TRULY HOPE YOU WILL RETAIN ADEQUATE, CONVENIENT and SAFE PARKING AT THE POOL DURING THE PLANNED 3-YEAR CONSTRUCTION PERIOD THUS ENSURING ACCESS TO ALL THE GRATEFUL SWIMMERS.

SINCERELY,

Ann O'Hara, TEAM MANAGER, TNT SF

RUNNER'S WORLD Finish Line

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Leukemia & Lymphoma Society Team in Training

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1257

Marina – Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
2742 Baker Street
San Francisco, California 94123
415-776-6522
3-30-2006
HAND DELIVER and EMAIL

REC'D MAR 3 1 2006
11:54am

Leroy L. Saage
Project Manager, Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
%San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue #26th Floor
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

RE: Doyle Drive Response DEIS/R

Dear Mr. Saage.

INTRODUCTION

Marina – Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants with boundaries between Union Street and Marina Blvd, Lyon Street to Van Ness Avenue support the Rebuild And Widen (Alternative 2).

While (Alternative 5) The Parkway has many attributes, it also has adverse Effects upon the following neighborhoods: Marina, Cow Hollow, and Richmond. Our Organization will support Alternative 5 if the following changes are made:

1. **The three lights entering Marina Blvd. In the Diamond and Circle Designs be changed to the current configuration.** This will eliminate what may be perceived as preferential treatment for one street to the determent of 9 streets
2. **The Section of the Diamond and Circle Options next to the neighbors at Lyon and Richardson and the Palace of Fine Arts to be eliminated**. There is no necessity for this change. 1
3. In both the Diamond and Circle Option there is an attempt to redirect traffic into **Gorges from Doyle Drive. Therefore, we request that the slip exit from Gorges into Lyon Street be closed.** This will protect Lyon, Chestnut, Greenwich, Filbert, and Union Streets Neighbors and Merchants from the Overflow traffic.
4. **Change the Entrance into Doyle Drive From Marina Blvd. from one lane back into two lanes .**This will alow more flow of traffic and less back up traffic and diverted traffic in the neighborhood.

COMMENTS ON THE DEIS/R DOYLE DRIVE

With deep regret, our organization must reply to a flawed and deficient Draft EIS/R for Doyle Drive.

This Draft is based upon assumptions that consists of what is perceived of an effort to seek out figures and studies to substantiate the assumptions without studying all of the information of the studies available for more accurate results.

The majority of the study appears to be based on the EIR/S of the Presidio Trust(PTMP). This study did not study in depth the ramifications of impacts upon the 2

socio and economic impact upon the adjacent Neighbors and Merchants.

The assumption that you are building an existing facility and therefore there will be no more increased traffic and impacts upon the adjacent neighbors is derelect in your duty to provide the citizens of San Francisco True Facts. 2 Cont

TRANSPORTATION and LOS STUDIES

The LOS Studies are conflicting and ambiguous at best. You cannot state that there be no more increased impacts on Richardson because the slip coming into Richardson has been changed from two lanes to three lanes.

In most of your studies you have based your counts on the counts at the Golden Gate Bridge. The Transportation Authority did not factor the counts of vehicles that come of Veterans Blvd/Park Presidio.

The LOS studies appear to be based upon on the assumptions of the required speed limit not the actual speed of the flowing vehicles.

There are no studies of the baseline maximum capacity of the proposed structures of the alternatives. Thus, you cannot base LOS unless you have an accurate baseline count that includes the maximum capacity of each alternative.

There is no mention of the State of California and other studies that project an in crease of 250,000 more vehicles a day within the bay area by 2030.. According to your own experts in public meetings of that 250,000 the Transportation Authority expects that the increase on the Golden Gate Bridge will be 25,000 more vehicles a day. This calculates to 6,255 more vehicles on Marina Blvd., 9,372 more vehicles on Richardson and Lombard, and Veterans Blvd/Park Presidio a day. Therefore, the assumption of what may be perceived as propaganda of the paid advocates and presenters of the Doyle Drive Alternatives that have said that there will be no increase in traffic on Doyle Drive and Richardson/Lombard is misrepresentation to the public. 3

As stated by representatives of the Transportation in public meetings there will 11 % increase on Richardson /Lombard according to the studies in Alternative 5 with the diverted traffic from Marina Blvd even with timed lights. This would be a cumulative increase of around 11000 vehicles a day on Lombard/Richardson and this is once again not addressed in the DEIS. This will be a cumulative increase of around 19000 vehicles a day by 2030-no mention of this increase in the DEIS/R.

Because of misinformation to the public and deficient studies and reports of increase in traffic denies the Draft EIS/R and accurate cumulative conclusion. Thus, potential overflow to the neighborhoods and merchants areas will occur.This is also not mentioned in this study .

There are no substantial studies in the Draft EIS/R from Lyon Street to Broderick within the scope of this document. 4

The Commuter Traffic were addressed in this document and mitigations of mass transit were mentioned. There was no mention of the statistics of the Tourists that also drive from around the country to drive across the Golden Gate Bridge.There was no quantitative study of how many of the commuters are tourists. Thus your assumptions are inaccurate for mass transportation. 5

A model is only a good as the information supplied to the model. Please in your answers to the above supply the public with every traffic count that you have within the

Transportation authority that was used in each section of the model study and every count(not just their summaries that that was not used in the model in their entirety (not just their summaries) and explain the mathematic principal that was used in each section of the model and why you chose that particular counts for each section of the model.

5 Cont

Please explain in my reply why these cumulative increases on Lombard/Richard are not going to cause diverted traffic into the Marina-Cow Hollow Neighborhood.

The exit from Marina Blvd. into Doyle Drive has been changed from two lanes into one lane entering Doyle Drive. This will cause traffic to back up even more than it is now and will cause the drivers to look for alternative routes throughout the middle (residential) of the Marina.

FUTURE MITIGATIONS of ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION and ROUTES

There is no mention of a need for future mitigations to alleviate future congestion problems such as by-pass to Broadway, Bart to the North Bay, Ferries and other mitigations. 6

URBAN STREET LEVELS OF SERVICE

Weekend Peak Hours-No mention of South of Doyle Drive within the scope of the study. Once again it appears that the Transportation Authority is catering to the Presidio and NOT to the neighbors (citizens of San Francisco)and the socio/economic impacts upon them.

There are no studies of the multiple (52 weeks of the year Special Events on weekends within the City and County of San Francisco. There is no mention of the traffic impacts of the tourists from the greater Bay Area that come into our city on the weekends. Many of the patrons of these events come into the City of San Francisco during Non Peak Hours to enjoy the City before the event. There are no counts for this in this document. 7

ELIMINATED EXISTING CONDITIONS

There is no study of the recently(before the Draft EIS/R)new Light at Doyle/Lyon and Richardson. There is no study of the existing backed up traffic from this light and how this existing problem will affect Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 and how it is and will affect the adjoining neighbors and merchants. 8

High 101 is the main entranceway into the City of San Francisco and is in the Middle of the Marina – Cow Hollow. There was no mention of a study for pedestrian safety within the city streets and mitigations for pedestrian safety within the confines of this study for San Franciscans. 9

THE DAILY ENERGY CONSUMPTION STUDY

The daily consumption study does not include vehicles larger than small trucks. There is no mention of 6 wheels or larger which travel from Doyle to Lombard every day. Thus the study is inaccurate. The conclusion provides a false assumption concerning the impacts to the neighbors, merchants, plants and wildlife within the adjacent areas. 10

STUDIES OMMITTED

There no Study of future diverted traffic and possible mitigations. 11

There is no study of the distributions of pollutants of the existing pollutant on the current Doyle Drive , there is no study of the existing pollutants that lodge on the current Doyle drive. Thus, there is no baseline to evaluate whether there will be a increase in pollutants on the ground level(alternative 5)and the impact upon humans, animals and plant life. The pollutant study is deficient. Please provide all studies in their entirety(not just the summaries) and please provide all studies in their entirety(not just the summaries) that were not used. This once again appears to be a study based upon assumptions. 12

NOISE

With the increase in traffic (particularly alternative 5) within the greater Marina/Cow Hollow the noise levels will increase above levels above environmental law. This study is not in the Draft EIS/R. 13

Thank you,

Patricia Vaughey

Patricia Vaughey

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Marina – Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Preferred Alternative was refined based on input received while still maintaining traffic operation LOS. The design workshops investigated many design refinements which as been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative, see Section 2.5.1.	1353
2	Based on the scope and location of the project, it is has been determined that there would not be any socioeconomic impacts beyond those experienced within the Presidio (see Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.4). Any potential traffic related impacts to those areas surrounding the Presidio are presented in Temporary and Permanent impact discussion in Section 3.2.8 of the FEIS/R.	1354
3	Traffic forecasts include traffic from Park Presidio and the Golden Gate Bridge, as well as Lincoln Boulevard in the Toll Plaza area. LOS studies are based upon the anticipated speeds given design treatments and posted limits for free-flowing vehicles. Faster auto speeds would result in improvements to LOS. Traffic forecasts are prepared in accordance with MTC and FHWA requirements and assign traffic growth throughout the Bay area roadways. Traffic growth in this corridor is projected to be lower than the statewide average because the growth projections in the immediate areas of northwest San Francisco and Marin County are lower, coupled with constrained traffic conditions at the natural gateways to the study area -- the Golden Gate Bridge, the MacArthur Tunnel, and Marina Boulevard and Lombard Street in the Marina District of San Francisco.	1355
4	The project proposes no changes to this area. This area was included in the explanded traffic study and no adverse impacts from the project where detected.	1356
5	All forecasts contain an assumptions of additional San Francisco tourist traffic. Design conditions were studied for the AM and PM peak hours, when tourist traffic is less but peak traffic is highest, as well as a weekend condition when tourist activity is the highest.	1357
6	Project alternatives were defined according to the Purpose and Need for the project. Major regional projects were not evaluated for this reason. Evaluation of major regional transportation projects are important to consider in other, larger studies, and are currently under consideration through separate strategic studies such as the Regional Rail Plan and the required Regional Transportation Plan, both currently in development by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.	1358
7	Weekend conditions are studied at study area intersections, see Section 3.2.8, Exhibit 3-22. All forecasts contain an assumptions of additional San Francisco tourist traffic. Design conditions were studied for the AM and PM peak hours, when tourist traffic is less but peak traffic is highest, as well as a weekend condition when tourist activity is the highest, see exhibits in Section 3.2.8.	1359
8	Traffic studies were based upon the base year established in the Notice of Preparation for the study. The EIR also explains why 2000 conditions were a more appropriate base year, as the traffic volumes were higher at that point in time. Studies also show that peak traffic from the Golden Gate Bridge is 15 to 20 percent less than the estimates used to calibrate the base year model.	1360
9	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1361

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Marina – Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
10	The energy study was revised and is included in Section 3.3.6 of the FEIS/R.	1362
11	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S, see the discussion under the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1363
12	The comment is concerned with existing particulate matter levels deposited onto Doyle Drive, and it is concerned with future levels deposited around Doyle Drive as a result of the Project. There are no measurements of existing pollutant levels deposited onto the surfaces around Doyle Drive. However, these levels are a function of the ambient air concentrations of particulate matter above the surfaces. The nearest monitor that measures particulate matter in that ambient air is at Arkansas Street. The DEIS/R shows that measured levels at this monitor are generally below the standards. Levels in the Project area would actually be lower than levels measured at Arkansas Street, because the Project area is usually upwind of the San Francisco urban area which is the main source of particulate matter in the region. As a result, particulate matter deposited on Doyle Drive would be low and would not measurably affect humans, animal and plant life.	1365
13	With the expanded traffic study, the noise study was revised to address potential impacts to neighborhoods. As no additional traffic impacts were detected, no additional noise will occur with the project.	1364

NAPP

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS FOR PRESIDIO PLANNING

3040 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco, California 94115 415-474-2466 hulka@earthlink.net

Cow Hollow Association

Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association

Lake Street Residents Association

Laurel Heights Improvement Association

Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association

Pacific Heights Residents Association

Planning Association for the Richmond

Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors

Presidio Terrace Association

Sea Cliff Properties Association

West Presidio Neighborhood Association

March 29, 2006

Mr. Leroy Saage, Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Ave., 26th floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

REC'D APR 0 3 2006

Doyle Drive Draft EIS/R Comments

Dear Mr. Saage:

Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning (NAPP) is a coalition of eleven San Francisco neighborhood groups bordering the Presidio National Park. NAPP delegates have been meeting monthly since 1989 to monitor the Presidio and to respond to activities and issues there that affect our neighborhoods. Most of our members, such as those who live in the Marina, Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights and the Richmond are and will continue to be directly affected by the flow of traffic on Doyle Drive.

In July 2004, NAPP wrote the San Francisco County Transportation Authority in support of Michael Painter's plan for Doyle Drive, which is now called Alternative 5:Presidio Parkway Alternative. We believe it to be superior to all other alternatives that we've seen over the years. We also understand that it meets safety and traffic requirements, appreciate its design and character and consider it appropriate to its setting in a national park. 1

NAPP supports Alternative 5.
NAPP reaffirms that basic position. The other choice, Alternative 2:Replace and Wide, replicates the existing structure, except that it would be twice as wide and taller in the no-detour option, which is its most likely construction method. While Alternative 2 meets safety and road capacity goals, it fails to meet many other basic objectives of the project, including direct access to the Presidio and an appropriate character for a roadway that traverses a National Historic Landmark District and national park.

According to the Doyle Drive Draft EIS/R, the working population of the Presidio is forecast to more than triple from the current 2,000 to 6,900 people in year 2020. Many of them will be working at Letterman Digital Arts. Under Alternative 2, we think that our streets that are city-side of the Lombard Gate would be overwhelmed and the backup on Lombard Street could extend to or east of Divisadero Street. This result of Alternative 2 would be unacceptable for our neighborhoods east of the Presidio.

By providing direct access to the Presidio, as called for in the project's objectives, Alternative 5 will help to mitigate congestion on our city streets. While the DEIS/R shows that Alternative 2 costs less, it appears that much of that "savings" comes from the failure to provide direct Presidio access and to meet other such project objectives.

NAPP supports Circle Drive.
We urge agreement on a design that meets these objectives:

1. Respects and minimizes impacts on the Palace of Fine Arts and maximizes views from the Palace to the Golden Gate Bridge;
2. Keeps Palace of Fine Arts traffic off the residential blocks of Lyon Street; 2
3. Discourages non-Presidio traffic from cutting through the national park;
4. Creates an entry to the Presidio that not only draws attention to its combination of historic buildings and natural areas, but also maximizes views of the Golden Gate Bridge.

The DEIS/R offers two options, Circle Drive and the Diamond Interchange. Each has tradeoffs, but Circle Drive appears to best meet our objectives for this area.

We note that both options keep a connection between the southern end of Gorgas St. and Lyon St. Because buses are prohibited on that portion of Lyon St., the link serves no transit purpose. Therefore, we view this as an opportunity for traffic to cut through the neighborhood and recommend against that connection.

NAPP supports the Hook Ramp option at the Park Presidio interchange.
It is our understanding that the original proponents of the Loop Ramp option, including Michael Painter, no longer support it because, after environmental review, it was found not to offer significant benefits, would be visually intrusive as seen from Crissy Field, and has an unjustified cost. We agree.

NAPP opposes the Merchant Road Slip Ramp.
It is costly, increases the width of what is already the widest part of Doyle Drive, and offers relatively slight improvements for traffic movements. Its costs outweigh its benefits.

NAPP supports Context Sensitive Design refinements.
Refinements based on these principals have continued after the deadline for changes in the DEIS/R and that process has directly improved the design by the Palace of Fine Arts. We think that Context Sensitive Design and other refinements in areas affected by Doyle Drive should continue into the next phase of the project and be incorporated into its final design. Should refinements in other areas of the project be needed, we urge the same respect for the project's location within a national park as for its impact on adjacent neighborhoods and the quality of residential life in the adjacent City of San Francisco.

NAPP recommends that some form of the Doyle Drive Task Force continue to meet to mitigate the impact on the City of San Francisco and adjacent neighborhoods to the Presidio. 3

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1464
2	Comment noted.	1465
3	The Authority has made the commitment to continue an open dialog with all project stakeholders throughout the completion of this project. This will include agency and citizen advisory committees, public meetings, living room briefings, project website, and published media.	1466

REC'D MAR 2 9 2006

PEOPLE FOR A GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

3627 Clement Street • San Francisco, CA 94121
Phone/fax: (415) 752-2777 • PFGGNRA@pobox.com

March 27, 2006

OFFICERS AND STEERING COMMITTEE

Edgar Wayburn, M.D.
Chairman

Amy Meyer
Co-Chairman

Michael Alexander
Secretary

Kikue Kiyasu
Treasurer

Gordon Bennett
Jean Berensmeier
Susan Bierman
Earl M. Blauner
Zach Cowan
Betsey Cutler
J. Peter Erickson
Rebecca Evans
Lawrence E. Fahn
Arthur Feinstein
Robert Girard
Richard Grosboll
Tom Hinman
Maurice Holloway
John Hooper
John H. Jacobs
Richard Jordan
Marc Kasky
Judith Kunofsky
Julie Lancelle
Gimmy Park Li
Sophie Maxwell
Len McKenzie
Ron Miguel
James Ream
Lennie Roberts
Fred Rodriguez
Toby Rosenblatt
Michael Rothenberg
Audrey Rust
Barbara Salzman
Susan Smith
Robin Sweeny
Michael Vasey
Laurie Wayburn
Robert C. Young

Leroy L. Saage, PE
Doyle Drive Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Doyle Drive Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Dear Mr. Saage,

People For a Golden Gate National Recreation Area is a coalition of conservation- and civic-minded groups and individuals that since 1970 has worked for authorization of the GGNRA, and then for its expansion and implementation of its legislation. One of our efforts resulted in inclusion of the entire Presidio in the national park.

Conversion of the Presidio from army post to national park has been a major goal of this organization since 1989, when the Presidio was declared excess to our nation's military needs. PFGGNRA supports Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway, Alternative 5, because it furthers this goal. The Painter plan calls for restoration and improvement of many Presidio features, including: 1

- expansion of the Crissy Field marsh
- restoration of the lower reach of Tennessee Hollow
- public access to the historic batteries on the bluffs opposite the national cemetery
- reconnection of the Main Post and Crissy Field for the first time in 70 years

The Painter plan will provide a far more compatible project through the national park, and a parkway experience for drivers. It will encourage traffic to move at a moderate and steady pace and will provide greater protection for pedestrians and bicyclists using crosswalks where Doyle Drive will intersect with Presidio and city streets. It directs traffic which wants to go to the Presidio to the Presidio, and not through the neighborhoods as does Alternative 2.

Automobile noise is a major distraction in parts of the Presidio. The parkway's tunnels will quiet traffic past two sensitive areas, the national cemetery and the Main Post, and will eliminate the environmental impacts of highway and vehicle lighting in those areas.

We are greatly encouraged by the commitment in the EIS to continue to refine the designs. We understand from those involved in that process that Michael Painter has made considerable progress in this regard, including greater protections for cultural and natural resources and safety for park users, in a process the EIS calls "Context Sensitive Design." That process should continue even after the close of public comments. 2

We strongly support the Circle Drive option at Richardson Ave. Circle Drive will allow the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio's Letterman area to be reconnected, reflecting their relationship during the historic Panama-Pacific International Exposition. They will improve sight lines from the areas between the Letterman Digital Arts buildings and its magnificent park, and to and from the Palace, and allow far better public access between these important cultural sites. 3 These are issues which the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation asked to be strengthened when they reviewed the designs for Letterman Digital Arts, and to which the Presidio Trust agreed. We understand that Michael Painter is working on designs for Circle Drive that would improve public transit connections between Golden Gate and Muni buses, and the PresidiGo shuttle, which are much needed to give visitors and workers good alternatives to use of private vehicles.

These significant improvements will come at the cost of the removal of the Presidio pool which is managed by the YMCA. This aging facility should be documented in a Section 106 historic preservation process. It should then be replaced, with Doyle Drive mitigation funds. with a building on a site near the main YMCA building. 4

It appears that Michael Painter received no credit in the draft EIS document. We hope you will correct this in the final document. His efforts have made an enormous difference. 5

Sincerely,

Edgar Wayburn, M.D., Chairman

Amy Meyer, Co-Chairman

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1474
2	Comment noted and the process of Context Sensitive Design is being incorporated into the refinement of the Preferred Alternative, see Section 2.2.3.	1475
3	Comment noted.	1476
4	The pool will not be impacted by the Preferred Alternative.	1477
5	Mr. Painter is credited in the FEIS/R.	1478

Planning Association for the Richmond

3145 Geary Blvd., # 205 - San Francisco CA 94118-3316
Voice Mail ~ 415-974-9332 - Fax ~ 415-641-8621 - Email ~ president@sfpar.org - www.sfpar.org

21 March 2006

Leroy L. Saage
Doyle Drive Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Ave., 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

REC'D MAR 24 2006

RE: Doyle Drive DEIS/R

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR) Board of Directors has voted unanimously to support Alternative 5 - The Presidio Parkway, as our greatly preferred alternative for the reconstruction of Doyle Drive. However, there are several aspects of the DEIS/R analysis which we feel either unfairly stress negative impacts of the Parkway Plan or are inadequately addressed -- these are set forth below. 1

PAR, founded in 1970, is the largest neighborhood association in San Francisco. We have a dues-paying membership of approximately 1,500 households in the Richmond District. The Richmond is one of only two San Francisco neighborhoods providing direct north-south access to this vital transportation corridor between San Francisco and Marin Counties. The Doyle Drive/Veterans Boulevard interchange (Highway 1) carries a very high north-south traffic volume within our City. In addition, the Richmond has the longest border of any neighborhood with the Presidio. Obviously, the proper configuration, viability and operation of this important highway segment is of vital importance to the citizens we represent.

PAR has been fortunate in having a member of our Board, Paul Epstein, serve on both the original and the present Doyle Drive Task Force, and we have hosted several public informational presentations during the planning process over the past several years. Attached, you will find our letters of 3 June 2003 to Jose Luis Moscovich, SFCTA, and of 23 April 2004, to Senator Diane Feinstein – both of which serve to emphasize our continuing and consistent support for the Parkway Plan.

The DEIS/R analysis of impacts of Alternative 5 unfairly stresses negative impacts which are out weighted by many positive aspects of this Parkway proposal, and, in some instances are inadequately addressed.

The Hook Ramp

The Hook Ramp is the preferred alternative adopted by the PAR Board of Directors. However, there is no adequate explanation in the DEIS/R of the financial savings of constructing that alternative as compared with the cost of the apparently more expensive Loop alternative. It would appear that there would be substantial savings with the Hook Ramp -- this needs further explication. 2

The Merchant Road Slip Ramp.

PAR believes that the negative impacts of this alternative are not adequately set forth in the DEIS/R. Additionally, it is not made clear how much money would be saved by elimination of this alternative. 3

Veterans Boulevard - Highway 1

The DEIS/R fails to adequately address the safety and environmental impacts of the Doyle Drive reconstruction upon Veterans Boulevard. It fails to delineate alternative mitigations and fails to adequately explain the financial impacts of various alternatives. 4

First, the omitted section -- Inexplicably, approximately forty percent (40%) of the portion of Veterans Boulevard that runs north from the MacArthur Tunnel to Doyle Drive, is omitted from the Construction Corridor. This is despite that fact that almost the entire omitted portion is <u>included</u> in the Biological Project Study Area.. There is no analysis of the logic of treating a significant portion of Veterans Boulevard in a manner different than the remainder of the roadway. 5

Second, the partial rebuild – All the DEIS/R alternatives, apparently, will only provide for rebuilding that portion of Veterans Boulevard presently included in the Corridor. There is no explanation as to why the safety and other roadway conditions (paving, shoulders, viaduct, barriers, etc.) that feed into the included portion should be ignored in the omitted portion. The age and existing condition of the entire feeder roadway system is the same. Why should only a portion be made safe and brought up to current standards? 6

Third, funding for Veterans Boulevard -- The DEIS/R fails to analyze how much it would cost to complete the rebuilding of the <u>entire</u> roadway from the MacArthur Tunnel to Doyle Drive. An analysis of potential savings from the elimination of the Loop Ramp option and the Merchant Road Slip Ramp option and other potential savings should be addressed. 7

Thank you for the extraordinary effort you have made in shepherding this process. PAR greatly appreciates your efforts as well as those of Michael Painter, without whom the Parkway Plan would never have been envisioned. There is no question that absent your remarkable public/private cooperation, we could not have progressed to this stage. Please keep PAR informed as to how we may assist in bringing the project to fruition.

Sincerely,

Ron Miguel, President

CC: Supervisor Alioto-Pier
Supervisor McGoldrick
NAPP
SPUR
Geary Boulevard Merchants Association
Clement Street Merchants Association

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Planning Assoc Richmond

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support of the Presidio Parkway Alternative noted.	1832
2	As shown in Exhibit 2-38 of the FEIS/R there is an approximate $11 million savings between the Hook and Loop ramps, primarily due to a smaller footprint.	1833
3	See Exhibit 2-38 of the FEIS/R - The Merchant Road Slip Ramp would have added an additional $14 million to the project.	1834
4	The study area for Doyle Drive Project was extended to include the portion of Highway 1 north of the MacArthur Tunnel. During the alternative screening process it was determined that the Kobbe undercrossing did not require repair or replacement based on its current structural condition. The portion of Highway 1, including the Ruckman undercrossing, that needs to be replaced as part of the Doyle Drive Project were included in the project analysis.	1835
5	The limits of the Doyle Drive replacement project are based on logical termini and independent utility (see Section 1.4.3 of the FEIS/R) to satisfy the project purpose and need. The reconstruction of Highway 1 extends only as far south as needed to accommodate the reconstruction of the Park Presidio Interchange. Furthermore, as the project is located within a National Park and National Historic Landmark District, every effort must be made to minimize the project's footprint and associated impacts.	1836
6	As stated in response to Comment #1836, the reconstruction of Highway 1 extends only as far south as needed to accommodate the Park Presidio Interchange in keeping with the logical termini for the project. In addition, the condition of the Kobbe structure is such that it does not meet the criteria to be programmed for replacement at this time but it will continue to be monitored as part of the regular bridge inspection program. A memorandum regarding the condition of existing structures and the need for replacement has been prepared.	1837
7	Reconstruction of the entire Veterans Boulevard is not part of the Doyle Drive Project and therefore was not analyzed. In addition to the logical termini of the project, there are no overriding reasons to replace the entire Highway 1 facility and increase the level of impact within the park. Detailed project costs were developed for the alternatives under consideration in the EIS/R. In addition, the project has undergone extensive value engineering with the goal to reduce the overall project cost.	1838

Presidio Environmental Council

Alliance for a Clean Waterfront ◊ California Native Plant Society
Dune Ecological Restoration Team ◊ Golden Gate Audubon Society
Natural Resources Defense Council ◊ San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
San Francisco Tomorrow ◊ Sierra Club

March 31, 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS/R on the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive. We would like to express our appreciation for the generous amount of time the Project Team members have dedicated to meeting with various communities of interest, for their responsiveness to public commentary and their willingness to quickly make commonsense changes. Additionally, we would like to give recognition to architect Michael Painter for his unstinting dedication to creating a beautiful and park friendly alternative for the public to review. We are very appreciative of his efforts.

The South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge is a very special roadway as it goes through and will affect portions of the Presidio, a National Park. Any alternative selected for the South Access will need to be especially sensitive to environmental concerns during siting, construction, operations and maintenance in order to (as stated on page ii of the DEIS) "preserve the natural… values of the affected portions…to minimize the effects of noise and other pollution from the Doyle Drive corridor on natural areas and recreational qualities at Crissy Field and other areas adjacent to the project area".

A number of groups focusing on the protection of the natural environment, convened under the umbrella organization, Presidio Environmental Council, supports Alternative number 5, as most recently described by Michael Painter on March 22, 2006, with the following reservations, which we will be sharing with the various permitting agencies. 1

PROCESS

We recommend and urge that a mechanism be put in place to ensure the coordination of the Doyle Drive Replacement Project with the Tennessee Hollow Restoration and Crissy Wetland Expansion projects. Specifically, we strongly encourage the appointment of a special project manager/coordinator to oversee a collaborative design effort for the intersection of these three projects. Such project manager/coordinator should initiate collaboration between and among the National Park Service, the Presidio Trust, and the Local, State and Federal and Transportation Agencies to accomplish the following: 2

Presidio Environmental Council
Steven Krefting, Convener
45 Montcalm St., San Francisco, CA 94110-5357

- take active steps to coordinate the planning and expansion of the Crissy wetland and the planning and restoration of the lower reach of the Tennessee Hollow Watershed
- establish timelines and action plans to coordinate *successfully* with the timing required of the Doyle Drive Project
- provide the public with detailed ecological restoration and wetland expansion plans
- continue to involve the environmental community throughout the decision making process to help to ensure that the FEIS is the best possible document and the Doyle Drive replacement alternative chosen is the most environmentally responsible option.

ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS & IMPACTS

The following issues and concerns will need to be addressed before the natural environmental community can support the chosen alternative:

A. Tennessee Hollow Crossing and the Crissy Wetland Expansion

1. Define how the section of roadway crossing the wetland and/or riparian areas will be designed to allow maximum daylight, wildlife movement, bird flight, and clearance under the roadway. 3

2. Further explore the use of translucent glass or similar materials to be used on the roadway to increase daylight passage into the wetland area**.** 4

3. Impacts on Tennessee Hollow and Crissy Lagoon:

   In the last paragraph on page 3-133, the first sentence should be re-written to read: "A challenging issue for the build alternatives is the crossing of Tennessee Hollow **and** an expanded Crissy wetland." **Both** the connection of a restored Tennessee Hollow Watershed to the Crissy Lagoon and Marsh **and** the expansion of the lagoon and marsh must be accommodated by the Project. 5

4. Where the road crosses the Tennessee Hollow Watershed riparian corridor/Crissy wetland, the foundation abutments should be located so as to avoid both the dry season creek bed and the wet season floodplain. 6

B. Animals

1. Safety features should be designed into the roadway to enable wildlife to pass 7

safely from one side of the facility to the other, e.g. at the Main Post, the National Cemetery and Fort Scott (***mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates***).

2. Lighting should be used that minimizes attraction to the roadway of insects and/or flying wildlife which prey on insects. 7 Cont

3. Incorporate appropriate design features to minimize the impacts of roadway noise, especially in proximity to the Battery Howe Wagner wetland, a site of significant natural resource value for many bird species.

4. Landscape and revegetation design immediately adjacent to and within the roadway should be chosen to minimize animal contact with traffic.

C. Vegetation, Revegetation, Landscaping and Weed Management

1. All revegetation should be done taking the needs of wildlife into consideration and should be coordinated by National Park Service and Presidio Trust natural resource experts. 8

2. Revegetation throughout the Doyle Drive construction corridor should be done with locally native species, woven into the fabric of the natural landscape of the area, and executed with particular attention paid to the potential for major weed invasion. For a list of priority weeds for San Francisco County, including the Presidio, see **www.sfwma.org**. 9

3. Looking to the Crissy Field Restoration project as an appropriate reference site, we cannot emphasize too strongly the critical need for all noxious and invasive weed abatement to be aggressive and thorough before, during and after construction and revegetation.. 10

4. Rare plants, such as the San Francisco gumplant and skunkweed, both Federal Species of Concern, will be destroyed and should be mitigated in kind, in the same watershed. San Francisco gumplant, *Grindelia hirsutula ssp. maritima*, in particular, is also on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, classified as a 1B – Rare and Endangered throughout all of its range. 11

The population of San Francisco owl's clover, *Triphysaria florabunda,* in between the Log Cabin and the Doyle Drive roadway is the largest south of the Golden Gate Bridge, and should be given extra protection during construction. This species is also on the CNPS list as a 1B. 12

6. Where historical planting is done, it should be with non-invasive plant species and come from the current Presidio plant palette. 13

7. We support and recommend adoption of Daniel Ariola's Peer Review Comment dated March 10, 2006, in which he said, "it seems reasonable to fund a small endowment to cover long-terms costs for managing exotics", i.e., the Doyle Drive Project must fund a long-term ecological stewardship program for the corridor. 14

D. Natural Communities, Habitats and Geologic Resources

1. Serpentinite is the dominant bedrock in the vicinity of the 101/1 interchange. While the overwhelming majority of natural resource impairment occurred as a result of the first Doyle Drive, serpentine habitat will be impacted and destroyed by the Doyle Drive Replacement at the western end of the roadway and should be mitigated in kind on the ground. Not only will habitat be taken, but also the geologic resource itself. Mitigation could include liberation and restoration of areas of eucalyptus trees where serpentine bedrock and soils are still intact. 15

Likewise, we agree with the recommendation regarding rare plants made by Peter Baye in his *Technical Memorandum* to Katherine Eastham of Parsons Brinckerhoff, dated March 10, 2006, in which he states, "The EIS should identify suitable mitigation for the precluded opportunities for future rare plant habitats (restored or naturally exposed…), commensurate with the potential importance for metapopulation structure or habitat." This applies to Franciscan thistle, *Cirsium andrewsii*, and the Raven's manzanita, *Arctostaphylos hookeri ssp. ravenii.* 16

2. Any increase in impermeable surface should be mitigated. 17

E. Biological Monitoring, Preconstruction Monitoring

1. Establish protocols for National Park Service and Presidio Trust natural resource experts to monitor wildlife within the construction corridor. 18

2. Establish procedures for the public to report wildlife distress to wildlife monitors (i.e. similar to Marine Mammal hotline). 19

3. Provide for preconstruction salvaging and relocation of flora and fauna. 20

4. Preconstruction mitigation will be needed to replace plants and wildlife in a nearby location. 21

F. Hydrology, Stormwater, Water Quality and Wetlands

1. Groundwater

Especially given that the Marina basin's aquifer is thin (p 3-128), continued groundwater recharge through the infiltration of rainwater could be an essential element of the natural hydrology of the project site, including but not limited to the degree to which the freshwater aquifer limits saltwater intrusion. Therefore, any increase in impermeable surface that prevents infiltration should be mitigated. It appears that the amount of paving in Alternative 5 will be less than it is currently, but mitigation measures should be developed for Alternative 2. 22

2. Construction Dewatering

On page 3-137, it is noted that the project proponent will characterize the quality of groundwater prior to initiation of dewatering. The characterization should take place as soon as possible so that management and treatment options can be planned well in advance of the need. 23

Constructed wetlands should be considered as a potential means of treating groundwater from construction dewatering. The project sponsors should study the feasibility of creating treatment wetlands as early in the process as possible to treat the pumped-out groundwater and construction runoff in the near term, as well as stormwater runoff in the future. If at all possible, water from none of these sources should go into the City's combined wastewater system, and if at all polluted, none should be discharged into the Bay untreated. 24

3. Construction Stormwater Run-off

When will the SWPPP be prepared, what agencies will approve it, and what agencies will monitor and enforce its implementation? 25

4. Permanent Stormwater Impacts:

It appears that runoff containing road-related contaminants will be less under Alternative 5, picking up pollutants from 85,236 square feet less pavement than under the no-build alternative. Under Alternative 2, with 260,000 square feet more impervious surface, the runoff would have a highly significant impact on the environment.

However, stormwater runoff impacts must be addressed for **all** of the alternatives. The status quo is not acceptable, and regulations controlling road runoff should be, and probably will be, strengthened in the future. We appreciate the document's acknowledgement of the project's location in a national park and the special consideration that must therefore be given. 26

The priority given to the treatment options (p 3-138) for polluted runoff is backwards.

The preferred option should be the one that is the most sustainable, environmentally just and ecologically sound. A watershed approach says that water should be treated and reused as close to the source as possible. Precious energy resources should not be used to pump water from one watershed to another – and certainly not from one end of town to another.

Moreover, it is unacceptable to add to the volume of the City's combined sewage and stormwater system, thus increasing the volume of combined sewage overflows (CSOs) into San Francisco Bay. These discharges, which receive primary treatment only (the floatables and sinkables are screened out), occur primarily along the southern waterfront, an already heavily degraded area. 27

Even if the CSOs did not carry pollutants, the alteration of the natural salinity regime could negatively impact the Bay's ecosystems.

If option 1 must be pursued, then at the very least there should be on-site detention ponds or other storage to allow the desynchronization of flows into the combined system, permitting treatment capacity to be restored after a storm event before further burdening the system.

Option 2 should be the preferred option, with the added consideration of constructed treatment wetlands near the project site. Using wetlands for water treatment is a time-tested low-impact technology that has proven successful throughout the world. Many treatment wetlands are incorporated into public open spaces, where they provide the multiple benefits of pollution control, wildlife habitat, visual amenities and outdoor classrooms. Examples can be found in Ashland, OR, and Fremont and Arcata, CA, to name just a few.

We urge that a cost-benefit analysis be done to evaluate the effectiveness of building an on-site or near-site stormwater treatment solution, such as a wetland, versus the cost of sending the SFPUC a check for taking the Presidio's polluted water into an already over-capacity combined sewer system. The Presidio should not be paying SFPUC a fee to increase pollution in the Bay. What is the estimated cost of such a fee? The money could be used instead for the creation and O&M of state-of-the-art environmentally sound treatment. 28

Washdown water from cleaning the tunnels might also be directed to the treatment wetland, perhaps first to a settlement forebay that may need to be dredged periodically, depending on the nature of the contamination.

5. Hydrogeology

Given the many unknowns regarding the impacts of the project on the hydrogeology of the bluffs (**could** alter or disrupt groundwater, **potentially** impact plants, groundwater conveyance to the fractures **could be** disrupted, tunnel construction **may** increase flow to seeps, **may** create excessively moist conditions, fill on top **could become** excessively dry, etc.), it seems extremely important to have a comprehensive plan in place for careful monitoring and adaptive management.

G. Road Configuration Options, Pedestrian and Bicycle Links, and Transportation:

1. The Presidio Environmental Council does not support the Loop Option or the Merchant Road Slip Ramp because of their expense and unnecessary negative impact on the natural landscape. 29

2. Pedestrian and Bicycle Links:

There is an existing system of walkways and tunnels around the area of the facility between the toll plaza and the high viaduct. However, there is currently no way to walk or bicycle from the Golden Gate Bridge/Battery East/Long Avenue area to Fort Scott without having to travel all the way around on Merchant or Lincoln. We suggest a pathway starting at the entrance to the GGB visitor area, which goes more or less parallel to Doyle on its east side along Armistead Road, then continues under the facility to come out on Miller Road, north of the Log Cabin parking lot. This would mitigate the impact of the structure on walking and bicycling for transportation and recreation, including maintaining a naturalistic experience and greater sense of connectedness to the park's resources. 30

3. Traffic Volume

In general, the fewer the cars, the less the pollution (air, water, noise) and collisions with animals. Therefore, we would like to see the roadway designed in such a way as to make it impossible to add more lanes in the future. The proposed seventh lane from Park Presidio Drive to the Marina junction should be shortened to assure that it functions as a merging lane only and will not serve as an additional traffic lane. A design with narrower lanes should not be ruled out just because the proposed roadway is in accordance with state highway standards. Highway designers should be able to consider exceptions for a road that goes through a national park located within a city. 31

Traffic volume impacts could be considerably mitigated by providing

transportation alternatives. We would like to see more study of the feasibility of public transit, with new traffic projections based on a sustainable transportation plan. Enhanced connections and designs for accommodating Muni and Golden Gate Transit buses and any internal park shuttles, with appropriately sited transit hubs, should be incorporated into the plan. We additionally question the justifications for the proposed numbers of parking spaces and underground lots without plans in place to enhance public transportation. 32

H. Other

1. Special measures will need to be identified and adapted to protect the darkness of the night sky in this National Park to benefit both the visitor experience and nocturnal wildlife. This is particularly important as the current roadway is overhead and the new roadway, proposed in Alternative 5, will be at ground level. The current ground level road without any lights at all near the Crissy Wetland and the Tennessee Hollow connection; a known and important wildlife corridor. The minimization of night lighting is called for in the Presidio Trust Management Plan. Information and resources on this topic may be found on the web site for the International Dark-Sky Association: www.darksky.org 33

2. Funding : We want information from the Park Service and the Presidio Trust about what is and is not funded, and if not funded what are the plans to secure needed funding with regard to the ecological restoration of the Tennessee Hollow Watershed and the Crissy Wetland Expansion. 34

CONCLUSION

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment on the environmental documents for the proposed Doyle Drive Replacement Project.

The organizations that work together under the umbrella of the *Presidio Environmental Council* would like to continue to be invited to work with the Project Team and Agencies over the life of the replacement of Doyle Drive. We want to help secure the most favorable outcome for the natural environment of the Presidio. We urge you to continue your successful and progressive outreach and look forward to working with you on this important project.

Sincerely,

Peter Brastow
Director,
Nature in the City

Jan Blum
Contact
Dune Ecological Restoration Team (DERT)

Jennifer Clary
Chair,
San Francisco Tomorrow

Rebecca Evans
Co-Chair,
Presidio Committee
Sierra Club
San Francisco Bay Chapter

Ruth Gravanis
Presidio Coordinator
Alliance for a Clean Waterfront

Amandeep Jawa
President,
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Steven Krefting
Convener,
Presidio Environmental Council

Jake Sigg
Conservation Chair
California Native Plant Society, Yerba Buena Chapter

Johanna Wald
Director, Land Program
Natural Resources Defense Council

Matthew Zlatunich
Conservation Committee
Golden Gate Audubon Society

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Environmental Council

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1172
2	Coordination of wetlands mitigation is currently underway with the partner agencies.	1173
3	The project team is coordinating the design of the facility over the proposed marsh restoration with the participating agencies.	1174
4	The project team continues to look for shade reducing design details in coordination with Caltrans, the Trust and GGNRA. Design refinements have increased the spacing between the north and south bound lanes which will increase the amount of light which will penetrate the structure.	1175
5	The text under Alternative 2, Alternative 5 and Preferred Alternative in the Alteration of Surface and Near-Surface Hydrology at the Main Post Tunnel of Section 3.3.1 has been changed as follows: A challenging issue for the build alternatives is the crossing of Tennessee Hollow and an expanded Crissy wetland.	1176
6	The bridges over the Tennessee Hollow area will be designed to be above the 100-year flood or coastal event. Detailed design regarding the interface between the roadway, column location and Tennessee Hollow restoration will be coordinated with the Trust and GGNRA as the Quartermaster Reach restoration plans are developed.	1177
7	The EIS/R discussed these topics. Minimizing light impacts is discussed Temporary Impacts to Common Wildlife in Section 3.4.4. Plantings along the roadway will be selected to avoid drawing wildlife into close contact with vehicles (see Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures in Section 3.4.4). The noise issue, however, is one the DEIS/R did not consider significant based on ambient disturbance during the construction period, with the exception of pile-driving (see discussion of Temporary Impacts for Special Status Avian Species in Section 3.4.4).	1178
8	Both agencies have approval authority over revegetation plans.	1179
9	The EIS/R addresses these concerns. See previous response and also the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures in Section 3.4.5 which describes measures to avoid introducing or spreading invasive species.	1180
10	See previous response (Comment # 1180) and Section 3.4.5 of the document.	1181
11	The project is not expected to cause permanent impacts to special-status plant species within the construction area. They will be avoided through the designation of "Environmentally Sensitive Areas" (ESAs) as described in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.4.3. See also response for Comment #1183	1182

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Environmental Council

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
12	The EIS/R provides this direction through designation and protection of ESAs, which are considered complete avoidance of the resource (see discussion of the Permanent Impacts to Alternatives 2 and 5 and Preferred Alternative is Section 3.4.3).	1183
13	See responses to comments 1179 and 1180	1184
14	The EIS/R is limited by the analytical framework of NEPA and CEQA documents. The intent is to identify and mitigate potentially significant impacts and to make a full and public disclosure of these topics. The Doyle Drive project, under these procedures, would not normally be required undertake actions which redress the effects of less-than-significant impacts, or to develop elaborate and speculative discussions of what these effects might conceivably be. Any topic of natural history study is complex, expensive and time-consuming and the outcomes not necessarily definitive, nor are there mitigations which can reliably meet performance expectations when working beyond the limits of best available data and professional judgment. Many comments, beginning with this one dealing with invasive species, are of a similar type, and appear to recommend that the project take responsibility for many long-term land management issues that, while worthy, are beyond what such a project would normally do. However, the lead agency recognizes that the environment of the Presidio has special natural values that transcend the "normal." Therefore, as part of this process, a separate document has been prepared that expands the Project commitments outside the NEPA/CEQA process. This "Doyle Drive Project Wetland and Wildlife Corridor Mitigation Prospectus" is presented as an attachment in Appendix K of the FEIS/R.	1185
15	The Biological Environment chapter of EIS/R by definition limits itself to living organisms. The importance of plant communities growing on serpentine soils, as well as the Bay checkerspot butterfly, is discussed at many places in the text and provides adequate mitigation.	1186
16	It is true that the EIS/R does not identify precluded opportunities for future rare plant habitats and that NEPA (CEQA to a much more limited extent) allows considerations of impacts on hypothetical future conditions without the project, if such are reasonably predictable. There were no plans which would provide such predictions available to the EIS/R preparers, apart from the recovery plans prepared for serpentine plant species within the San Francisco Bay Area. The Natural Environmental Study (NES) describes consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the impact of the project on implementation of those plans. Restoration planning for Tennessee Hollow is conceptual and preliminary, and the precluded opportunities highly speculative at this point. Notwithstanding, discussions on these and related topics with NPS/Trust natural resource staff and peer-reviewers were extensive and as a result the appended document (see response to comment 1185) was prepared to address concerns not part of the CEQA/ NEPA analysis. Metapopulation analysis is not appropriate at this scale. It is normally applied for long-term viability estimates over areas where dispersal between isolated populations is problematic, e.g., grizzly bears or spotted owls. Metapopulation models assume that some parts of the landscape are can potentially be occupied by the species in question, and the remainder is unsuitable to the point where it affects dispersal rates. In the close confines of the Presidio, the project does not significantly fragment local populations of any species beyond the conditions already present.	1187
17	The storm water management plan will be finalized as part of final design of project.	1188

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Environmental Council

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
18	It is unlikely that the NPS or the Trust would have the resources to perform such monitoring themselves, although the project would welcome their participation. The monitoring program described in the EIS/R and the NES outlines monitoring procedures and the required qualifications of biological monitors devoted solely to this activity. The monitors will submit the reports to all responsible resource agencies (USFWS, the CDFG, the NPS, or the Trust), if requested, for their review.	1189
19	The construction monitors will be present throughout the period of construction disturbance. The monitoring program will adequately the commentor's concern	1190
20	Salvage of important flora may be practicable, and the NES states (Section 8.2.5.1): "Native plants would be salvaged and replanted to the extent feasible." Relocation of animals is not proposed as a routine action, because of stress during relocation efforts, especially capture and handling, and the fact the placing animals in new suitable habitat ignores the problem that the receiving habitat is probably already at carrying capacity. The idea is not without merit, however, and the response to this comment is a commitment to developing a rescue protocol when injured animals are found by the construction monitors, with procedures for capture and transport and a standing arrangement with a competent wildlife rescue center, such as the Lindsay Museum Wildlife Hospital in Walnut Creek.	1191
21	See response for Comment 1191	1192
22	Depending on location, increases in impervious cover can exacerbate existing flooding problems, if any, and contribute to water quality degradation. Storm-related flooding and potential impacts to downstream floodplains is not a concern at the project site because of the proximity of the site to the Bay. Any increased flows from the project site will be conveyed to the Bay without causing downstream flooding. In addition, as described in Response to Comment 1171, the runoff from the proposed roadway would be treated prior to discharge (and runoff is not treated under the existing condition). Therefore, the project will result in a net benefit to receiving water quality.	1193
23	The comment is noted for the record. As indicated in the text of the DEIS/R, the groundwater quality in the vicinity of the dewatering operations would be characterized and the permit to discharge acquired prior to initiation of dewatering activities.	1194
24	If Option 2 (described under Long-term Stormwater Treatment Options in Section 3.3.1 of the EIS/R) is selected as the preferred and feasible runoff management option, then on-site land-based biofiltration, detention, and infiltrations measures will be considered and evaluated for specific application to this project.	1195
25	As described under Construction Stormwater Run-off of Section 3.3.1, the SWPPP would be prepared by Caltrans. Under the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.1, the consultation/review process is described. Caltrans (and potentially the Caltrans contractor) would consult with the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service on the contents of, and actions required by, the SWPPP. Ultimately, the Regional Water Quality Control Board would be responsible for enforcement.	1196
26	Please refer to Response to Comment 1171. The "status quo" will not occur under the proposed project. Treatment of runoff from the new roadway would be required by existing regulations.	1197

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Environmental Council

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
27	Runoff from the proposed project may or may not be directed to the City's combined system. If it is determined, based on capacity analysis and risk if CSOs, that the increased discharge could impact water quality, then it is likely that the runoff would not be directed to the combined system and would be treated on-site. Both options are presented in the Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS.	1198
28	Cost of mitigation is not a required component of a CEQA/NEPA analysis, as long as specified mitigation is feasible. Treatment of project site runoff would not "result in much greater contamination to the Bay" because under existing conditions, the runoff is not treated at all and runoff would be treated under the build alternatives of the project.	1199
29	Opposition to the Loop and Merchant Road Slip Ramp options noted.	1200
30	A bicycle/pedestrian pathway is not included as part of the project alternatives nor is it necessary as mitigation since there are no permanent impacts to walking or bicycling on the western end of the project alignment. The route of the suggested pathway is already served by existing roadways and would continue to be served with implementation of any project alternative.	1201
31	The Authority, Caltrans and FHWA have made great efforts to minimize the footprint of the facility while meeting the project purpose of seismic, structural and traffic safety as indicated by the application of project specific parkway design criteria. The facility has reduced lane widths, included continuous shoulders to meet minimum safety requirements, while the auxiliary lane between Veterans Blvd and Girard road is needed to maintain adequate traffic operations.	1202
32	The Parking study was updated with the selection of the modified Alternative 5 as the Preferred Alternative. During construction, temporary loss of parking may be mitigated through the use of the Parade Grounds and the existing shuttle service. The Transportation Management Plan finalized prior to construction will address these concerns. A new parking facility located to the west of Halleck Street and south of the tunnel was proposed to meet an overall unmet parking demand of 126 spaces. The Preferred Alternative does not include the parking structure which is part of the Presidio Parkway Alternative. The project design does not preclude the addition of transit centers or additional transit services. Section 2.2.2 and 2.3.2 discuss the alternatives that were considered but determined not consistent with the project purpose and need.	1203
33	Streetlights will be designed to minimize glare where the facility is not in a tunnel.	1204
34	The project is committed to continue coordination efforts with the restoration of Tennessee Hollow to ensure the new roadway and restored Tennessee Hollow can function together; however, the question regarding the current funding of the restoration efforts would need to be directed to the Park Service and the Presidio Trust.	1205

PHAN

PRESIDIO HEIGHTS ASSOCIATION OF NEIGHBORS
www.phansf.org
P.O.BOX 29503
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94129

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2005 - 2006
DOROTHY GLANCY ANDERSON
DONALD P. BLACK
RONALD BLATMAN
SANDRA BLEY
MICHAEL CARBOY
MARGARET CHARNAS
VIRGINIA COE
JAMES COLE
CYNTHIA COLEMAN
KITRIDGE COLLINS
PAUL B. FAY, JR.
DR. WILLIAM FAY
CHARLES FERGUSON
ROBERT FRIESE
FRANCESCA GARDNER
MARGARET GAULT
MEREL GLAUBIGER
RICHARD N. GOLDMAN
DR. GEROLD GRODSKY
CAROL LANDA
FRANCES LILIENTHAL
JOHN B. LOWRY
SARAH LOWRY
JANE R. LURIE
JEAN MacDERMID
KATHY COLE MANACE
MICHAEL MARSTON
BRUCE McKLEROY
PETER MEZEY
MARGARET MOORE
WALTER S. NEWMAN
LISLE PAYNE
FRANCES PETROCELLI
VALERIE PINKERT
TOBY ROSENBLATT
FRANCA SCHILT
CAROL SOLFANELLI
MARY TILDEN
PETER TRENDELL

OFFICERS 2005 - 2006
PRESIDENT/CHARLES FERGUSON
VICE PRESIDENT/MICHAEL CARBOY
VICE PRESIDENT/CAROL LANDA
SECRETARY/BRUCE McKLEROY
TREASURER/FRANCESCA GARDNER

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
RONALD BLATMAN

Mr. Leroy Saage, Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Ave., 26th floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 15, 2006

REC'D FEB 17 2006

Doyle Drive Draft EIS/R Comments

Dear Mr. Saage:

Historically, the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors (PHAN) has supported Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway now designated as Alternative 5. We believe it to be superior to all other alternatives that we've seen over the years. We also understand that it meets safety and traffic requirements, appreciate its design and character, and consider it appropriate to its setting in the Presidio National Park. 1

PHAN supports Alternative 5.
PHAN reaffirms that basic position. The other choice, Alternative 2, Rebuild and Widen, replicates the existing structure, except that it would be twice as wide, and taller in the no-detour option, which is its most likely construction method. While Alternative 2 meets safety and road capacity objectives, it fails to meet many basic objectives of the project, including direct access to the Presidio, and an appropriate character for a roadway in a national park. 2

According to the Doyle Drive Draft EIS/R, the working population of the Presidio is forecast to more than triple from the current 2,000, to 6,900 in year 2020. Many of those people will be working at Letterman Digital Arts. Under Alternative 2, cars would continue to drive through our neighborhood to reach the Presidio. The vicinity of the Lombard Gate would be overwhelmed, and the backup on Lombard St. would appear to extend to or east of Divisadero. This is unacceptable. 2 cont

By providing direct access to the Presidio, as called for in the project's Objectives, Alternative 5 mitigates these impacts. While the DEIS/R shows that Alternative 2 costs less, it appears that much of that "savings" comes from the failure to provide direct Presidio access and to meet other project objectives.

PHAN supports Circle Drive.
We urge agreement on a design that meets these objectives: 3

1. Respects and minimizes impacts on the Palace of Fine Arts and maximizes views from the Palace to the Golden Gate Bridge;
2. Keeps Palace of Fine Arts traffic off the residential blocks of Lyon Street;
3. Discourages non-Presidio traffic from cutting through the national park;

4. Creates an entry to the Presidio that not only draws attention to its combination of historic buildings and natural areas, but also maximizes views of the Golden Gate Bridge. 3 cont

We thank the project team for the effort that has gone into this complex and important design. The DEIS/R offers two options, Circle Drive and the Diamond Interchange. Each has tradeoffs, but Circle Drive appears to best meet our objectives for this area.

We note that both options keep a connection between the southern end of Gorgas St. and Lyon St. Because buses are prohibited on that portion of Lyon St., the link serves no transit purpose. Therefore, we view this as an opportunity for traffic to cut through the neighborhood and recommend against that connection. 4

PHAN supports Context Sensitive Design refinements.
Refinements based on Context Sensitive Design principles which have continued after the deadline for changes in the DEIS/R have further improved the design by the Palace of Fine Arts. PHAN urges that those refinements continue into the next phase of the project and be incorporated into the final design. Should refinements in other areas of the project be needed, we urge the same respect for the project's location in a national park. 5

PHAN does not support the Hook Ramp option at the Park Presidio interchange.
It is our understanding that even the original proponents of the Loop Ramp option, including Michael Painter, no longer support it because after environmental review it was found not to offer significant benefits, would be visually intrusive as seen from Crissy Field, and has an unjustified cost. We agree. 6

PHAN opposes the Merchant Road Slip Ramp.
It is costly, increases the width of what is already the widest part of Doyle Drive, and offers relatively slight improvements for traffic movements. Its costs outweigh its benefits. 7

PHAN remains concerned about the Lyon/Marina/Mason St. intersection.
Previously, PHAN expressed concern for the dangerous conditions at this five-way intersection at the Marina end of Doyle Drive. We appreciate that the City conducted three workshops to seek improvements to this dangerous intersection. The management of those workshops was ineffective in producing a consensus, and we've heard nothing since on what improvements would be made, nor how or when they would occur. 8

Credit for Work Done by Michael Painter.
Finally, we are very surprised that we are unable to find either credit or mention of Michael Painter, the visionary designer of the Presidio Parkway, in the Draft EIS/R. Thus, we strongly request that his work, much of it *pro bono,* be properly credited in the final document. 9

Thank you for your consideration of and response to the above comments.

Sincerely,

Charles Ferguson
President

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1248
2	Objection to Alternative 2 noted.	1249
3	Preference for Alternative 5 Circle Drive option noted.	1250
4	Preference for Alternative 5, Circle Drive option noted.	1251
5	Comment noted. Context Sensitive Design is an important part of the alternative design process and will continue through final design.	1252
6	Opposition to the Hook Ramp option noted.	1253
7	Opposition to the Merchant Road Slip Ramp option noted. This option was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.	1254
8	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S under the discussion of the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1255
9	Michael Painter is acknowledged in the Final EIS/R.	1256

RICHARD AND RHODA
GOLDMAN
FUND

March 29, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage
Doyle Drive Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

The Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund supports landscape architect Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway design (Alternative 5) for replacing Doyle Drive. In October 2005, the Goldman Fund completed renovation of 211 Lincoln Boulevard in the Presidio. We are located on the Main Post with the north side of our building facing directly on to Doyle Drive.

We believe that the Presidio Parkway design is the best plan to enhance the natural values and public use of the Presidio. Not only is the current Doyle Drive dangerous and unattractive, it effectively divides most of the Presidio from easy access to Crissy Field. The proposed Parkway would reconnect the Main Post with the waterfront and make it possible for larger numbers of people to visit and enjoy the Presidio. 1

As a longstanding supporter of the U.S. National Park system, the Goldman Fund has contributed over $6.7 million in support of various national parks since 1982. As a tenant of the Presidio, we are devoted supporters of the continued protection and beautification of the park and adjoining natural areas. We are confident the project committee will agree that the Presidio Parkway is the best alternative for the redevelopment of Doyle Drive.

Sincerely,

RN Goldman

Richard N. Goldman, President

The Presidio P.O. Box 29924, 211 Lincoln Boulevard, San Francisco, California 94129
Telephone: 415.345.6300 Fax: 415.345.9686 Website: www.goldmanfund.org

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1513

Creating, Enhancing and Protecting
the Unique Beauty and Livability of San Francisco

SAN FRANCISCO Beautiful

REC'D MAR 20 2006

Mr. Leroy Saage
Doyle Drive Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Agency
100 Van Ness Ave., 26th floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

March 14, 2006

SUBJECT: Comments on the Doyle Drive Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Dear Mr. Saage,

For over a decade San Francisco Beautiful (SFB) has participated in efforts to improve the Presidio as it transitions from a military base to a national park. Reconstructing Doyle Drive is a major component of this transition and SFB is proud to support Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway as the preferred alternative in the Draft EIS/R. 1

SFB has supported a parkway design from the earliest days of Mr. Painter's vision, including awarding a grant and a beautification award for an early model of the parkway concept. We are pleased that Mr. Painter's concept has been proven superior to earlier designs and has stood the tests of feasibility, cost and preliminary engineering.

The parkway is the only alternative that meets the objectives of the Doyle Drive project. In addition to increasing safety and meeting modern highway design and capacity needs, it will be far more beautiful than the "Rebuild and Widen" alternative (Alternative 2) which, despite advances in construction techniques, would be wider, taller and even more of an ugly intrusion on the Presidio National Park than the existing road.

By providing direct access to the Presidio, the parkway will allow Presidio-bound traffic to avoid traveling through adjacent neighborhoods. Alternative 2 fails to meet this key project objective, which is called for in plans of the Presidio Trust, the National Park Service, the City, as well as in a study of Doyle Drive's regional importance.

SFB encourages continuing efforts to improve the Parkway alternative, which the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report describes as "Context Sensitive Design." It is fundamental to recognize that the southern approach to the Golden Gate Bridge is a world-renowned site to which roadway design must be sensitively adapted.

SFB opposes the Merchant Road Slip Ramp because it unnecessarily impacts the National Park for very minor traffic benefits.

SFB prefers the Hook Ramp option at the Highway 1 interchange (as opposed to the Loop Ramp option) for its lower impacts to the Park's visual, natural and cultural resources. 2

Mrs. Friedel Klussmann
Founder

Dee Dee Workmon
Executive Director

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Gilbert H. Costle, III
President
Rosabella Safont
Vice-President
Edmond K. Hon
Treasurer
Lindo B. Muir
Secretary
Michael Alexander
Robin Chiang
Carmen C. Clark
Michael Dowling
Scott Emblidge
Peter Fortune
Robert C. Friese
Milo F. Hanke
David Hayes
Tim Kochis
Ann K. Lanzerotti M.D.
Meagan Levitan
Bruce Marcucci DDS
Mona S. Masri
Tito Patri
Byron Rodriguez
Mark P. Ryser

www.sfbeautiful.org

564 Market Street, Suite 709 • San Francisco, CA 94104 • T 415 · 421-2608 • F 415 · 421-4037 • E sfb@sfbeautiful.org

SFB prefers the Circle Drive option because it would provide a more beautiful and gracious entry to the Presidio and give greater respect to the Palace of Fine Arts by placing the roadway farther from that historic site. We support the Circle Drive objective of visually and physically reuniting the Presidio and the Palace, as they were during the historically significant 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition. However, the consequential but necessary loss of Bldg. 1151 must be fully mitigated by the project. Circle Drive should be constructed during the latter phase of the Project if at all possible, so that there is ample time for mitigation to be completed first. If Circle Drive is able to incorporate better transit access to the area, so much the better! 2 Cont 3

SFB is very disappointed to find no credit to the parkway's creator, Michael Painter, in the Draft EIS. We request that this oversight be corrected in the final document and that apologies to Mr. Painter and MPA Design be recorded in the Response to Comments. 4

Thank you for providing SFB with the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Dee Dee Workman

Dee Dee Workman
Executive Director
San Francisco Beautiful

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: San Francisco Beautiful

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1839
2	Project option preferences noted.	1840
3	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1841
4	Michael Painter is acknowledged in the Final EIS/EIR.	1842

SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE COALI

995 Market Street Suite 1550
San Francisco, CA 94103
415.431.BIKE
fax
org

Amended

please discard our earlier comments dated 25 March 2006

30 March, 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment

Dear Mr Saage:

The San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC) is a 5300-member nonprofit advocacy organization promoting the bicycle for everyday transportation in the city. We are pleased to share our comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Study/Report (DEIS/R) for the Doyle Drive Reconstruction project.

Although the SFBC envisions an ideal world where there is bicycle access on every major transportation facility equivalent to automobile access, we recognize the financial and engineering implications of designing a bike path for the Doyle Drive Reconstruction. Therefore, we have instead focused our energies on ensuring that safe, direct, and inviting alternate routes for bikes and pedestrians are provided in conjunction with any new facility and that the new facility does not degrade any existing conditions.

Specific comments on the Draft EIR:

1) We strongly favor Alternative 5 - The Presidio Parkway due to its
   a. reduced footprint and potential for **open space;**
   b. **aesthetic design** with increased landscaping and terraced roadways; 1
   c. potential for **improved** traffic calming elements in its detailed design and **interface with surface streets.**

2) <u>If the Parkway Alternative is selected; bike lanes (with lane cross-overs at right turn conflicts) be installed on the new extended Girard Street</u>, since this will be the most direct route from Marina Blvd/Lyon to and from the Letterman complex and other central post destinations. Cyclists will take this route and should have safe access designed into the new roadway. (The Old Mason and Halleck route is much longer and can be used by cyclists who prefer a less direct route with less traffic) 2

3) <u>We strongly prefer the Circle Drive option because it would allow for a new, safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connection between the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio, and because the latest version we have seen would</u> 3

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste with soy-based ink. Processed chlorine-free.

permit, for the first time, a convenient transfer between all three transit systems: Golden Gate, Muni and PresidiGo. We regard that transfer as a critical objective of the Parkway project. We are concerned that the Diamond option appears to create a dangerous condition where northbound buses are moving left from the bus stop after Lyon St., while traffic is moving right to exit the ramp. In addition, the Diamond ramp adds another road intersecting Girard St., creating another opportunity for auto, bicycle and pedestrian conflict. 3 Cont

4) We support continuation of the process of bringing representatives of agencies and citizens groups together to improve the detailed design of the Parkway, in particular improved transit connections and safe bicycle and pedestrian crossings of the roadway. This process is identified in the EIS as Context Sensitive Design. 4

5) In light of the fact that there are no tangible alternative transportation improvements included in the $600- $700M price tag and that the existing walkway on the Doyle Drive structure will be eliminated, we ask that the following mitigation measures be included in the Final EIR to provide for improved access for non-motorized transportation:
   a. Reconfigure the uphill portion of Crissy Field Ave from Mason St to Lincoln Blvd. into a two way bike way and pedestrian path with emergency vehicle access only. Cars from Crissy Field and the Presidio Post area should be directed to the new parkway via Girard or alternate routes as needed.
   b. Install a wide multi-use path along the East side of Lincoln Blvd or other improved configuration along Lincoln between the junction of Crissy Field Blvd and Vista Ave. This is currently a heavily used, yet dangerous and uninviting corridor. 5
   c. Study and install other traffic diversion or calming measures to further discourage commuter cut-through traffic on Presidio surface streets in accordance with the Presidio Master Plan.
   d. Apply mitigation funding from the project to local alternate project to install a bike, pedestrian, and maintenance path on the West Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, a corridor adjacent to dense population centers and where no current non-motorized access exists.

We are hopeful that additional alternative transportation and recreational enhancements can be made during the detailed design process and we will continue to offer our support and input towards the goal of providing world-class bike facilities in an urban park

Sincerely,

Andy Thornley
Program Director
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1292
2	The project incorporates the current Presidio Trust Bikeways and Trail plan to provide bike lanes on Girard Road which is extended to Marina Boulevard under the Preferred Alternative.	1293
3	Preference for Circle Drive Option noted.	1294
4	The Authority will continue to actively involve the community, interested parties and agencies during the design process and refinement of Context Sensitive Design Solutions.	1295
5	The restoration of the project area, including bike paths will be coordinated with the Trust and their Bikeways and Trails Mater Plan. The mitigation measures for the project are presented in Chapter 3 of the EIS/R. The mitigation measures are designed to address specific project related impacts.	1296

1. SPUR supports Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway (Alternative 5)

1

The Presidio has magnificent scenic, natural and cultural resources to be protected. But Doyle Drive is not one of them. It's ugly, unsafe and dangerous, and was built to army specifications which are now incompatible with a national park—even one which honors its military past.

The Presidio Parkway is the only alternative which meets the objectives of the Project. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors called for a parkway design in 1993, the National Park Service in 1994, the Doyle Drive Intermodal Study in 1996, and the Presidio Trust in 2002. Alternative 2 is a freeway, taller and twice as wide as what we now have, insuring that increasing numbers of people driving to work, live or play in the Presidio will be forced to use neighborhood streets to access the park, as they do today.

2. SPUR supports the Circle Drive option

At the Eastern end of the Project there are two great sites, the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio national park. People want to see and enjoy both of them. But for 70 years, Doyle Drive has been a physical and visual barrier between them.

Before that, the Presidio and the Palace were united, as sites of the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exhibition which celebrated the rebirth of San Francisco from the earthquake and fire.

That unity was foremost in the mind of the great landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, when he created the stunning new park sweeping towards the Palace from the Letterman Digital Arts campus. It was also a goal of the

SPUR's objectives have been to reunite the Presidio and the Palace, to lessen impacts on the Palace, to provide a magnificent Presidio entry, to minimize traffic in the neighborhoods and the park, and to provide an intermodal transit connection that is convenient to the Palace and the Presidio. SPUR believes that Circle Drive best meets those objectives. 2

The Diamond takes cars bound for the Presidio on a freeway-style off ramp, past much of the length of the Palace. This adds the equivalent of nearly two lanes of road width and extends the third northbound lane 722 feet farther north. The result is to bring traffic closer to the Palace, and to create a dangerous weave between buses entering Doyle Drive from their stop in the northbound bus bay, and cars moving to the right to the exit ramp. That situation is further complicated by the dropped right lane, just north of the exit ramp.

Circle Drive separates Palace and Presidio traffic at the Palace's south end. It is 57 percent narrower than the Diamond along Doyle Drive's most constrained area.

The Diamond uses a freeway-style off ramp, visually signaling to drivers that they're entering a freeway, instead of a moderate speed parkway. Circle Drive provides a more gentle exit which visually says, you're entering a national park.

We think about 500 of the 1,500 cars going to Letterman will be coming from San Francisco. Under the Diamond design, each of those hundreds of cars a day will have to make a nearly 1/2 mile long loop to the north, in order to enter the Letterman garage. Circle Drive brings them to the garage almost directly. In addition, the Diamond design requires two signalized intersections on Girard Rd. whose left turn sequences will delay morning rush traffic from Doyle which is exiting to Marina Blvd. The result is an incentive for drivers with options to use Richardson Ave. instead, which unbalances the needed split to handle the traffic load on both streets.

Circle Drive would allow bus bays on the far sides of the new intersection, with room for Golden Gate Transit and Muni. The PresidiGo shuttle would be able to pick up passengers from both sides of Circle Drive, creating a true intermodal transit connection for visitors to the Palace and the Presidio.

In complex projects, nothing is free. The impact of Circle Drive is that it means removal of Building 1151, the pool, which was built in the very last year of the Presidio's 169 year period of historic significance. Removal must require compliance with historic preservation regulations, and that the Doyle Drive project pay for the replacement of the building and its use, elsewhere in the Presidio. We think most Y members would find a new aquatic center near the main Presidio YMCA more convenient.

The visual result of Circle Drive would be a truly spectacular reconnection of the Presidio and the Palace of Fine Arts. It would also provide an entry to the Presidio that would draw visitors in through an historic area with a view into the recreation area of the Letterman park, then lead them to a natural area with stunning scenic vistas. History, recreation, nature, scenery. Those were the reasons the Presidio was saved as a national park. What an incredible experience that would be for neighbors and visitors!

View to west if Bldg. 1151 is removed.

3. SPUR supports closure of the link between Gorgas Ave and Lyon St. under the Circle Drive option

3

While the connection should be maintained for emergency vehicles, it should be closed to other through traffic so that drivers are not tempted to use Gorgas as a shortcut to bypass traffic on Richardson.

4. SPUR supports continued refinement of the Parkway designs and details.

4

SPUR regards the DEIS/R as the starting point for final design. Michael Painter and others have made many important improvements to the EIS concept designs. That process, which involves agencies, transportation officials, neighbors, civic groups must be continued past the close of public comments. Issues currently include, but are not limited to, shadowing of the potential marsh expansion/ Tennessee Hollow connection and some historic preservation matters. SPUR thanks the SFCTA for its commitment to this continuing process.

5. SPUR supports the hook ramp option at the Highway 1 interchange

5

After preliminary engineering and environmental evaluation, it became obvious that the Loop Ramp has many failings: it would be far more costly, takes park land and trees unnecessarily, and would be too visible from Crissy Field. Furthermore, careful attention to the Hook Ramp design its reduced its impact historic buildings.

6. SPUR opposes the Merchant Road slip ramp

6

The slip ramp would add another lane to the width of Doyle Drive, plus the width of inside and outside shoulders. It would require the removal of four residences (Buildings 1253-1256) on Armistead Road, the removal of a line of trees, and the taking of more than an additional acre of park land. The new design for the Highway 1 interchange adds sight distance and eases the weave which is the reason for the slip ramp proposal.

7. SPUR supports modern traffic management systems

In 1996, the Doyle Drive Intermodal Study strongly demonstrated that Doyle Drive is a critical link in the regional highway system. Were Doyle Drive to be closed, the Golden Gate Bridge would be out of operation or severely constrained, and the traffic impacts would be felt from Santa Rosa to the East Bay to San Jose.

In addition to recommending the reconstruction of Doyle Drive, the Intermodal Study called for its replacement to have modern traffic management systems, including an extension of the video monitoring of traffic that is on the Golden Gate Bridge, and other electronic devices that would allow for better and safer management of the roadway. SPUR supports the conclusions of the Intermodal Study, and recommends that the Doyle Drive project include modern traffic management systems including video monitoring, electronic signing and lane controls.

7

8. Give Credit to Michael Painter

8

Without Michael Painter, there would not be a Presidio Parkway design that the public and responsible agencies would have been able to agree upon. However, he was not credited in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report. SPUR asks that this embarrassing oversight be corrected in the Final EIS/R.

9. Visual representations.

9

In general, the Visual Impact Assessment fails to show the visual differences of the alternatives, and their impacts. Photographs were taken from the wrong locations, sometimes of the wrong side of the project, and with the wrong lens. SPUR will provide specific examples to the EIS team on request.

SPUR thanks the SFCTA and the project team for the opportunity to comment on this major project in a national park at the Golden Gate.

/s/

Jim Chappell
President

/s/

Michael Alexander
Chair, Doyle Drive Task Force

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1385
2	Support for the Circle Drive Option noted.	1386
3	Comment noted.	1387
4	The Authority has made the commitment to continue an open dialog with all project stakeholders throughout the completion of this project. This includes agency and citizen advisory committees, public meetings, living room briefings, project website and published media.	1388
5	Preference for the Hook Ramp option noted.	1389
6	Opposition to the Merchant Road Slip Ramp option noted.	1390
7	Comment noted.	1391
8	Mr. Painter is credited in the FEIS/R.	1392
9	The visual assessment follows the format and content guidelines provided in FHWA's Visual Impact Assessment for Highway projects. The viewpoints that were used for the analysis were selected in consultation with the Trust, National Park Service, Caltrans and SFCTA.	1393

San Francisco Tomorrow

Since 1970, Working to Protect the Urban Environment

March 31, 2006

REC'D MAR 3 1 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Doyle Drive DEIS/EIR Comments

Dear Mr. Saage:

The main problem with the alternatives chosen is that the emphasis seems to be on moving vehicles not on moving people. The DEIS/EIR projects future traffic growth on Doyle Drive, connecting roadways and city streets and the Golden Gate Bridge and apparently assumes it will all be automobiles. Insufficient study has been made of the possibility of moving more people on public transportation – buses and ferries. It projects more traffic on the Golden Gate Bridge. Is this a prelude to another attempt to put a second deck on the bridge? This is something citizen activists have fought and beaten back in the past. It would be extremely undesirable because it would generate alleged reasons to widen this roadway even more and because of the effect it would have on the neighborhoods into which this traffic would be dumped. 1

San Francisco citizen activists have been struggling for years to prevent an eight lane freeway being built as a replacement for Doyle Drive. The designs presented in this document make it all too easy to do this in the future. It is noted in the DEIS/EIR that an act of the state legislature says that Doyle Drive can not exceed six lanes without permission of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. However a future legislature that is not familiar with the background and reasons to this act could repeal it. One of the problems with term limits is a loss of history and reasons for certain pieces of legislation.

Several things about the proposed design are very disturbing.

The proposed seventh lane from Park Presidio Drive to the Marina junction is one. It is allegedly a merging lane. It is about 4200 feet in length. It is very questionable that a lane this length is required for merging. 500 feet or even less would seem more appropriate if this lane is really meant for merging only. As proposed now it is effectively another full traffic lane and is an increase in roadway capacity. This lane should be shortened so that it will not be an additional traffic lane. 2

41 Sutter Street, Suite 1579 . San Francisco CA 94104-4903 . (415) 566-7050

Recycled Paper

The proposed lane and shoulder widths are disturbing. They are wide enough that minor changes in the striping of the roadway would increase the roadway to eight lanes. In order to prevent this, the design should be modified so that the shoulders are discontinuous. Doing this would prevent the addition of an eighth lane. The alleged reason for this wide shoulder is to enable disabled vehicles to get out of the way of moving traffic. Having frequent pullouts rather than a continuous shoulder that is in effect a continuous lane would accomplish the same thing and eliminate the possibility of it becoming another traffic lane. A design with narrower lanes should be analyzed. It should also be noted that narrower lanes will result in lower speeds on this roadway and therefore a safer transition from freeway speeds to city street speeds when vehicles leave this freeway. 3

We can anticipate an argument that the proposed roadway is in accordance with state highway standards. Highway designers must realize that there is a difference between roadway requirements in rural areas and in densely populated cities. Designs that may be appropriate for the flat wide open spaces of the Central Valley are not appropriate for San Francisco. 4

The EIS/EIR should not be certified until:

1) alternative designs that are in accordance with the above comments are made and analyzed, 5

2) a complete study is made of ways to increase use of public transportation in order to remove the perceived need for increased roadway capacity.

Please address correspondence on this matter to Norman Rolfe, Transportation Chair, San Francisco Tomorrow, 2233 Larkin Street #4, San Francisco, CA 94109
phone/fax 415-775-9167, normrolfe@juno.com

Very truly yours

Norman Rolfe

Norman Rolfe, Transportation Chair

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: San Francisco Tomorrow

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The SFCTA travel demand model forecasts changes to all mode choices based on a series of complex forecasting formulae and assumptions.	1347
2	The seventh lane is required to accommodate the downstream traffic at Marina/Girard off-ramp.	1348
3	The proposed continuous useable outside shoulder is the minimum needed to address traffic safety while minimizing the facility footprint. In addition the proposed facility will have reduced lane widths and reduced design speed where appropriate as documented with the extensive number of design exceptions approved for the project.	1349
4	This is why context sensitive design is being implemented with the project. However, Caltrans safety standards must be maintained as this is a state owned facility. The Authority, Caltrans and FHWA have made great efforts to minimize the footprint of the facility while meeting the project purpose of seismic, structural and traffic safety as indicated by the application of project specific parkway design criteria. The facility has reduced lane widths, continuous shoulders to meet minimum safety requirements, while the auxiliary lane between Veterans Blvd and Girard road is needed to maintain adequate traffic operations. The parkway design is documented through the approval of extensive design exceptions.	1350
5	As mentioned in the preceding comments, context sensitive design is being implemented (see Section 2.2.3) with the project while maintaining Caltrans safety standards. The proposed project does not increase roadway capacity it is about replacing an existing roadway facility while improving the seismic, structural and traffic safety on Doyle Drive. Any studies regarding ways to increase the use of public transportation is beyond the scope of this project.	1351

March 31, 2006

Leroy L. Saage
Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Comments of Doyle Drive DEIS/DEIR

Dear Mr. Saage,

Transportation for a Livable City (TLC) is a nonprofit membership organization dedicated to making San Francisco more livable by fostering complete streets and vital neighborhoods. We strongly support the idea to replace the ugly, spindly, unsafe Doyle drive with a Presidio Parkway (Alternative 5), and salute Michael Painter for his dedication to sensitively integrating this project into its national park setting, respecting the natural and historic values of the park in the design, and transforming this project into a multimodal project which integrates walking, bicycling, and public transit while minimizing the impacts of traffic on the park. 1

- We cannot emphasize strongly enough that this project must be designed as a ***parkway***, not a *freeway*. Parkways are designed to move traffic at moderate, not excessive, speeds, and well-designed parkways integrate scenic and natural values of the setting into the experience of movement without overwhelming or degrading the setting. The Presidio Parkway calls for context-sensitive design, not a set of freeway specifications plucked from a highway engineering manual. Context-sensitive design may call for narrower traffic lanes than a conventional freeway, in order to encourage moderate speeds and reduce the impact of the road on the landscape. We urge the Transportation Authority to continue to work with Caltrans to remain true to the parkway concept through final design and engineering. In addition, context-sensitive design will enhance bicycle and pedestrian circulation along and around the parkway. 2
- Traffic volumes, and their attendant degradation of the natural park setting, can be reduced significantly by enhancing sustainable transportation modes (walking, bicycling, and public transit). We would especially like to see additional study of improving public transit service in the study corridor, and new traffic projections based on a transportation plan that emphasizes sustainable modes. Enhanced connections and designs for accommodating Muni and Golden Gate Transit buses and any internal park shuttles, with appropriately sited transit hubs, should be incorporated into the plan. 3
- No parking should be included as part of the project, as expanding parking serves only to increase vehicle trips, and the attendant environmental degradation. 4

Transportation for a Livable City
995 Market Street Suite 1550
San Francisco, CA 94103
415.344.0489
www.livablecity.org

- We are glad to see that the Presidio Parkway design has tried to accommodate the proposed expansion of the Crissy Field wetlands, and restoration of Tennessee Hollow and El Polin Creek. The design should continue to be refined so as to maximize the potential for environmental restoration.
- We support the hook ramp option at the Highway 1 interchange, as it less costly than the loop ramp option and does less harm to the park than the loop ramp.
- The proposed seventh lane from Park Presidio Drive to the Marina junction should be shortened to assure that it functions as a merging lane only and will not serve as an additional traffic lane.
- We oppose the Merchant Road slip ramp, as it provides only marginal benefits to traffic movement at a cost of great harm to the park. 5
- We support the Circle Drive option, as it provides much better pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit connections between the Palace of Fine Arts, Crissy Field, and the Presidio.
- In conjunction with the Parkway alternative, bicycle lanes, with lane cross-overs at right turn conflicts, should be installed on the new extended Girard Street, since this will be the most direct route from Marina Blvd/Lyon to and from the Letterman complex and other central post destinations. Cyclists will take this route and should have safe access designed into the new roadway. The Old Mason and Halleck route, which is much longer, could still be used by cyclists who prefer an indirect route with less traffic.
- In light of the fact that there are no tangible improvements to sustainable transportation modes (walking, bicycling, and public transit) included in the $600- $700 million project cost, and that the existing walkway on the Doyle Drive structure will be eliminated, we ask that the following mitigation measures be included in the Final EIR to provide for improved access for non-motorized transportation:
  - Reconfigure the uphill portion of Crissy Field Ave from Mason St to Lincoln Blvd. into a two way bike way and pedestrian path with emergency vehicle access only. Cars from Crissy Field and the Presidio Post area should be directed to the new parkway via Girard or alternate routes as needed.
  - Install a wide multi-use path along the East side of Lincoln Blvd or other improved configuration along Lincoln between the junction of Crissy Field Blvd and Vista Ave. This is currently a heavily used, yet dangerous and uninviting corridor. 6
  - Study and install other traffic diversion or calming measures to further discourage commuter cut-through traffic on Presidio surface streets in accordance with the Presidio Master Plan.

We hope that the above comments are helpful in creating a Presidio Parkway that will do justice to its extraordinary setting, and set a new standard for the design of future multimodal transportation projects.

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich

Tom Radulovich
Executive Director

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Transportation for a Livable City

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1458
2	Comment noted.	1459
3	Existing transit service is currently fully utilized and works with the Presidio Shuttle. The Preferred Alternative includes extended bus bays on both sides of Richardson Avenue (see Section 2.5.4). The extended bus bays will provide safer merging capability for the buses and will facilitate transfers between Golden Gate Transit, Muni and PresidiGo vehicles.	1460
4	Comment noted.	1461
5	Comment noted.	1462
6	The restoration of the project area, including bike paths will be coordinated with the Trust and their Bikeways and Trails Mater Plan.	1463

From: David Schonbrunn [David@Schonbrunn.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 12:35 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: TRANSDEF's comments

TRANSDEF participated in the Citizen's Advisory Group several years ago, and supports the Parkway alternative. After attending the hearing in the Presidio, we offer the following comments in the spirit of generating and presenting clearly the information necessary to lessen the divisiveness heard that night: 1

For the non-professional, the EIS/R is very difficult to read and comprehend. Clustering the traffic information on the basis of neighborhoods, instead of randomly listing roadway names, would help greatly in the comprehension of the traffic data. Many of the speakers seemed to identify strongly with their neighborhoods, so having an easy way to compare the impacts of the various alternatives on different neighborhoods would be very useful. 2

We think it would be useful for the FEIS/R to contain a matrix that identifies the interests of each of the adjacent neighborhoods. 3

Many of the speakers appeared to have the hidden agenda of seeking to have the Doyle Drive project reduce the cut-through traffic in their neighborhood. That appeared to be the reason so many objected to the introduction of a new traffic light. 4

After developing the requested matrix, the study should identify the impact on traffic volumes and speeds in each of the neighborhoods. Projected travel times though the Doyle Drive Corridor for the various alternatives for am and pm peak and for off peak periods also need to be made prominent. This will hopefully eliminate the hysteria about the new traffic light. In particular, the vehemently protesting speakers seemed to miss the fact that the traffic light would be in place a block before an existing traffic light, thus not creating a major hindrance to traffic. 5

It is our hope that, through clear and simpler presentation of the data using a neighborhood perspective, as described above, a consensus can be achieved on a preferred alternative, thus leaving the funding as the sole remaining problem. 6

--David Schonbrunn, President
Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF)

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: TRANSDEF (Schonbrunn, D.)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1562
2	Comment noted and will be considered for future traffic studies.	1563
3	Although the comments are not separated by specific neighborhood, a summary of the comments received during the formal review process is provided in Appendix E of the FEIS/R. Many themes which emerged from these comments were addressed through public outreach prior to the completion of the FEIS/R and it also reflected in the appendix. Appendix L provides all the comment letters and responses.	1564
4	Comment noted.	1565
5	The project proposes no changes to this area. This area was included in the explanded traffic study which demostrated no impacts from the project.	1566
6	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange option was chosen as the Preferred Alternative.	1567

Urban Watershed Project

3229A Clement Street
San Francisco, CA 94121
(415) 828-2622
dougkern@sbcglobal.net

March 31, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS/R on the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive. The Urban Watershed Project (UWP) appreciates the efforts of Project Team members to meet with members of the Presidio natural and cultural resources community during this comment period and to respond to specific requests for information and assistance. We appreciate the efforts of Michael Painter and his project vision. We also appreciate the time-extension of the comment period.

UWP recognizes the need for repairing the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge and at the same time understands the special nature of the National Park lands that the project spans. In particular, the Tennessee Hollow restoration project is perhaps the most important large-scale natural restoration project within the Presidio and its orientation perpendicular to Doyle Drive creates difficult challenges. UWP respectfully suggests the extra effort the Doyle Drive project team takes now in creatively integrating the Tennessee Hollow stream and habitat corridor will leave a lasting positive impression on visitors and the drivers for decades to come. UWP has confidence that project team designers understand the need to integrate the vision of Tennessee Hollow into the final design. 1

UWP, along with the Presidio Environmental Council, supports Alternative number 5, as most recently described by Michael Painter on March 22, 2006, with some caveats. 2

UWP acknowledges Mr. Saage's comments encouraging the National park Service and the Presidio Trust to develop a Tennessee Hollow/Crissy Marsh design so that Doyle Drive can appropriately include these features. We are particularly encouraged by his offer to build the marsh expansion/riparian corridor extension, if the design is ready by 2009. UWP recommends this design process be well coordinated and integrated with your own design process or else much greater delay is possible. UWP recommends the appointment of a design coordinator from your team to direct this complicated and 3

challenging multi-faceted project.

Among the most difficult challenges remaining for Doyle Drive and its intersection with Tennessee Hollow/Crissy marsh are the specific road crossings and their impacts. 3 Cont

- UWP appreciates the efforts to spread ramps and roadways apart to allow for more sunlight to penetrate to the habitat corridor and marsh.
- Please develop designs that consider the impacts of shading under spans during the day. The Tennessee Hollow project will ultimately cost many millions of dollars and the area where it enters the marsh is a very sensitive and rare habitat area. Develop an award winning parkway design that fully incorporates the riparian system as it enters the marsh, even though a major roadway with off-ramps is running through this ecologically crucial transition zone. 4
- Investigate and include the use of translucent materials in the roadways or along the shoulders to allow light to penetrate. 5
- Investigate and include large lengths or spans of roadway without piers or abutments in the habitat zone. 6
- Investigate and appropriately design for the birds flying near the parkway as it crosses over Tennessee Hollow to minimize impacts. 7
- At night, we expect that certain types of lighting may attract insects and therefore, birds to the parkway as it crosses Tennessee Hollow/Crissy Marsh. Please design night lighting to minimize these potential conflicts. 8
- Roadway noise is anticipated to be an impediment to pedestrian and wildlife enjoyment nearby the parkway. UWP recommends that the Doyle Drive team continue to reduce vehicle speeds in this area around riparian corridor/marsh expansion, so the roadway noise itself does not become the focal point. 9
- Roadway runoff is a difficult and important challenge. Roadway runoff can add a toxic shock to ecological systems after several months of buildup. UWP suggests that regular roadway cleaning and treatment of runoff prior to discharge into local waters may make the most sense from a watershed perspective, rather than discharging to the sanitary sewers, resulting in much greater contamination to the Bay from combined sewage overflows (CSOs.) 10
- With the caveat of runoff treatment, possibly through the use of a local treatment wetlands, allow local infiltration to maintain groundwater hydrology in the marsh and stream corridor areas.
- Allow for human pedestrian and bicycle travel in the marsh/riparian zone near the Doyle Drive crossing as the vision for Tennessee Hollow is one where visitors may walk along the marsh and then up into the riparian corridor, eventually to the headwater springs. A careful design will include this very important ability for humans to view the wildlife corridor and its inhabitants along its entire length. 11
- UWP recommends that an adaptive management approach be incorporated into design elements involving natural resources. We should expect the unexpected and allow for open reporting and communication of eventual problems so that they me addressed rapidly. 12

- UWP recommends that post-construction monitoring and reporting procedures be developed to receive comments on an ongoing basis as unexpected project impacts occur. 13
- UWP recommends that the Doyle Drive team continue to actively involve community members during the design process. UWP would like to be invited to participate in ongoing design considerations particularly with respect to the marsh, and riparian corridors. 14

UWP is greatly encouraged by the openness and willingness to integrate community concerns into the project. We consider the Doyle Drive design effort to be a work-in-progress with major hurdles being overcome regularly. We respectfully request to be invited to participate in the process throughout the construction phase of the project. 15

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this important document. If you have any questions or would like to contact me, please call (415) 828-2622, or by email at dougkern@sbcglobal.net.

Sincerely,

Doug Kern
Executive Director
Urban Watershed Project

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Urban Watershed Project

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1258
2	Comment noted.	1259
3	Comment noted.	1260
4	The project team is coordinating the design of the facility as well as the proposed marsh restoration under the facility with the participating agencies.	1261
5	The project team continues to look for shade reducing design details in coordination with Caltrans, the Trust and GGNRA	1262
6	All efforts are being made to avoid conflicts with sensitive habitats and further refinements to the roadway will be part of detailed design process. The facility will be designed to be above the 100-year flood zone while the detailed design will be coordinated with the Trust once marsh restoration plans are developed.	1263
7	This is part of detailed design. Workshop held on 3/22/06 identified proposed design enhancements and recommendation were made as to the types of plants which should be planted below the structure.	1264
8	Streetlights will be designed to minimize glare along the facility including at-grade and elevated portions of the roadway.	1265
9	In addition to containing the facility in a tunnel where it runs closest to the marsh, the project team has proposed to investigate and incorporate alternative paving materials and absorptive tunnel linings to minimize road noise in addition to ongoing application of traffic calming strategies.	1266
10	It should be noted that under the existing condition, none of the runoff from the roadway is treated prior to discharge. Therefore, under either Option 1 or 2 described in the FEIS/R (Section 3.3.1), there would be a net benefit to receiving water quality because the runoff will be treated. Runoff from nearly the entire City flows into the combined sewer system and is treated at one of the City's treatment plants. The FEIS/R allows for either discharge to the sanitary sewer system or for on-site treatment measures in accordance with the Caltrans Storm Water Management Plan (which is regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board).	1267
11	The project will continue to coordinate with the Trust and GGNRA as they developed the design of the marsh restoration.	1268

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Urban Watershed Project

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
12	While the project is being implemented, the monitoring program provides this kind of situational response. Over the longer, post-project period, the EIS/R commits to long-term assessment of the success of restoration, with contingency plans, in a manner similar to adaptive management. The term is used in this context in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of Section 3.4.1.	1269
13	See response to Comment 1269	1270
14	The Authority will continue to actively involve the community, interested parties and agencies during the design process.	1271
15	The Authority will involve the community, interested parties and agencies throughout the construction phase of the project.	1272

We build strong kids,
strong families, strong communities.

March 31, 2006

Leroy L. Saage, PE
Doyle Drive Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94102

Re: Doyle Drive DEIS/DEIR

Dear Mr. Saage:

The YMCA of San Francisco is a tenant of the Presidio Trust in two locations within the Presidio: a site a the intersection of Funstan Avenue and Lincoln Boulevard ("Main Post Facility") where we operate a gymnasium and fitness facility, and a site on Gorgas Avenue northwest of the intersection with O'Reilly Avenue ("Letterman Facility") where we operate a gymnasium and aquatics facility.

In this capacity, we express strong preference for the Presidio Parkway (Alternative V) as described in the DEIS/DEIR. This alternative will preserve and enhance the circulation, environmental character and sight lines of the Main Post area of the Presidio far better than either of the other two alternatives. This alternative also provides the added benefit of a direct and landscaped pedestrian connection between the Main Post Facility and the Crissy Marsh, where we conduct recreation and environmental education activities. 1

With regard to the access options at the eastern end of Doyle Drive, we prefer the Circle Drive Option to the Diamond Interchange Option, even though it will require the relocation of a portion of our Letterman Facility, namely the swimming pool we currently operate at that location. Assuming that the relocation of that facility can be at least partially funded as part of the cost of the overall project, the preservation of sight lines between the Lucas Arts Letterman campus and the Palace of Fine Arts is an overriding consideration. 2

Respectfully submitted,

YMCA of San Francisco

William Worthington
Vice President, Property Development

YMCA of San Francisco • 631 Howard Street, Suite 500 • San Francisco, CA 94105
415-777-9622 • fax: 415-777-6915 • www.ymcasf.org

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: YMCA of SF

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1206
2	Preference for the Circle Drive Option noted. In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1207

Reviewers	Page	
Public Hearing January 18, 2006	Comment Letter	Responses
Vaughey, P.(Cow Hollow Neighborhood Merchants)	184	207
Sachs, J.	189	208
Covert, R.	194	209
Lem, L.	196	210
Blum, J.	197	211
Levin, M.	199	212
Hermann, Dee	203	213
Reviewers listed in order from transcripts		

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
IN PARTNERSHIP WITH
CALTRANS, FHWA, GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE HIGHWAY AND
TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
IN COOPERATION WITH THE PRESIDIO TRUST, THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS

DOYLE DRIVE DRAFT EIS/R
PUBLIC HEARING
MILTON MARKS CONFERENCE ROOM
455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE (LOWER LEVEL)
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2006
7:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948

---o0o---

A P P E A R A N C E S

KAY WILSON
Moderator

MYRNA VALDEZ
GARY KENNERLEY
Parsons Brinckerhoff

MICHAEL PAINTER
MPA Design

JARED GOLDFINE
California Department of Transportation

LEE SAAGE
San Francisco Transportation Authority

JOE STORY
DKS Associates

P U B L I C S P E A K E R S

Patricia Vaughey
Jackie Sachs
Richard Covert
Lewis Lem
Michael Levin

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS READ FROM CARDS FOR:

Jan Blum
Dee Hermann

---o0o---

end of the time that you speak, then, any questions that we can, we'll forward to the panel.

If the questions are -- we want to answer as many as we can, but if they're too technical or too detailed, then you can know that they'll be answered in the final environmental document. But the ones that are fairly straightforward we'll try to work through tonight so we can clear up as many questions as you have.

And then after that, if the -- if you have a clarifying comment after the panel questions, we'll give you a minute just for a clarifying comment. We would ask that no time slots will be yielded or traded. Please don't interrupt the speakers with side conversations or applause. We want to be able to hear everybody. And please turn off those cell phones and beepers. We don't want to be too draconian here, but we do want to get through and hear from everybody. And we appreciate your cooperation. And let's get some speaker cards up here, please.

Just raise your hand, and we'll be glad to -- Okay. Well, we'll start out with the first two, and I'll check back in a few minutes.

Patricia Vaughey?

PATRICIA VAUGHEY: Good evening.

KAY WILSON: Good evening.

PATRICIA VAUGHEY: Patricia Vaughey for the Cow Hollow Neighborhood Merchants.

There were two slides back on No. 5 concerning Marina Boulevard's entrance. And I want to make a statement, first, that our association has a stand that we all have to share the burden in the greater neighborhood and that all of us are going to have to share some of this traffic.

But there are two slides that Gary produced. One of them, he says that Doyle Drive was one third on Marina Boulevard and two thirds on Lombard. And yet the next slide, it says 22 percent on Lombard. And Gary said that's 2 percent. And it's actually 11.

My question is, is this -- is what studies did you do with this transportation analysis for your model, and what was the mathematical principle behind it? I've asked this question several times, and no one can seem to answer it. 1

At the time the stop signs were put on Marina Boulevard, Lombard was at 98 percent. And then when the stop signs went up, it went up to 104 percent. Then, after the dot com boom, it went down to 96 percent, and now it's up to almost 99 percent. With 11 percent increase, not counting the projected 25,000 by 2030, we are going to be approximately 110 percent over maximum 2

capacity. What mitigations do you have for this? We already have Greenwich, Filbert, Chestnut, Alhambra, Francisco being inundated with people that want to get off of Richardson and divert throughout our neighborhoods. Marina Boulevard, after the stop signs went up, on Baker they put a "no right-hand turn." So now the cars are going up Scott. 2 cont

My question is, is what mitigations are you going to do to help the entire neighborhood on this, and how can you rationalize diverting some traffic from one neighborhood to another so close together? And that's my big problem. 3

My next problem on this is, the section near Lyon and Bay, the diamond portion and the circle portion, not the highway part, but the part that goes into the Palace of Fine Arts, there's some great impacts on the neighbors. Okay? 4

And I want to know if there is any way we can get that mathematical principle behind that study, because I think you're a little bit off on some of it. And I'd like to be able to have a look at that mathematical principle myself.

Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Patricia, you've asked some meaty questions. Let me summarize a couple of them for the

traffic folks and see how they do.

What studies were done as far as the transportation model, and what were the mathematical principles behind that?

We'll start with that, and then I'll go to the other two.

Joe?

JOE STORY: I guess it's a Joe question.

KAY WILSON: I think so.

JOE STORY: Thanks.

Actually, the traffic analysis was done in two different -- with two different steps. The first step is to look at the forecast on what's supposed to happen by 2030. And that part of it was handled by the Authority staff themselves. And of course, with Doyle Drive as an existing roadway -- and we certainly have a no-build condition -- we needed to see how traffic volumes would actually change by 2030.

The way that the TA does this is, they have what's called a multimodal regional traffic model that it's built that is designed to simulate traffic behavior characteristics across the entire Bay Area. It's specifically focused in the city of San Francisco.

And that focus actually looks at the travel speeds and the travel times of each length of every city

street in the entirety of San Francisco. That -- when you get outside of the city, the other regions are represented by the portion of the model that replicates what's done by MTC, or Metropolitan regional [sic] commission at the regional level. And that allows for the forecast to be technically consistent with FHWA standards for doing projections.

But a more specific answer to Pat's question is, the volumes are a result of traffic speeds. And the model has what's called an "equilibrium assignment."

So between any two points or any two districts in the model, it looks at the minimum travel-time paths and looks at several different paths and assigned probabilities to each of those paths so that what ends up happening is, some people may choose to go from Downtown to Marin County via Marina, and some of those people may choose to go from Downtown to Marin County via Lombard.

And the probabilities are directly related to what is the travel time on each of those paths. Then the model has what I would call a feedback mechanism that the higher the traffic volumes get, the model then begins to say, "Well, the road can't handle this much traffic. It's going to get slower and slower."

And also there's this relationship between the

theoretical capacity, the carrying capacity of the roadway, and the actual speeds that are achieved on the roadway.

KAY WILSON: Okay. A couple of follow-ons: What mitigations have we proposed to address traffic issues? And how can you rationalize diverting traffic from one neighborhood to another?

JOE STORY: That's certainly an interesting question. I would begin by saying it's almost a chicken-or-egg question. And the reason I say that is because the alternatives were designed, and then the question came up whether or not the alternatives would create significantly more or less problems on the adjacent roadways.

And while we did identify some percentage changes between the alternatives, in the aggregate, the alternatives did not have what I would call a fatal flaw in terms of significantly making a negative result happen. One of the reasons for that is, as Gary said in his presentation, is most of the traffic increase is in the non-peak direction rather than in the peak direction.

KAY WILSON: Patricia, do have a follow-on comment or question?

PATRICIA VAUGHEY: No one seems to be able to tell

me what the principles behind this model are. And my only question on that is, the studies were based on 2000. And we're at 2006 right now. And we had a great increase before Lucas, and now we have a great increase after Lucas.

And I'm just wondering, for the greater neighborhood, if we're not being more cautious -- I think we can do a better job. I think I like what we've done. I am on the citizens advisory committee.

But we've got to look into these issues because the side streets of all of Scott, from Marina Boulevard on up, as well as the side streets of Greenwich and Filbert, are getting inundated with diverted traffic. And this isn't fair to the entire neighborhood. Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Jackie Sachs is our next speaker, please.

JACKIE SACHS: Good evening, Panel. I'm also on the citizens advisory committee. I have a few questions regarding transportation and traffic.

First of all, regarding traffic, near the Palace of Fine Arts, how will this construction impact the parking at the Palace of Fine Arts? -- for the simple reason that you will not only have people taking public transit, you will have tour buses, you will have

1

cabs wanting to drop people off and pick people up, you will have MV vans with senior and disabled individuals. You might even have some handicapped buses, bus loads of people that are handicapped

And I was just wondering, how will this new -- how will the -- will there be enough -- and you may even have limousines as well. How will all of this impact the parking at the Palace of Fine Arts? That's question number one.

Question number two, as you know, there are currently two bus lines that go through the Presidio, the 28 and the 43. Once the construction is started, how are you going to re-route those buses, and what are you going to do with the 18-wheelers that get off the Golden Gate Bridge, and they want to go down to the Marina? How in the world -- how -- they'll have to go down -- they may have to -- how are you going to accommodate those 18-wheelers that have to make deliveries down at the Marina? And that's about it.

2

3

KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you. First question is for traffic near the Palace of Fine Arts, how will construction impact parking at the Palace?

GARY KENNERLEY: What we're looking at doing there, for during the construction period, we've been working with the Presidio Trust on the parking study; we had to

analyze. There will be some lesser parking in that area. We're looking at -- working with the Presidio Trust with their spaces, to manage it. The Palace of Fine Arts, specifically we're looking at, if necessary, providing shuttle buses to other areas of parking to maintain that access.

KAY WILSON: The second question -- and I don't know if we have this one available tonight -- bus lines, how will buses be rerouted, and what about 18-wheelers? Are we at that level of detail yet?

JOE STORY: I can address the bus issue.

KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

JOE STORY: But not the 18-wheeler issue. That's probably a Gary issue.

KAY WILSON: Okay.

JOE STORY: Because this is a design study and it's not a transit routing study, we are not at liberty to redirect local bus routes within San Francisco. So we basically have assumed that the local routes would generally follow the paths that they do today.

Having said that, we did relocate the bus stops in the Parkway alternatives and -- at the intersection of Francisco, north of Richardson -- and created enough room for the buses to pull out of the line of traffic, in closer to the Palace of Fine Arts from where the

current Richardson stops are today.

But we did not reroute the 43. That's a decision that Muni would make themselves. But that would affect the 28.

JACKIE SACHS: What about the follow-up to that? What about the transit hub that they're planning on putting into the Presidio? Would the construction in any way affect the transit hub that they want to put near where Letterman -- well, where Lucas is now?

4

JOE STORY: As I understand it, the transit hub is not part of the scope of these alternatives. So it's actually not in the right-of-way of the Doyle Drive corridor as it is. There is going to be enough room for these stops on Richardson that will be able to accommodate the buses, as I mentioned earlier.

KAY WILSON: Thank you, Jackie. And we'll have to answer that other one in the final analysis.

JACKIE SACHS: Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Any other yellow cards, please? We'd love to hear from some more people. If you don't have a yellow card, raise your hand, and Lauren will bring you one.

Do you have a card?

MALE IN AUDIENCE: No, I don't.

KAY WILSON: Oh, well, we'll get you one. That's

easy.

Raise your hand if you would like a yellow card, and we'll run them around.

Okay. Are you ready to come on up?

RICHARD COVERT: My name is Richard Covert. I'm a long-time resident of San Francisco and a former assistant chief counsel of CalTrans legal. And I was retired, but I had occasion to have been interested in some Doyle Drive litigation.

But I have a question, a specific question about the land-use alternatives on Page 11 on your handout, for Alternative 5, the Parkway. And under the temporary impacts, it's got, "Construction staging will require use of the parking lot at the Post Exchange." And that's now, I believe, a Sports Basement.

So as I understand it, under Alternative 2, you would be putting that Sports Basement temporarily out of business for an extended period of time during construction, which would obviously have an impact on revenues to the City.

On the other hand, Alternative 2, which is to Replace and Widen, has significantly less construction costs than Alternative 5, for obvious reasons. You'd have it two times. So that would obviously increase construction costs of the Parkway over the

Alternative 2.

My specific question is, what analysis -- and I also note under the Parkway alternative, you're not going to be impacting the Sports Basement during construction. So it could stay open. So we don't have that severe impact, economic impact, on the Presidio under the Parkway alternative that you do under Alternative 2.

And I'm wondering what specific studies have been made in right-of-way costs, which it would appear you would have under the Parkway alternative because you don't have to close the Sports Basement, which I would think would generate a very significant revenue for the Presidio. Under that Parkway alternative, you don't have to close it up, whereas under Alternative 2, you do have to close it up.

1

KAY WILSON: Okay. Gary, do you have any input on that?

GARY KENNERLEY: Very quickly. One thing, all alternatives will actually be using a portion of that parking lot for staging. However, that parking lot has greater capacity than the Sports Basement actually needs. So the detour alternative under Alternative 2 would actually require the removal of that building; otherwise it could stay in operation.

RICHARD COVERT: I wasn't calling on the detour so much as on the -- the way I read this, and this is on Page 11, is even without the detour, you're going to have -- under Alternative 2, you're going to have construction staging that's going to take out that parking lot for significant periods of time, which would, obviously, affect the liability.

2

GARY KENNERLEY: As I say, it wouldn't take out the whole parking lot. It would leave enough. But basically, to answer your question on the right-of-way, generally we have taken square footage of buildings, typically projected in-line, sort of building-use work in the Presidio, and applied typical commercial rates to those square footages to generate anticipated right-of-way costs.

RICHARD COVERT: Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you. Any more yellow cards?

We'll collect that one.

And Lewis?

LEWIS LEM: Hi. I just have a quick question. I'm Lewis Lem. I work for AAA of Northern California. I was just starting to look at the documents, but I have one question just about the data on the highway safety and level of service, and as somebody familiar with that, just a very simple question. Maybe not too

simple; we'll see.

As I read it, basically, on the highway segments between -- comparing between Replace and Widen and the Parkway options, other than Richardson, there's really no difference in level of service. There's difference in volumes of traffic carried. That's what it appears to be. But it doesn't look like, other than Richardson, the level of service for the segments of the highway are any different with this scenario, Replace and Widen --

1

KAY WILSON: Can you confirm that, Joe?

JOE STORY: I don't have the -- I don't have the tables in front of me, so I couldn't say exactly what it says.

I will say that the term "level of service" is a qualitative term that's based on some quantitative analysis. I would expect level of service is based upon the density of traffic, which is, if you -- how many -- how close together are the cars, how tightly packed or loosely packed in are they? And it's created like your school report cards: A, is very little congestion, and F is over-saturation.

Having said that, because it is a replacement project, from the no-project to the project, we're essentially looking at carrying, roughly, about the same

amounts of traffic. There may be nuances within that traffic of 100 vehicles or 200 vehicles that might change a letter here or there just because of where the line is drawn when we calculate things.

But certainly the whole project as a replacement project does not create a major regional attractiveness to the roadway or away from the roadway.

LEWIS LEM: Is there a way we can just check and get an answer?

KAY WILSON: Yes. Maybe after the meeting, we can get the document out and go over the tables.

LEWIS LEM: I just think that's a relatively important question when you're comparing the Replace and Widen with the Parkway. Basically, as I read it, other than Richardson, there's no difference in terms of the level of service. But I wouldn't presume to have the answer to that question because I could be wrong.

JOE STORY: I would need to check the technical reports one more time.

KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

The next yellow card that's been submitted is by Jan Blum. And she's asked that I read these comments:

"How far off the ground will the Parkway be in elevation to the marsh expansion area?" Gary? 1

GARY KENNERLEY: Off the existing ground?

KAY WILSON: Yes, that would be my guess.

GARY KENNERLEY: Basically, it would vary from pretty much being -- as it comes out of the Main Post tunnel, it will be pretty much at-grade. And as it goes over where the Halleck Street connection would be, it would be about three meters -- ten feet above the existing ground.

KAY WILSON: And then the next few questions I believe pertain to the height of the Parkway:

"What is the maximum height in feet? What is the minimum height in feet?" 2

GARY KENNERLEY: The minimum is zero. When you say "height in feet," again, I would assume -- are we talking height off the ground, or absolute --

KAY WILSON: Yes. I'm getting a nod "yes."

GARY KENNERLEY: At the high viaduct, it is approximately about 35 meters above -- it's the same place as the existing structure is, about 35 meters off the ground.

KAY WILSON: And in feet?

GARY KENNERLEY: Which is about 100 feet.

KAY WILSON: Thank you. Okay.

Michael Levin?

And please raise your hand if you've got some

more yellow cards to give us.

MICHAEL LEVIN: Thank you. I'm Michael Levin. I'm not too well prepared for this, but you're soliciting comments, so I thought, well, why not. And I have a lot of reading to do. I know we're supposed to be commenting on the thoroughness of the Draft EIR/EIS, but maybe my questions are at least partly answered in the report.

But first of all, you mentioned that a few historic buildings that, in the case of Alternative 2, would have to be temporarily relocated and, in the case of Alternative 5, the Parkway, would be lost, as I understand it. Again, I don't know if there's more thorough discussion on exactly what these are in the report, but maybe you could say something more about that, what these buildings are, their significance. 1

There are a lot of historic structures in the Presidio. And I think every one of them should be treasured. That's why they were designated historic structures.

But on the other hand, maybe the loss would be mitigated by the benefit of this new parkway. As someone who's lived here all my life, is very used to Doyle Drive -- although it's certainly negative on the environment through most of its length, it's something

that we're used to. And I sure would like to think that in my lifetime I would be able to see something that's less harmful to the environment, that's an improvement, a significant improvement over what's there now.

So I'm hoping that one of these alternatives -- and it sounds like the parkway would be it, would be that type of change. But again, I have more reading to do.

Also, I just thought I'd mention, with regard to the bus lines, the previous speaker mentioned the 43 and the 28. There's also the 29 bus, which takes just an amazing scenic route through the Presidio which I've often traveled. And it's one of the best bus rides in the city. And I'm hopeful that that will remain in place. And I'm wondering if there's going to be any significant impact to that. I know you've already said it's up to Muni whether they'll be rerouting any buses. 2

But riding that bus will give me a chance, I hope, to see this project when it's actually under construction. Anyway, thank you for listening to my comments.

KAY WILSON: Okay.

Jared, do you want to respond?

JARED GOLDFINE: Yeah, I would need to respond -- can you just -- here. Thanks.

There is a difference in the number of buildings. But first of all, the Presidio is part of a national historic landmark district. And the alternatives do take varying numbers of buildings within the Presidio. As we worked towards selecting a preferred alternative, we were working with the advisory council and the State Historic Preservation officer to devise some means of addressing the adverse effects resulting from the loss of those historic buildings.

KAY WILSON: And anybody on Muni Line 29?

JOE STORY: Yeah. There's certainly -- you know, there's nothing in any of the alternatives that would preclude having to change the 29 in the current situation. There may be issues with the 29 during construction periods, so we would need to address that in the final EIR.

MICHAEL LEVIN: If I could just follow up with -- regarding historic structures -- could you clarify a little bit more what you meant by what's being addressed with that, how you're working this out with the other agencies?

3

JARED GOLDFINE: Of course, we're working with the Presidio and the National Park Service because the Presidio Trust is the landowner. And so we're trying to develop ways to record loss of historic buildings. And

if we can relocate historic buildings back into their existing locations, how we can do that, so a program of -- a program in order to address the effects on those historic buildings.

Some of those buildings will be lost. And so to the extent that we lose those, we will have to do recordation of those.

LEE SAAGE: We often get so caught up in agonizing over the loss of a building -- as we should -- but sometimes we forget to mention that we've worked very hard in designing the project to try to miss as many buildings as possible. And in fact, both the Parkway and Alternative 2 have been very, very carefully designed to thread their way through that maze of historic structures as carefully as possible.

And we have been watched like hawks by the cultural resources both at the Presidio and the State Historic Preservation officer. And I can assure you, they have held our feet to the fire on that and that we are doing everything humanly possible to minimize the impact. And it's only with great reluctance that we have concluded that a few of those buildings will be lost. And that is detailed within the environmental document.

MICHAEL LEVIN: Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Dee Hermann has submitted a card, and she'd like me to ask this question:

"In light of the diamond interchange option, does Section 4F preclude the selection of the circle drive option under Parkway alternative?" 1

Jared?

JARED GOLDFINE: No, it does not preclude the selection of the circle drive option. We need to develop that decision, hearing a variety of factors. And of course, the input, the comments that we get during the public review period will help us make that decision. But 4F does not preclude that.

As it happens, by virtue of engaging in this project, we are having an effect on 4F resource. So -- no matter how we slice it. But what we're trying to do is minimize that effect. And gravitating on what Lee said earlier, we have attempted to do that throughout this project by reducing impacts on recreational resources within the Presidio and historic resources.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Any more people that would like to address this? Any comments? Love to have them.

Anybody else? Going once. Going twice.

Okay. Looks like we've heard from everybody

tonight. I really thank you all for working with us with our guidelines and getting us some good questions. Please submit any other written comments that you have by the close of the comment period, which is 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 1st. And thank you very much. Have a good evening.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 8:09 o'clock p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARIN)

I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, duly authorized to administer oaths pursuant to Section 8211 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct transcription of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

Dated the 10th day of February, 2006.

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
IN PARTNERSHIP WITH
CALTRANS, FHWA, GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE HIGHWAY AND
TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
IN COOPERATION WITH THE PRESIDIO TRUST, THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS

DOYLE DRIVE DRAFT EIS/R
PUBLIC HEARING
GOLDEN GATE CLUB - SAN FRANCISCO PRESIDIO
135 FISHER LOOP
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2006
7:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cow Hollow Neighborhood Merchants (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Modeling is conducted based on the MTC Regional Transportation Model and SFCTA and Caltrans criteria. These criteria examine projected traffic volumes based upon future population and employment changes predicted in San Francisco and across the Bay Area. The mathematical principles of travel forecasting are found in the San Francisco County Transportation Authority documents, including Chapter 10 of the 2006 Congestion Management Program (http://www.sfcta.org/Publications/documents/Chapter10_000.pdf). In addition, the Authority hosted a workshop to describe the modeling process and principles to interested partieson February 21, 2006.	1046
2	Traffic volumes on Lombard in the future are predicted to be similar in the No Project and Preferred Alternatives. No additional impacts are anticipated from the Preferred Alternative, so no additional mitigations are appropriate.	1047
3	Additional local intersections were studied in the Refined Presidio Parkway alternative on these streets, and no additional delay to create a level of service problem was identified for those streets. Although the Authority supports traffic calming, an area wide traffic calming study, as requested by the neighborhood, is beyond the scope of this project.	1048
4	As stated in Section 2.5.1, the Preferred Alternative maintains Palace Drive as a two-way street and incorporates the modifications proposed by the San Francisco Department of Recreation and Parks. Based on comments from area residents, the alternative will maintain Lyon Street as a two-way street with connection to Bay Street.	1049

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Sachs (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	There would be a loss of 258 parking spaces in the Palace of Fine Arts Area during construction. Replacement parking at the Parade Grounds augmented by the existing shuttle service was proposed. Parking will be coordinated with the Presidio Trust.	1050
2	Routing of 28 and 43 will not need to change during or after construction. Muni may choose to reroute the bus as part of a different effort.	1051
3	18-wheeled trucks are not allowed on the remainder of Marina Boulevard. This project does not propose any procedural changes in regards to trucks.	1052
4	This project is designed for bus service on Doyle Drive. No elements of this project would preclude a Presidio transit hub.	1053

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: R. Covert (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Community Impact Assessment (August 2005) (pages 4-15 - 4-18) describes the initial right-of-way assumptions and results; final right-of-way will be agreed upon between the FHWA and the Presidio Trust.	1054
2	Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway Alternative, has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Replacement parking at the Parade Grounds has been proposed to address any project-related impacts during construction. Details pertaining to the proposed mitigation would be developed in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1055

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Lem (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1056

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Blum (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The project description is enhanced in the FEIS/R.	1027
2	The minimum height of the strcuture is zero. The maximum height at the high viaduct is approximately 35 meters or 100 feet above the ground, about the same as the existing structure.	1848

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Levin (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The text explaining the process for preserving structures was enhanced in the FEIS/FEIR.	1028
2	Muni Route 29 would not be affected upon completion of any alternative. The route may need to be temporarily relocated during construction when Halleck Street is closed, and the bus would be able to use McDowell. This would not be a significant impact to the project.	1029
3	Comment noted. The EIS/R adequately addresses these concerns, since "landscape," as the term is used by biologists, comprises natural habitats and plant communities.	1030

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Hermann (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Circle Drive option was not selected as the Preferred Alternative for the project.	1031

Reviewers	Page	
Public Hearing February 15, 2006	Comment Letter	Responses
Alexander, M.	218	276
Chappell, J.	221	277
Kernan, R.	223	278
Widman, G.	225	279
Hermann, Diane	227	280
Bogatay, L.	229	281
Bulter, J.	231	282
Rowe, D.	232	283
Barry, D.	235	284
Tilles, D.	236	285
Hayward, W.	238	286
Orre, K.	240	287
Solomon, E.	242	288
Strunsky, M.	243	289
Chang, S.	244	290
Ream, J.	245	291
Coffin, R.	24	292
Keck, M.	249	293
Boland, M.	251	294
Foster, R.	253	295
Vaughey, P.	255	296
Nicholson, G.	257	297
Brooke, L.	258	298
Kern, D.	259	299
Perez, E.	260	300
Bancroft, D.	262	301
Hathaway, E.	262	302
Harrison, A.	262	303
Caramatti, J.	264	304
Brooke, J.	265	305
Figone, J.	269	306

Public Hearing February 15, 2006	Comment Letter	Responses
Betsy	271	307
Blum, J.	272	308
Marston, M.	274	309
Reviewers listed in order from transcripts		

---o0o---

A P P E A R A N C E S

KAY WILSON
Moderator

MYRNA VALDEZ
GARY KENNERLEY
Parsons Brinckerhoff

MICHAEL PAINTER
MPA Design

JARED GOLDFINE
California Department of Transportation

LEE SAAGE
San Francisco Transportation Authority

JOE STORY
DKS Associates

P U B L I C S P E A K E R S

Michael Alexander	Richard Coffin
Jim Chappell	Michael Keck
Redmond Kernan	Michael Boland
Gary Widman	Rick Foster
Diane Hermann	Patricia Vaughy
Lucia Bogatay	Doug Kern
Joseph Butler	Eugena Perez
Diane Barry	Ann Harrison
Dick Tilles	Jean Caramatti
Winchell Hayward	John Brooke
Eric Solomon	Joseph Figone
Michael Strunsky	Betsy
James Ream	

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS READ FROM CARDS FOR:

Diane Row	Lori Brooke
Kristofer Orre	David Bancroft
Sue Chang	Elaine Hathaway
Monica Dantas Absent	Jan Blum
Gretchen Nicholson	Michael Marston

---o0o---

Chappell, and Michael Marston.

MICHAEL ALEXANDER: Good evening. I'm Michael Alexander, Chair of SPUR's Doyle Drive Task Force and Vice Chair of the Board of Supervisors' Doyle Drive Task Force in 1993.

SPUR strongly supports Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway. The parkway is the only alternative which meets the objectives of the project. A parkway design was called for by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1993, the National Park Service in 1994, the Doyle Drive Intermodal Study in 1996, and the Presidio Trust in 2002. 1

Alternative 2 is a freeway, taller and twice as wide as what we now have. It ensures that increasing numbers of people who drive to work, live, or play in the national park will be forced to use neighborhood streets to access the park, as they do today.

The parkway, by contrast, has direct access to the Presidio.

The Presidio Parkway is the result of years of work to accommodate the needs of neighbors and agencies. Michael Painter's goal has been to make this necessary roadway much better -- better for drivers, better for park users and visitors, and better for the Presidio's neighbors.

SPUR supports the hook ramp option at the Highway 1 Interchange. We do not support the slip ramp to the Bridge parking lot, which adds roadway width at the project's widest point, removes residences and trees, and adds over $10 million in costs.

Legitimate concerns have been raised about the Parkway's impacts to natural and cultural resources. We asked Michael Painter to do sun and shadow studies on the impact of the Parkway over an expanded marsh and the Tennessee Hollow restoration. They show that the shading impact is a small fraction of the shading of the freeway alternative.

While marsh expansion and creek restoration are not part of this project, the Presidio Parkway has been designed to accommodate them. We urge the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service to accelerate designs for those projects because excavation coordinated with Doyle Drive's construction would save tens of billions.

We've examined carefully the legitimate concerns of some historic groups about impacts of the Main Post tunnel on the bluff edge and Halleck Street, which are historic landscape elements. We're convinced they can be mitigated so the Main Post and Crissy Field can be reunited for the first time in 70 years. Where

today you stand at the Main Post and watch trucks roaring by, you will be, instead, looking at the bay and never hear the traffic.

The Parkway also restores the historic alignment of Halleck Street.

Finally, the Parkway needs modern traffic-management features, including video monitoring, as called for in the Doyle Drive intermodal study. They will also increase the Bridge's security. Remember, if Doyle Drive is closed, so is the Golden Gate Bridge. The deadline for including that in the regional plan for national security funding is March 1st.

Give us a parkway through the national park, moving traffic at moderate speed that is worthy of being the southern approach to the Golden Gate.

Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Jim Chappell, with SPUR.

JIM CHAPPELL: Jim Chappell, President of SPUR.

Good evening. Getting the eastern end of Doyle Drive right has always been the project's greatest challenge. At the eastern end, there are two great sites: the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio National Park. People want to see and enjoy both of them, but for 70 years, Doyle Drive has been a physical and visual

barrier between them.

Before that, the Presidio and the Palace were united as sites of the 1915 Panama Pacific Exposition. That unity was foremost in the mind of the great landscape architect and National Medal of Honor winner Lawrence Halprin when he recently created the stunning new park, sweeping towards the Palace from Letterman Digital Arts Campus. But Halprin could do nothing about the intervening Doyle Drive. We can.

SPUR's objectives have been to reunite the Presidio and the Palace, to lessen impacts on the Palace, to provide a magnificent Presidio entry, and to minimize traffic in the neighborhoods and the park.

There are two options for the Presidio access, circle drive and the diamond. Each has advantages and disadvantages. SPUR believes that the circle drive best meets these objectives.

The diamond takes cars borne for the Presidio on a freeway-style off-ramp past much of the length of the Palace. This adds the equivalent of nearly two lengths of road width and extends the third northbound lane 700 feet farther north. The result is to bring traffic closer to the Palace and to create a dangerous weave between buses entering Doyle Drive and exiting cars.

1

Circle drive separates Palace and Presidio traffic at the Palace's south end. It removes between 17 and 45 feet from Doyle Drive's width along its most constrained area.

The diamond uses a freeway-style off-ramp, visually signaling to drivers that they're entering a freeway instead of a moderate-speed parkway. Circle drive provides a more gentle exit which visually says you're entering a national park.

We think about 500 of the 1500 cars going to Letterman will be coming from San Francisco. Under the diamond design, each of those hundreds of cars a day will have to make a nearly half-mile-long loop to the north in order to enter the Letterman garage.

Circle drive brings them to the garage almost directly. However, circle drive means removal of Building 1151, the pool, which was built in the very last year of the Presidio's 169-year period of historic significance. Removal must require compliance with historic preservation regulations and that the Doyle Drive project pay for the replacement of the building and its use elsewhere in the Presidio. We think a new aquatic center near the main Presidio YMCA more convenient and cheaper to operate.

The visual result of circle drive will be a

truly spectacular reconnection of the Presidio and the Palace of Fine Arts. It will also provide an entry to the Presidio that will draw visitors through a historic area and then lead them to a natural area with a stunning scenic vista. And I recommend people to our Web site, spur.org, for further information.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Michael Marston.

Michael Marston?

Redmond Kernan.

REDMOND KERNAN: Good evening. I'm a SPUR board member, and I did want to append to the SPUR presentation that SPUR did today at their board meeting, recommend a 60-day extension with conditions that it didn't harm the project in terms of its funding. So -- just so you're aware of that.

So I would like to speak today from the Fort Point & Presidio Historical Association, and we ask that the comment period be extended from March 1 to May 1. 1

Alternative 2 has the least environmental effect, the least cultural effect, and the least cost. It is therefore attractive to many people.

I believe it is not the most desired alternative from an aesthetic point of view and from the point of view of a national park.

Alternative 5 is much recommended. And it has a greater environmental and historic impact. But those can be alleviated. And it's a question of how they're alleviated. Right now the alternative is the entire Alternative 5 -- without sub-options to look at the Main Post, how could buildings be preserved, what are the options in terms of where they might be relocated.

To some preservationists, relocating a building is not a good thing, and you might as well get rid of it. I don't agreed with that. I think relocating is an option that should be explored. 2

So there's a process that you're required to go through because not only is the Presidio a national park, it is, in fact, a national historic landmark. And you're required to go through the 106 process for landmark status as well as a memorandum of agreement.

We don't have the results of that. That process lags the environmental process. And if we knew the mitigation measures that might be applied, that would help in being able to make a decision or recommendation to you. Right now, we lack that.

The mitigation measures in the draft DEIS could be simply to record, photograph, put in a file, document the building that was there but remove it entirely with no evidence that there was ever a building there. We 3

find that unacceptable.

We therefore ask that this additional time be used to study sub-options for the areas that are troublesome in terms of historic preservation. And that is not only the building but the bluff itself, which is a topographic feature. So we urge you to have the extension and let us work together to find options that add the historic preservation to what is otherwise under consideration. 3 cont

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Next three speakers: Gary Widman, Diane Hermann and Lucia Bogatay.

GARY WIDMAN: I'm Gary Widman, President of the California Heritage Council. And I have to say that I agree with virtually everything that you just heard from Redmond Kernan, who is also one of our members as well as being on the Fort & Point Presidio Historical Association.

I'm concerned that, if the objectives of the project were to call for a parkway in 1993, there is really only one parkway alternative that's described. And it seems that a process should produce more than one alternative that meets the project objectives. 1

We're also concerned for historic preservation of the structures, including the swimming pool. We note

that the concerns -- two of the slides that listed concerns did not mention historic preservation or historic issues, although they did mention cultural resources on its list of concerns. But historic preservation and interpretation should be a concern as well. 2

So we believe that the comment period should be extended for 60 days, as Mr. Kernan just suggested, and those 60 days put to the use of developing sub-alternatives to 2 and 5 that could better preserve the historic properties involved and still produce the optimum structures for everyone. 3

We think that one should consider that, as one drives into the Presidio from the north and exits to Marin County -- exits San Francisco for Marin County, that a great many people's aesthetic values will be at stake as they drive through that area. And it's not just the aesthetic concerns of the people that are walking along the shoreline that should be considered here but the aesthetic concerns of the people who are driving the freeway need to be considered as well. 4

And to that end we do recommend the extension and greater attention to the historic resources.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Diane Hermann.

DIANE HERMANN: Good evening. Tonight I would like to focus on a lack of full and fair disclosure in the DEIS of the adverse effects of the Parkway Alternative as currently proposed on the Presidio as a national historic landmark district. As required by the National Historic Preservation Act, a document called "Finding of Effect," which is almost as thick as the DEIS, was recently issued for the Doyle Drive project but has not been distributed to the public with the DEIS.

1

The Finding of Effect does contain full disclosure of the adverse effects on historic buildings, features, and cultural landscapes. But its most revealing points are ignored or given only passing attention in the DEIS. Three examples include the following.

First, the Finding of Effect states that the presence of a continuous bluff to the north of the Main Post is a character-defining feature of the Presidio and explains why the bluff's removal or even its alteration would lessen the public's understanding of the development of the Presidio over time.

2

In contrast, the DEIS states only that the bluff, quote, "influenced the pattern of development of the Main Post," end of quote.

Second, the Finding of Effect notes that

3

1 Halleck Street is a character-defining circulation
2 characteristic of the lower Main Post. It discusses how
3 the Parkway Alternative's creation of a man-made hill
4 under Halleck Street will destroy the visual connection
5 between the Main Post and the water's edge and will
6 lessen the integrity of setting, association, and
7 feeling of this part of the Presidio. The DEIS
8 discussion of the adverse effect of the Parkway
9 Alternative is limited to the bare statement that
10 historic Halleck Street will be realigned.

3

11 Finally, the Finding of Effect discusses
12 cumulative adverse impacts on the NHLD, for example, the
13 removal, since the Army's departure from the Presidio,
14 of dozens of historic buildings near Doyle Drive,
15 including the demolition of 39 historic buildings for
16 the Crissy Marsh project. That discussion underscores
17 why the demolition of three of the very few remaining
18 historic buildings in the quartermaster's district
19 should be avoided. The DEIS does not discuss these
20 cumulative impacts.

4

21 We therefore respectfully request that the
22 comment period be extended 60 days so that the public
23 can be given a fair opportunity to review the full
24 nature and depth of the project alternatives' relative
25 impact on the national historic landmark district and

its historic buildings, features, and cultural landscapes.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Lucia Bogatay.

LUCIA BOGATAY: Good evening. I'm Lucia Bogatay, an architect member of the Fort Point & Presidio Historical Association and long-time advocate for preserving and interpreting history of the Presidio. I believe the design, as many of the previous speakers, for Alternative 5 must be reconsidered in the sensitive area closest to the Main Post. 1

The four historic structures slated for demolition should be retained. Buildings 204 and 201 date from 1896, just before the Spanish-American War. One of them has an important design role in defining the west edge of Halleck Street, which is the original route to the wharf. And given what happened to this route to the wharf next to the marsh, it definitely needs to be preserved all the more. 2

The circle drive, in my opinion, is not worth the sacrifice of Building 1151, which was -- although it was built at the last possible year, it could be preserved. It was important to the rehabilitation of the wounded following World War II. And in the spirit of sustainability, which is supposed to motivate this 3

park, not tearing it down would prevent having to rebuild it. 3 cont

Second, the DEIS does not give proper weight to the damage to the cultural landscape, which would be caused by burying the bluffs at the foot of the Main Post. 4

The Secretary of the Interior's guidelines for treatment of cultural landscapes call for beginning the resource preservation effort by, quote, "...identifying those landscape features and materials important to the landscape's historical character and which must be retained." The guidelines list as the important character-defining features of a cultural landscape, quote, "...its spatial organization and land patterns, features such as topography, vegetation, and circulation."

The bluffs and Halleck Street are such character-defining features. And altering or destroying them should be avoided at all costs. And its impacts are avoidable thanks to Red's idea of drafting one end of Alternative 2 to the majority of Alternative 5. 4 cont

In any case, it's somewhat ironic to think that, after watching Crissy Field disappear under the dirt from the first marsh project, that we will have to watch the bluffs disappear under the dirt from the

second marsh project. And you can bet I will be there, standing by the bulldozers.

In any case, I do think that additional time would give a possibility for coming up with a better solution, and I applaud the possibility that that could happen.

Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Joseph Butler.

JOSEPH BUTLER: Good evening. My name is Joseph Butler. I'm an architect here in the city and chair of the San Francisco Preservation Consortium.

Today I'd like to echo the comments of Diane Hermann and support the notion of a 60-day extension for the purpose of looking at whether Buildings 201 and 204 that define Halleck Street and speak to the history of the Presidio from the latter part of the 19th century could be conserved or preserved with a roadway scheme that's similar to the Parkway but one which moves further north and allows the Parkway to come to grade and even perhaps go below grade as it passes the base of the Main Post.

1

It was mentioned that the Main Post should be reconnected to Crissy Field. But I think the purpose of the siting by the Spanish was the attraction of the

2

bluff and the disconnect that it made between the beach and the main post that they were establishing for defensive purposes above the bluff. To eliminate this cultural landscape as part of this project seems too high a price. 2 cont

And while the Parkway is greatly preferred to the Alternative 2, which environmentally as a roadway has fewer attributes, the better part of 2, its lighter foot, if you will, on the cultural and landscape resources, should be carried through in the Parkway Option 5 so that Parkway option, which is aesthetically preferable, could also be culturally and landscape-resource preferable as well. Thank you. 3

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

I have a card submitted by Diane Rowe. And she asked me to read her comments.

"The DEIS includes two project objectives that appear to be impossible to meet in the Repair and Widen alternatives, number one, to design the Doyle Drive corridor using a parkway concept, and two, to improve intermodal and vehicular access to Presidio which is the Girard Road exit/entrance ramps in the Parkway Alternative.

"I have two questions: One, why isn't there an additional parkway alternative that would avoid or 1

minimize adverse impacts on the national landmark district?" 1 cont

Second question, "Why don't all build alternatives contain an exit/entrance ramp into the Presidio?" 2

Does anyone have any response to those questions?

The first one was, "Why isn't there an additional parkway alternative that would avoid or minimize adverse impact to the national landmark district?"

LEE SAAGE: I can try.

The alternatives that were eliminated from the study in 2004, Alternative 3 and Alternative 4, were actually developed in response to the notion of a Parkway Alternative. So in a sense, those were part of the collection of early parkway alternatives.

In fact, in trying to achieve the two goals of those alternatives -- one to avoid impact to historic resources and to -- and to maintain or create the opportunity to reconnect Crissy Field with the upper portion of the Post, we wound up with the very long tunnels that were associated with those alternatives. It turns out that, with those alternatives, the attempt to, if you will, save cultural resources wound up having

such adverse effect on natural resources, it drove the cost of the project up to the point that it simply wasn't tolerable. It just became a challenge that couldn't be met.

The alignment that's associated now with the Parkway Alternative is really confined by the constrained features of the Presidio. It would be very difficult to find an alternative that was materially different in terms of its alignment or its primary characteristic.

It's certainly possible to make adjustments or changes to the alternative with regard to precise length of tunnels or location of tunnels or even how many tunnels there are. And that's something that we're hearing comments on tonight and something that can certainly be looked at.

In terms of alternatives, particularly Alternative 2, not meeting all the objectives of the project, there are a number of objectives that were established for the project. And none of the alternatives have met all of the objectives in exactly the same way. If they did, we'd only have one alternative.

So that's kind of a part of the process, that each alternative meets the various project objectives to

a greater or lesser degree. And part of the evaluation process is to try to make judgments about which alternatives, overall, do the best job.

Alternative 2 in part was developed to be sort of the minimum cost, minimum replacement project that would meet purpose and need. And it does do that.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Diane Barry, Dick Tilles, and Winchell Hayward.

DIANE BARRY: I just have to say that, to the extent I support any alternative, it would be Alternative 2, the Replace and Widen without a detour. I think it's the superior environmental alternative, and I think it provides certainly a reasonable and prudent alternative to taking out the pool. I think we should retain the historic Letterman Pool and reject the circle drive option under the Parkway Alternative. 1

And during construction, I would ask that you retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool. 2

I'd also like to request an extension of the comment period for 60 days. I am a user of the pool. And in trying to drum up support for people to come and speak here tonight, the YMCA, on February 6th, put out a statement telling the people who use the pool that they were not asking for support and that there were some 3

project options that would result in an elimination of Buildings 1151 and -52, which is not correct. And they stated -- and I would like to submit this statement to you -- that they were not asking their YMCA members to rally against the project at this time, until they have more substantive information about the project and their options.

Certainly they don't have the information that I have. And I'm just a regular citizen. They are a tenant of the Presidio Trust. So because of that, I would ask for an extension -- at least a 60-day extension of the comment period so that the Y can be educated. And I'd like to submit this to someone.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Dick Tilles.

DICK TILLES: Thank you, Kay.

I'm speaking here as a private citizen, although someone who's been involved with the project for many years.

I want to say I do support the Parkway Alternative, and I thank the SPUR, Michael Painter, and our consultants for making it a reality when we thought it might be dead for a while. I also support the diamond option and do not believe that the Merchant Road slip ramp is necessary. I think we can accomplish just

1

about all that the Merchant Road slip ramp does by adding a stop sign for cars going to the Bridge from the Presidio and by eliminating a couple of toll booths, which should be done one of these days if the Bridge District gets their act together.

1 cont

My main concerns for the project, though, are really during the construction period. It's pretty important. It's going to be five years, about the time the Presidio Trust needs to meet its financial goals. And it's five years in a national park.

I have two primary concerns. One is that the connection between Route 1 and Doyle Drive eastbound or southbound not be maintained during construction. There are a number of reasons for that. There's good alternative routes that exist between the Marina and Richmond and the Sunset -- Geary, California Street. So we don't really need this connection. The project would be built faster and for a lower price if we did that.

2

It would also reduce traffic on Doyle and help move traffic along during the construction period. There will be detours. The lower amount of traffic we have on Doyle during that period, the better.

Traffic from the Bridge needs to use Doyle Drive. Traffic coming from the Richmond and Sunset does not. So it shouldn't be -- that connection should not

be made during the construction period.

Secondly, I'm very concerned about what the EIS says about connections between the Main Post and Crissy Field during the construction period. Basically that there's no north-south access between Lyon Street and McDowell Street, quite a distance. Access really does need to be maintained, both for vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles during that period. So I'm hoping that there will be a traffic-management plan that comes out very soon that addresses that issue.

3

Thank you very much for your time.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Winchell Hayward.

WINCHELL HAYWARD: Good evening. My name is Winchell Hayward. I'm a long-time resident of San Francisco and of various historic preservation groups [sic]. I am speaking in support of Alternative 2 because -- for several reasons. Number one, the traffic lanes are somewhat wider. Alternative 2 has six 12-foot lanes, whereas Alternative 5 only has four 11-foot lanes and two 12-foot lanes. Why there's a difference, I don't know. But it adds up to a difference in the overall width. Alternative 2's overall width is, from shoulder to shoulder, 124 feet. And Alternative 5 is 148 feet. I might be off a foot or two either way, but

1

it's a significant difference.

Now, both alternatives would modify that Park Presidio Interchange. One of them, Alternative 5, proposes a 270-degree turn. But I suspect that's going to be eliminated, but that's very expensive.

Another thing, too, is that the Alternative 2 only removes the one building. That's if you use the no-detour option, only one building would disappear. But if you use Alternative 5, you're going to lose 13 buildings, according to the DEIS. And I'm not sure -- I think that figure may have been changed, but that's what's printed in the book: 13 buildings would be lost if Alternative 5 is adopted.

2

Now the -- of course, one of the most significant things, at least in my book, is the huge difference in cost between Alternative 2 and Alternative 5. Alternative 2, without the detour, is about $553 million. Alternative 5 with the Merchant Road access is $710 million, give or take a few thousand. So that's a 28 percent increase of Alternative 5 over Alternative 2, $157 million.

3

I think as taxpayers, we have to open our eyes and ask ourselves, is it really worth -- that 257 million [sic], is that worth the environmental enhancement? It's really -- to my way of thinking, it's

not. But others may think differently. But bear in mind that significant difference of cost.

The book did not indicate a total construction time. I suspect there's some difference between the time of each of these, but it's not indicated. 4

Also, to the grades, the grades are somewhat different. It's a constant grade, essentially, for Alternative 2, whereas Alternative 5, there's a little bit of a dip up and down. And I suggest that that's not necessary. 5

And is this enough for me?

Okay. One more sentence? Alternative 5 is going to erase some parking spaces at Palace of Fine Arts.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Kristofer Orre has asked that I read a couple of comments. The first one is, "Have you considered the incorporation (present or future) of a rail system and/or bike paths along the Doyle Drive corridor?" 1

The second is, "How will you mitigate for not only the loss of threatened/endangered species but also the loss of native habitat? What specific actions will be taken, and for how long after the completion of the project will they be carried out?" 2

Lee, did you want to comment on the alternative

light rail that's going to be considered?

LEE SAAGE: The primary purpose of the project, as indicated in the purpose and need statement, is to replace the existing Doyle Drive. And the existing Doyle Drive is a highway facility, so we did, during the early scoping process, look at a number of options including rail. But for a variety of reasons, looking at rail only associated with Doyle Drive, it didn't seem to be a reasonable thing to do because there's nothing to connect it to on either end.

With regard to the question concerning endangered species, I think we can probably ask our environmental expert from CalTrans to comment on that.

KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

Jared?

JARED GOLDFINE: Yeah. The short answer to that is that there are no threatened and endangered species that would be affected by the project.

There are habitats that would be affected, and we will be mitigating those, but in terms of federally or state-listed species, none will be affected.

KAY WILSON: Is there a guideline in terms of how long mitigation will be in place after the project is carried out?

JARED GOLDFINE: Those are detailed in the

environmental document, how they'll be mitigated.

KAY WILSON: Okay, thank you.

Next three speakers: Eric Solomon, Michael Strunsky, and Sue Chang.

ERIC SOLOMON: Yeah, very quickly -- I think you ought to save the swimming pool. Yes. I think enough stuff has happened to veterans of our wars who need rehabilitation, not to do a symbolic smash in their faces at this time or at any time.

1

Number two, I get sense that the mapping and the whole discussion tonight is based on a world where something ends at Richardson or the Palace of Fine Arts. There is more, you know. There's Lombard Street. There are all the side streets.

I happen to live on Filbert. I deal with megavolts [sic] every day now, helping the Presidio. So I'm a contributor.

2

But I do not grasp why you haven't discussed what the hook is, what the circle is, and what the lights are, or how many lanes are going -- is it going to be the same? Is it going to be different? What will be the traffic implications? Will people want to take every possible side street to escape what this highway is going to do?

And, finally, I want to thank the various SPUR

people who I've never seen in action before, because I think they've made a very sensitive and interesting suggestion.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Michael Strunsky.

MICHAEL STRUNSKY: Thank you for this very interesting presentation.

My comments are based upon the fact that my home is almost exactly at the eastern end of this project. And I would like to just ask the design team to be very critical and assure the accuracy, in particular, of its traffic studies. 1

The last gentleman before me talked about the impact away from the project. And I just want to reinforce that. It is very hard for me to understand or believe the traffic studies that show the rather circuitous way of getting to Marina Boulevard is going to function [sic]. 2

And I point out the major construction project that existed at the eastern end of the Bay Bridge which, if any of you have tried to get on or off the Bay Bridge in heavy traffic times, it's just a disaster of waiting in traffic and so forth. 3

Don't let that happen here. If it takes another 60 days, as many people have recommended, to 4

look again at this, look again also at your traffic studies because they are very hard for me to believe that they are correct. 4 cont

Marina Boulevard seems to be forgotten in this. Don't let political pressures of the nice fancy houses there ruin the rest of San Francisco. Do it right, please. We only have one chance. Thanks.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Sue Chang.

Okay. She wrote a comment down, so I'll read it.

It says, "Please combine 2 and 5 and offer a beautiful Alternative 2 if possible." 1

Okay. The next three speakers -- and when you come up, stand back just a little bit from the microphone, and maybe we'll get rid of a little bit of that ringing.

James Ream, Richard Coffin, and Michael Keck.

JAMES REAM: My name is James Ream. I'm a member of the SPUR's advisory council, although I'm speaking tonight for myself and not for the council.

Once in a great while, a city -- and in this case a city and park -- has an opportunity for greatness. And Michael Painter's parkway scheme has given us that opportunity. And I'm absolutely convinced

that we're going to proceed in that direction.

Michael's vision and 15 years of work with this project and everybody else who has helped him along the way have brought us to this point. I think it's a great moment for the city, and I applaud everybody who has been involved with it.

I'd like to also address the concerns for the historic preservation that have been brought up here tonight, and I'm sure that your panel has given a lot of time and attention to. And I speak to that as a past vice president of the San Francisco Preservation Advisory Board and past president of the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage. So I care about these matters.

Too often, the concerns for preserving pieces of history have stood in the way in this city of projects from which we could all greatly benefit and which could increase the livability and enjoyability of this city.

A rational society will take a look at what might be lost in the way of historic structures and compare that to what will be gained by doing a worthy project in the best possible way. And I'd like to urge everybody connected with this project to stay in there, weigh these alternatives, and make a decision in favor

1

of the optimum Presidio parkway system. 1 cont

Michael, I'd also planned to ask this audience to join me in a round of applause for the work that you've done, but that's against the rules. So what I'm going to do is just applaud you myself as I've always wanted to do.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Richard Coffin.

RICHARD COFFIN: Good evening. My name is Rich Coffin and -- let me raise this up.

Okay. I get ten more seconds now.

I'm here on behalf of the 5,000 members -- over 5,000 members of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. We want to thank you, first of all, for allowing us to serve on the citizens advisory committee. And we've had input over the last three years on a lot of issues on the project. We appreciate that.

We'd also like to say we favor Alternative 5 for the aesthetic values that it offers, for the reduced footprints, and especially for the options to allow better interface with city streets. I think Michael Painter did an excellent job with that. I think there's a lot of work to still be done with that, but I think there's a lot more potential in Alternative 5 than there is in Alternative 2. 1

We also ask that, if the boulevard alternative is selected, that Girard Street have bike lanes on it. They're not currently shown in the design. There's been talk about alternate routes on old Mason to Halleck. But the more we've looked at the situation, it's definitely a desirable route for bicycles that would want to go from Lyon and Marina into the Main Post. And we think bike lanes could be accommodated really easily on that stretch and safely with crossover lanes and new techniques. So we ask for that. 2

We also ask that, in light of the fact that there are no bike facilities in a some 6- to $700 million project, that some other mitigation measures be considered, such as improvements to Marina -- check my notes -- to Crissy Boulevard -- Crissy Field Avenue from Mason Street up to Lincoln Boulevard, and also that a multi-use path be installed from the top of Crissy Field Avenue up to Vista Avenue along the stretch from the Golden Gate Bridge. That's a heavily used bicycle and pedestrian corridor. I know the Presidio pathway plans have some improvements designed for that already. We'd like to see those implemented as part of mitigation for this project. 3

Furthermore, we'd like to consider the fact that, since there are no bicycle lanes or pedestrian -- 4

in fact, we're losing a pedestrian path on Doyle Drive -- that money, perhaps, get applied from this project to the west span of the Bay Bridge and -- for the new maintenance and pedestrian path and bicycle path on that project, so....

4 cont

Again, I want to thank you for including us in this process, and we hope that we can work with you in the future to develop a world-class parkway alternative. Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Michael Keck.

MICHAEL KECK: My name is Michael Keck. It's K-E-C-K.

KAY WILSON: My apologies.

MICHAEL KECK: That's okay. I've had other versions thrown at me.

I think this project is about 30 years too late in coming. I've looked at the history that you've put forth in the program here. And you've tried it several times. I come from a very unique perspective that I'd like to address to you, something that Mr. Kennerley touched on, which is I am a survivor of a head-on on Doyle Drive, July 26th, 2003, just about outside this window.

One of the things that you have failed to give

the public -- and I've heard some questions so far as, "Why are you going to 12-foot lanes? Why are you making it so wide?"

Mr. Goldfine can certainly verify, one of the facts is that CalTrans sets forth regulations when you build highways and freeways here. The minimum lane width that they feel is acceptable for safety is 12 feet. But the bottom line is that ten feet, there's no room to get out of an accident. And if somebody changes lanes and sideswipes you, you all of a sudden find yourself on the other side of the roadway where you don't belong. And whatever you do, cars aren't going to save you; air bags aren't going to save you.

I was incredibly fortunate. Unfortunately, the young lady that was on her way to a birthday party for her best friend was not, and she was killed.

But I hear, "More time. More time. Let's talk. Let's study." How many more people are going to die in that passage of time?

Mr. Goldfine of CalTrans can probably run the numbers for you because CalTrans keeps track of all the accidents on its highways. They keep statistics. And they're pretty cold. They know which roadways are dangerous because they have more accidents.

That road out there is one of them. The sooner

1

2

you can change it is not soon enough. But one of the things that you should provide these people as they're making their decisions about aesthetics and animals and marshes and buildings -- how many lives is it worth? It wasn't worth the life of that young lady that died two and a half years ago. I'm here to tell you about it. And I've got some issues. I'm still walking. I've just had my third surgery.

2 cont

But people can live. You need to move this forward with all speed. I can't tell you which life you'll save, but I can guarantee you, you're going to save lives. Do it now.

KAY WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Keck.

Michael Boland, followed by Rick Foster and Monica Dantas.

Excuse me. That last one I'll read.

MICHAEL BOLAND: Thank you. My name is Mike Boland. I'm director of planning for the Presidio Trust. I'd like to thank everyone for organizing a wonderful event tonight, and an opportunity for us all to see the incredible work that's gone into the Doyle Drive project.

The release of the Doyle Drive EIS, I believe, is really a milestone, something that's been coming for a long time, a long time in the making. I think Doyle

Drive has been waiting a long time for the right solution. And I think that the process has finally closed in on that proper solution for the future of this place.

The Presidio Trust and National Park Service are in the process of transforming the Presidio into a 21st-century national park. We're trying to turn this into a place that's a model of innovative design, of resource management, heritage preservation, and community stewardship.

Because of its size and scope, the reconstruction of Doyle Drive obviously has an enormous effect on our ability to accomplish this mission.

The old Doyle Drive carried civilians over the Presidio to the Golden Gate without letting them touch down in the Presidio, without giving them an opportunity to enjoy the wonders of this place. We believe that a new Doyle Drive can and should reflect the Presidio's new life as a national park and as a public resource by engaging the public in the landscape of this place in a way that the old Doyle Drive does not and cannot because of its design.

As a result, we believe the Parkway Alternative best achieves our vision of the Presidio as a wonderful public place. We think that the Parkway Alternative

1

better meets the objectives of the Presidio Trust management plan, which is our land-use management plan that guides all of our actions here in the Presidio, in Area B. And we think that the Parkway Alternative better achieves the objectives for the Doyle Drive project as stated in the EIS and, you know, the objectives that have guided this process thus far, that it really creates a roadway that responds in a very contextual way to the Presidio and to its future as a national park. 1 cont

We applaud the fact that the Parkway re-creates a direct connection between Crissy Field, a wonderful new public resource that the citizens of this city and the nation can enjoy, to the Main Post, which in PTMP we imagine as the other great public site in the Main Post of the Presidio, to create together a really world-class ensemble along the northern waterfront of the Presidio. We think that the Parkway Alternative allows this to happen in a way that the retrofit and widen would not. 2

Lastly, we really believe that the Parkway Alternative will set a new standard for highway design in this region and that it will endure as a model for how civic-mindedness can drive us to achieve greatness in the transformation of the landscape. We don't see any of these benefits in retrofit and widen alternative. 3

We're extremely pleased with the progress that's been made thus far. We're also pleased that the design team has been so open to our comments as it incorporated so many of them as we've worked together on this project. We look forward to our continuing collaboration as the project alternatives are refined, based on the feedback you receive on your draft EIS. 4

Our goal maintains the goal we began with: To minimize the impacts of this roadway to parkland and to the park's resources and to maximize park benefits by creating a world-class roadway that we think is worthy of this world-class park site.

For that, I thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Rick Foster.

RICK FOSTER: I'm Rick Foster with Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Brian O'Neill, our superintendent, was unable to participate in tonight's meeting. But he asked me to convey his enthusiastic support for the Parkway Alternative, Alternative 5. 1

GGNRA first endorsed replacing Doyle Drive with a parkway rather than a freeway in the general management plan for the Presidio in 1994. We've participated in the draft environmental impact statement for Doyle Drive for the past six years and have worked 2

closely with the transportation agencies and consultants in an effort to help them gain a better understanding of the recreational, cultural, and natural resources in the national park.

Through this effort, project-specific design guidelines have been developed for Doyle Drive for the Parkway that have resulted in a narrower, slower roadway that responds to its unique setting in a national park. We appreciate the efforts that Michael Painter and SPUR have contributed to this effort, and also for the efforts from Federal Highways, CalTrans, and especially the Transportation Authority in support of the many design exceptions that they've championed in an effort to keep the Parkway vision for Doyle Drive alive.

2 cont

Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you, Rick.

Monica Dantas.

Is Monica still here?

Okay. We're making very good progress through our cards. I appreciate everybody's cooperation. We're getting through the stack. If anybody does want to turn in a card, please raise your hand now, and Lauren will collect them. Over there? Thank you. And we'll keep going.

Patricia Vaughy.

Patricia?

PATRICIA VAUGHY: Patricia Vaughy. Can you guys hear me? I'm going to have to do it like this.

KAY WILSON: Let us lower the mike. Just a second.

PATRICIA VAUGHY: Well, the 5 plan looks pretty. And I think it has some good merits. I don't think that anybody ever looked at the traffic patterns of the Marina-Cow Hollow and of the Richmond. And I think that these counts may be off. And what I'm more disturbed about is neighborhood meetings where the establishment's supposed to be asked, the Transportation Authority, and people from outside neighborhoods coming in and interfering. That really bothers me. 1

The Marina-Cow Hollow is a very, very, very tight neighborhood. We may have associations that squabble, but we will come together for a solution. And right now I am saying everything don't -- into the middle part of the Marina and into the side streets of Cow Hollow.

And I feel very, very, very sad that -- the counts that are missing from the EIS. I would particularly like for that 60-day extension so that we can do a better study. 2

Yes, people have been killed. But we have an accident every two days almost at the corner of

Francisco, Alhambra, and at Lyon. We don't have police protection. When we call for somebody after an accident, the State comes, the City comes. They argue for 30 minutes which one has the territory. And there's a lot of things that are happening.

I am sorry that SPUR did not include people of Marina-Cow Hollow in their plan because I think that we could have gotten a plan through better and faster had they been included. And I'm very sorry about that. I have not be able to find anybody from the area that is on that committee that actually speaks with authority, and I'm sorry.

3

The other thing is, I would like to have a more open dialog with the Department. I feel that, when we go to the CAC meetings, that people from SPUR get 30 minutes to speak, and we get to speak two minutes and we get cut off. And I think that we really desperately need to have more input on this, and I think we can come up with a win-win solution. But right now I'm not seeing it.

4

I'm hearing more and more people, because of these -- 30 seconds? Great.

I really think right now we should look at No. 2, but I would like to look at No. 5 when we can find solutions. But right now I'm not seeing it.

And I will not support anything being put next to the neighbors at Lyon and Bay. There is no reason for that phase of the circle or that phase of the diamond project. The circle and diamond, you can go up and use them up on the Parkway. But you don't need them up against people's houses.

5

Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Thank you, Patricia.

Gretchen Nicholson has asked that I read this, representing herself and YMCA members. And she writes as follows:

"As a member of the Presidio YMCA and frequent user of the former Letterman Pool (Building 1151), I deeply oppose the circle drive option of Alternative 5, Presidio Parkway.

1

Since the purpose of converting a former military facility to public cultural, recreational use is to foster and promote and serve such uses, it makes no sense to destroy the Letterman Pool to widen a road when there are other alternatives. The pool is heavily used by families, the elderly and the disabled for educational, health and rehabilitative type and recreational purposes, which is what this national park should be supporting and not destroying."

Okay. We have a comment from Lori Brooke

that's representing the Cow Hollow Association, asked me to read as follows:

"How does traffic get onto Doyle Drive from Marina Boulevard heading west?" That's the first question.

"Does this cause a greater delay from the current configuration?" Joe? Gary?

JOE STORY: It would be easier to show with a map.

KAY WILSON: "How does traffic get to Doyle Drive from Marina Boulevard heading west?"

JOE STORY: That's good. There we go.

This is the famous five-points intersection up here, which is where Lyon and Old Mason and Marina meet. And this, of course, is the current corridor that the viaduct from Marina Boulevard currently is in place now. There is still two lanes at this intersection. And traffic is obviously stopped, controlled here before it gets onto Doyle Drive.

In the Parkway option, the traffic would move through this and go up to the next intersection here, where we're envisioning having a yield sign and a right turn sign, essentially a free right, that would then continue up and get onto the mainline of Doyle Drive.

In terms of the actual additional travel time required, I don't have every single number of the

1

traffic study in my head. I believe it will probably take about another eight or ten additional seconds to do that. There's not an additional signal that somebody heading west will have to go through.

I may also point out that the Richardson corridor is also going to be designed with some super-elevation modifications and such to encourage traffic not to achieve a fast speed on Richardson as well, but certainly, unlike today where you have the loop that loops up and back, there will be a slightly shorter path on Richardson.

KAY WILSON: Thank you. I've been asked to make an inquiry in the group -- are there people that are planning to use the Presidio Shuttle at the end of the meeting? If we could have a show of hands -- because if not, they may send the driver home. But if there's people that want to use it, they may keep it.

Thank you.

Doug Kern.

DOUG KERN: Hello. Good evening. I'm Doug Kern. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

On behalf of ten environmental and community organizations, I'd like to respectfully request a 60-day time extension so that we can respond to this document. Most of our organizations have been involved in the

1

process for six to ten years, and we appreciate the substantial amount of work and effort that's been expended on this document.

While we are keenly aware of your desire to keep a steady momentum with the project, our organizations are still wading through the voluminous documents and supplementary documents that accompany the DEIS. We need additional time to prepare coordinated responses to many of our technical concerns regarding the Doyle Drive impacts to marsh expansion and wildlife corridors. Thanks for considering our request.

KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.

Eugena Perez.

EUGENA PEREZ: Thank you. I -- in Spanish (speaking Spanish)

I would like to address a tiny little line under circle drive option that would have a significant effect on a large part of the population. And that is, it says, "Would require the removal of the YMCA swimming pool." 1

Such a little line for a resource that's so valuable. And as somebody who is an immigrant, it really shocks me that we treat a huge valuable resource as this pool -- you know, it goes along with having to throw away my fax machine because nobody will fix it, or

using disposable razors.

This Letterman Pool is a large beautiful pool. And I'm a psychologist. And I'm particularly concerned about removing this resource from two specific populations. It teaches swimming to a great many children from infants to teens. And we know that there is a huge obesity problem in this country. And we have children learning from very early, establishing habits that will help them with that problem. And we're destroying the pool.

And most of the population are seniors, of whom I happen to be one. And I use the pool for aqua-fit to maintain my physical and mental health. And I know that there are many, many seniors for whom this resource prevents depression and, in many cases, their health.

So I would urge you to look for an option that would not include destruction of this very valuable resource. 1 cont

Thank you.

KAY WILSON: Please raise your hand if you didn't submit a card so we can collect them all. Lauren is out there to collect and hand them back. Anybody in the front? Like to get all of the cards in.

Okay. The next one is from David Bancroft who asks that I read the following comment:

"With respect to Alternative 5, what justification is claimed for" -- sorry.

"What justification is claimed for dealing with the very heavy traffic coming off the Golden Gate Bridge otherwise getting onto Marina Boulevard by, one, reducing the number of lanes from two to just one; two, most importantly, interposing two new four-way intersections and presumably stoplights; and three, providing the number of lanes" -- "reducing the number of lanes going north?" 1

Okay. Another card from Elaine -- I cannot read the last name, a concerned citizen, "Save the pool for the people." 1

And the next speakers are Ann Harrison and Jean Caramatti.

ANN HARRISON: Hi. Good evening, everyone. Good evening, all of my neighbors. I'm a resident here in the Marina District. I love our community here in San Francisco. I think that we have a beautiful town, and we want to keep it so it's beautiful. People come here from all over the world just to be here. They come here for a number of reasons.

I'm not a professional speaker, by the way.

Also, I would like to let you know that I think Alternative 2 is the better alternative for our 1

community. The reasons are the following: The cost is less than -- between 165- and $200 million than Alternative 5.

Alternative 2 provides us with less disruption to existing buildings in the Presidio, San Francisco wildlife. It's not destroyed -- and the trees. Fewer historic buildings are destroyed also.

On Doyle Drive, with Alternative 2, views of the San Francisco National Cemetery are left intact as well as the San Francisco Bay as you commute in and outside of our beautiful city.

On Doyle Drive views give drivers visual and emotional relief, so road rage is not encouraged, and we have open sky throughout. The traffic flows would be about the same in and out San Francisco with Alternative 2.

But traffic is diverted more to Lombard and to Richardson with Alternative 5, so you'd have increased noise. And with Alternative 5 you also increase the growth in the Presidio. The Presidio is our park, is our heritage. I have children that live here in San Francisco. They want to stay here living in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to stay as this beautiful community that we have. I want it to be there for them to enjoy our parks, not only for us but for

1 cont

future generations.

Alternative 2 is better because, if there is a terrorist attack, an open existing Alternative 2 will be the least amount of risk to family and friends trapped in tunnels than Alternative 5 is being considered [sic].

Alternative 2 has the feel of a relaxed, cozy existing community commute to and from San Francisco.

The construction time for Alternative 2 is less than a minimum of 2 years. Can you image what it's going to be like if we go for Alternative 5? It's not going to look like the Marina anymore. It's not going to look like the beautiful approach when you come across from Marin and you come across the Golden Gate Bridge. Alternative 2 allows us to keep the feel that we have currently in place intact.

Thank you very much for your appreciation and consideration. And I hope that the committee will consider the needs and the wants of the local community here.

And I appreciate the opportunity to talk tonight. Thank you so much.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Jean Caramatti.

JEAN CARAMATTI: Just a couple of comments. I'm completely opposed to the stoplights that you're

1 cont

1

1 considering placing getting onto Marina Boulevard. I
2 believe, as do many residents in the area, that it will
3 shift traffic onto Richardson much in the same way that
4 it did when the stop signs were placed on the boulevard.

1 cont

5 Second, I'm disappointed that you find it
6 acceptable to tunnel under the Presidio to protect the
7 cemetery, but you aren't giving the residents of this
8 neighborhood the same consideration. I think it's very
9 important that you start considering the residents in
10 this area because I think we're being left out of this
11 loop here.

2

12 And finally, I do support a 60-day delay in the
13 comment period. Thank you.

3

14 KAY WILSON: Thank you very much.
15 Last call for speaker cards. Please raise your
16 hand. Lauren is in the back, and she'll collect them.
17 Okay. John Brooke.
18 JOHN BROOKE: Hi. Thanks for the presentation
19 process tonight.
20 I think the Parkway is a very attractive
21 alternative; it seems to meet many of the objectives
22 that were set out. But it also seems to have an
23 objective that wasn't said up there, and that's to push
24 the traffic off Marina Boulevard and onto Lombard.
25 The projections that you gave, Mr. Kennerley,

1

indicated that 37,000 cars, vehicle traffic, per day with -- I think it was the expanded Alternative 2. And now it's going down to 25- with Alternative 5. So that's a 30 percent reduction. That seems like there's a new objective here that wasn't stated in the PowerPoint slide presentation, moving traffic onto Lombard Street. 1 cont

I have a couple of questions and -- let me finish with this. I urge you guys to reconsider that to balance the alternatives to look at leveling traffic flow, and I think -- the percentages, the ratios to what there is today so that there isn't a seeming other objective for Alternative 5 versus Alternative 2.

Back on your level-of-service charts, it indicates that, today, Richardson -- the intersection of Richardson and Broderick is considered AAA. That's -- I think best of -- best operation of flow. But Marina Boulevard, Divisadero and Marina intersection, and Marina Boulevard and Broderick intersection is FFF. There's clearly a different rating standard there. Maybe you guys can explain that. 2

Question number two, the presentation indicated that flow to Marina Boulevard was nearly identical in the Alternative 5 scenario as it is today, but yet it showed a 30 percent reduction in traffic. Can you guys 3

explain that?

Thank you very much.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Joe can you -- the first one was about Richardson and Broderick, AAA and --

JOE STORY: Yeah.

Certainly, the definition of "level of service" is something that's a nationally developed standard over a number of years. It's used widely across the country and recognized by basically CalTrans and most of the public agencies. What it does is it actually grades the performance of traffic. There's different methodolgies for signalized and unsignalized intersections and for an intersection with what we call two-way stops and intersections that are all-way stops.

So what ends up happening is an intersection like the one on Broderick, which is signalized, this one methodology does not -- every car has to stop and go through; if the light's green, the car keeps going. But on the other hand, cars that go from the all-way stop like the ones on Marina Boulevard -- every car has to stop or go through that. Well, eventually that just creates more and more delay. And according to the national standards, that means that the average car is going to have a higher level of delay to get through

that intersection.

KAY WILSON: Okay. And then explain the 30 percent reduction.

JOE STORY: Yeah. The 30 percent reduction on Marina Boulevard is a situation that happens -- basically the traffic on Richardson is the controlling point of the system. And as you may know, all of San Francisco traffic signals, wherever possible, have a fixed time and control so that pedestrians will have enough time to get across the street.

Sometimes you take your life into your own hands when you do that, but basically what ends up happening in our analyses is that if there is no traffic, people prefer to take Lombard Street, and so in the increases in -- or I'm sorry. So what ends up happening is, when you actually open up the additional access from Girard Road which then cuts through the Presidio to the Presidio Gate, it actually opens up a little bit of a relief valve.

Well, because the preferred route is still Lombard Street, the traffic -- some of the traffic shifts from Marina Boulevard to Lombard. Some of the traffic shifts from Lombard Street over to Girard Road. So the net result is a reduction of traffic incurred on Marina Boulevard.

KAY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

Did you have a follow-on?

JOHN BROOKE: Just that second answer on that seemed to be a little bit inconsistent when the traffic on Richardson was a little over 80,000. So it doesn't seem to be -- at or less than the same capacity, it doesn't seem like we'd be reducing traffic on Marina Boulevard.

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

I have two more speaker cards, and two that I'll read at the end.

Joseph Figone.

JOSEPH FIGONE: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm a 44-year resident of the Marina District. I've seen this area in almost every way you can imagine, growing up here. I've seen many cars wrapped around the corner of Richardson and Francisco. I think right now our biggest thing is safety. Safety means that we probably would need a parkway. And that would be one of our best alternatives. Of course, my biggest concern, also, is the neighborhood and the neighbors and their concerns, traffic and our streets. That needs to be looked at and addressed.

With the Parkway, I understand there's to be demolition, possibly, of Letterman Pool. I used that as

1

a toddler learning how to swim. And I used it when I became a charter member of YMCA. Things need to be changed after awhile. And there's a swimming pool that was built on Third Street for $9 million dollars -- or what was it -- I forgot the exact figure. I think it was 9 million.

Why couldn't we replace that pool eventually with something else in that nearby facility of the Presidio?

2

I also have a question of, with Bay Area rapid transit and all that, when things are built, different counties pay and assist in all this. The majority of users of Doyle Drive of the Marina infrastructure right there come from Marin County.

Why is it that one third comes from local, one third from the state, and one third from the federal government? Why doesn't Marin County, since they're pushing over a hundred thousand of their cars from there to here? That's about all I have to say. But I do support the Parkway, and I've been living here all my life.

3

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Betsy?

BETSY: Just a quick -- oops. Just a quick comment. To me, I am a fifth-generation San Franciscan,

and I feel very passionate about this city. And I feel very passionate about this project. I look at San Francisco as an internationally recognized city for its beauty and for its vistas from different elevations around town.

As I review Alternative No. 5 here on the screen, I am extremely disturbed by its likeness to the web of freeways in Los Angeles. It is quite a weaving of pavement, circling around. And I think once it's up, it will be, really, a blight on the beauty of the Marina District. 1

In addition, I feel the Presidio is a unique area, needing unique attention, that it's crucial to protect and preserve the heritage of the Presidio. It's a landmark status to the State of California and very, very important to those of us who are natives to California and to San Francisco. Once this massive structure is up, it becomes a permanent part of San Francisco. 2

The traffic flow is of tremendous concern to me, both in the neighborhood and the approach to the bridge, across the bridge. All of it is needing of a tremendous amount of discussion and attention. And I think it has some concerns when you think of how California is exploding in population. Tonight on the 3

news, they talked about the farm disappearing in California to make way for people who need homes.

There's no way that traffic, it seems like, will ever be reduced. It is a major, major part of this freeway. And it is going to be an impact to the neighborhood around it.

Therefore, I am advocating an additional 60-day time extension, please. Thank you. 4

KAY WILSON: Thank you.

Do I have everyone's cards?

Okay. I've got two more to read.

Jan Blum submitted a card. And it says: "When will the public know a 60-day extension will be granted?" 1

Lee, do you have any insight on that?

LEE SAAGE: We'll certainly take it under advisement. The only thing I can commit to is if the Transportation Authority, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration and CalTrans decides that the extension is appropriate, the extension will be announced prior to the close of the comment period.

KAY WILSON: Okay. And I have one last submittal that I've been asked to read. And the submittal is from Michael Marston on behalf of the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors. And I have in my hand a

letter he has submitted that is signed by Charles Ferguson, President. And I've been asked to read certain portions.

"Dear Mr. Saage, historically, the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors has supported Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway now designated as Alternative 5. We believe it to be superior to all other alternatives that we've seen over the years. The PHAN board unanimously supports these positions. PHAN supports Alternative 5. PHAN supports circle drive. PHAN supports contact-sensitive design refinements. PHAN does not support the hook ramp option at the Park Presidio Interchange. PHAN opposes the Merchant Road slip ramp. PHAN remains concerned by the Lyon-Marina-Mason Street intersection. 1

"Credit for work done by Michael Painter: Finally, we are very surprised that we weren't able to find either print or mention of Michael Painter, visionary designer of the Presidio Parkway, in the Draft EIS/EIR. Thus we strongly request that his work, much of it pro bono, be properly credited in the final document." 2

Just to clarify, for the record, I believe Mr. Painter is listed as part of the team, as a contributor to the project. But it's a big book, and it

might have been hard to find.

On that note, I'd like to thank you all for the time and attention you've given us and for cooperating with us to get through submitting your comments. Please be advised, to remind you, you have until close of business on Wednesday, March 1st to submit your comments, that being 5:00 p.m., unless there's an announcement that the comment period has been extended.

Thank you, and good evening.

(Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 9:21 o'clock p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARIN)

I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, duly authorized to administer oaths pursuant to Section 8211 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct transcription of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

Dated the 22nd day of February, 2006.

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR (M. Alexander (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1060

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR (J. Chappell (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 with the Circle Drive option noted.	1061

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: SPUR (R. Kernan (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was already extended an additional month.	1062
2	Building removal is negotiated with the Presidio Trust. The relocation of buildings will be detailed in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) which was developed with input from participating agencies as outlined in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11. The PA is provided in Appendix I of the FEIS/R.	1063
3	This was addressed as part of the PA and treatment plan process. The resolution of adverse effects associated with the project is provided in the PA (see Appendix I of the FEIS/R). Mitigation measures are outlined in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion of Section 3.2.11.	1064

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: California Heritage Council (G. Widman (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Through the alternative screening process the modified Parkway Alternative (Alternative 5) was selected as the Preferred Alternative.	1065
2	This was addressed as part of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) and treatment plan process. The resolution of adverse effects associated with the project is provided in the PA (see Appendix I of the FEIS/R). Mitigation measures are outlined in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion of Section 3.2.11.	1066
3	The comment period was already extended an additional month. Discussions with the Presidio Trust resulted in the PA presented in Appendix I of the FEIS/R.	1067
4	The visual analysis does consider the visual effects to motorists traveling on Doyle Drive, see Section 3.2.10 of the FEIS/R. Also viewpoint 13 in the Visual Impact Assessment specifically addresses the motorists view while traveling on Doyle Drive.	1068

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Hermann (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Discussion was expanded to address these concerns. See discussion of Permanent Impacts in Section 3.2.11.	1069
2	Discussion under Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway in Section 3.2.11 was expanded to address these concerns.	1070
3	Discussion under Alternative 5: Presidio Parkway in Section 3.2.11 was expanded to address these concerns.	1071
4	See Section 5.6.4 for the discussion of cumulative impacts to cultural resources.	1072

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Bogatay (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Design workshops were held to modify Alternative 5 to enhance its features which resulted in the creation of the Preferred Alternative (See Section 2.5.1). Those measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigation impacts associated with the project are presented throughout Chapter 3. In addition, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) was prepared which presents those avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures for impacts to cultural resources (see Section 3.2.11 and Appendix I).	1073
2	The Presidio Trust has determined that the top floor of Building 201 will be retained along Halleck St. Building 204 will be deconstructed and materials salvaged for preservation and/or reuse.	1074
3	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1075
4	Cultural Resource preservation discussions to minimize impacts and possibly preserve the bluff similar to 1920's photo were held prior to the FEIS/R, see the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11.	1076

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Bulter (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was extended an additional month. The issues stated in the comment can be addressed during final design of the preferred alternative. Measures to mitigate impacts to cultural resources are outlined in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) prepared for this project (see Section 3.2.11 and Appendix I of the FEIS/R)..	1077
2	Cultural Resource preservation discussions to minimize impacts and possibly preserve the bluff similar to 1920's photo were held prior to the FEIS/R. As stated in Section 2.5.1, the refinements make for the Preferred Alternative reduce the disturbance of the existing bluff.	1078
3	The profiles of Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 are independent. Great effort has been spent to minimize impacts to resources.	1079

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Rowe (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	While a considerable effort has been spent to minimize impacts to resources, not all resources can be avoided with the Parkway Alternative.	1080
2	The intent of Alternative 2 was to replace the existing facility to meet the project purpose of traffic, seismic and structural safety. The current facility does not provide an exit to the Presidio.	1081

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Barry (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted. In July 2006, the Presidio Parkway (Alt 5) with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would retain the YMCA swimming pool.	1082
2	Comment noted. Detailed design of parking facilities affected by the project would take pedestrian circulation, traffic safety, and parking access into consideration. Such design will be developed as part of the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1083
3	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1084

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Tilles (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted. in July 2006, the Presidio Parkway (Alt 5) with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Merchant Road slip ramp is not an element of the Preferred Alternative.	1085
2	Comment noted. The management of traffic during construction will be finalized as part of design to minimize impacts. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared as part of the project which will include strategies to minimize potential pedestrian, bicycle and traffic impacts during construction of the project. See Appendix K for the draft TMP.	1086
3	A detailed Transportation Management Plan will be developed during final design that will address access during construction.	1087

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: W. Hayward (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1088
2	Preference for Alternative 2 noted. The Preferred Alternative would result in the permanent removal of 8 buildings, see Section 3.2.6 of the FEIS/R.	1089
3	Preference for Alternative 2 noted. Updated project cost information is presented in Section 2.7 and Exhibit 2-38 of the FEIS/R.	1090
4	Correct, construction time would vary by alternative but was estimated to take approximately 5 years. Modifications to Alternative 5 and the construction staging proposed may reduce the contruction time to approximately 3.5 years for the Preferred Alternative.	1091
5	Design of the alternatives, including grades, was to provide the proper safety features while minimizing impacts to the surrounding environment.	1092

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: K. Orre (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The project does not preclude the extension of light rail into the Presidio or hinder the implementation of the Presidio Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan.	1093
2	Comment noted. The EIS/R mitigations are clear on these points. Mitigation for wetlands, probably the most productive of the habitats present, is discussed at length in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of Section 3.4.2; avoidance of sensitive habitat areas and their revegetation (where avoidance is not possible) in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures portion of Section 3.4.3. Generally, restoration actions are begun as soon as possible after construction, and monitoring continues for a period of five years.	1094

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Solomon (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006 Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will be preserved.	1095
2	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S - see the discussion under the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8. However, as this project is to replace an existing transportation structure increases in transportation impacts based solely from this project is not anticipated to occur.	1096

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Strunsky (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1097
2	Comment noted.	1098
3	Comment noted.	1099
4	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1100

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: S. Chang (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The modified Alternative 5 which was selected as the Preferred Alternative incorportated several elements from Alternative 2 to enhance overall design and to reduce the construction period.	1101

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Ream (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1102

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: R. Coffin (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1103
2	Current Presidio Trust Bike and Trail plan proposed bike lanes on Girard Road.	1104
3	The restoration of the project area, including bike paths will be coordinated with the Trust and their Bikeways and Trails Master Plan.	1105
4	This project does not impede the existing Presido Trust Bikeways and Trails Master Plan.	1106

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Keck (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The roadway is being designed to meet all safety standards.	1107
2	Comment noted and as Commenter stated, increased safety is one of the elements of the Purpose and Need for this project.	1108

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Presidio Trust (M. Boland (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1109
2	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1110
3	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1111
4	Positive comment regarding the management of the project.	1112

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: GGNRA (R. Foster (021506))

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1113
2	This comment contains the reasons why the GGNRA gave its support to Alternative 5 in comment #1113.	1114

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: P. Vaughey (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1115
2	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1116
3	The EIR is not related to how SPUR developed their plan.	1117
4	Following the circulation of the DEIS/R, there were a series of workshops and meetings with interested parties to develop a consensus for the preferred alternative. The project team has made the commitment to continue an open dialog throughout the completion of this project.	1118
5	Comment noted.	1119

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: G. Nicholson (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1120

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Brooke (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	There is no additional delay associated with traffic in this direction as one unsignalized lane can accommodate the traffic volumes for this stretch; there is a lower speed limited in Alternative 5 for this portion of the project as the transition zone between city streets and the highway is moved westward.	1121

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Kern (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1122

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Perez (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1123

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Bancroft (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	There is no additional delay associated with traffic in this direction as one unsignalized lane can accommodate the traffic volumes for this stretch; there is a lower speed limited in Alternative 5 for this portion of the project as the transition zone between city streets and the highway is moved westward.	1124

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Hathaway (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1847

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: A. Harrison (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1125

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Caramatti (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted; the proposed intersections meet project design requirements and would also include signal coordination.	1126
2	Numerous opportunities have been provided throughout the life of the project for public involvement. Public meetings and workshops were held and a Citizen Advisory Council, consisting of representatives from the neighborhoods, has been involved from the beginning to provide recommendations on the project.	1127
3	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1128

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Brooke (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Project alternatives do result in less traffic on Marina Boulevard. This is a consequence, not an objective of the project.	1129
2	The Refined Presidio Parkway Alternative achieves a much closer balance of traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue.	1130
3	The Refined Presidio Parkway Alternative achieves a much closer balance of traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue. The traffic decreases in the original alternative were in the off-peak direction.	1131

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Figone (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Preferred Alternative is being designed to improve safety throughout the corridor. The proposed facility will have increased curvature to enhance traffic calming and provide a transition zone starting at the Main Post tunnel in order to reduce vehicle speeds prior to entering city streets.	1132
2	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1133
3	Marin County residents pay sales taxes which results in the funds available from state and federal sources, so the Marin residents are paying into the project. The Marin residents who use the facility are traveling to SF where they most likely work, shop, and spend money which generates sales taxes for SF City/County.	1134

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Betsy (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1135
2	An enhanced description of the process for building preservation and other historic preservation efforts is included in Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R.	1136
3	Traffic projects are based upon population and employment forecasts as established by ABAG in order to meet requirements set forth by FHWA and CTC. Marin County and Richmond District populations are not forecast to experience "exploding" growth.	1137
4	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1138

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Blum (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The comment period was extended an additional month.	1139

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: M. Marston (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 with the Circle Drive option noted.	1140
2	Mr. Painter is credited in the FEIS/FEIR as a participant in this process.	1141

Reviewers	Page	
INDIVIDUALS	Comment Letter	Responses
Alami, S.	317	318
Antonetty, M.	319	320
Artman, E.	321	322
Auchincloss, E. [sic]	323	324
Bancroft	325	335
Barroca, J.	337	340
Bendet, D.	333	344
Berg, V.	345	346
Berkowitz, Z.	347	348
Bishop, P.	349	350
Bochenek, T.	351	354
Bone, B.	355	356
Borcherding	357	358
Bowles, P.	359	360
Brockob, R.	361	362
Brooke, J.	363	364
Brooke, L.	365	367
Bryant, P.	368	369
Buck, S.	370	371
Bui, T. [sic]	372	373
Canihan, B.	374	375
Caramatti, J.	376	377
Carlisle, B.	378	379
Cauthen, G.	380	381
Chen, T.	382	383
Cleek, K.	384	385
Cotter, A.	386	387
Cotter, P.	388	389
Courant, J.	390	391
Davies, A.	392	393
Deakers, K.	394	395

INDIVIDUALS	Comment Letter	Responses
DeMartini, G.	396	397
Dodds, J.	398	400
Dolan-Smith, T.	401	402
Downing	403	404
Duane, J.	405	406
Dupre, E.	407	408
Elaine	409	410
Elgin, H.	411	412
Elliot, B.	413	414
Epstein, P.	415	417
Evertz, M.	418	419
Fang, J.	420	421
Feierabend	422	427
Franzone, T.	429	430
Frischen	431	432
Frost, K.	433	434
Fulbright, C.	435	436
Fuller, L.	437	438
Gelman, M.	439	440
Giuliotti, D.	441	442
Gleason, E.	443	444
Glesnor[sic], J.	445	446
Hall, T.	447	448
Hann, J.	449	450
Harrington, S.	451	452
Harrison, B.	453	454
Hayward, W.	455	459
Heyman, J.	460	461
Heyman, M.	462	463
Honda, E.	464	465
Hope, P.	466	467
Howson, A.	468	469

INDIVIDUALS	Comment Letter	Responses
Howson, J.	470	472
Hueso, E.	473	474
Hughes, M.	475	476
Humnicky, W.	477	478
Ingham, M.	479	480
Jackson, C.	481	482
Jacob, J.	483	484
Jones, M.	485	486
Kennedy, J.	487	488
Kirby, R.	489	490
Kitt, T.	491	492
Kovacs, G.	493	494
Landerghini, M.	495	496
Lee, W.	497	498
Llewellyn, J.	499	500
Loughlin, B.	501	502
Loukas, C.	503	504
Lum, L.	505	506
Lyons, A.	507	508
Maller, L.	509	510
Manning, M.	511	512
McAteer, T.	513	514
Mellemseter, L.	515	516
Meyer, A.	517	518
Meyerson, B.	519	520
Moore, N.	521	522
Mulcare, R.	523	525
Myers, A.	526	527
Neil, W.	528	529
Nickerson, S.	530	531
Nurre, J.	532	533
O'Brien, K.	534	535

INDIVIDUALS	Comment Letter	Responses
O'Connor, M.	536	537
O'Connor, S.	538	539
Olson, E.	540	541
Panter, S.	542	543
Parrott, D.	544	545
Patrick, H.	546	547
Pearson, R.	550	551
Peterzell, M.	552	553
Petition 12 Signatures	554	561
Petition with 32 Citizens' Signatures	562	569
Phillips, L.	570	571
Ream, J.	572	573
Ridless, J.	574	575
Robbins, E.	576	577
Robinson, D.	578	579
Roehl, C.	580	581
Rolfe, N.	582	583
Romain, G.	584	585
Saggers, K.	586	587
Saroyan, J.	588	589
Saroyan, R.	590	591
Schulte, F.	592	593
Sears, R.	594	595
Serbinoff, F.	596	597
Setthemiei, J. [sic]	598	599
Soloman, I.	600	601
Speakman, S.	602	603
Stellanova, TC	604	605
Strunsky, M.	606	607
Swanson, E.	608	609
Taylor, J.	610	611
Thompson, K.	612	613

INDIVIDUALS	Comment Letter	Responses
Tilles, D.	614	616
Torgun, G.	617	618
Tricarico, M.	619	620
Tsiu, S.	621	623
Tucker, S.	624	625
Tyson, S.	626	627
Unknown	628	629
Voorhees, K.	630	631
Voyvodich, K.	632	633
Wallace, S.	634	635
Wanvig, J.	636	638
Wessing, J.	639	640
Wilbur, S.	641	642
Wing, D.	643	644
Wong, B.	645	646
Woss, R.	647	648
Zacharias, P.	649	650
Zakerin, M.	651	652
Zegart, M.	653	658

From: samer [samer_alami@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 9:07 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: AGAINST pool closure

I live in the Marina and have used the Letterman Pool on many occasions. I am against the Letterman Pool closure. It would be a shame not to have access to the pool during the construction period that is being purposed. I urge you not to close the pool and to provide access to it during any construction period. 1

-Samer Alami

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Alami, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1524

From: Margot Antonetty [areyou12@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2006 9:34 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool
To Whom It May Concern:

As a San Francisco resident, I would like to go on record that it needs to be a priority to retain the historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative, since the pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes. Furthermore, please keep the pool open during construction and retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users. 1

Sincerely,

Margot Antonetty

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Antonetty, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1536

Name: Eric A. Artman
Organization/Agency:
Address: P.O. Box 471
City: Tiburon
State: CA
Zip: 94920
E-mail: eartman@aol.com

Comments:

The EIR as proposed is incomplete. Alternative 5 fails to consider a "smooth" or "direct" access transition to Marina Boulevard, instead presenting only a diamond interchange. Preserving the direct access to Marina Boulevard of the present Doyle Drive is clearly a possibility, both discarded "tunnel" alternatives has sub options with this possibility. 1

Without the direct access to Marina Boulevard presently available on the existing Doyle Drive, traffic congestion and backups will surely occur. This will result in increased pollution and decreased aesthetics within the Presidio, a severe adverse effect to the goals of this project. 2

Without consideration of a direct, smooth connector to Marina Boulevard, the EIR is incomplete as written.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Artman, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The direct access suggested would result in the elimination of marsh area.	1649
2	The LOS analysis indicates that no congestion beyond acceptable average delays within the Presidio will occur with any project alternative.	1650

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Eva Buchinskaya Date: Jan 18, 06

Address: 3620 Lyon St

SF CA 94123
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 563 - 7519 Work Phone:
Area Code Number Area Code Number

E-mail: Company:
Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

When replacing the off ramp onto Marina Blvd. it is important to build a more gradual ramp and ideally get rid of the curve ~~at~~ just before the traffic light. There are multiple accidents at that corner as people build up speed before the light and hit the wall not anticipating the curve. Ideally you would get rid of the sheds and build the off ramps where they currently exist. 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Auchincloss[sic](011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Alternative 5 provides an urban street connection. The Marina Blvd off-ramp was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.	1026

COMMENTS ON THE DOYLE DRIVE DEIS

by David P. Bancroft DPB 3/31/06

RECD APR 03 2006

I. **Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen) Should Be Implemented**

A. Alternative #2 provides the best traffic dispersion southbound east onto both Lombard and Marina Boulevard rather than, as Alternative #5 proposes to do, interposing two (2) to three (3) stoplight intersections along a new looping access from Doyle Drive to Marina Boulevard.[1] This would send *25 to 30% more* cars onto Lombard Street in the morning commute.[2] That, in turn would cause:

(a) grave congestion resulting in protracted delays;

(b) substantially increased air and noise pollution along the Lombard corridor; 1

(c) traffic escaping through the Cow Hollow residential streets on the way to Van Ness and the Broadway tunnel, California and Bush, headed downtown, and to the south city and Route #101; and,

(d) consequent noise and air pollution, and traffic, endangering neighborhood pedestrian safety, especially for resident children, the many students attending schools in the neighborhood, and seniors.

B. Alternative #2 provides the best (i.e., two lane) access *from* Marina Boulevard onto Doyle Drive going west/north, rather than the single lane access prescribed by Alternative #5. One lane would force *25-30% more* cars to use Lombard, 2

[1] The DEIS's The Diamond Option prescribes three (3), and the Circle Option two (2) stoplighted intersections before accessing Marina Boulevard (DEIS Exs. 2-29 and p. 2-49).

[2] The Traffic Operations Analysis – Level of Service Summary, south access to the Golden Gate Bridge, Doyle Drive (SFTA, FHWA, CalTrans) ("Analysis") shows Marina Boulevard handling almost 40% of Richardson/Lombard traffic eastbound and westbound at peak hours in 2000, and as projected for 2030. (See Analysis, diagrams No Build Base Year 2000, and Alternative #5, Presidio Parking – Circle Drive Option Year 2030.)

which is already gravely congested at peak hours, all with the same adverse consequences noted in ¶¶ I.A(1) and (2), above. 2 Cont

C. Alternative #2 provides a total of *5 feet more lane width* (DEIS, *compare* Ex. 2-27 *with* Ex. 2-30), an increase which can make the difference between side-swiping collisions, consequent grave injuries and prolonged traffic delays.

D. Alternative #2 preserves more of the Presidio: *up to 3 acres and 12 buildings more* (DEIS, Ex. 5-7 at xiii).

E. Alternative #2 would save up to *more than a year* of construction delays (*compare*, DEIS, Ex. 2-34 *with* Ex. 2-35).

F. Alternative #2 would be much less expensive: $115 *million* to $155 *million* cheaper (DEIS, § 5.5 at xi).

II. **If Alternative #2 is Not Implemented, Then Alternative #5 Must Be Modified to Proceed as Alternative #2 East of the Parkway Portion** 3

A. Alternative #5 suffers from the numerous serious traffic, pollution and safety deficiencies identified in ¶ I.A, above. Those major defects can be obviated using Alternative #2's roadway plan to implement Alternative #5: (1) east of the Parkway underpass, where the auto traffic disperses to both Marina Boulevard and the Lombard roadways, and (2) where Alternative #5 flows from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive.

B. The DEIS is severely deficient in failing to mitigate the deficiencies of Alternative #5, in the following notable respects: 4

(1) It ignores DEIS's own mandate with respect to and street transportation.

(2) It begs the question of adverse impact by falsely defining its Project Area and Area of Concern as ending where the problem begins: on the east, at the major egress from Doyle Drive to City streets; and, on the west, at Marina Boulevard, the principal access to Doyle Drive from the City;

4 Cont

(3) It ignores its own traffic figures in incorrectly claiming that there would be little traffic impact from Alternative #5's major re-routing of City/Bridge traffic.

1. The DEIS's Own Mandates

As set forth in the DEIS:

> Specific objectives of the Doyle Drive Project, as they relate to the project's purposes, are:
>
> . . .
>
> • to maintain the function that the Doyle Drive corridor serves as part of the regional and city transportation network
>
> . . .
>
> • to minimize the effects of noise and other pollutants from the Doyle Drive corridor on ... the other areas adjacent to the project area
>
> • to minimize the traffic impact of Doyle Drive on ... local roadways.
>
> (DEIS, § 5.2 at ii-iii, emphasis supplied)

Yet, clearly, Alternative #5's interposition of multiple traffic lighted intersections on a looping access off Doyle Drive to Marina Boulevard, and restricting

traffic to one lane from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive will cause all the adverse consequences identified in ¶¶ I.A. and B, above.[3]

2. The DEIS's Definition of Its "Project Area" is Inconsistent With Its Own Mandate 5

The DEIS begs the question in favor of Alternative #5 regarding whether it would adversely impact the Project Mandates (see, ¶ II.B.1, above). The fact is, of course, that Alternative #5's effects (see, ¶ I.A., above) are completely inconsistent with those mandates. But by defining the Project Area so as to *exclude* the very the area where Alternative #5's adverse effects will be so seriously felt, the DEIS is able to claim "no adverse impact." The DEIS does this by defining the Project Area as going only "to" (i.e., not including) Broderick and, as to the Lombard Street corridor, only the immediate block area to the north "to" (i.e., not including) Chestnut and Greenwich, 6 the DEIS acknowledging, as it must, that the remaining adjoining land uses are primarily residential. (DEIS § 2.1 at 2-1; § 3.2.1 at 3-3). In sum, this means that when the DEIS claims no adverse impact from Alternative #5, it can do so because it has sought to exclude the entire residential area that would be so adversely impacted by it.[4]

---

[3] This major feature of Alternative #5 (2 to 3 stop lighted intersections being interposed between Doyle Drive and Marina Boulevard) is never stated in the DEIS as a feature of Alternative #5: It is only incidentally mentioned under "Additional Preliminary Alternative" and there, is in the context of simply referring to *origin* of the "parkway concept." (DEIS at vi). Thereafter, the most that is ever said about this radical feature is the vague, understated references in the discussion of the Diamond and Circle Drive Options: that both of them would provide (only) what the DEIS then proceeds to euphemistically call "indirect access" to Marina Boulevard (DEIS at ix-x). Even more remarkably, the fact that Alternative #5 contemplates *reducing* the access from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to but one (1) lane, from two (2) in peak hours is not mentioned *at all* in the DEIS. It is revealed only on other project drawings that indicate just one lone arrow in the roadway pointing west.

[4] But the DEIS is, ultimately, unable to completely divorce itself from the adverse impacts of Alternative #5. By including Richardson and Lombard in the Project Area, the DEIS plan must, therefore, mitigate the adverse effects of traffic and safety at least on them. But since, after all, it is those adverse impacts on Richardson/Lombard which will result in the adverse impacts on the adjoining residential areas, the DEIS is compelled to mitigate them in that respect, yet it wholly fails to do even that.

The DEIS wholly fails to address the fact of Lombard and Marina Boulevard traffic *presently* escaping the current congestion there in peak hours and infiltrating the residential streets south of Lombard in search of passage to downtown and the Peninsula, and from same to the Golden Gate Bridge. Further, the DEIS makes no prognosis as to the consequence of Alternative #5 diverting 25 to 30% (or more) cars from Marina Boulevard to Richardson/Lombard. 7

One more comment is clearly in order regarding the adverse traffic, air pollution, noise and safety adverse effects of Alternative #5. It proposes an exit from Doyle Drive going east to Gorgas and then Richardson/Lombard, *and to Lyon*. Clearly, traffic created on Doyle Drive and/or further delays on Lombard will exit on Gorgas, but not simply re-join the congestion at Richardson/Lombard: instead, it will shoot up Lyon to cross over to downtown and get to south city or Route #101, all via the Cow Hollow and Pacific Heights residential streets. To avoid this untoward result[5] but to still allow Gorgas to be used as an entrance to the Presidio itself, Gorgas should be made a one way pedestrian mall west of Lyon to accessing the Lucas park.[6] 8

3. <u>The DEIS's Traffic Figures Belie Its Conclusion</u>

No 2005 traffic figures are included.[7] What is clear is that historically, Marina Boulevard has handled about 40% of the Golden Gate/San 9

---

[5] Indeed, it is for this very reason that for the past 2 years, Lyon was closed to traffic off Lombard during peak hours, and is now permanently closed.

[6] The Cow Hollow Association was informed by Gary Kennerly 3/7/06 that no plans have been made to deal with this problem; only that the Presidio Trust has informally said that if traffic shooting up Lyon does present a problem (!), it will deal with it. It is not responsible public administration to propose to build a roadway plan without having determined how to satisfactorily deal with its consequences, in this case, without having obtained an enforceable commitment regarding the Gorgas/Lyon traffic entrance. *Other* examples of Alternative #5 planning oversight are set forth in the Appendix to footnote 9.

[7] See ftn. 2

Francisco east and west bound traffic.[8] Clearly, restricting access to Marina Boulevard by interposing a looping access off Doyle Drive with 2 to 3 traffic lighted intersections before drivers can get onto Marina Boulevard, as Alternative #5 prescribes (versus an exit ramp directly to Marina Boulevard, as presently), will push the vast majority to virtually all of the downtown and south city/Peninsula traffic onto Richardson/Lombard, causing congestion there at peak hours to orders of magnitude greater than the current grave situation. But astonishingly, the DEIS concludes that there will be no traffic congestion as a result of severely restricting the 17,000 cars per day traffic now accommodated by Marina Boulevard (DEIS at 3-89).[9] In sum, the consequence of Alternative #5's roadway design east of the parkway would, in fact, be greatly increased traffic escaping through adjacent neighborhood residential streets to avoid the delays caused by the most severe congestion that it would cause on Richardson/Lombard. Indeed, the DEIS/R acknowledges this secondary effect (as it must) but again, its acknowledgment is obscured so that these serious adverse consequences are never addressed in the DEIS.[10] 10

---

[8] See ftn. 2

[9] This conclusion is, in fact, completely unsupported. How unsupported – and therefore how fatally flawed Alternative #5's roadway plan east of the parkway is – deserves a more detailed treatment than can be accommodated in a footnote. Accordingly, that analysis is set forth in the Appendix, attached.

[10] Only in a discussion of a design option that was *withdrawn* does the DEIS refer at all to this most major adverse consequence.

> No New Presidio Access Option
>
> This option was withdrawn ... because it would result in additional traffic *and would hamper traffic operations. Changes in traffic patterns would increase intrusion in the residential areas of Cow Hollow (and) Pacific Heights* ... (DEIS at § 2.3.1 at 2-26; emphasis supplied).

Although Marina Boulevard presently experiences substantially greater delays than Richardson/Lombard (DEIS, Ex. 3-21), this cannot justify diverting traffic from it onto Richardson/Lombard because it is very clear that: (1) Richardson/Lombard cannot take any more traffic than the 60% commute load it presently carries; (2) the Marina Boulevard traffic cannot really be bad because the efficient "marketplace" of traffic demonstrates that, notwithstanding, 40% of vehicular traffic *still* chooses Marina Boulevard over Richardson/Lombard; and, (3) synchronized traffic lights in lieu of stop signs on Marina Boulevard, at least during peak periods, would very significantly alleviate congestion there, just as they allow much *more* traffic on Richardson/Lombard to move with *much less* delay. (DEIS, Ex. 3-21; *compare,* Synchronized Intersections, items ##12-16 *with* Stop Controlled Intersections, items ##10 and 12.) 11

III. **Conclusion**

A. Implement Alternative #2 for all the reasons stated in ¶ I.A., above.

B. If not, implement Alternative #5 to incorporate the roadway plan of Alternative #2 east of the parkway underpass, making Gorgas a one way pedestrian mall from Richardson/Lyon to the Lucas park. 12

C. The deficiencies of Alternative #5 and the DEIS's failure to address and mitigate them, as required by law, can and must be avoided. It is respectfully submitted that implementing the foregoing proposals will do that.

REC'D APR 0 3 2006

APPENDIX TO FOOTNOTE 9

This claimed basis for DEIS/R's extraordinary conclusion emerges from the Final Traffic and Transit Operations Report ("Report") and its Appendices B-E (December, 2040) and from statements made by project and its contractor personnel in community meetings. That conclusion is based upon four demonstratively flawed premises.

1. False Premise #1. "[P]opulation and employment are not projected to increase ..." so "peak hour peak direction volumes are projected to grow by less than 7% (total, until 2030)" (Report, pp. 2-3), i.e., only about one-fifth of one percent per year.

First, this analysis is based on population and employment projections, without any reference to trends of recent 2003-2006 traffic counts, or more importantly, *any* of the many other critical factors affecting commute traffic: the availability of alternate fuels (making commuting more for affordable and sensible), improved roadway access to and from #101 (the major artery to/from the Golden Gate Bridge); the prospect of refined fastpass and carpool protocols, economic well-being, generally (in the past, double digit traffic increase was ascribed to the dot.com boom (Report at p. 2-1, noting the post 2000 decline), increased City concentration of sports, entertainment and cultural facilities, as well as increased use of S.F.O. and other City travel hubs, etc., etc. And even as to the supposed population and employment basis, it appears that no distinctions are made as to *what* population and *what* jobs, i.e., whether there will be increases in the *car commute population*: Those with sufficient means and whose particular type of jobs create a need to commute by car.

Second, there is *no* basis for believing that long term traffic projections, let alone those going out to 25 to 30 years, are reliable. According to a consulted traffic engineer, *no* follow up studies have *ever* been done validating long term traffic projections, like those going out 25 to 30 years. In sum, there is no *reliable* margin of error. What we *do* know, however, is that the present Doyle Drive/Richardson-Marina Boulevard traffic distribution has been working (albeit marginally at times), and that there is no reason to believe that it could not be made better with adjustments.

2. False Premise #2. Synchronized lights for the 2 to 3 intersections planned by Alternative #5 for the southbound access to Marina Boulevard access will allow its present traffic load (50% of Richardson/Lombard) to be maintained.

Although synchronized lights work better than stop signs, common sense dictates that if, as Alternative #5 proposes southbound, access to Marina Boulevard is severely restricted by: (a) having to take a looping (slowing) road to it instead of a direct exit ramp, and (b) having to negotiate two intersections with the prospect of getting caught on the wrong side of synchronized lights, drivers will instead, of course, choose the straight ahead (no loop/no intersection) exit off Doyle Drive onto ... Richardson/Lombard.

3. False Premise #3. The southbound exit proposed by Alternative #5 to Girard Avenue (for traffic to access to the Presidio itself and, variously, the Presidio

Heights neighborhood) will relieve some 470 cars per peak hour going down Richardson/Lombard.

First, this is a highly questionable figure. It is completely contrary to current everyday observations of numerous nearby residents. The only way such a figure could ever have been determined is by placing transponders on cars eastbound on Doyle Drive to record their routing off it and through the Presidio. Nowhere does the Report indicate that such a major undertaking even occurred.

Second, it is notable whatever the benefit it can also be achieved by providing a comparable exit but otherwise maintaining Alternative #2's plan east of Alternative #5's parkway, without any adverse consequences to the Marina Boulevard/Richardson-Lombard traffic.

Third, while this exit would release traffic on the very early southbound parts of Richardson/Lombard that are used to circle back through the Lombard Gate to access the Presidio and Presidio Heights, it will do *nothing* for all the 95% traffic heading down Lombard to downtown and the City, which under Alternative #5 will increase by the 25-35% of traffic that would otherwise use Marina Boulevard.

4. False Premise #4. Alternative #5 assumes, without any basis whatsoever, there will be no occasion for any 2 to 3 year short traffic surges in the next 25 to 30 years (as there was by 11% in the dot.com period; see Report at p. 2-1) notwithstanding the development of biotech and stem cell research facilities, including the UCSF complex, the office and entertainment development south of the ballpark, and the opening of Hunters Point naval shipyard. It is noted that this entire area is one served by Marina Boulevard/Bay Street proceeding along the Embarcadero. This, of course, makes easing the traffic flow on Marina Boulevard even more imperative, when Alternative #5 would restrict it.

Overarching the entire Alternative #5 roadway plan with respect to Marina Boulevard and Richardson/Lombard is the fact that it is clear that it has not been properly researched. Therefore, to venture with it would be extremely improvident. For if the traffic projections of Alternative #5 are wrong, it will have been built at great cost and we will be truly stuck with it. On the other hand, we do know that Alternative #2's roadway plan does work, and there is no reason to believe that it cannot be made to work better. A reality must be faced: *Doyle Drive is the principal roadway access to and from downtown San Francisco, and it crosses the Presidio.* To attempt to compromise that function as much as Alternative #5 does will frustrate our citizen drivers and push escaping traffic into adjacent neighborhoods.

Just to mention *two* distinct indicators of the failure to plan and research Alternative #5's roadway consequences:

1. *No* account has been taken of the City's plan to take one-third of the Van Ness traffic lanes exclusively for mass transit, that is, restrict car traffic each way to but 2 lanes instead of the present 3. (Van Ness Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Study, SFTA,

2005 at sftca.org/vanness/index.htm). This will severely restrict traffic attempting to exit Lombard on to Van Ness which, together with the increase of 25 to 30% in Lombard traffic affected by Alternative #5's restriction of Marina Boulevard traffic, will cause traffic to back up severely on Richardson/Lombard during peak hours. This is all the more remarkable since the Van Ness mass transit roadway plan is a creation of the San Francisco Transit Authority, a principal agency in the Doyle Drive project.

2. *No* account has been taken for Alternative #5's traffic plan for the following: Alternative #5 has the traffic in the 2 of the 4 southbound lanes to Richardson/Lombard exiting off Doyle Drive before then to Gorgas. But there, cars will have to face an intersection at Girard. The stoplight there will, of course, *back traffic up onto Doyle Drive,* at least the far right lane trying to exit off it to Gorgas. This defect in traffic planning can be avoided in Alternative #2 (because it does not interpose the traffic intersections prescribed by Alternative #5) by creating a right turn exit lane from Doyle Drive flowing directly onto Girard without having to have intersections and therefore without the necessity of interposing any stoplight or stop signs.

These are but two of the number of adverse traffic consequences not accounted *anywhere* for in Alternative #5's roadway plan. This kind of oversight, coupled with the complete lack of validated traffic study projections, makes the implementation of Alternative #5 a totally unacceptable risk at best, and at worst, a very expensive major mistake.

[Please return to the main text accompanying footnote 9.]

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Bancroft

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	A modified Alternative 5 was carried forward as the Preferred Alternative for the project. To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1408
2	Alternative 5 is to be carried forward as the preferred alternative for the project. To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1409
3	The Preferred Alternative is Alternative 5 with some modifications based on feedback from public comments and agency/public workshops and to address traffic circulation, tidal inundation issues and parking (see Section 2.5).	1410
4	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated	1411
5	Exhibit 2-1 was changed to show project area.	1412
6	Project proposes no changes to this area, though this area was included in the expanded traffic study.	1413
7	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1414
8	The Authority, as part of the preferred alternative selection has commited to working with the Presidio Trust to restrict access between Gorgas Ave and Lyon St to address local residents concerns regarding cut-through traffic.	1415
9	As stated in the FEIS/R (see Methodology in Section 3.2.8), 2000 traffic conditions were determined to be more congested than in 2003 for peak direction traffic. In order to prepare the EIR for release in 2005, traffic studies were completed in 2004 and those studies were based upon the most recent data available at that time -- in October 2003.	1416
10	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1417
11	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1418

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Bancroft

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
12	Alternative 5 was selected as the Preferred Alternative. Traffic impacts resulting from this project will be mitigated. Mitigation measures are found in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.8 of the FEIS/R.	1419

Name: Janette Barroca
Organization/Agency:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
E-mail: jbb3252@yahoo.com

Comments:
Marina Blvd - Traffic patterns to remain as is - Cutoff the Gorgas slip at Lyon and Francisco - Northbound (GG bridge) Marina Blvd traffic to be two lanes - Lyon, between Richardson and Bay street to remain as is 1

Additional thoughts that were discussed:
Strong preference to Alternative 2, Rebuild and Widen. No objection to Alternative 5 up to the eastern portion. But, at that point use the "rebuild and widen" design. The widening of Richardson at the PFA to 3 lanes each way is indeed an increased capacity for the roadway and intended to makeup for the reduced traffic into Marina Blvd 2

Below are the comments and I had prepared prior to last night's meeting. Take a look:

COMMENTS and background information to the EIR - 2/1/06 Informative Paragraphs (can be used to "make our point):

1. Page 2-1: Para 2.1, Doyle Drive Project extends, on the west, from the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza to Broderick Street on the east, and includes Richardson Avenue, Gorgas Avenue, and Marina Boulevard.

2. Page 2-26: Para 2.3.1, NO MARINA ACCESS OPTION.
Changing traffic patterns would increase intrusion in the residential area of Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, and the Marina by increasing local traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue.

Comments:

1. Page 2-43, para 2.4.3, Exhibit 2-29 shows an off-ramp exiting to Girard Road and Gorgas Ave. The EIS does not address the traffic volumes that would occur at the intersection of Gorgas Ave. and Francisco and Lyon Street. We object to the Girard/Gorgas off-ramp design because of the likelihood that Gorgas will become a commuter cut-through into our local streets. As mitigation for the cut-through traffic the neighborhood would accept closing the slip of Gorgas Ave. at Francisco/Lyon Street and modifying it to only allow bicycle, pedestrian, and emergency vehicle access. 3

2. Page 2-43, para 2.4.3, Exhibit 2-29, the off-ramp exiting to Girard Road and Gorgas Ave. The EIS fails to address the speed limits, traffic controls, the increased traffic volumes as well as the resulting noise, pollutants, and vibration, for the streets west of Richardson Ave and defined as: Francisco Street, Lyon Street, Chestnut St., Greenwich St., Union St., and Green St. 4

3. Page 3-91, para 3.2.9, Temporary Impacts...it is anticipated that some routes may require temporary re-routing. Sufficient notice will be given to the general public regarding new, temporary routes within the project area. The EIS identifies (Exhibit 2-36, and 2-37) which routes may require temporary closure and re-routing but fails to identify alternative routes for all proposed alternatives. Please provide the exact alternative routes and exact temporary rerouting routes. 5

4. Page 3-173, para 3.3.5, Affected Environment. The paragraph identifies noise sensitive receptors as: Baker Street, the south side of Marina Blvd, the east side of Lyon Street (north of Lombard), Richardson Avenue, and the Palace of Fine Arts. Based on the Project scope boundary, the EIS fails to identify Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, the west side of Lyon Street, and Lombard Street. Please include the 6

mentioned streets and provide the appropriate noise data expected for each alternative utilizing FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model, STAMINA 2.0. 6 Cont

5. Page 3-175, Exhibit 3-49, Long Term Noise Measurements. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 23CFR772, requires noise level measurements be made 50 feet (app. 15 metre) from source and utilizing FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model, STAMINA 2.0. The tabulation presented in Exhibit 3-49 is not in accordance with FHWA's measurements requirements. Therefore, any modeled projected noise levels are inaccurate. Additionally, the EIS fails to include noise measurements taken along the complete projects boundary, i.e. Golden Gate Toll Plaza to Broderick Street. These measurements must include Richardson, both sides of Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick. 7

6. Page 3-178, Residences Richardson Avenue and Marina Boulevard. These areas could be exposed to noise levels above 89 dBA during construction. When construction noise impact is anticipated at a highly complex or controversial major urban project, the FHWA requires the utilization of the computerized prediction model HICNOM. FHWA Section 772.19, Construction Noise, FAPG 23 CFR 772, specifically address this issue. The EIS fails to define what mitigating or protective measure will be taken to reduce the noise level to acceptable levels. Additionally, the EIS fails to include both sides of Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick. 8

7. Page 3-190, Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures. Further prediction of noise impacts are unnecessary since they have already been identified to exceed the FHWA or NAC requirements (Exhibit 3-49, 3-50, 3-53, 3-54, and 3-55). Each alternative requires mitigation/minimization effort. Therefore, any postponement until the preferred alternative is selected is unnecessary. For the residents of the impacted areas, Marina Blvd, Richardson Ave., Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick, the only viable and acceptable mitigation/minimization is traffic management. Your Traffic Management paragraph, page 3-191, is unacceptable since the EIS only addresses vehicle speed and traffic volumes. Additional mitigation measures (23 CFR 722) are Prohibition of certain vehicle types, Time use restrictions for certain vehicle types, Modified speed limits, Exclusive land use designations, and Traffic control devices or combinations of these measures. FHWA (23 CFR 722) requires compliance when the criteria are approached or exceeded. Additionally, compliance is a prerequisite for the granting of Federal-aid highway funds for construction and re-construction of a highway. How do you propose to implement the traffic management required to mitigate the noise impacts for Marina Blvd, Richardson Ave., Lyon Street, Baker Street, Francisco Street, Chestnut Street, and Lombard Street at Broderick? 9

8. Page____, The north-bound ramp from Marina Blvd. is limited to a single lane. Since Marina Blvd. is a two-lane street, the ramp towards the GG Bridge should also be two lanes. CAN'T FIND THIS ANYWHERE 10

9. Page 3-195, Alternative Paving Materials. Using alternative paving materials such as open-graded or rubberized asphaltic concrete is another noise reducing measure. According to FHWA it is very difficult to forecast pavement surface condition into the future. Unless definite knowledge is available on the pavement type and condition and its noise generating characteristics, no adjustments should be made for pavement type in the prediction of highway traffic noise levels. Studies have shown open-graded asphalt pavement can initially produce a benefit of 2-4 dBA reduction in noise levels. However, within a short time period (approximately 6-12 months), any noise reduction benefit is lost when the voids fill up and the aggregate becomes polished. The use of specific pavement types or surface textures must not be considered as a noise abatement measure. HIGHWAY TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS AND ABATEMENT POLICY AND GUIDANCE, Page 38, Paragraph F. Please provide alternative noise reduction methods. 11

Patricia, pass the "Noise" related comments I prepared to your expert. If my perception is correct, they could have far reaching consequences to the whole Doyle Drive redesign.

Need more info on the recent Michael Painter plan for a circle drive between the Palace of Fine Arts & the Presidio ~~ if it could be done further north/west more in line with Lucas' garage and ending in the parking lot behind the PFA that would be much better.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Barroca, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	These elements have been incorporated into the refinement of Alternative 5, except for the two lane for Marina Blvd. One lane will remain and the right of way will be reserved for a possible future additional lane.	1667
2	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1668
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis is presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1669
4	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented under the discussion of the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8 of FEIR/S. Impacts associated with Noise (Section 3.3.5) and Air Quality (Section 3.3.4) are available in Chapter 3 of the FEIS/R. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1670
5	Temporary routes and the means to share this information with the public will be developed as part of final design and the Transportation Management Plan.	1671
6	The limits of construction for the project have been defined as from Merchant Road to the intersection of Richardson Avenue/Francisco Street and Marina Boulevard/Lyon Street, as noted in the December 2004 Noise Study. It appears that the eastern extent to Broderick is only in the vicinity of Marina Blvd and not at the Richardson/Broderick intersection. No additional noise impact assessment is proposed because the project impacts do not extend to this area. The intended limits are defined in the FEIS. All noise modeling applied to this project was done using the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (Version 2.5) as required by 23CFR Part 772.17(a).	1672
7	FHWA guidance for the taking of field measurements is found in FHWA-PD-96-046 entitled "Measurement of Highway-Related Noise" highway project. Section 4.1.2.1 of this document states that "Typically, the reference microphone is positioned at a height of 1.5 m (5 ft), and located within 30 m (100 ft) of the centerline of the near travel lane at a position which is minimally influenced by ground attenuation and atmospheric effects." "However, the specific location of the reference microphone may be defined by the location(s) of any noise-sensitive receiver(s)." Therefore additional field measurements are not warranted and those taken are valid. STAMINA 2.0 is no longer approved for use by FHWA. The Traffic Noise Model (Version 2.5) is the FHWA-approved noise prediction model as noted in 23CFR Part 772.17.	1673

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Barroca, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
8	Temporary noise impacts in the FEIS/R (Section 3.3.5) are expanded to include construction noise reduction options that are considered reasonable and feasible. Those measures are currently listed in Section 8.1.4 of the Noise and Vibration Study of December 2004 and includes numerous methods of noise control that can be employed. The statement that FHWA requires the use of HICNOM is not correct. FHWA does not require the use of HICNOM or any construction noise model - it merely provides them for the use of the highway agency. Specific construction noise reduction methods to be used by the Contractor will be defined in the design plans and included in the construction documents. Since the area beyond the intersection of Richardson Avenue and Lyon Street will not be within the active construction zone, no special noise controls are anticipated for those areas.	1674
9	This section of the FEIS (Section 3.3.5) was expanded to include a discussion of all of the traffic management options that were considered. These options included speed reductions, traffic volume reductions and the restriction of certain vehicle types. The investigation of each of these traffic management options show that they were not reasonable approaches to control the traffic noise. For instance, the reduction of speed through the corridor would result in increased congestion, higher consumption of energy, increased air pollution, and increased time wasted in transit. The reduction of traffic through rerouting was also investigated but the results of that investigation indicated that it would actually increase traffic noise impacts within other segments of the community. Finally, the restriction of certain vehicle types (trucks, buses, etc.) could actually reduce the overall noise level within the corridor, however this was not a viable option since there is no alternative route for trucks, buses or motorcycles to take to traverse the span between the downtown area and the access point to the Golden Gate Bridge. Therefore it was determined that while these options appear to be feasible on the surface, they are not considered reasonable due to the deleterious side effects of this action. Unless a major design change occurs during the design of this project, further prediction of noise impacts is not warranted. For the preferred alternative a more detailed assessment of noise control options has been developed and will be outlined in the FEIS. However, the selection of final noise abatement options will not occur until final design. This will follow the completion of an intensive public involvement effort to identify the desires of the impacted property owners in the vicinity. The reviewer is correct that only traffic management efforts could provide any relief to the traffic noise generated. However, as noted above, due to the nature of the roadway, traffic patterns, and limited physical options, no reasonable control methods have been identified. As noted by the reviewer, FHWA requires "examination and evaluation of alternative noise abatement measures for reducing or eliminating the noise impacts." (23CFR Part 772.9(b)(5)) FHWA further states that "If a noise impact is identified, the abatement measures listed in Sec. 772.13(c) of this chapter must be considered." Consideration of abatement measures listed in this section have been considered, including the use of traffic management measures. However, as noted above, the use of traffic management measures was determined not to be reasonable and feasible for the areas of concern. Therefore, further consideration of noise abatement in the form of traffic management is not warranted at this time.	1675
10	Based on traffic analysis, only one lane is needed.	1676

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Barroca, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
11	The statement by the reviewer that FHWA does not currently allow the use of paving materials as a "noise reduction option" in the prediction of future traffic noise levels. This does not mean that the application of a quieter pavement surface cannot be used as a means to reduce traffic noise. It simply means that you cannot use this option as a way to predict lower future traffic noise levels. The application of a quiet pavement in states like Arizona have shown a 4 dBA or more reduction in traffic noise levels for a period of several years. The long term benefit is still unknown but at least an initial benefit can be realized. Therefore the application of a quiet pavement surface will continue to be considered as an abatement option. As noted in this section, noise barriers, absorptive tunnel lining, and retrofitting windows are three additional abatement options being seriously considered. Commitments to further assess each of these options will be established in the FEIS for the preferred alternative as appropriate. Final details on the actual abatement options will be determined during the design phase of the project in concert with the impacted property owners.	1677

Name: David Bendet
Organization/Agency:
Address: 3032 Baker Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: david.bendet@hok.com

Comments:
As a SPUR member and local resident in the Marina, I am opposed to any option that eliminates the Doyle Drive off ramp on to Marina Blvd and sheds more traffic to the Richardson and Lombard corridor. Since one of the stated goals for the project is "To maintain the functions that the Doyle Drive corridor serves as part of the regional and city transportation network", any option that alters Doyle Drive's functionality is non-compliant. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Bendet, D.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The project maintains existing traffic balance.	1628

From: Reidbaker@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 7:01 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: pool closure

I strongly object to the closure of the YMCA pool in the Presidio during the construction of Doyle Drive. The pool is valuable to all of us in the area who use it. 1

Vera Berg

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Berg, V.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1525

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Zach Berkowitz Date:

Address: 439 Avery ST

SF

City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: Area Code Number Work Phone: 415 613-7111 Area Code Number

E-mail: Company: Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Great JOB!

1 Alternative 5 and 2 are not equal products
- 5 has access to presidio
- 2 does not

with = products price difference becomes small and then #5 looks like a slam dunk!

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Z. Berkowitz (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1152

From: Pauline Bishop [pauline2@infinex.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 2:37 PM
To: Doyle Drive
Subject: Replacement Project

It has come to my attention that consideration is being given to the demolition of some buildings in the Presidio for the replacement project for Doyle Drive in San Francisco. 1

I would like to express my concern that one of these buildings might be Building 1151 which is the location of the YMCA swimming pool. The Presidio YMCA has a large and diverse membership which enjoys the facilities both in the main gym and in the two swimming pools in Bldg. 1151. The larger pool ranges from 3.5 to over 7 feet deep, and the smaller pool is in the 3 foot range. This means that the very young to the most experienced swimmers can benefit from these two pools which are unmatched elsewhere in the city. I have been a member of the YMCA for 4 years and a member of the Presidio for over 2 years and, as a former heart patient, recommended by my cardiologist to the Acquatic Fitness Programs conducted by trained specialists at this facility. These classes are very popular and are very well attended by seniors with vast variety of disabilities and/or complications.

I am concerned that all development/improvements are made with the idea of "moving more cars/traffic" and very few are dedicated to improving the quality of life for the people who live here. Just note how many bus stops in the city have been moved to center of blocks from the corners, just to accomodate the traffic flow. This means that people who use public transportation are forced to walk further - and miss connections. Traffic signals are timed to keep the flow moving and there is not sufficient time for many seniors to get across the streets on a green light. Granted, Doyle Drive has been hazardous since it was first opened, but there must be ways of making it safer without destroying the quality of life for a great number of people. 1 Cont

We must change our attitude in this country. Long term planning must incorporate other means of transportation than the automobile. Oil is running out, the earth is overheating and while we are surrounded by water here in the Bay Area nothing is being done to support the increase of ferries or other types of water transportation.

Letterman Pool is a great public facility. It must not be destroyed. 1 Cont

Pauline Bishop

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Bishop, P.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1528

145 Richardson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94123
March 26, 2006

RECD MAR 29 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comment
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

As a homeowner in affected area, I have the following concerns regarding the evaluation of alternatives as presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report:

- With the two Parkway alternatives, a larger portion of the city traffic would be shifted the Richardson Avenue/Lombard area from the Marina Boulevard area, which would:
    - Discourage pedestrian traffic between the Palace of Fine Arts and Letterman Digital Arts Center, two neighborhood attractions for both residents and visitors 1
    - Isolate the Letterman Digital Arts Center from the surrounding San Francisco neighborhood—particularly the Chestnut commercial area of the Marina, with its restaurants & shops
- With the Parkway Circle Drive option, the YMCA pool would need to be removed. This would eliminate a neighborhood recreational resource in the Marina/Cow Hollow area. 2

<u>Balance of Traffic Between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue/Lombard</u>
Using Exhibits 3-26 to 3-28 of Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report, I see that under the Parkway Options, there is a large anticipated increase in the amount of traffic that enters or exits this part of the city through Richardson Avenue. The increase is absolute as well as relative to the portion of traffic anticipated on Marina Boulevard under the Parkway Options. The increased traffic on Richardson Avenue would have a negative impact on the neighborhood, particularly pedestrian access. In addition, it will limit the impact of any future improvements to vehicular traffic flow that may be implemented on Marina Boulevard. 3

The restoration of the Palace of Fine Arts (currently underway) combined with the recently constructed Letterman Digital Arts Center creates an opportunity for this part of the Marina/Cow Hollow area. If pedestrian movement is encouraged (particularly across Richardson Avenue) people will be able to enjoy two scenic areas (Palace of Fine Arts and Letterman Center) while enjoying the commercial area of Chestnut Street, including its shops and restaurants. 3 Cont

However, by shifting more traffic to Richardson/Lombard from the Marina Boulevard area, there will be a negative impact on pedestrian traffic between the two sides of Richardson Avenue. Already, many residents of this area have a difficult time crossing the street as traffic signals do not allow enough time, and red light violations by vehicles are common. The increased traffic would:

- Discourage pedestrian traffic between the Palace of Fine Arts and Letterman Digital Arts Center area of the Presidio, two neighborhood attractions for both residents and visitors
- Isolate the Letterman Digital Arts Center from the surrounding San Francisco neighborhood—particularly the Chestnut commercial area of the Marina. This would discourage Letterman Digital Arts Center employees and visitors from patronizing restaurants & shops on Chestnut Street

In addition, the Doyle Drive replacement will be with us for decades, so it makes sense to provide the most future options to optimize traffic flow between Marina Boulevard and Richardson/Lombard. In future years, Marina Boulevard may have better traffic control, providing more capacity, but if the Doyle Drive replacement limits access to this area, future improvements would have limited impact on traffic. 4

While the Parkway options are good looking, I see no reason to "bundle" choices that could be separated. The visually attractive Parkway alternatives could have the same traffic split between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue/Lombard as present.

<u>YMCA Pool</u>

With the Parkway Circle Drive option, the YMCA pool would need to be removed. This will eliminate a neighborhood recreational resource in the Marina/Cow Hollow area. Relocation of this pool to another area of the Presidio will do little to mitigate the effect, as this resource has value due to the proximity of the populated Marina and Cow Hollow neighborhoods which have many families as well as senior citizens who value this resource. 5

I hope you will consider my comments as you continue through the process.

Regards,

Thomas P. Bochenek

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: T. Bochenek (032606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1479
2	Correct, the Circle Drive option of Alternative 5 would require the removal of Building 1151 (the YMCA swimming pool). In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 will remain intact.	1480
3	The studies show an increase of traffic on Richardson Avenue at Francisco Street from 66,300 in the base year to 77,000 in the no build design year condition. The Refined Presidio Parkway shows an increase to only 69,800 in the design year condition, as a result some traffic that would use the newly created Girard Road access to reach destinations in the Presidio and points south. Traffic signal timings assumed in the signalized intersection evaluation were specifically designed to allow for adequate crossing time for pedestrians on Richardson Boulevard.	1481
4	Comment noted.	1482
5	Correct, the Circle Drive option of Alternative 5 would require the removal of Building 1151 (the YMCA swimming pool). In July 2006 Alt 5 with the Diamond Option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 will remain intact.	1483

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: BARRY BONE Date: 2/15/06

Address: 2781 FILBERT

SF (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: _____ (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

PREFER ALTERNATIVE 2 –
EASIER & CHEAPER 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: B. Bone (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1040

REC'D FEB 2 2 2006

FHWA Caltrans

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Randall P. Borcherding Date: February 20, 2006

Address: 155 Retiro Way
San Francisco, CA 94123
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ Area Code Number Work Phone: _____ Area Code Number

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

I have reviewed the Doyle Drive "Citizens' Guide and other details, including attending information presentations. I emphatically urge an approval of Alternative 5. It is unquestionably the better alternative as compared to
1 Alternative 2. This is an opportunity for the government agencies to do something which will really enhance the beauty and esthetics of an area already special place because of the GGNRA improvements. The proposed tunnels and improved views in Alt. 5 are far superior to Alt. 2. The ease of Presidio access with Alt. 5 is a major plus. "Replace and Widen" is unimaginative and backward in the the face of lasting improvement which will be a credit to a forethinking vision by responsible government agencies. The public will gratefully credit government with wise planning and decision-making by approval of Alt. 5.

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Borcherding

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1232

Name: Philip Bowles
Organization/Agency:
Address: 505 Sansome St. #1975
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94111
E-mail: peb@bfarm.com

Comments:
I think it would be foolish to narrow the lanes and the shoulders, and to reduce the banking on the Palace of Fine Arts turn, as SPUR has suggested. If there is an accident (which will be far more likely under the SPUR design) the lack of adequate shoulders will cause a huge traffic jam. Why on earth we would want to build a road that is slower and more dangerous is beyond me; but then I'm one of those people who don't think owning a car is a crime. The rest of the new design is great! 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Bowles, P.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The roadway is being designed to meet all safety standards.	1648

Name: Robert and Diane Brockob
Organization/Agency: Marina Community Association
Address: 1490 Francisco St. #7
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: livearch@aol.com

Comments:
Diane and I strongly endorse, as Marina District residents, Alternative 5, Presidio Parkway, Circle Drive option. We feel strongly that this option provides the best access to the Presidio and encourages pedestrian movement through the Presidio to Crissy Field and the bay. 1

It is very important to consider linking the Palace of Fine Arts with the presidio, both visually and with pedestrian ease.

The existing pool facility would be better placed closer to other similar activities such as the gym. This would make sense in terms of auto traffic to these sites and be more efficient to staff and attend for users.

My extreme gratitude to Michael Painter for his vision and persistence in bringing this alternative to us.

Also, I would like to thank Michael Alexander for his willingness to show up at meetings and explain the options to many of us.

In general, we feel the pedestrian friendly elements of this incredibly beautiful area need to be supported. These open spaces within an urban environment are priceless and must be respected.

With appreciation,
Bob and Diane Brockob

We wish you all the best in bringing these needed improvements to fruition.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Brockob, R.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1682

Name: John B. Brooke
Organization/Agency:
Address: 2628 Greenwich Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: john.brooke@oracle.com

Comments:

The DEIS/R does not include the traffic impacts downstream from the project area. The study needs to consider the impacts at least to Van Ness on Lombard and to Fort Mason on Marina Blvd. Further, the impacts on the residential streets of Cow Hollow and the Marina need to be studied if this is to truly assess the environmental impacts. Please include a more thorough and comprehensive traffic study in the final EIS. 1

Alternative 5 clearly results in a redistribution of traffic from Marina Blvd to Richardson/Lombard. This needs to be studied further, modified, or eliminated as an alternative. Such a redistribution is not a evaluation criteria or other goal of the project. 2

Alternative 5 eliminates direct access to and from Marina Blvd to Doyle Drive. Further, so called "traffic calming" design elements have been put in place for the indirect routes to and from Marina Blvd. Similar design elements have not been added for Richardson/Lombard. The result is a dramatic shift in traffic distribution from Marina to Richardson/Lombard. 3

Given the lack of additional capacity on Lombard, traffic will spill onto the residential streets of Cow Hollow. This environmental impact cannot be ignored -- it must be measured and fully described as part of any evaluation of alternative 5. 4

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Brooke, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis is presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1678
2	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis is presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1679
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis is presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1680
4	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis is presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1681

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Lori Brooke Date: 2/15/06

Address: 2628 Greenwich St.

SF (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 749-1841 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: ——— (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: Lbrooke@lmi.net Company: Cow Hollow Association (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

The parking area used by Letterman Gym/Pool and located behind the barracks (Presidio Sport, etc.) needs a better connection to the gym & pool.

Currently, there is no safe sidewalk to get children and adults to and from their cars. As of now, pedestrians and drivers share the same road. In fact, there is a blind turn into the parking lot that causes all parents great concern as children try to get to the buildings. 1

I suggest a sidewalk around the parking lot and connecting to the gym/pool. 2

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

~~Cotomatively,~~

Also, I suggest only one access point to the parking (the area near the dance studio). It also makes sense to remove the parking directly next to the gym therefore eliminating ~~any need~~ the greatest problem area for drivers and pedestrian.

2 Cont

Thanks for your consideration. You have all worked hard and done a nice job.

(sorry about the messy writing!)

fold here

Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments

c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority

100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

place stamp here

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Brooke

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Detailed design of parking facilities affected by the project would take pedestrian circulation, traffic safety, and parking access into consideration. Such design will be developed as part of the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1043
2	Detailed design of parking facilities affected by the project would take pedestrian circulation, traffic safety, and parking access into consideration. Such design will be developed as part of the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1044

Verbal comment from Public Hearing on 2/15/06

From: Paul Bryant [pauljbryant@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 10:19 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Against Potential Pool Closure

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to ask to save the Letterman Pool for our community. Pool activities including swimming, water running and water exercise/swimming classes are very important to our community, seniors and children, not only today, but for many years to come.

In addition to keeping the pool, I hope the pool will remain open during construction. A 3-year closure during construction will not meet the needs of our community.

1

I'm hoping one of the following options might be a viable alternate to pool closure:

a) Retain historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option
under the Parkway Alternative completely, or

b) Retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users, or

This pool is heavily used by our community families including children, seniors, swimmers and triathletes.

Thank you for your consideration.
Paul Bryant

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Bryant, P.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1529

From: skeeter buck [skeeterbuck@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 8:53 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Retain Historic Letterman Pool

Please retain historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative. 1

Skeeter Buck
Triathlete

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Buck, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1521

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Thu Bui Date: 2/16/06

Address: 169 Idora

SF, CA 94127
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ Work Phone: _____
Area Code Number Area Code Number

E-mail: _____ Company: _____
Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Alt. 2 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: T. Bi[sic] (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1042

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Bill Canihan Date: 2-6-06

Address: 485 Marina Blvd.
San Francisco (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 (Area Code) 990 9270 (Number) Work Phone: 415 (Area Code) 929-8190 (Number)

E-mail: bcanihan@pacbell.net Company: (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

I prefer Alternative 5 with the Hook Ramp Option. 1

I would like to shorten the lengths of the 2 tunnels, to approx 500ft., if at all possible, as that would enhance the views of the bay, and lessen the environmental impact, along with increasing traffic safety. 2

It appears that the majority of the subject land is owned by the Federal Govt, Nat'l Park Service, and they should pay their fair share of the project cost, and thereby lessen the City's responsibility of cost sharing. 3

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: B. Canihan (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 with the Hook Ramp option noted.	1142
2	The length of the tunnels are controlled by adjacent elements such as Lincoln Ave and in an effort to avoid biological and historical resources.	1143
3	Though owners of the neighboring land, these entities are not responsible for the transportation facility through their property.	1144

From: Jean Caramatti [Jean.Caramatti@flysfo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2006 3:40 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: pvaughey@yahoo.com
Subject: Comments to Doyle Drive DEIS/R

March 30, 2006

Mr. Leroy Saage
Project Manager
DEIS/R Comment
San Francisco County Transportation Authority 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

I write in support of Alternative No. 2 to rebuild and widen Doyle Drive as I believe that it is in the best interest of those that use the Doyle Drive corridor and those who live in the surrounding communities. 1

I feel strongly that a shift in traffic onto Richardson/Lombard would result if Alternative No. 5 was implemented. No reasonable person could possibly believe that a series of three stop lights leading onto Marina Blvd. followed by a series of stop signs on the boulevard itself would encourage commute traffic coming off the Bridge to take that route.

Furthermore, the evening commute would surely cause traffic to back up at least half way, if not all the way to Van Ness Avenue if Alternative No. 5 is selected.

I would also like to state my support for cutting off the slip ramp off of Gorges onto Lyon and Francisco as this will surely bring additional traffic on Lyon, Francisco and Chestnut under the Alternative No. 5 scenario. As a resident of the last block of Chestnut Street, I can assure you that the traffic on my street has increased considerably since the Lucas Project. I would not like to see a bad situation made worse. 2

Cow Hollow and Marina are communities that happen to be in the middle of Highway 101. There is no getting around that fact. However, having said that, it does not mean that the safety and quality of life of the residents of those areas is irrelevant because of where they live. Schools, parks and small businesses are located in the Marina / Cow Hollow area. The residents of the area, both young and old alike, cross Lombard and Richardson every day to get to and from school, parks, the library and to run errands in the neighborhood. As traffic increases ... and it will ...the safety of those taxpaying residents must be taken into consideration. 3

Clearly something must be done about Doyle Drive. I cannot and will not dispute that fact. But those who will make this decision must acknowledge that whatever decision is made will undeniably affect the surrounding communities. I ask that you take these issues and comments into serious consideration before making your decision. We cannot be viewed as dispensable just because we happen to live next to Highway 101.

There is a workable and livable solution.

Sincerely,

Jean Caramatti
2636 Chestnut Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Caramatti, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 2 noted.	1619
2	Preference for cutting off Slip Ramp noted.	1620
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis was presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1621

From: Barbara Carlisle [bbcusa@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:53 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool

To Whom it may concern,
I am writing to express my sincere hope that Letterman pool will remain open. I personally use the pool and am always pleased to see the number of children who regularly participate in swim team and swim lessons. The pool is an important part of our neighbor hood and an great resource to those of us who live in this area. It would be a tremendous loss if the pool were to close, even temporarily. 1

Regards,
Barbara Carlisle
Cow Hollow Resident

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Carlisle, B.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1571

From: Cautn1@aol.com
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:27 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive

I have not followed the Doyle Project closely and will be unable to attend the forthcoming public hearing. So these comments will have to suffice:

No one can object to the idea of making a freeway facility safe, both in earthquakes and with respect to collisions.

I hope the project confines itself to that. Any move to either increase capacity (such as by adding 10-foot shoulders capable of being used as traffic lanes) or interrupt existing at-grade topographical and access patterns would degrade what's there today. Whatever else one might say about the existing structure it does two good things: 1

first, it compliments the Golden Gate Bridge as a traffic-throttling device
second, it has a relatively benign effect on the open spaces below.

Gerald Cauthen
transportation engineer

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cauthen, G.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The added shoulders represent a safety measure, not an increase in capacity.	1568

Name: Tim Chen
Organization/Agency: concerned citizen
Address:
City: SF
State: CA
Zip: 94115
E-mail: tim@tagbadge.com

Comments:
Please do not close the YMCA pool, I swim there every week, as do many YMCA members and children of family members. There are no other pool options anywhere nearby. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Chen, T.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1637

Name: Karen Cleek
Organization/Agency:
Address: 178 Funston Avenue
City: San Francisco,
State: CA
Zip: 94118
E-mail: meroden@sbcglobal.net

Comments:
I am in favor of the Presidio Parkway Plan. Regardless of the alternative chosen, I have a few concerns I'd like to share: 1

1) Palace of Fine Arts is an historical treasure but not the sturdiest building. I would like to see traffic passing by that structure minimized as much as possible - both for the safety of the building and to maintain that peaceful place within the City. 2

2) That traffic within the residential areas be minimized as much as possible. Although I am very supportive of the Presidio as a wonderful park within the City, I am more willing to sacrifice some of that space than I am to see neighborhoods disturbed. 3

3) I am a frequent user of the SB Exit from Doyle Drive onto Park Presidio Blvd, and have worked on neighborhood traffic calming studies of Park Presidio Blvd. Regardless of the alternative, a better merge onto Veterans (or PPB) is mandatory. Because of the number of accidents at both Calif & PPB and Lake & PPB, I am asking that you give close scrutiny to the flow of traffic from the new ramps onto the Blvd at those points - even though it is outside the construction zone per the maps. I don't want to see the situation at these intersections worsened, and there might be some improvements that the Doyle Project is making that could actually make them safer. 4

Thank you!

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cleek, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1652
2	Comment noted.	1653
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis is presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1654
4	This element is outside the project scope.	1655

Name: adrian cotter
Organization/Agency:
Address: 26 cumberland st
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94110
E-mail: Adrian.Cotter@sierraclub.org

Comments:
I support the Parkway Design, with the Diamond option. I do believe the circle option to be a little better, but unless there is a plan to relocate the YMCA swimming pool, then I feel that building ought to be left alone. 1

While I understand that some feel the Parkway option damages too many historic properties, I feel that cost is worth it. I would rather have additional land added to the park itself than buildings that mean nothing to me.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cotter, A.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 with Diamond Drive Option noted. In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1633

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: PATOUT H. COTTER Date: 02/26/06

Address: 3825 SCOTT ST #103

SAN FRANCISCO (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 563 - 0445 (Area Code Number) Work Phone: (Area Code Number)

E-mail: PATCOTTER@EARTHLINK.NET Company: HGHOA (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

1 THE PRESENT RESTRICTIVE CONFIGURATION OF ALT #5 VOL. REPLACE AND WIDEN OF THE FLOW FROM MARINA BLVD TO DOYLE DR. WILL CAUSE AND INCREASE OF COMMUTER (PM) TRAFFIC ON MARINA NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS, i.e. ALHAMBRA/ FRANCISCO AND BEACH. BERKELEY MEASURES (NO LEFT TURNS & BARRICADES) WILL BE REQUIRED TO MITIGATE THE USE OF NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS BY COMMUTERS. IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE CONFIGURATION BE MODIFIED TO ALLOW THE CONTINUED FREE FLOW OF MARINA BLVD. TO DOYLE DR. TRAFFIC WITH THE ADDITION OF AN "ON-RAMP" FOR THE PRESIDIO.

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Cotter

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Travel time comparisons between alternatives was included in the Final Traffic and Transit Operations Report. Increased travel times due to congestion do not indicate successful traffic calming, as traffic calming techniques are defined as physical treatments intended to encourage traffic speeds at all times of the day (both in congested and uncongested conditions) (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tfhrc/safety/pubs/its/planning/toolbox.pdf). The Refined Presidio Parkway Alternative includes additional traffic calming measures on the east end of the project (which introduce traffic calming elements of mainline traffic that are not in the original circle loop option in this comment). The Merchant Road slip ramp was recommended to relieve a design deficiency, but is not part of the recommended project.	1242

From: jay@presidiosport.com
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 3:38 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Please don't close the Presidio YMCA Pool

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to ask that you not close the Presidio YMCA pool, permanently or even temporarily during reconstruction. 1

This pool serves a true community of people, young children first learning to swim, older people finding a comfortable way to exercise during the aging process, athletes working out training for races or general fitness, people with injuries taking advantage of the therapeutic benefits of exercising in a partial or non-weight bearing environment.

As a physical therapist at Presidio Sport & Medicine (1169 Gorgas Ave) we use this pool to not only perform aquatic therapy for acutely injured patients, but also to offer free water running classes to the community 3 times per week. These classes are the only ones of their kind in the Bay Area and allow many folks with long term injuries or perhaps no health insurance to still find a way to rehab from many debilitating injuries. To remove this facility, will leave a large population of injured people with no medium to perform rehab, especially in the earlier stages of the injury. 1 Cont

Please reconsider this decision and look at other alternatives that would have less impact to so many people.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Jay Courant, PT, ATC
Presidio Sport & Medicine

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Courant, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1546

Name: Alexandra Davies
Organization/Agency:
Address: 2531 34th Avenue
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94116
E-mail: avondavies@yahoo.com

Comments:
After reading the Summary pdf, I would like to register my support for the Park Presidio plan. This is not Los Angeles; we should not have freeways towering in the air. Please support the tunnel plan to improve views and Presidio access. 1
Thank you.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Davies, A.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1651

From: Deakers, Katie [Katie.Deakers@Diageo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 11:14 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive/Letterman Pool Hearing

To Whom It May Concern:

This is a request to please retain the historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative. The community (San Francisco athletes, rehab patients, children, etc) needs access to the pool as well as and adequate, convenient and safe parking during the 3-year construction period. 1

Thank you for your consideration.
Katie

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Deakers, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1561

From: EVDemar@aol.com
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 8:39 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive Option

Dear Mr. Sagge,

With certain modifications, we support the Michael Painter Parkway Alternative. The modifications would be to have, two lanes going to Marina Blvd rather than one as we feel that everyone should be able to take their fair share of traffic.

The Circle Drive option for Lyon St looks like it could help those of us that live on the 3200 block of Lyon St. We would like to study it further and if possible see a model of this design, before making a final decision. 1

Sincerely,

Gene & Jeannette De Martini
3234 Lyon St.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: DeMartini, G.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Circle Drive was not carried forward as an element of the preferred alternative.	1622

From: Paula & John [sanforddodds@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 7:40 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive Comments

A nice job on the EIR & design. A pretty good design job for a very constricted and complex interchange.

My comments follow:
1. I vote for the Presidio Parkway option. 1
Reason: it reduces the visual impact of the freeway on the Presidio & water views. It gives the option of more access over the freeway for the Park users, who will be looking at the views & sitting on the grass. The drivers, most of whom are the single occupant of the vehicle, should not be looking at the views anyway. Keeping the vehicles closer to the ground or in tunnels should be maximized.

2. As a frequent user of the Park Presidio Doyle Drive interchange (2-3 times per week in both directions) I vote for the HOOK Ramp option from Park Presidio to Doyle Dr.. AS LONG AS there is the proposed longer exit ramp from the Park Presidio exit. The problem with this interchange is NOT the tight corner, but entering into the tight corner as you exit from Park Presidio going north. The traffic moves too fast. The exit ramp needs to be wider & longer, AS PROPOSED, to allow exiting vehicles to slow down while NOT impeding the through traffic to the Bridge, before it gets into the tight curve of the corner. I do question the need for such a wide (6.6m-20ft) inside shoulder on the curved ramp. IF this were to be narrowed, it would force vehicles to the left side where they SHOULD be traveling AND eliminate some of the intrusion of the unused massive concrete structure onto the property below. 2 3
The loop option is not aesthetically pleasing as it will contribute to a complex massive freeway look to the interchange -and probably block even more of the view. The goal should be to minimize the amount of concrete.

On the entry from Doyle west to Park Presidio south, I question the narrowness and length of the on/merge ramp. At the moment this entry ramp enters INTO ITS OWN LANE. The proposal is for the entry to come into the right or second lane that will be occupied by vehicles traveling south. The merge length is very short. The lower merging traffic from Doyle Dr. CANNOT see if there is oncoming traffic behind & up above in the right lane of the southbound traffic from the bridge, due to both the merging traffic's lower elevation AND the fact that the oncoming traffic is also curving to the right & so comes upon the merging traffic from behind, not from the side. There are no usable shoulders. This is asking for an accident since the southbound traffic thinks it has right of way over the merging traffic from Doyle Dr, and will not give way until it is too late. Is there any way to add some shoulder space on the right side of the merge or lengthen the merging lane distance? I know the little bridge & tunnel come up fast, but every little bit would help. Ideally there should be a shoulder or merge lane ALL the way up to the tunnel. Any accident in this location will completely block ALL south bound traffic from the bridge to Park Presidio south, AND will probably be a 3 or 4 car accident, and very quickly back the bridge up causing major delays. Is there a message system that will warn drivers if this exit is blocked & tell them to take the Richardson exit? 4

3. At the Marina Blvd/Girard/Gorgas St. end, I vote for the DIAMOND Option. 5
There are already too many stop lights on Richardson Ave/Lombard St/Highway 101 which is SUPPOSED to be the main artery to exit SF to the north.. We do not need another light which is what happens with the other option. The lights are not sequenced properly as it is, they result in delays in getting the traffic OUT of the City, which results in more local traffic delays, not to mention pedestrian accidents, more auto pollution in the City and delays in total travel time across the bridge. People who are coming down Lombard can use the Lombard St entry to the Presidio, OR turn right down Broderick etc to use the existing light at Chestnut to cross over Richardson to get to the Presidio, they do not need another one two blocks further down Richardson. For the FEW people who do go this way it is better to use the Diamond option to enter the Presidio. It gets them out of the way of the Bridge traffic and should speed up egress from the City.

(What you really need is a tunnel under Richardson/Lombard St to make Highway 101 a freeway all the way through the City, but that is beyond the scope of this project. - It is a total disgrace that US Highway 101 is one of the few major US Highways that is NOT a freeway)

3a. I question the design of the Marina Blvd/Girard St extension entry going west. Specifically, the one lane width of Girard from Marina Blvd up to where it widens out to give a freeway entry lane onto Doyle Drive (unless I have misread the drawing??). This part of Girard needs to be 2 LANES west, - the right lane is freeway entry only, the left is local traffic and freeway entry. As it is you should realize that both lanes of traffic are going to turn right to enter the freeway, ANYWAY, regardless of what the design intends. If Girard St is ONLY one lane going west before the freeway on ramp then this restricts access to the freeway, thus adding more City traffic congestion, idling in the Marina causing pollution etc and aggravating my asthma. The idea should be for making getting out easy. Marina Blvd is 2 lanes at under 30mph, albeit with stop signs & lights, & BOTH lanes used to enter Doyle Drive freeway. Why do you now want to REDUCE the total existing freeway access by 20-25%, (or the Marina access by 50%) by making Girard a single 30mph lane west, which then enters a 2 lane freeway ramp going at 45+mph.? Are you trying to force the cars to stay in the City? Sorry, but this is STUPID- it violates all common sense design guidelines. Surely I must have misread the drawing?? Also a minor technical note, the Girard/Marina exit has 2 lanes that turn left onto Girard going east, BUT the arrow shows the center exit lane turning onto the left Girard lane instead of onto the right Girard lane. Please fix. 6

4. While I vote against the replace & widen option 2, (it is too big & bulky & intrusive - just like the original freeway that ran along the San Francisco Embarcadero - & we know what a mess that was!!), I do suggest that IF it is allowed for option 5 to only have a 10ft shoulder on ONE side each way, then it should also be allowed for Option 2 to ALSO have only one 10 ft shoulder, not two. The shoulders should be on the outside, to prevent drivers from having to cross traffic to escape (someone is stupid enough to try this!!). This will allow you to reduce the massive size (& cost) of option 2.by a width of 14-20 ft. Maybe you can even reduce it to 2 support columns instead of 3. In spite of this potential reduction in cost - I would prefer to pay extra for the parkway/tunnels. 7

5. Do you have a reserved parking location, either along Girard or along Richardson, where a Caltrans towtruck /police car can be stationed to help push the inevitable stall off the bridge access very quickly? 8

Sincerely
John Dodds

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Dodds, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1574
2	Preference noted.	1575
3	The width of the inside shoulder is necessary to provide minimum sight distance to meet traffic safety standards.	1576
4	Roadway geometrics have been carefully studied and reviewed. Caltrans has concurred with the proposed design of the Preferred Alternative.	1577
5	Support for the Diamond Interchange Option noted.	1578
6	Based on traffic analysis, only one lane is needed.	1579
7	Comment noted.	1580
8	The continuous shoulders will allow most vehicles to pull off the facility and also improve emergency vehicle response.	1581

From: Todd Dolan-Smith [toddisodd@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 1:53 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: too fast?

nice try , but the best way to fix doyle drive is to enforce the speed laws , its not the road that kills , its bad drivers like me,,, but lets not look at the truth,, lets find a way to spend more money ,,, or better yet ! ,, give me lots of money ill tell you whatever you need to hear to make you feel like your important . gee maybe i should be the one who says < the buck stops here> oh then i guess we might have to get a real job ? can you say < would you like frys with that> ? PS gophers love the tunnel idea! 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Dolan-Smith, T.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1573

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Diane Downing Date: 2/24/06

Address: 155 Alhambra Street
San Francisco (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 931 5112 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: Company: (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Alternative 5 is a disaster in the making. As a resident of the 1989 quake and an emergency medical responder the proposed construction of tunnels in this area is unconscionable. How are rescue personnel supposed to access the injured – it is well known and tunnel rescues during auto accidents are difficult – given the type of soil and earthquake potential. Those driving will be put at great danger.

Other issues: 1) COST – over 100 mil more 2) destruction of YMCA pool & gym 3) potential increase traffic flow into Richmond neighborhood.

Alternative 2 is the only logical alternative

1

2

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Downing

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	All structures will be designed to withstand the necessary seismic loading. In addition an emergency response plan will be developed for the tunnels.	1238
2	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1239

From: JACK DUANE [jackduane2001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 3:22 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Presidio pool

People, I have swam at the pool for many years. It is vital to my heart health. For all the good reasons that exist,this facilty should be preserved. It is in a National Park and is part of the YMCA which serves the community, as it should be. I was opposed to commercializing the Presidio National Park e.g. Lucas Films and still am. Don't make a huge mistake regarding this excellent swimming pool. Thank you. 1

Jack Duane

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Duane, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1547

Name: Eric Dupre
Organization/Agency:
Address: 45 Henry St. #1
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94114
E-mail: edupre@mindspring.com

Comments:
I support Michael Painter's Presidio Parkway (Alternative 5). It best meets the concerns of the neighbors and the City.

I also support the Circle Drive option, because it is safer, has the fewest impacts on the Palace of Fine Arts and reunites the Presidio and the Palace.

I support the hook ramp option at the Highway 1 interchange, because it has fewer impacts on the national park and costs less than the loop ramp. 1

I oppose the Merchant Road slip ramp.

Michael Painter ought to be applauded for his efforts. He should be credited in the Final EIR and in the public meetings.

Thank You.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Dupre, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5, the Circle Drive Option, and the Hook Ramp Option noted. Opposition to the Merchant Road Slip Ramp noted. Michael Painter is acknowledged in the Final EIS/EIR.	1684

Name: Elaine
Organization/Agency:
Address: 1842 Jefferson Street, #207
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: elwang2000@yahoo.com

Comments:
Retain historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative.

Retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users. the pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes. Please feel free to forward this message. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Elaine

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1639

Name: Heather Elgin
Organization/Agency: Teacher
Address:
City:
State:
Zip: 94123
E-mail: elgin@sacredsf.org

Comments:
When planning this project, please consider the great need for an affordable recreation facility that the Presidio YMCA Letterman Center satisfies. I, personally, use the pool three times a week and cannot afford to join a more expensive facility in this area of the city. Every time I visit the pool, I run into numerous famililies, athletes, and senior citizens for whom the YMCA provides a safe, affordable, convenient location in which to exercise. I implore you to work towards finding a way to keep this facility open while moving forward with the Doyle Drive project. Thank you for your consideration. 1

Sincerely,
Heather Elgin

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Elgin, H.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1636

From: Bruce [beachinfl@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 9:33 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Rebuilding the monster

Greetings:

I've driven Doyle Drive for the last 45 years and think the current roadway configuration should be rebuild as is = (as an elevated platform/viaduct). I think having tunnels is a maintenance nightmare. Ask any police or fire individual and they will say working an accident in a tunnel is also a nightmare and one of the most difficult places to work an emergency situation. Its plain uncomfortable! Yes, the soccer-mommies want the most beautiful plan (mostly underground), but its a roadway/highway and obviously the current configuration has worked for the last 70 years. 1

Straighten it out and completely rebuild it, minus tunnels, and we'll be good to go.! For SF Fire Dept, Caltrans, CHP and the Bridge District, having tunnels is going to be a nightmare for those Agencies involved.

Keep the darn thing above ground and eight-lanes wide... 1 Cont

[Also, we should not forget the countless scores of people that have died on the current darn thing]

Thanks for your time and effort,
Bruce R. Elliott

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Elliot, B.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for current roadway configuration noted.	1602

From: Paul A. Epstein [paulsfo@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2006 9:44 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: DEIS/R Comments

Leroy L. Saage, PE March 21, 2006
S. F. County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Lee:

Here are my personal comments with regard to the Doyle Drive DEIS/R:

The Presidio Parkway, Alternative 5, is my preferred alternative for the reconstruction of Doyle Drive. Within that selection I believe that the DEIS/R analysis of some elements of Alternative 5 are poorly addressed and so detract from many positive aspects of the Parkway proposal.

1. The Hook Ramp alternative, which I favor, is not adequately examined in the DEIS/R with regard to the savings in construction of that alternative as compared with the cost of the more complex Loop alternative. It would appear that there would be substantial savings with the adoption of the Hook Ramp. 1
It is also not clear how much money could be saved by elimination of the Merchant Road Slip Ramp entirely and the selection of the Circle Drive option. 2

A detail analysis of these three elements, since the alternatives are simpler (and should cost less) or eliminated, should result in significant cost savings .The DEIS/R fails to adequately explain the financial impacts of various alternatives since the costs are treated as similar although the actual construction costs of competing alternatives would appear to be quite different. These need further financial analysis and discussion in the EIS. 3

2. It is inexplicable that approximately forty percent (40%) of the portion of Veterans Boulevard that runs north from the MacArthur Tunnel to Doyle Drive is omitted from the Construction Corridor. This is inexplicable because my notes show that on at least two occasions (Jan.30,2001 and again on Nov. 17, 2003) this point was raised by me in the CAC. I was assured that reconstruction north of the Tunnel would be included within the project. The DEIS/R fails to discuss the decision making process that apparently altered the prior publically made commitment to rebuild all of the roadway north of MacArthur Tunnel.

It is worth noting that almost the entire omitted portion is included in the Biological Project Study Area. There is no analysis in the DEIS/R of the rebuild of Veterans Boulevard and of the treatment of a significant portion of Veterans Boulevard in a manner different than the remainder of the roadway. 4

The age and existing condition of the entire Veterans Boulevard roadway system is the same. Why should only a portion be made safe and brought up to current standards ? For example, the noise analysis fails to discuss how alternative paving materials might be installed on Veterans Boulevard and their impact. What is the impact of new pavement being installed on only a portion of the roadway?

The DEIS/R fails to analyze how much it would cost to complete the rebuilding of the entire roadway from MacArthur Tunnel to Doyle Drive as compared with the current projections.

The potential savings from the elimination of the Loop Ramp and the Merchant Road Slip Ramp options, adoption of the Circle Drive option and other potential savings should be calculated. Funds may be so identified to cover the additional costs of a more complete Veterans Boulevard up grade. 5

3. The discussion in Section 5-5, Other Projects and Plans Considered in this Analysis, fails to explain how the Presidio Transit Center (page 5-5) will interface with the transit operations on Doyle Drive. 6

There needs to be more adequate discussion and analysis of the operation and effectiveness of the Doyle Drive entrances, exits, and interchanges/intersections in promoting mass transit access for Presidio visitors, residents and employees. The DEIS/R fails to address mass transit and Doyle Drive operations in any useful depth. 6 Cont

Very truly yours,

S/ Paul A. Epstein

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Epstein, P.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted. Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange and Hook Ramp options and various other refinements was selected as the Preferred Alternative (see Section 2.5).	1582
2	Exhibit 2-38 in Section 2.7 provides a cost table of all the elements. Approximately $14 million will be saved with the elimination of the Merchant Road option.	1583
3	Construction costs of the alternatives with the various design options configurations are provided in Exhibit 2-38 of Section 2.7.	1584
4	There are two structures along Veterans Blvd between Doyle Drive and the MacArthur tunnel. The Ruckman structure will be rehabilitated/replaced as part of this project to improve traffic safety at the Park Presidio interchange. The Kobbe structure was retrofitted in 1996 and currently does not meet the requirements for replacement and hence is outside the scope of this project. However, the project team is working with Caltrans to program the rehabilitation of the Kobbe structure to coincide with the replacement of Doyle Drive.	1585
5	Reconstruction of the entire Veterans Boulevard is not part of the Doyle Drive Project and therefore was not analyzed. In addition to the logical termini of the project, there are no overriding reasons to replace the entire Highway 1 facility and increase the level of impact within the park. Detailed project costs were developed for the alternatives under consideration in the EIS/R. In addition, the project has undergone extensive value engineering with the goal to reduce the overall project cost.	1586
6	The transit section of the FEIS/R was enhanced.	1587

Name: Marten G. Evertz
Organization/Agency: Self
Address: 3931B 18th Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94114
E-mail: ever12tz@yahoo.com

Comments:
It should not have taken this long. Only in SF. Spend the money to do it right. Get the road below grade. Caltrans wanted to initially circumvent the entire city with lovely raised freeways. Have them put this freeway below grade. There will have to be inconvenienced commuters for awhile no matter what. Get it right for once and for all. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Evertz, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for a below grade freeway noted.	1656

Name: Jan Fang
Organization/Agency:
Address: 2001 McAllister Street #118
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94118
E-mail: jfang88@yahoo.com

Comments:
Please keep the Letterman Pool open and make it accessible to all residents and YMCA members during the 3-year construction period. 1

I personally use the YMCA pool. I recently injured my leg during a snowboarding incident in December. I am doing Ironman Canada this summer and the water running class is perfect for rehab. YMCA members, Masters swimmers, SF residents, athletes, old and young, need the pool. Please don't close it!

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Fang, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1638

Carey Feierabend
planning, design, preservation
PO Box 150972
San Rafael, Ca. 94915

Leroy L. Saage, PE
Doyle Drive Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94120

March 31, 2006

To whom it concerns:

First off, I would like to congratulate all of the project team for the excellent and comprehensive work done to date on this complex project. The release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the accompanying technical reports is a major milestone and you are all to be commended for this achievement. That said, I would like to voice some concerns and provide specific comments on the DEIS. 1

Although the grand vision for the Presidio Parkway Alternative is exciting and interesting, I have several concerns about this alternative – namely the effect on the park resources and the costs for implementation. I am most concerned about the impacts on the Presidio's historic resources due to the number of proposed historic building removals and the effects on the cultural landscape. Since the Presidio became part of the national park system, it has undergone numerous changes and more are forthcoming. Therefore, adverse effects to the NHLD from the reconstruction of Doyle Drive must be minimized so as not to jeopardize the status of the Landmark District. This project needs to be considered within the entire District and in the context of previous and forthcoming, anticipated projects elsewhere within the Presidio. 2

Furthermore, the Presidio Parkway Alternative proposes historic building removals in several planning areas, not just one location. So not only are the building removals an adverse effect on the total NHLD, they also would have an effect on multiple historic planning areas, or component landscapes of the overall cultural landscape, which each developed on its own, under different historic building campaigns of the Presidio. In other words, the effect would not just be on the Letterman Complex or Crissy Field alone; rather, the removals would erode away at the character of the Letterman Complex, Crissy Field, and the Main Post. 3

Furthermore, in today's fiscal climate when we face the need to find funding for numerous critical public projects, I believe we must exercise prudence in selection of a construction alternative. Undoubtedly the costs presented in this analysis are vulnerable to changing market conditions and overruns, as witnessed in other major transportation construction projects in the Bay Area. The Presidio Parkway alternative is the most costly alternative (with perhaps many unknown costs yet to come based upon the need for further study), it is not the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and would have a significant adverse effect on the National Historic Landmark District. I cannot make a convincing argument as to why the Replace and Widen Alternative would not be the Preferred Alternative.

The following are specific comments on the document.

Project Costs

In the summary section, under S.5 Project Costs, the document states that the costs are "based on 2003 unit prices and are presented in 2004 dollars." However, in Exhibit S-6, the table header states that the figures presented are 2005 dollars. Please clarify this discrepancy – are the figures 2004 or 2005 dollars? If the numbers are 2004, they should be updated to reflect current market conditions as the cost of materials (steel, concrete, labor) have recently been quite volatile. Do the cost estimates include estimates for relocation of utilities and replacement costs for buildings removed? 4

More information should be presented on funding sources and the assumptions behind them. Specifically, please provide additional information as to what would be included in the category of "local funds such as bridge tolls and value pricing" which are footnoted on page 1-14. There is already public concern over the current budget crisis with the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District and the potential to raise bridge tolls in the near future to fund the operating deficit. Golden Gate transit riders are facing fare increases over the next five years in addition to cuts in service which is a disincentive to using public transportation. If this project is considering the pursuit of additional funding through bridge toll increases or a toll road fare along Doyle Drive, this information must be disclosed in the final document and analyzed accordingly. 5

Please provide more detail as to what contingencies are factored into the construction cost estimates. Although the cost estimates are conceptual, there are a lot of assumptions being made in the document based upon the results of future studies, such as geotechnical reports, hydrology design, archeological discoveries, and compensation for building removals that could significantly increase the costs of construction. Are all of these included within the existing contingency estimate? 6

Please explain whether any operating costs that would distinguish the alternatives are factored into the project alternatives. If not, please provide these figures, for purposes of comparing the alternatives, and identify the agency responsible for that maintenance item and the source of funding (such as annual operating budget by CalTrans?). In addition to the normal wear and tear of the roadway, figures that should be considered in this should include annual utility expenditures for operating the tunnels, water usage for irrigation, 7

short-term monitoring of landscape installation, ongoing maintenance of new landscaped areas, etc.

Cumulative Projects

Several projects are missing from the cumulative project list that should be included in the analysis because of their relevancy to the Doyle Drive project. These are:

Merchant Road realignment – an undertaking by the Presidio Trust, National Park Service, and Golden Gate Bridge District. The project on the west side of the Golden Gate Bridge is scheduled for construction later in 2006 and will realign the road corridor and its intersection with Lincoln Boulevard and will reconfigure the current parking alongside the road. Since Merchant Road could be affected by the Doyle Drive alternatives, this upcoming project should be included in that analysis particularly under the Replace and Widen alternative under which northbound vehicles accessing the Presidio would have to use this access route.

Golden Gate Bridge Plaza Enhancement - In the National Park Service's General Management Plan Amendment for the Presidio, a concept was set forth to improve the area, enhance scenic vistas, and redesign the plaza to allow for an enhanced visitor experience. The Golden Gate Bridge plaza is a major visitor destination and will continue to be so. Page 5-19 of the DEIS refers to future improvements at the plaza but does not include it in the list of projects in 5.5. Please include it in the list. In addition to the visual quality analysis evaluation which is presented, the EIS should discuss, for each alternative, the opportunity for accomplishing the GMPA's concept for this area in the future – how does each alternative either enhance that ability or preclude it?

8

Public Health Service Hospital Project - a Presidio Trust project currently underway consider the future of several buildings within the 42-acre Public Health Service Hospital area, located between Mountain Lake and Lobos Creek Valley on the park's southern border. A Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement was released for public review in 2004; the Presidio Trust is now studying input received and considering a range of issues and options regarding this project. One of the options being studied is a new access into the Public Health Service complex from Park Presidio Boulevard. The Doyle Drive EIS should reference this project as there could be potential cumulative effects resulting from the scope and timing for implementation of both projects, potential traffic congestions associated with construction activities, etc.

Main Post Parade Ground - The Presidio Trust is currently crafting plans to transform the historic Main Parade Ground, currently a surface parking lot, into an exciting new central gathering place for the public. Improvements to existing roadways, the addition of new sidewalks and trails, completion of the Main Post Depot, and reorganization of existing parking to meet future demand are intended to make the Main Post an easy place for visitors to enjoy. This undertaking, which is adjacent to the Doyle Drive project area and the Area of Potential Effect, will have an effect on the cultural landscape of the NHLD, as well as parking, circulation, and visual resources in the area. The scope of these proposed changes as they relate to Doyle Drive's reconstruction and the timing of

implementation of this project should be taken into consideration in the Doyle Drive analysis.

Summary of Cumulative Effects – Historic Resources

The conclusion presented in Exhibit 5-1, Summary of Cumulative Effects, for Historic Resources conflicts with the text presented in the same chapter. The table concludes there would be no impacts expected for individual structures under the two action alternatives, yet text elsewhere in the document contradicts this as follows:

"The Replace and Widen Alternative would likely cause an adverse cumulative effect on the Golden Gate Bridge historic property" (p.5-15); and,

"The Presidio Parkway Alternative would likely cause an adverse cumulative effect on the Golden Gate Bridge historic property" (p.5-18).

Likewise, the text on page 5-15 under the Presidio Parkway Alternative, Presidio Impacts, reads "The Presidio Parkway Alternative (under either option) could result in an adverse cumulative effect on the Presidio NHLD." Yet Exhibit 5-1 does not reflect this and states "no impacts expected" on the Presidio. Please correct and/or clarify. 9

Parking

Please provide more information on the proposed underground parking garage at the east end of the project area, between the Mason Street and Gorgas Avenue warehouses. There are several references to a proposed parking garage, and associate assumptions in the impact analysis. In one instance it is assumed to have a minimum of 258 parking spaces and in another instance the document states that it would supply approximately 500 spaces. Please clarify. Yet it is not clear as to who is the lead for this project, whether the costs are included in the project cost estimates, and what the cost is for this undertaking. Is this an undertaking by the Presidio Trust, the City on behalf of the Palace of Fine Arts, or the Exploratorium? Please identify or call out this proposed parking garage location on the Presidio Parkway Alternative under which it would occur (page 2-44). 10

Open Space Restoration/Water Demand

The Presidio Parkway Alternative calls for the restoration of open space and the installation of a grassy area to cover one of the tunnels. Likewise, it appears in the conceptual drawings that under the Replace and Widen Alternative, "green space" replaces the area where the Commissary, PX and associated parking lots currently are. It is not clear what these grassy areas will be and how they will be used and maintained. Are these areas to be landscape vegetation or native plant restoration? Whichever it is, there will be associated irrigation requirements for this area, as well as the other open space restoration site (at least during the initial phase of installation). Please provide the effects on water demand for these restoration projects, and clarify if the supply will come from the Presidio Trust water system or reclaimed water system. Also, who will be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of this new grassy area near the Main Post? If the presidio Trust is responsible, has this been factored into their maintenance and operating budget? 11

Environmentally Superior Alternative

This section is a very helpful summary comparison between the alternatives. However, the second paragraph on page 4-16 (beginning with "Both the Replace and Widen…") needs clarification. The statement "the Replace and Widen alternative would require the removal of approximately 13,600 square meters (146,400 square feet)" needs to be qualified that these figures are for the Detour Option, not for the No Detour Option. 12

Furthermore, in this same sentence, the statement that the building space removed would be *throughout* the Crissy Field and Letterman planning areas is erroneous and misleading. Please clarify that under the Detour Option the building removals would only be non-historic structures clustered together just north of the existing alignment (Commissary and PX). And under the No Detour Option, only one non-historic building in the Letterman Complex would be removed. 13

In addition, the square meters/square footage figures presented in this paragraph do not track with those presented in Exhibit 3-12, Buildings Temporarily Removed and Returned or Permanently Removed by Alternative (the figures on page 4-16 are greater than those shown in Exhibit 3-12). Please clarify. 14

Finally, the last sentence of this same paragraph states "The land use development plans identified in the PTMP call for an increase in building space in each of the identified planning areas, therefore the removal of building space from these areas would be in conflict with the proposed land use goals of the PTMP." The conclusion of this statement is not wholly correct. Although PTMP does allow for an increase in net building space for these planning areas, it does not preclude the option for building removal complemented by replacement construction. The removal of building space in these planning areas does run counter with the long-term goals per PTMP, but the net result would depend upon the outcome of the terms of the compensation package to the Trust for the removal of buildings as part of the acquisition of interest and right of way process. 15

Thank you for the extended opportunity to review and comment on this project.

Sincerely,

Carey Feierabend

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Feierabend

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted on a job well done.	1155
2	An enhanced description of the process for building preservation and other historic preservation efforts is included in Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R.	1156
3	The Cultural Recordation project team coordinated with the Presidio Trust regarding which buildings should be preserved. Minor alignment modifications to Alternative 5 resulted in the creation of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would require the removal of 9 buildings, see Section 3.2.6 of the FEIS/R.	1157
4	Text in S.5 was edited to address comments.	1158
5	The Authority is looking at a variety of sources for local funding. Tolls along Doyle Drive have been identified as a subject of investigation as part of the Authority's Congestion Pricing Study. The funding table has been updated to reflect the current funding programmed for the project.	1159
6	Project cost estimates are based on the technical reports and include contingencies appropriate for the level of design detail.	1160
7	Operating and maintenance figures are not included in the estimates. The maintenance agreement will be prepared to clarify responsibilites.	1161
8	The cumulative analysis presented in the EIS/R includes those projects that were implemented, planned, approved, and funded at the time the document was being prepared. Therefore, of the projects noted in the comment, the Merchant Road Realignment, Public Health Service Hospital, and Main Post Parade Ground projects will be included in the cumulative project list. Currently, the Golden Gate Bridge Plaza Enhancements are only conceptual ideas put forth in the GMPA. Without a specific plan for analysis the plaza enhancements will not be included in the cumulative analysis.	1162
9	The changes were made in Section 5.6.4 of the FEIS/R.	1163
10	The underground parking option referred to by the comment is no longer a component of the project. It is expected that unmet parking demand would be handled through the management of available supply by the Presidio Trust within the study area and in other nearby areas. Costs associated will parking are included in the project estimates.	1164
11	Restoration of the project area will be coordinated with the Trust in accordance with the Vegetation Management Plan.	1165

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Feierabend

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
12	The 14th paragraph within Section 4.5 was revised to clarify that it is the Detour Option being discussed.	1166
13	The text will clarify the buildings removed for both the Detour and No Detour options although no reference to the historic or non-historic will be made in this paragraph. The discussion of historic elements is presented in a later paragraph within Section 4.5.	1167
14	The building area removed numbers are now consistent throughout the document.	1168
15	The text in question (Section 4.5) provides a general summary of the impacts of each alternative in order to make a determination as to which alternative is the environmentally superior alternative based on the their impacts and as the commentor agrees, the removal of building space is the planning area is in conflict with the goals of the PTMP which is an impact associated with the alternative. It is correct that as mitigation for the removal of these buildings the Trust would be compensated as part of the right-of-way acquisition and would potentially have the ability to offset the loss of building space in certain areas with the creation of new buildings but it is beyond the scope of this project to determine how exactly the Trust would allocate the compensation they receive.	1169

Name: Ted Franzone
Organization/Agency:
Address: 3230 Lyon Street
City: SAN FRANCISCO
State:
Zip:
E-mail: t.franzone@sbcglobal.net

Comments:
I live at the corner of Richardson and Lyon. I want to know how either the circle or diamond options will effect my ability to get in and out of my garage? Also it is not clear to me if I will still be able to exit my house onto Lyon Street as I do now. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Franzone, T.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The refinement of Alternative 5 would not impact Lyon Street.	1632

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: JEANINE CAROLE FISCHER Date: 2/24/06

Address: HILTCO 2107 UNION ST

SAN FRANCISCO (City) CALIFORNIA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 563-0445 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: 415 321-4253 (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: Company: ARMCO (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

If an Alternate 5 option is used, it needs to be modified to preserve the capacity of Marina Blvd. so that the existing proportion of traffic flow between Bay/Marina Blvd. and Lombard/Richardson is maintained. The data provided for the PM peak are: 1

- No Build Base Year 2000 - Marina Blvd. 1820P; Richardson 2800P or 39.4% Marina Blvd. and 60.6% Richardson Ave.
- Alternate 2 Replace and Widen - Marina Blvd. 1700P; Richardson 3010P or 37.3% Marina Blvd. and 62.7% Richardson Ave.
- Alternate 5 Presidio Parkway - Marina Blvd. 1280P; Richardson 3400P or 27.4% Marina Blvd. and 72.6% Richardson Ave.

Traffic flow on Marina Blvd. is reduced from 1820P to 1280P or 29.7%. This decrease in capacity will increase the gridlock time on Bay/Marina Blvd. and Lombard/Richardson and divert commuter traffic to cow hollow and marina neighborhood streets. 1 cont

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Frischen

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Refined Presidio Parkway Alternative achieves a much closer balance of traffic between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue. Also, traffic flow strategies can implement signal timing to divert commuter traffic as needed.	1241

From: Kathleen Frost [frost.kathleen@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:52 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool

I have learned that the Presidio YMCA Letterman Pool might be closed to facilitate the planned improvements to Doyle Drive.

I live in Marin and work in San Francisco. I commute by car so that I can take my 9 year old daughter to and from school in San Francisco. As a daily user of Doyle Drive, I certainly can appreciate the importance of improving this structure. However, I am saddened by the prospect that the Letterman Pool would be closed.

My daughter and I make frequent use of the Presidio YMCA. My hobby is triathlon and I have had a great many workouts in the The Letterman Pool in connection with my training. The deep water running classes at the pool are an excellent way for injured athletes and other individuals to maintain or improve fitness while rehabilitating their injuries. My daughter participates in the excellent Presidio YMCA summer camp program, which makes use of the Letterman Pool throughout the summer. Lastly, the Presidio YMCA and the pool benefit the local community by providing an affordable facility that families, triathletes, senior citizens and others can use to stay healthy. It would be a shame to take this pool away and to force those individuals to join expensive health clubs or to give up their swimming routines. 1

I urge you to re-consider the plan to close the pool.

Thank you,

Kathleen Frost

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Frost, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1541

From: Cary Fulbright [cfulbright@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 9:47 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: Kory O'Rourke
Subject: Save Letterman Pool

I write to encourage you to not make any rash decisions that would affect Letterman Pool and possibly close it, whether for "just three years during construction", or permanently. Please reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative.

1

The Letterman Pool as run by the YMCA is an important part of the community. My younger son is on the Presidio Pirates swim team, which was formed just two years ago and already has over 50 young swimmers aged 8-16. Without this swim team, which practices seven times per week, some of these kids would be on the streets getting into trouble.

My older son swims three mornings a week as his PE requirement for his high school. My son has never been in better physical shape since he began this regimen, and gets up at 6:15am those days to swim. Other kids in his high school are now planning to swim in the morning, also.

I myself swim at the Letterman pool five mornings per week as part of the masters program. The masters program has a large membership, and has been operating for over seven years. Members range from hardcore triathletes to middle-age people like me who are swimming to keep my blood pressure down and prolong my life.

When you balance these three examples of the hundreds of similar stories of children and adults learning to swim, adults improving their health, and the YMCA providing scholarships and financial aid to many so that everyone can participate, against the slight convenience that would come from expanding Doyle Drive, I think it is clear that it would be an absolute travesty to close Letterman Pool and throw these hundreds of people out into the streets.

Regards, Cary Fulbright

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Fulbright, C.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1569

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Lynn Fuller Date: 1-18-06

Address: 2949 Divisadero St
San Francisco CA 94123
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: (415) 474 9742 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: (415) 522-4012 (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: lynndfuller@sbcglobal.net Company: Cow Hollow Assn (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Residents of Cow Hollow are greatly concerned about traffic impacts on neighborhood residential streets - especially an increase in cut-throughs due to motorists' frustration with traffic flow on major arteries. Of the proposed alternatives, it appears that some would slow down the Marina Blvd on/off-ramps, thus increasing traffic flow onto Lombard and the north-south streets to the south (up hill) of Lombard. No alternative should be selected without adequate data and, if necessary, preventive/mitigating measures such as:

- signalization of Marina Blvd to equalize traffic flow between Marina and Lombard.
- coordination with SF City agencies studying traffic counts and traffic calming measures for Cow Hollow in the blocks adjacent to Lombard. Cow Hollow's traffic calming application should be expedited to facilitate better coordination.

1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates. by email only.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: L. Fuller (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the permanent impact discussion of the Preferred Alternative in Section 3.2.8 of the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated. In order to maintain traffic during construction, a transportation management plan will be prepared prior to construction.	1023

From: Marina [marinafromsf@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2006 10:21 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Save the pool

Retain historic Letterman Poole and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway alternative. 1

The pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes.

Marina Gelman
marinafromsf@yahoo.com

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Gelman, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1534

From: Cresterr@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2006 3:38 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: aaron.peskin@sfgov.org
Subject: Doyle Drive

To: Leroy L. Saage, Doyle Drive Project Manager
Jose Luis Moscovich, Executive Director

My name is Doris Giuliotti and I've resided at 42 Richardson Avenue for the past 40 years. After reviewing the Doyle Drive plans that you kindly mailed me, I've come to the conclusion of opting for alternative two, which is replacing and widening the road in the same configuration as it is now. 1

The only reasons Doyle Drive needs replacement is to be retrofitted for earthquakes and to widen the lanes and place a center divider for traffic safety. There is no need to go through intricate landscaping and reconfiguration of the road with tunnel segments. Tunnels aren't safe, in case of accidents within or in the event of an earthquake. Of course those that submit the extravagant plans don't reside here. Being practical, alternative five would be far too costly and not meeting the needs of the residents. This can be illustrated with the plans that have been proposed for the Bay Bridge which took several years of arguments and then the work was abruptly suspended when the expenses proved to be non cost-effective. Given that the bay Area has been the slowest to recover from the recession that's overcome the country since 2000, alternative two is the most cost effective.

Beautifying the Presidio park and its views is not the purpose of Doyle Drive replacement. The bridge approach has been architecturally beautiful for 70 years and admired throughout the world as a unique landmark. The reason why I would like the road to be in the same configuration as it is now is because I don't believe that traffice should be curtailed from Marina Boulevard. Marina Boulevard residents have been whining for ten years attempting to divert all traffic to Lombard St. and Richardson Avenue, which are already above capacity with traffic from commuter cars from Marin, 19th Avenue and 280. Plus we get Golden Gate Transit buses, Muni buses, trucks, heavy rigs, noisy motorcycles which Marina Boulevard was able to have prohibited from their street. At least the cars should have the option to use any street that they wish. 2 2 Cont

Why should we be the sole victims to inherit even more traffic in front of our property? Bureaucracy has always been applied in favor of the residents that pertain to a higher income bracket and with influence in government. Everyone should share the burden of traffic---I mean everyone. We all pay taxes and it's fair that we all should share the consequences for having to live in this beautiful city.

First and foremost let's not overlook the environmental impact--noise, vibration and pollution. The noise is in proportion with the traffic. The more traffic, the more noise. Buses, motorcycles and trucks besides the traffic, emit alot of noise, especially when they're idle or come to a stop. The vibrations of traffic cause our upkeep to be very expensive having to repair cracks on our walls. The worst of it all is the pollution. I've been complaining for years to the Health Dept. and they had agreed after visiting my place that the traffic and the fumes of the cars are leaving heavy soot deposits in front and on our property. What should we say about inhaling all these toxic fumes? Mr. Tom Rivard, Senior Environmental Health Inspector told me recently that he's going to place a toxin meter to measure the level of toxicity but I haven't heard from him lately. 3 4

In closing, I would apprecaite you taking my e-mail in consideration. Let's have common sense prevail. I love the Presidio; that's why I've been living here for 40 years but let's not neglect human life. Trees can be replanted but there's no price on a human life.

Sincerely,
Doris Giuliotti

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Giuliotti, D.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 2 noted.	1598
2	Comment noted.	1599
3	The expanded traffic study did not indicate that traffic levels would be impacted from this project, thus additional noise will not be an issue.	1600
4	Without information on the location of commenter we cannot address impacts on their site.	1601

From: Edward Gleason [edgleason1@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 10:43 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle drive

We have no need to to take down SF amenities like to pool to get the flow of suburbanites back to ' pristine Marin' faster. Take out the other side first, 1

Ed Gleason San Francisco

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Gleason, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1557

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Jeanne Glennon Date: Feb 15, 2006

Address: 3606 Lyon St

SF (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ (Area Code Number) Work Phone: _____ (Area Code Number)

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

From the point of view of Crissy Field, Alt 5 is the only one that gets rid of the Wedge viaduct. Alt 2 just makes a big, ugly structure look bigger & uglier. Alt 2 would also demolish building at Marina Blvd & the Lyon St gate. Alt 2 fails to provide direct access to the Presidio. 1

On & off ramps at the Palace of Fine Arts must leave Palace Drive 2-way as neighbors need access. The diamond option seems to threaten this. 2

The slip ramp near the Toll Plaza seems to remove a bad merging problem of on & off traffic, coming ~~to~~ from the Presidio & going to the Wiggins area. 3

At Lyon St, both the circle & the diamond plans seem to demand removal of trees. Local residents need these trees to block ~~that~~ noise & pollution. Please avoid removing trees 4

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Glesnor[sic] (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference noted for Alternative 5.	1032
2	The Final Design options for the Diamond Interchange will incorporate Palace Drive modifications. Alternative 2 was not selected as the Preferred Alternative.	1033
3	The slip ramp was not carried forward as an element of the Preferred Alternative.	1034
4	It is the intent of the project to minimize tree removal. However, while some trees will need to be removed opposite the Gorgas warehouses to accommodate the Girard Road connections, the overall tree screen will be maintained.	1035

From: Tracy Hall [tracyhall_fun@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 7:49 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Construction - Letterman Pool

I understand there is some forthcoming construction and that the Presidio Lettermen Pool could close during this period.

As a member of the Presidio YMCA and community, I would like to voice my concern and belief that the pool should remain open during construction. Myself, as well, as many others, including children in the area, older adults, and those rehabilitating from injury all use and rely on this pool. Other substitutes are simply too far, require special parking situations and costs. Please consider these points in keeping the pool open. 1

Thank you.

Tracy A. Hall

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Hall, T.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1515

Name: Jason Hann
Organization/Agency: Comsys Information Technology Services
Address: 114 Granada Drive
City: Corte Madera
State: CA
Zip: 94925E-mail: iceehann@hotmail.com

Comments:
I have been a resident of SF for over 6 years our recent move to Marin has changed my commute to include Doyle Drive. I am an avid supporter of Alternative 5 and feel that this would be better in safety as well as aesthetics. It would also create better access to areas of the Presidio, Marina, and SF that I frequently visit. If you are indeed collecting votes, I am a definate yes on Alternative 5 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Hann, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1661

From: Shelly Harrington [shelly_harrington@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 4:22 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Please keep Letterman Pool open

I'm a local triathlete that uses this pool for training. It's critical to my training because I can easily bike and run after swimming, and this is not nearly as possible anywhere else. Please make sure to retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users. The pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes. 1

Thanks,
Shelly Harrington

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Harrington, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1522

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Betty Ann Harrison aka Ann Harrison Date: Feb 15, 2006

Address: 2536 Chestnut Street

San Francisco (City) CA (State) 94123-2406 (Zip)

Optional Information

Alternative 2 is the better alternative.

Home Phone: ____ (Area Code Number) Work Phone: ____ (Area Code Number)

E-mail: blueskybah@yahoo.com Company: ____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Brief Comparison of Alternative 2 to Alternative 5 which I do not approve

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Alternative 2 – Replace & Widen is my approval vote with either construction staging options utilized and selected in DEIS options

Reasons are: Cost is less than Alternative 5 by over 200 million $165

: Less disruption to existing buildings in Presidio and S.F. Wildlife and foliage (Fewer historical building destroyed

On Doyle Drive : Views of S.F. National Cemetery are left intact / S.F. bay

: Views give drivers visual, emotional relief views so road rage is not encouraged, Open sky throughout

: Traffic flows will be about the same in and out of S.F. with Alternative 2, controlled growth for Presidio

Traffic is not diverted more to Lombard which is what Alternative 5 would do as well as increased noise –

: With terrorist threats an open existing Alternative 2 is better than risk to family / friends trapped in tunnels if Alternative 5 is considered.

: Alternative 2 has the feel of a relaxed, cozy, existing community commute to and from S.F.

: I don't want to be stuck in tunnels going into or out of S.F. when using Golden Gate Bridge. (Why don't you drive through the Broadway Tunnel at around 8:00–8:30 on a weekday

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: B. Harrison (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1045

208 Willard North
San Francisco, CA. 94118
March 20, 2006

Gary Kennedy 85

Mr. Leroy L. Sager, PE, Project Mgr.
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th floor
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Subject: Doyle Drive Project - Selection of Alternate on Which to Proceed

Dear Mr. Sager:

Thank you for giving us advocates for a new and better Doyle Drive another month (ending March 31) to study this very lengthy and extremely comprehensive document, and to make our comments. Certainly my own comments will have been improved by this additional month in which to study the DEIS, and I submit them to you herewith for your and your staff's consideration, and hopefully for your agreement with them.

Your files may include a letter from me on this subject that I sent several months ago, in which I endorsed Alternative #2 over several other alternatives that were being considered at the time. After studying the DEIS, I wish to reaffirm my support for Alternative #2 (over Alternative
1 #5), and for several more reasons than were mentioned in my earlier letter. The last sheet in this letter is a tabulation consolidating some of the most important data, which are taken from various places in the DEIS.

Following are my reasons for endorsing Alternative #2 (no detour) over Alt. #2 (with detour) and over any of the four listed variations of Alternative #5:

1. Least cost - Alt. #2 (no detour) is about $146 million cheaper than the least-expensive option of Alt. #5, when the Merchant Ramp option is included.

2. Alt. #2 (no detour) has the shortest construction time (40 months). Alt. #5 would take 15 months longer. With Alternative #2 (with detour) we would be spending about $33 million over the no-detour option only for a temporary benefit, and the construction time would be 11 months greater, so I think that Alt. #2 (with detour) is not a good deal and I would recommend against it. The attached tabulation shows other factors in which the no-detour option is clearly the better one.

3. Alt. #2 (no detour) would necessitate the removal of only one building. Alt. 5 (any option) would take 13 buildings. The "Circle" option of Alt. #5 would also take the swimming pool, which has been vigorously protested by its users.

4. The Alt. #2 (no detour) option woukd only take 2.2 acres, which is about one-fifth of the acreage that would required by any of the Alt. #5 options.

5. The amount of material (soil and rocks) to be excavated for Alt. #2 (either option) is less than one-fifth of the material that would be excavated for Alt. #5. I will discuss this further later in this letter.

6. Alt. #2 (no detour) would displace only five current job positions, vs. 48 or 68 jobs displaced under Alt. #5.

7. Alt. #2 requires a lesser width of roadway than Alt. #5, and also has 12-ft. widths for all 7 traffic lanes. Under Alt. #5, four of the seven traffic lanes would be only 11 ft. in width, with the other three lanes being 12 ft. wide.

8. The viaduct plan for the eastern part of Doyle Drive (under Alt. #2) enables the land underneath the freeway to be used for other purposes, such as parking of cars or possible extension of the Crissy Marsh. Under Alt. #5, the land under the freeway in that area is not available for any other purpose than vehicular travel. Also, having a viaduct (instead of a ground-level freeway) facilitates movement of people and vehicles between the areas on either side of the freeway.

9. Exhibit 2-37 (pages 2-62 and 2-63) seems to indicate that there will be fewer short-term road closures under Alt. #2 than under Alt. #5.

10. Alt. #2 would permit the use of moveable median barriers (or dividers) in order to facilitate rush-hour traffic, as is done on the Golden Gate bridge. This could not be done under Alt. #5.

11. Alt. #2 includes no signalized intersections, instead using overpasses or underpasses where roads cross. Alt. #5 has at least two signalized intersections, which will tend to slow up traffic.

12. Alt. #5 will create a parking space deficit of 118 places as opposed to only one parking space lost under Alt. #2 (no detour) or 20 spaces lost under Alt. #2 (with detour). Alt. #5 would take up many of the present parking spaces on the west side of the Palace of Fine Arts.

13. The Alt. #5 "hook ramp" would require removal of a row of eucalyptus trees at the southwest corner of the Park Presidio-Doyle Drive Interchange. Alt. #2 seems not to require their removal.

14. The profile drawings for Alt. #2 indicate a constantly-decreasing elevation for all vehicles proceeding eastward (although the grades differ), with a maximum grade of 4.00 %. The profile drawings for Alt. #5 also indicate a constantly-decreasing elevation for a vehicle traveling eastward (max. grade 4.25%) except at the eastern end, where Drawings P-3 and P-4 indicate a rise of about 15 feet and then a decline of about 10 feet, which may be an overpass at Halleck Street. Over time, this "blip" in the roadway profile at the east end will require vehicles to work harder to get over the "blip" and thus add to air pollution. The "blip" will also tend to slow up traffic (particularly trucks). Doyle Drive should not be encumbered with traffic impediments such as this "blip", and Alt. #2 has no such "blip" (i.e. short down-and-up or up-and-down) throughout its length. I understand that traffic speed is expected to be slower for Alt. #5 than for Alt. #2, and that is another reason why Alt. #2 should be chosen. We should remember that most people who will be driving this traffic connector will be intent upon getting from SFto Marin County or vice-versa, as rapidly as reasonably possible, and I think that the highway design chosen should be the one that helps them best to achieve that objective.

15. Referring back to item 5, page 3-149 (third paragraph) states: "in soft soil areas, such as the Main Post tunnels, the soils are inadequate for supporting the tunnels and backfilled soil cover," and that piles may be needed to support the tunnels and their loose soil-and-rocks overburden. To me, it seems ludicrous to go to such extraordinary measures as to scoop out a huge amount of soil and rock so that it can be piled on top of a pile-supported tunnel in order to create an artificial hill that will have a tunnel through it. How effectively could such a loose soil-and-rock hill be compacted?

(Item 15, continued)

3 Cont How would it perform during an earthquake? I believe that the whole idea of such unnaturally-created hills on top of tunnels is completely unnecessary, wasteful of taxpayers money and even potentially dangerous. Again, Alternative #2 would obviate the need for pile-supported tunnels and unnecessary excavation and backfilling. Another aspect of this is that the excavation contemplated under Alt. #5 may include a lot of rock, for which blasting would probably be required. Such blasting may be a disturbance to those who live and work in the Presidio and neighboring areas.

4 16. I believe that there should be better access to the Presidio Main Post from the freeway than is presently planned. At this late date in the "game", I will have the temerity to propose that an off-ramp be provided for eastbound freeway traffic to Halleck Street, and that an on-ramp be provided from Halleck Street to westbound freeway lanes. This would be a proposed addition to Alternative #2.

After all of the above hopefully-well-considered comments, it may seem inappropriate to close this letter with what I would call a "nit-pick". But I was curious regarding the use of the word "parkway" in reference to Alt. #5 and "freeway" in reference to Alt. #2. CalTrans provided me with the following definitions from the AASHTO's California Highway Design Manual:

> Parkway: an arterial highway for non-commercial traffic with full or partial control of access and usually located within a park or ribbon of parklike development.
>
> Freeway: a divided arterial highway with full control of access and with grade separations at intersections.

5 Strictly speaking, then, Alt. #5 should not be called a parkway since it would carry commercial traffic (trucks and buses) as well as automobiles. But neither can it be called a freeway since it would have signalized intersections instead of grade separations at two locations. Alt. #2 fits the freeway definition very well, of course. But "parkway" is a "warm and fuzzy" word that best describes Alt. #5, even if it is used slightly inaccurately.

Thank you for your attention to and consideration of these comments. I would be pleased to discuss them with you with you or any member of your staff, if you wish.

Sincerely yours -

Enclosure: Tabulation entitled "Comparison--"

Winchell T. Hayward
Retired Electrical Engineer
*Member of the California Heritage Council and of the Fort Point & Presidio Historical Assocation

*The opinions expressed herein are my own - I am not speaking for these two organizations.

CCw/enc: Gary Kennerley, PBQD, PE
Craig Middleton, Exec. Director, Presidio Trust
Michael Bolan, Planner, Presidio Trust
Brian O'Neill, Supt., GGNRA
Rick Foster, Nat. Park Service, GGNRA
Redmond Kernan, Ft. Point & Presidio Historical Association
Whitney Hall, " " " " " "
Gary Widman, President, California Heritage Council
Dianne Rowe, Secretary , " " "

Comparison Of Some Significant Factors for Alt. 2 & 5 – Doyle Drive Project
(Data Shown in Various Tables of DEIS)

	Alt. 2 No Detour	Alt. 2 With Detour	Alt. 5 – Diamond-Loop Ramp	Alt. 5 – Diamond-Hook Ramp	Alt. 5 – Circle-Loop Ramp	Alt. 5 – Circle-Hook Ramp	Merchant Ramp (add to Alt. 5)
Estimated Cost	$552.8 Million	$585.6 Million	$701.2 Million	$690.0 Million	$701.2 Million	$689.9 Million	$8.6 Million
Number of Bldgs. Lost	1	4	13	13	13 (incl. swim pool)	13 (incl. swim pool)	4 (residences)
Loss of Acreage	2.2 acres	1.5 acres	11.4 acres	11.4 acres	11.1 acres	11.1 acres	1.7 acres
Construction Time	40 months	51 months	55 months	55 months	55 months	55 months	
Addl. Parking Spaces Needed	1	20	118	118	118	118	
Cubic yards of Soil & Rock Removed (Amt. returned as fill):	54,000 (31,400)	59,000 (40,600)	309,000 (309,000)	309,000 (309,000)	309,000 (309,000)	309,000 (309,000)	
Employees Displaced	5	36	48	48	68	68	
Overall Roadway Width (Min. roadway width)	124 ft. (106 ft.)	124 ft. (106 ft.)	148 ft. (128 ft.)	148 ft. (128 ft.)	148 ft. (128 ft.)	148 ft. (128 ft.)	
Lanes & Widths	2-12' wide lanes	2-12' wide lanes	4-11' lanes 3-12' lanes	4-11' lanes 3-12' lanes	4-11' lanes 2-12' lanes	4-11' lanes 3-12' lanes	

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: W. Hayward (032006)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 2 noted.	1394
2	Alternative 5 was selected as the preferred alternative.	1395
3	Alternative 5 addresses specific environmental issues to provide a natural environment on top of the tunnel structure. The embankment on top of the tunnel can be engineered and designed to perform well during the design earthquake such that no significant damages occur. Because the material and the placement will be specified, the properties and compaction of the embankment can be controlled and monitored for conformance during construction.	1396
4	Alternative 2 was not selected as the preferred alternative. Presidio access is provided at Girard Road in Alternative 5.	1397
5	Comment noted.	1398

From: Jody Heyman [jdstrat@pacbell.net]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:53 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool

I have been a member of the Y for many years and have used the pool both for personal use as well as for my family. It is a true community where the instructors and lifeguards make it a point to know who comes to visit. They all know when I have an injury because I spend more time in the water. They know our routines!

It is also a place for so many people to enjoy at all hours. at 5:30am I have taken advantage of the masters swim program. If I come after 8, I crowd in the lanes with other swimmers trying to get our workouts in before heading to work. By 9:30, the seniors take over and we have to be patient until their class is finished. It's a pool that is in constant motion being used by both the young and old. We would be devastated not having access to this wonderful community. 1

The pool and the facilities need updating, but we beg of you NOT to close such an important part of this community.

Thank you for your time,

Jody E. Heyman

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Heyman, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1544

From: Heyman, Mel [mheyman@peds.ucsf.edu]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 10:18 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman pool

To Whom It May Concern:

I wish to let you know how important it is that the Letterman pool (Presidio YMCA) remain open. My family, including my wife, three boys, and I, has used the pool for many years. It remains an important resource for the community. And it is a popular training area for many swimmers and tri-athletes of all ages! 1

I also would appeal to you to keep the pool open during construction. (Otherwise, the pool will be closed for the anticipated 3 years of construction.)

Please feel free to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Mel Heyman, MD
Professor of Pediatrics
UCSF

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Heyman, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1553

Name: Erik Honda
Organization/Agency: San Francisco Citizen
Address: 183 Henry Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94114E-mail: ehonda@acalanes.k12.ca.us

Comments:
Hello Mr. Saage:

Please please please approve the much superior Presidio Parkway plan, and let's get started ASAP. For 36 too many years we've been waiting to get rid of an ugly, dangerous blight on some of the loveliest urban landscape in the entire world, and replace it with something we can all be proud of, whether we're entering the city acorss the bridge or standing in our beautifully restored Chrissy Field. The Parkway plan will do just that, while the replace and widen plan would be a step backward that generations of San Franciscans would regret for years and years to come. 1

Thanks for your work on this.

Erik Honda

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Honda, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1657

From: Peggy Hope [p.hope@att.net]
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2006 2:48 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: adding my voice

I am a senior citizen who has discovered the relief of relative mobility by spending three mornings a week doing water aerobics in the Presidio YMCA pool. My arthritic bones are crying out against the proposed demolition of said pool. So many older people, like myself, have benefited from this program. And it is a joy to see the young children being introduced to the water in the smaller pool. Then there are the accomplished swimmers doing laps, keeping themselves fit and respecting us duffers for trying to do the same. I know that thousands of people avail themselves of this wonderful place. Having been born in the Presidio, I have a special feeling for the Presidio and its historic buildings. I love what George Lucas did with his project. It preserves the integrity of its surroundings. Also, the location is most important as I do not drive a car. 1

There must be some other way of protecting the over-zealous drivers who must speed there way into our city by way of Doyle Drive, without destroying a vital part of our Presidio and the YMCA organization. But if you must do it, then please find the funding to build a replica of our pool, somewhere near the gym, before destroying the present one. 1 Cont

Thank you for your time.

Peggy Hope

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Hope, P.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1527

From: Funston@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 1:29 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive Project
To : Leroy L. Saage / doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org

Re : Doyle Drive

My name is Anne Howson. I live at 3258 Lyon Street between Richardson Ave. and Bay St. Obviously, the work that your group is doing is of great concern to me. It will greatly affect the quality of life in my neighborhood. I have to admit that I view your work with a great deal of mistrust. This mistrust stems from the fact that about two weeks after we moved into our home on Lyon Street a great many very large and quite beautiful trees that stood directly across from our home providing a screen from the traffic noise and auto emissions on Richardson were simply cut down. This was done to accommodate the creation of a bus stop on Richardson, which, for the past two years, has NEVER EVER been used for a bus. I am sure that everyone would agree that the foliage, which was put in as replacement for the trees, is way less than adequate and, I might add, far less than was promised in the "Planting Plan" sheet # 52 of the "Lyon, Richardson, Gorgas Improvement Project". The chip ground cover, in particular, is an unsightly mess, which just collects tourist detritus, dog poop, and overflow parking when there is an event at the Palace Theater. The only reason that a healthy patch of Canadian Thistle has not taken hold in the "Richardson Triangle" is that my husband Jeffrey goes out and digs it out with a shovel about twice a month.

Proposals for Doyle Drive
Obviously a great deal of thought and time and MONEY has been put into the proposal so far. It is clear to me the "Parkway" alternative is preferred by everyone on your team. The presentation in the booklet and on the posters that were created makes it abundantly clear that we will get some version of the "Parkway" no matter what input comes from the public. The "Parkway" shows vision and respect for the beauty of our city, but, you must get back to the drawing boards in designing the flow of traffic on the city end of the project. Clearly, you are pressured to have an easy access to the Lucas Film garage, but NOT at the expense of the YMCA swimming pool. PLEASE! So, eliminate the "Circle Drive" right off the bat. The "Diamond Option" drawings in the booklet are unclear as to how it will work vis a vis Lyon St. We need a better idea and better drawings and a clear written explanation of what it is you are trying to accomplish with these two options. 1

In general, I think your ideas for the Gorgas off ramp and the stop lights to get to Marina Blvd. will force most drivers to flow into the city on Richardson. In my mind it is not acceptable to do so. Traffic should flow into the city equally onto Richardson and Marina Blvd. This could be done with SYNCed STOP LIGHTS on Marina Blvd. The current access to the Presidio (and the Lucas garage) at the city end of the project is adequate. It seems equally important to consider how many people want to get to the Palace of Fine Arts and the Marina Green. 2

Please try to get Michael Painter to work more with the Lyon Street homeowners whose quality of life should be of concern in this planning process.

Sincerely
Anne Howson

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Howson, A.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Circle Drive option was not selected as the preferred alternative. The YMCA swimming pool will not be removed as part of the preferred project.	1595
2	Stop lights on Marina are currently beyond the scope of this project.	1596
3	Comment noted.	1597

REC'D MAR 2 9 2006

TO: Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
FROM: Jeffrey M. Howson
SUBJECT: Doyle Drive Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report
DATE: March 26, 2006

I reside at 3258 Lyon Street, San Francisco, CA 94123, i.e at the eastern edge of the Doyle Drive project, and accordingly many of the following comments will focus on that portion of the project.

It is important to consider the implications of the traffic flow to and from the eastern boundaries of the Doyle Drive project.

- The reality of traffic flow east of Doyle Drive is that it will diffuse through the individual streets of the Marina and Cow Hollow neighborhoods, because once traffic is backed up on Doyle Drive going east or Lombard Street/Richardson Avenue going west, drivers will seek alternate routes. 1
- Accordingly, the issue requires the planning of the Doyle Drive project so that traffic will diffuse sensibly and equitably among the streets of the neighborhoods involved.
- The current plans make Marina Boulevard an unattractive eastward exit relative to Richardson Avenue, because it is necessary to go through several stop lights on the planned extension of Girard Road. We request that you reduce the number of stop lights on Girard Road or otherwise reconfigure the Girard Road pathway to Marina Boulevard to make it as attractive to drivers as Richardson Avenue. This is a necessary prerequisite to creating an effective traffic corridor that will continue through Marina Boulevard. 2
- The current plans make Marina Boulevard an unattractive westward access to Doyle Drive, because the on-ramp to Doyle Drive is reduced at one point to a single lane. Modify this on-ramp in some way to provide for two lanes for its entire length. 3

It is necessary to re-think both the Diamond Option and Circle Drive Option.

- The Circle Drive Option should be rejected because it destroys a perfectly good swimming pool building that many other people and I use regularly. 4
- A potential difficulty with the Diamond Option is impeding the goal of improved eastward flow of traffic onto Marina Boulevard described above. Please review the Diamond Option carefully with this issue in mind. 5
- You must provide a detailed drawing of exactly how the Diamond Option will interact with or intrude upon Lyon Street and proceed through the so-called Richardson Triangle. This is a very limited space, and real care must be taken to design something that really works. Page 2-49 of the DEIS/R states that "East of Letterman garage, Gorgas Avenue is a one-way street and connects to Richardson Avenue with access to Palace Drive via a signalized intersection at Lyon Street. Palace Drive would operate as a one-way road and would be separated from Lyon Street." 6

Will Lyon Street continue to be a two-way street with westward access to Richardson Avenue or become a one-way street north to Bay Street? (Alternative 5 Presidio Parkway Diamond Option Layout page L-4 in Appendix B of the DEIS/R implies to me that Lyon Street becomes one way north to Bay Street.) What will happen to the existing trees in the area between the two lanes of Lyon Street and in the Richardson Triangle that provide us some relief from the noise and pollution from Richardson Avenue? I request the Michael Painter continue to work on this issue and meet with the affected residents of Lyon Street. 7

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Howson

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Refined Presidio Parkway alternative achieves a balance of traffic flow between Marina Boulevard and Richardson Avenue more akin to the anticipated No Build Condition. Some alleviating of traffic is forecast to occur with the introduction of Girard Road access into the Presidio, attracting local traffic to and from destinations in the Presidio and points south that are not available in No-Build Alternative.	1467
2	The design refinements that were made as part of the preferred alternative have resulted in a much closer match to the existing balance of traffic between Richardson and Marina. This has been confirmed by the additional traffic operations analysis included in the Traffic Operfations Addendum, October 2005 and summarized in Section 3.2.8 of the FEIS/R including Exhibits 3-30 and 3-31.	1468
3	Marina Blvd. is working at capacity as one lane. Right of way should be preserved to enable two lanes in the future.	1469
4	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative, therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1470
5	Comment noted.	1471
6	Detailed drawings of all the design alternatives are provided in Appendix B of the FEIS/R. The Preferred Alternative is detailed in Section 2.5.1 of the FEIS/R.	1472
7	Lyon Street and the trees will not be altered by this project.	1473

From: Eduardo Hueso [ehueso@ilm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 9:24 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Retain Letterman Pool

Dear Sirs,

I work in 1 Letterman Dr. and use the Letterman pool regularly. Swimming is the most effective therapy to my back injury and the number one recommendation from my doctors.
Anyone who has been to the Letterman pool knows the impact it has on the community's physical and mental health.

From serious athletes to seniors, hundreds of people benefit from this facility.
To the best of my knowledge there is no local alternative to the Letterman pool.

I kindly request that the pool and parking associated with it is kept and kept active during the construction of the Doyle Drive project.

1

Thanks you,

Eduardo Hueso
Software Engineer
Industrial Light and Magic

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Hueso, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1558

From: marilyn hughes [marilynh94123@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2006 10:37 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool

I am a low-income 70 year-old living in senior housing at Lyon and Lombard Streets. I suffer from arthritis and spinal stenosis. The convenient location and reasonable fee at the Letterman pool enable my mobility. Please find an alternative to the Circle Drive option under the Parkway Alternative so that the Letterman pool can remain in operation. Thank you. 1

Marilyn Hughes

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Hughes, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1535

From: William humnicky [whumnicky@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 9:49 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Please don't close the pool in the Presidio!

Dear Sirs:

I am a resident of the Presidio and am saddened to learn that the Presidio pool may be closed (even temporarily) due to construction on Doyle Drive.

Please save the pool for water running and swimming workouts for many years to come and for all the seniors and the children who take water exercise/swimming classes. The pool is a valuable resource for the community. Yes there are other pools in San Francisco, but, they are much farther away, do not have easily accessible free public parking and can be much more expensive to use. 1

Thanks to training I did in the pool, I was able to recover from a leg injury.

Keep the pool open permanently, even during construction.

Sincerely,

William Humnicky
whumnicky@yahoo.com

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Humnicky, W.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1514

From: Mary Ingham [mbeckman@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:53 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: PResidio pool

Please save the Presidio Y pool! 1

One of many athletes using it regulary!

Mary Ingham

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Ingham, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1532

Name: Chris Jackson
Organization/Agency:
Address: 821 Marina Blvd.
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: chrisjackson@earthlink.net

Comments:
Comments for Alternative #5:
I would like to the design team for their hard work and thoughtful design. In an era where it is very easy to be negative on government and government projects, it is really great to see something produced that is a true benefit to the community. Listed below are a few reasons why I like Alternative 5 for the Doyle Drive project.

#1 SAFETY! The current configuration is terrible for pedestrians and children. Cars sometimes come off Doyle drive speeding at 40-50 miles per hour. They come off the drive at that speed, around a curve with limited visibility, into a residential neighborhood. It is terrifying to have young children who could run into the road and be hit by drivers who can not stop in time at those speeds. It is also impossible to cross Marina Blvd at the assigned crosswalk at Baker street. The cars are coming to fast to stop by the intersection and don't bother. Alternative 5 is FANTASTIC. By having traffic for Marina Boulevard exit on the right and come to a stop before driving onto Marina, cars are moving much slower by the time they get to the homes, kids and crosswalks. This is terrific. 1

#2 Improved views. It is great to see people put so much thought into one of our countries national treasures. The restoration of Crissy field is something this city can really be proud of. Thousands of people enjoy it every day. My family and I are some of those people. Unfortunately, the current Doyle drive does not add to that pleasure. It is clear to anyone who has visited the Presidio that Doyle drive is an eye sore towering above the park. If we have to have a major highway running into our city it should at least try to be as pleasing as possible to the eye. The designers of Alternative 5 have clearly put a lot of thought into this. Their design of putting a tunnel in part of the drive is terrific. It connects the whole Presidio to Crissy field visually and allows guests to walk from one to the other without having to go under the current structure. The current drawings really seem to mitigate the visual negative impact of this major road. It would be such an improvement to have Crissy joined visually to the rest of the Presidio. 2

My only suggestion is that there is a lot of concrete around and under Doyle drive. If some of that space could be smoothed out for roller bladders, roller hockey, basket ball etc. that would be a great bonus. The area has lots of park and walk areas and it would be great fun to have a play ground for roller hockey and basket ball players. Since the asphalt already exists it would just need to be smoothed a bit. 3

Anyway thank you for the good work. Sincerely, Chris Jackson

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Jackson, C.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1658
2	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1659
3	Comment noted.	1660

From: JJacobiEsq@aol.com
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 3:30 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Reject circle drive option under the Parkway alternative, save Letterman Pool

The Letterman pool is a wonderful community resource. Unlike the fancier facilities in the new Letterman arts complex, the Letterman pool is open to the public for a reasonable fee, and is well managed by the Presidio YMCA which I am a founding member. I try to use the pool once a week and observe many others, especially families with children, getting healthy exercise in this facility. Please do whatever you can to work Doyle Drive construction around this valuable San Francisco resource. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Jacob, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1545

Name: Martina Jones
Organization/Agency:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
E-mail: martina@stanfordalumni.org

Comments:
I've attempted to review the Citizen's Guide to Doyle Drive improvements. Alternative 5 appears to have many more permanent and far reaching affects on the Presidio (loss of land, loss of buildings, loss of facilities) than other alternatives. As an athlete and frequent visitor of the Presidio, I wish for as little of the existing park to be permanently changed, in particular the closure of the YMCA pool. Many families and athletes -- all of whom are extremely respectful, regular users of all the Presidio's facilities -- take advantage of the land that would be "removed" from circulation and the pool that would be closed. Please don't change something that the most active and enthusiastic residents of this city love and use. 1

Respectfully,
Martina L. Jones

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Jones, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1644

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Jo Kennedy Date: Feb 15

Address: 2648 BAKER ST

SF

City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: Area Code Number Work Phone: Area Code Number

E-mail: Company: Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

I am a resident of Cow Hollow. We deserve a parkway but my concerns are the effects on the marsh and the problems that might arise in the construction of the tunnels. 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Kennedy (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted. The FEIS/R adequately addresses these concerns. Please review the "Implementation and Monitoring Plan" under the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures in Section 3.4.2 for additional information.	1036

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: ROBERT W KIRBY JR Date: 2·26·06

Address: P O BOX 911

BERKELEY, CA 94701
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: 510-834-3309 (Area Code Number) Work Phone: N/A (Area Code Number)

E-mail: N/A ~~Company~~: PRESIDIO NATURAL RESOURCES — REGULAR VOLUNTEER (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

THANK YOU FOR THE THOUGHTFUL EFFORTS OF ALL PARTIES TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES FOR BRINGING THIS ROADWAY UP TO CONTEMPORARY STANDARDS — AND TO BE SENSITIVE TO ITS LOCATION IN A UNIQUE NATIONAL PARK.

1 I URGE THAT ALL RIGHT-OF-WAY LANDSCAPE PLANTING BE DONE WITH SAN FRANCISCO NATIVE PLANTS. NOT ONLY ARE THESE BEST ADAPTED TO LOCAL CLIMATE, BUT THEY'D GIVE ALL VISITORS THE MOST AUTHENTIC EXPERIENCE AVAILABLE.

THESE PLANTS ARE READILY AVAILABLE THROUGH THE PRESIDIO NATIVE PLANT NURSERY.

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Kirby

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Planting will be in accordance with the Trust Vegetation Management Plan which gives strong consideration to native plantings.	1240

→ MAIL THIS FORM(to be received by march 1, 2006, TO:

DOYLE DRIVE DEIS/ COMMENTS
c/o San Francisco Co. Transportatio Authority

COMMENT CARD

100 Van Ness Ave., 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

REC'D MAR 21 2006

Name: Ted Kitt Date: 3-15-06

Address: 2801 Broadway
S.F. Ca. 94115
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 563-8809 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: cell (415) 218-0370 (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: Company: retired (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

The object of the necessary change is obviously safety to avoid the headons previously suffered, and installed without delay. The cost should be lower without compromise for environmental & aesthetic appearances.

1

Thus if the present number of lanes is sufficent for the traffic expected, then a barrier between the two opposing lanes should be analyzed for feasibility.

2

The innovative proposed concept is to enclose it with see through newly developed stronger than previously known plastic glass like material for the short run area that is the danger area for existing accidents.

3

This look could be more enhancing than the present appearance of the Doyle Drive scene. The scratchess material would have a see through modern scope pleasing to eye & without wet windshields to the traffic.

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Kitt (031506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1825
2	The present number of lanes (6) is only sufficient with the reversible lanes.	1826
3	The project aims to be designed to be functional as well as complementary to the surrounding environment with the materials currently available.	1827

From: george.kovacs@gm.com
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 12:30 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Safe the Presido Pool

To whom this may concern:

Please retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period (if it happens) to ensure access to all users. 1

The pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes!!! To loose access would be a hardship for many community users.

Thank you very much!

George Kovacs

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Kovacs, G.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1554

From: mark [landerinsf@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 6:03 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: garypetersen@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Doyle Drive Parkway

Thank you for designing a wonderful parkway and solution to the Doyle Drive reconstruction.

I very much favor the new Parkway design located at surface level and including two tunnels. 1

It will reunite the Presidio Park with Crissy both visually and topographically, and is well worth the extra investment for a project that will have far-reaching and long-term effects on this beautiful quarter of San Francisco.

Thank you,

Mark Landerghini

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Landerghini, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1588

From: William Poy Lee [vdragon@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 7:58 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: bbowman@sfchronicle.com
Subject: Doyle Drive Tunnel Should Have Natural Air and Sun Openings to the Surface.

Dear Road Worriers -- regarding the underground tunnel option of the new Doyle Drive, please include open air breaks to the surface along the tunnel route. 1

While recently visiting Paris, we became stuck in slow-moving traffic in the tunnel highway between the airport and Paris. It was like being stuck in a slow-death gas chamber as the accumulating fumes of the commute traffic started to seep into our taxi and into our lungs. The fans in the ceiling were not of much use. I was never more glad than to get free of that tunnel.

I am not against the tunnel, but as a 4th generation San Franciscan, I would only ask you to provide not only mechanized air ventilators (which can break down by the way), but intermittent openings that allow natural air as well as sunlight to flood down into the tunnel. I'll miss the beautiful drive to the bridge, but this looks inevitable. 1 Cont

Thanks -- William Poy Lee, Esq.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Lee, W.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Tunnel ventilation will be developed in the detailed design. A goal of the ventilation design will be to minimize tunnel Operations and Maintenance costs. The use of natural light and ventilation will be used as much as possible, but the proposed system must satisfy the necessary fire and life safety requirements.	1572

From: Jody Llewellyn [youngjody@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:01 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Maintaining Letterman Pool

Dear Doyle Drive Committee --

Understanding that you have a public hearing upcoming, I was compelled to put in my resident's two-cents on the matter. I respect and understand the need to improve this critical artery -- no doubt it will result in increased quality-of-life for all in the area with traffic flow, noise reduction, and, of course, safety. Clearly, your team has put many years and much study into the options and alternatives available to move forward.

It has also come to my understanding that one impact would be the 3-year-or-longer closing of the historic Presidio YMCA Letterman pool. This pool is a cornerstone of the community in the area, and if there is any way to consider keeping it open, you would be doing the community a major service. 1

On any given day, all walks of live come through Letterman's doors to enjoy this valuable (and rare) community asset -- swim lessons, seniors, rehab patients who take the water running classes taught by Presidio Sport + Medicine, and athletes.

There really are not many other options in the area -- not that are accessible on a walk-in basis to the community, and to YMCA members at a reasonable cost. The other pools belong to more expensive gyms, far-flung and limited-hour city pools in completely different parts of town, and the Embarcadero Y, which would be very difficult to access for those who are used to driving to the Presidio, and I am sure the Embarcadero could not absorb the volume of the Presidio Pool Community.

It would be sad to see this pool abandoned for a long period of time, especially in its historic condition. 1 Cont

I encourage you to work with residents and the Y community to find a way to keep it open and accessible.

Thanks,
Jody Llewellyn

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Llewellyn, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1543

From: Britt Loughlin [brittloughlin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:20 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: 'Jody Llewellyn'
Subject: Please don't close letterman pool!

Hello,

I just learned that there is a chance Letterman Pool in the presidio could be closed for up to 3 years during the extension of Doyle Drive. If there is any way to avoid closing the pool I would strongly recommend it. The YMCA has done an incredible job of maintaining this historical landmark which is used for recreation and fitness across all ages from children taking their first swim lessons to adults participating in Masters. There are classes that the injured and elderly take advantage of which help them recover and stay active. It is not only that so many people would lose out on the benefits of having the pool but there are also the jobs that will be lost to consider. Dedicated swim coaches, life guards, etc. 1

I have to believe there is a way to keep the pool open and I appreciate your giving it consideration.

Britt N. Loughlin
Executive Search and Staffing Consultant

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Loughlin, B.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1570

Name: Cheryl Loukas
Organization/Agency: Buckland & Taylor Ltd.
Address: 101-788 Harbourside Drive
City: North Vancouver
State: BC
Zip: V7P3R7
E-mail: cloukas@b-t.com

Comments:
I was trying to download the fact sheet, but it was not available. Do you know when the project will be advertised for bid? Has a design firm been chosen to design the bridge? 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Loukas, C.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	It is anticipated that construction would start in 2009. The selected method of project procurement, either traditional design-bid-build or design-build will dictate when the project is advertised for bid. The preliminary design will be completed by a combination of Autority's selected consultant and Caltrans.	1646

From: Lara Lum [lara_lum@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 9:04 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Save Letterman Pool -- public comment

As an active user of the Presidio Letterman Pool, I would like to voice a comment.

Many people -- YMCA members, day use people, swim lesson students, and youth groups -- use this pool. YMCA also sponsors fund raising events here. 1

It is integral to the neighborhoods surrounding the Presidio, in addtion to the people and families who live in the Presidio.

There are very few pools open year round that are affordable and family friendly. Many of the pools are in very expensive gyms, such at Club One or Pinnacle.

The location is convenient and offers parking. It's also close to open space, so a combined workout can be done -- swimming, running, biking. Many triatheletes use these facilities.

This pool is a great asset to San Francisco and Letterman Pool should be retained and the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative rejected. 1 Cont

While the Doyle Drive Replacement project is underway (3 yrs), adequate, safe, convenient parking for Letterman Pool should be provided for all pool users.

Your consideration of this input is greatly appreciated.

Lara Lum

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Lum, L.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1539

From: Amy Lyons [amy@goldmanfund.org]
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 2:36 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Comments on Doyle Drive Project

March 31, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage
Doyle Drive Project Manager
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:

I am writing to reiterate the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund's strong preference for the Presidio Parkway design (Alternative 5) for replacing Doyle Drive. Given our building's close proximately to Doyle Drive, I would also like to advocate for several construction options that would address our concerns regarding permanent and temporary construction noise. 1

With regard to permanent noise impacts, the predicted traffic noise level of the Rebuild and Widen alternative of 74dB at Goldman's Building 211 [DEIS, Exhibit 3-53, page 3-183] is significantly higher than the federal Noise Abatement Criteria, and is unacceptable in a national park setting.

The Activity Categories in Exhibit 3-48 are too broad and we believe set too high a traffic noise threshold for a national park. The 66dB predicted for the Parkway in Exhibit 3-53 is obviously much better, although we question that high a prediction when traffic will be buried in a capped concrete box below the bluff edge. 2

We support the objective of the National Park Service Director's Order 47, at DEIS, page 3-171. It should be the noise objective for the Project.

Regarding construction noise impacts, given our building's proximity to the Project, we feel it should be listed in the same "Sensitive Areas" [DEIS, page 3-178] as the Crissy Field Center. Since all our activities are noise sensitive, noisy construction in our area would need to be outside office hours. The noise of pile driving is of particular concern, and the EIS should commit to the quietest available techniques. The mitigation plans referred to on page 3-197, "alternate construction methods may be used to reduce the noise caused by pile driving and other equipment near sites that are noise-sensitive," is inadequate. It is our position that the statement require the most stringent noise reductions. This could be accomplished by using the phrase, "…shall be used….," instead of "… may be used." 3

We have similar concerns about traffic and construction vibration [DEIS, page 3-197, et. seq.], and their mitigation. The EIS only speaks of effects on historic buildings. It inadequately assesses vibration impacts on Building 211 and its proximity to the project. 4

Last, we also support the principles of Context Sensitive Design. We support this process of continued improvement to the Parkway design involving governing agencies and affected institutions and public groups. The designs in the DEIS must be the starting point for the Project, and not the end point. 5

We hope that the commission will recognize that the Presidio Parkway and construction alternatives outlined above are the best options for all parties involved.

Sincerely,
Amy Lyons
Executive Director

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Lyons, A.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1623
2	Alternative 2 was not selected as the preferred alternative. The statement that the NAC is set too high is not reflective fo the process that was used to develop the criteria. The NAC is a balance by FHWA between what is desirable and what is reasonable. The Director's directive has been used as a noise objective, and was considered in the assessment of noise on this project.	1624
3	All residential units were given the same level of "sensitivity" as the Crissy Field Center. From the reviewer's comments it would appear that the building in question is used as an office building although the noise sensitive activities that take place within this building were not identified. Consistent with all alternatives, the construction noise impacts will be reduced to the extent possible using equipment and methods that will be identified in the contract documents. Stringent noise reduction statements will be included in the construction plans.	1625
4	Traffic vibrations will generally not be noticeable during the operational phase of this project. During construction, vibration impacts will be limited by the use of low-impact construction methods and equipment. This concept was spelled out in detail in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.5. The impacts on Building 211 will be consistent with those of other buildings of its type, location and age and will be monitored during construction to ensure that the potential for damage is minimized.	1626
5	Comment noted. See Section 2.2.3 for a discussion of Context Sensitive Design and Section 2.5.1 for a discussion of the Preferred Alternative.	1627

Name: Laurence Maller
Organization/Agency: WA Thomas Co
Address: 2356 Pacheco Bl
City: Martinez
State: ca
Zip: 94553
E-mail: laurence@wathomas.net

Comments:

I prefer option 5 with the diamond option. I like the direct ramp from southbound into parking and northwestbound onramp. You shouldn't cave to the NIMBY's ... the freeway has to be extended those few blocks along Richardson directly onto Lombard, otherwise the same near-gridlock status will never change. Perhaps as a 4-lane bus/HOV-only median strip (at grade, separated by k-rail barriers) with one diagonal overpass onto Lombard? 1

$800 million for 1.5 miles of road? Wow. Don't let the special interests in the City delay this project and drive up its cost. Safety first, capacity second, cosmetics third. 2

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Maller, L.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1629
2	Comment noted.	1645

Mark Manning
2340 Pacific Ave #103
San Francisco, CA 94115
2/6/06

Doyle Drive DEIS/R - Comments,
C/O SF County Transportation Authority,
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor,
San Francisco CA 94102.

Letterman Pool Closure

Dear Sir,

I am saddened to hear that the County Transportation Authority would even consider the temporary or permanent closure of the Letterman Pool during the proposed construction on Doyle Drive. This pool is the only local facility for many families, children and athletes in the area. As a member of one of the top Adventure Racing teams in the Bay Area, my team uses this pool for training and swim practice on a regular basis. This kind of training allowed us to represent San Francisco at the USARA National Championships in 2005. Without this facility training for future events will be much more difficult. 1

I am sure that with the large underground parking facility across the street from the pool at the Lucas Center, it is possible to retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users. This pool is a great asset to the community and would be a very difficult loss to overcome if it were to close. Please reject any option outlined in Doyle Drive DEIS/R that doesn't provide adequate protection to the continued use of the Letterman Pool. 2

Yours Sincerely,

Mark Manning.

RECD FEB 07 2006

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Manning

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1233
2	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1234

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: TOM McAteer Date: 2/15/06

Address: 2937 Broderick

SF (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ (Area Code Number) Work Phone: _____ (Area Code Number)

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Alternative 2 looks good to me.
This is what I vote for 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: T. McAteer (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1041

From: Liv Ingrid Mellemseter [livi@liaaen.name]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:43 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool (Presidio YMCA pool)

Hello,
I just found out that there is a chance you will be closing the Letterman Pool (Presidio YMCA pool). This was a big surprise, and I have to say I am very disappointed that you have not posted information about this or the upcoming hearing at the pool's bulletin board. Wouldn't that ensure that all users of the pool get a chance to let you their opinion. Please make sure such a posting is done.

Well, anyway, I found out through a friend and this is what I think about it:

* I urge you to keep the pool.
* I urge you to keep it open during construction of the roads.
* I hope that you find another option than the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative. 1
* During the construction period, it should be possible to continue to offer parking for pool users.

I love going to the pool. I am a 30 year old women. When I go there (to waterrun 2-3 times a week) I get to spend time with people both my age, younger, older and much older. It's a fantastic community, and a safe place to stay fit (the only way for me and many others with injuries or age limitations). And not to forget the kids and teenagers that come there.

Have you been to the pool lately!?? It is heavily used by both families and children, elderly and althletes!

KEEP IT - AND KEEP IT OPEN!

See you on the 15th...

Regards,
Liv

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Mellemseter, L.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1538

REC'D MAR 29 2006

Amy Meyer
3627 Clement Street
San Francisco, CA 94121
Phone 415-221-8427 Fax 415-752-2777

March 27, 2006

Leroy L. Saage, PE, Doyle Drive Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102 Re: Doyle Drive Draft EIS

Dear Lee:

I was a member of the Presidio Trust board of directors for six years. For much of that time, the design of the Letterman Digital Arts buildings was under review. In particular, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation wanted to improve the connection between the Presidio and the Palace of Fine Arts. They wanted the LDA structures to frame the view of the Palace for passers-by, and so the connection to the Palace would enhance the pleasure of people in the park in front of the LDA buildings.

A major obstruction to the view of the Palace of Fine Arts is the old army pool building. It has historic significance but it is not architecturally outstanding. I personally support the Circle Drive option at Richardson Avenue, which would mean removal of the pool. The Diamond Interchange is a freeway off ramp which counters the Presidio parkway's character, whereas the Circle Drive is designed to moderate the speed of traffic. The Diamond Interchange also adds a lane and two shoulders to the width of the project at a point where the roadway should narrow to give respect to the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio. 1

The present pool facility is poorly located relative to the main building of the YMCA. It is too far away to be used in tandem with its athletic facilities or to be administered efficiently. Replacement of the pool near the YMCA gym would seem to be a win for everyone. Y members would no longer be driving between the gym and the pool, thus reducing local Presidio traffic in the national park and parking demands on the Presidio Trust. The Y would have a more efficient, modern facility in a location convenient to its members. I would think that the old pool could be removed near the end of the Doyle Drive construction period, allowing time to first construct the new pool. 1 Cont

Sincerely,

Amy

Amy Meyer

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: A. Meyer (032706)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Circle Drive Option noted. The Diamond Option was selected as part of the Preferred Alternative so the pool will not be impacted by this project.	1484

From: ber8832@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 9:53 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Support for Michael Painter design options

I wish to add my support to the alternative designs for Doyle Drive prepared and modified by Michael Painter and would expect that Mr. Painter's substantial contribution to the project by properly acknowledged in the final EIS. 1

As someone who has been engaged in various elements of disaster planning, I wish to oppose any design that includes any elevated roadways. While I can appreciate that modern engineering design can mitigate potential failure of such roadways caused by major earthquakes, the risk and increased cost are not justified if such road raising is otherwise unnecessary. 2

The parkway design of Mr. Painter provides for adequate movement of vehicles to and from the Golden Gate Bridge (in this regard, the inclusion of modern traffic management systems on the drive is strongly recommended), reestablishes an important connection between the Presidio and the Palace of Fine Arts with a Circle Drive design at the south end, minimizes negative impacts with a hook ramp at the intersection of Highway 1, minimizes negative impacts for Presidio neighbors, and provides parkway users with a wonderful visual connection with the Presidio and its environs; one of San Francisco's jewels.

The memory of the tragic impacts of Loma Prieta on elevated road structures, coupled with the consequent dramatic rebirth of the Embarcadero and Octavia Boulevard in San Francisco, and the Mandela Parkway rejuvenation in Oakland serve as excellent examples supporting the Parkway design for Doyle Drive.

Our extraordinary natural environment and our magnificent urban structures deserve no less.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Bernard L. Meyerson

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Meyerson, B.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Michael Painter is acknowledged in the Final EIS/EIR.	1603
2	The terraine in the project corridor requires a combination of bridges, tunnels and at-grade sections to blend the facility into its physical setting in the Presidio, part of the stated purpose of the project.	1604

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Nyla Riccinelli Moore Date: Mar. 2, 2006

Address: 3150 - Steiner St.

San Francisco, Ca. 94123
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 9 2 5094 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: (415) cell - 699 - 5094 (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: nylap@sbcglobal.net Company: Retired Teacher (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

1 As an owner in the area for over 22 year and a native San Franciscan, I don't feel alternatives 2 and 5 would be beneficial to the residence in this area. San Francisco (area wise) is a small city and ~~we~~ all of this is encouraging pollution and excess traffic. This excessive construction will benefit the working commuters who live out of San Francisco

I am for Alternative(1) with what is programmed for safe measures by the year 2004.

Sincerely—
Nyla Riccinelli Moore

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Moore

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 1 noted.	1231

March 10, 2006

Ronald J. Mulcare
655 Marina Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94123

Leroy L. Saage, PE, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments
c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments

Dear Mr. Saage:

The following are comments regarding the DEIS/R for the Doyle Drive Project which comments are now due by March 31, 2006.

Marina Boulevard is located easterly of the Project alternatives described in the DEIS/R. The properties adjacent to Marina Boulevard are zoned Open Space, Park and Residential by the City of San Francisco. The Master Plan and the policies of the City require that traffic be diverted away from properties so classified.

In general, I support Alternative 5 over the other Alternatives in the DEIS/R but wish to make the following observations. 1

The DEIS/R Alternatives provide for a maximum of one (1) lane of traffic onto Doyle Drive from Marina Boulevard and for a maximum of two (2) off of Doyle onto Marina. As part of the DEIS/R process, public hearings and meetings have been held at which representatives of the Transportation Authority have confirmed these numbers of lanes, which are the numbers of lanes presently providing access to and from Doyle and Marina. Any increase in the numbers of these lanes, i.e., one lane onto Doyle from Marina and two lanes off of Doyle onto Marina, will cause a substantial impact to the properties adjoining Marina Boulevard and their users and residents consisting of, for example, noise, dust, fumes, vibrations and safety hazards, which have not been assessed in the DEIS/R. Thus, any increase in the numbers of lanes providing access between Doyle Drive and Marina Boulevard would require a new DEIS/R. 2

/

Additionally, other than reconnecting Doyle Drive and Marina Boulevard as described above at Lyon Street and Yacht Road where they currently connect, the DEIS/R Alternatives do not include any changes, construction, reconstruction or any other alterations to existing Marina Boulevard. Thus, a new DEIS/R would be required for any alteration whatsoever to Marina Boulevard. 3

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Mulcare

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Mulcare (031006)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1829
2	The traffic operations analysis is used to determine the project volumes and hence the number of lanes needed.	1830
3	The project does not propose any changes to Marina Blvd. east of the Lyon St intersection.	1831

→ MAIL THIS FORM(to be received by march 1, 2006, TO:

DOYLE DRIVE DEIS/ COMMENTS
c/o San Francisco Co. Transportatio
Authority

COMMENT CARD

100 Van Ness Ave., 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: M Adrienne Myers
88 Toyon Dr
Fairfax, CA 94930-2127

Date: FEBRUARY 23, 2006

Address:

City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 - 453 - 0298 (Area Code Number) Work Phone: (Area Code Number)

E-mail: Company: (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

I would like to state my support for Alternative #2 "REPLACE AND WIDEN" in regard to the DOYLE DRIVE PROJECT 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Myers

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1243

Name: William Neil
Organization/Agency: Golden Gate Triatholon club
Address: 131 Congo Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94131
E-mail: rwneil@gmail.com

Comments:
There are simply not enough Swiming pools in San Franciso to afford the closure of the Letterman Pool (Presidio YMCA pool) for any extended time period.

Every pool in this city is already over-booked at the times most people can use them. Even early mornings and late evenings are frequently packed with swimmers. 1

Please seriously consider options that would ensure that the Letterman Pool continues to be available during construction on Doyle Drive.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Neil, W.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1641

Name: susan Nickerson
Organization/Agency:
Address: 273 20th avenue
City: san francisco
State: ca
Zip: 94121
E-mail: sf1sue@aol.com

Comments:
Please do not close the presidio pool. It is a vital part of our community. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Nickerson, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1635

From: j.m.errun.sf@att.net
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 9:41 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive Alternatives

Dear Sir:

I would like to add my name to the list of the public asking for the retention of Letterman Pool. There must be a way to accomplish a safe Doyle Drive without destroying an extremely valuable recreational facility. The total community and its visitors should be considered not just the automobile drivers driving dangerously fast through.

1

My family from tri-athletes to the very young have spent many essential exercise and pleasurable hours at the pool. We have healed after surgeries, after the death of a spouse, and made many lasting friendships at the community of Letterman Pool. We know firsthand that San Francisco is very lacking in affordable aquatic resources for the users of all ages and incomes.

San Francisco was once the home of the world's largest pool, Fleishhacker Pool at the end of Sloat Boulevard near the San Francisco Zoo. Imagine a pool almost as long as the Empire State Building is tall that was Fleishhacker. Maybe that was a bit much, but the community has lost too many recreational areas to the power of the automobile. The site of Fleishhacker is now a parking lot for the zoo. Now several of your alternatives show Letterman Pool wiped out by the automobile. As the girth of the public grows, the pool and recreation sites diminish their dimensions. This is not a justifiable sacrifice for the convenience of the automobile. Please do not have a narrow focus of what is good for the public all parts of the community need to be considered.

Mitigation must follow if this plan destroys the pool. Money from the project must be provided for a pool of equal size and convenience before the new road is completed.

1 Cont

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jane Nurre

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Nurre, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1548

Name: Kevin O'Brien
Organization/Agency: Palace of Fine Arts League, Inc.
Address: 3301 Lyon Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: kevin@palaceoffinearts.org

Comments:
The Diamond Option and the Circle Drive Option at Palace Drive creates access problems to the Palace of Fine Arts Theatre for patrons and delivery vehicles. These options eliminate needed parking spaces. Also, it is unclear if tour bus zones will need to be moved and if access to the theatre stage door and loading door will be impacted. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: O'Brien, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Parking removed (temporarily or permanently) due to project construction will be replaced as part of the mitigation and transportation management plans.	1686

Name: Megan OConnor
Organization/Agency:
Address: 2585 Union St, #5
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: moconnor13@yahoo.com

Comments:
I love the Presidio and I agree that Doyle Drive needs an overhaul. However, I ask the the Letterman pool stay open and continue to have safe parking during the construction time. The pool is used by many many people on the neighborhood and there is not alternative so it should remain open and accessible. 1

Thanks,
Megan

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: O'Connor, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1640

From: Sheila O'Connor [slaveryoco@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 9:20 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Keep Letterman Open!

I am writing to request that the Doyle Drive Committe consider the following:

1) Retain historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative, and
2) Retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users.

1

I have a young daughter and we joined the YMCA specifically to teach her pool safety and how to swim. Without the Letterman Pool, we will be unable to do so. The city is much better off with a pool than another highway.

Kind Regards,
Sheila O'Connor

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: O'Connor, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1523

From: Elias Olson [ewvo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 11:42 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive Extension

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing to you to voice my opinion that the historic Letterman Pool be retained and the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative be rejected. I also strongly urge the pool remain open during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users, and further, that you retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during this period. The pool is heavily used by families and children, as well as runners and triathletes, and its operation needs to be continued for the sake of our community, particularly in light of the limited number of swimming pools we have in San Francisco. 1

Thank you in advance for considering my comments in your decision making process.

Sincerely,
Elias Olson

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Olson, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1556

From: scott panter [mailto:sspanter@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:04 PM
To: Lee_Saage@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive

Mr. Leroy Saage
Project Manager DEIS/R Comment
c/o S.F. Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Ave., 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage:
My wife and I are residents of the Cow Hollow area of San Francisco, and we have concerns regarding the Doyle Drive upgrade. We agree with those changes advocated by Ms. Patricia Vaughey of the Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants, as follows:

a. The exit from Doyle to Marina Blvd. be retained as depicted in Alternative #2.

b. The entrance from Marina Blvd. to Doyle be retained as depicted in Alternative #2.

c. Eliminate the slip ramp from Gorgas with outlets into Lyon and Francisco.

d. All city land between Richardson, the Bay, and Doyle remain the same as on 2/1/2006. The same for Lyon St.

If these changes cannot be made, we prefer Alternative #2. 1

In addition, since the stop signs have been installed on Marina Blvd., we have noted a considerable increase in traffic on Greenwich St., which is the location of our residence. Sometimes it takes 3-5 minutes to get out of our driveway in the morning. Any modification of Doyle that further restricts or impedes traffic flow onto Marina Blvd. will exacerbate this situation, which is unacceptable. 2

Sincerely,

Scott Panter and Barbara Ellington

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Panter, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comments noted.	1612
2	Comments noted. Based on the traffic analysis, traffic conditions along Marina Blvd are expected to be similar as the existing conditions for the Preferred Alternative (see discussion of Preferred Alternative impacts in Section 3.2.8).	1613

From: Debbie Parrott [dparrott@iconexhibits.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 2:38 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool

I recently heard through my triathlon friends that the accessibility of Letterman Pool may be compromised soon due to a construction project in that area. This would be a major loss to the numerous families, children and competitive athletes who rely on the pool for recreation and training.

I am a triathlete and am recently pregnant and the one sport that supposed to be safest form of exercise for pregnant women is swimming. I personally would be crushed if the pool was shut down. 1

I and my athlete friends so appreciate the facility and those who run it. Please do not close Letterman Pool.

Debbie Parrott

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Parrott, D.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1560

From: HPatrick [HPatrick@GMSSR.COM]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2006 1:00 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive Project

As a fourteen-year commuter over the Golden Gate Bride, I am very interested in the Doyle Drive Project and am extremely surprised at the lack of general publicity over the intended "upgrades". I only happened to learn about it while switching channels, and stumbled on it on a news report on the Ten O'Clock News about two days ago. I am sure that other long-term commuters would be just as interested.

Quite frankly, it is the traffic situation on the surface road where the new Lucas Arts Center has been built that needs greater attention. After the introduction of FastTrack, the commute traffic flows extremely swiftly through the Bridge, but more often than not, the surface street with the traffic lights, cannot cope with the volume of traffic, and the traffic is backed up to almost the Bridge. I generally get to the Bridge at about 8.33 a.m. every morning. The situation is a little better before this time.

As far as I am concerned, the surface of Doyle Drive is much better than the 101 from Marin County. It really seems to be quite a waste of money to replace something that, in my view, is in far better condition than the approaches to Doyle Drive. 1

I shall be forwarding more detailed comments on not only the project, but the need for the project.

From: HPatrick [HPatrick@GMSSR.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 1:20 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Comments on Doyle Drive DEIS/R

As a fourteen-year commuter into San Francisco from Marin County, I would like to comment on the proposals for the reconstruction of Doyle Drive.

I strongly support the "No Build" Alternative 1 - Exhibit 2-23 on page 2-33, with any appropriate seismic and other necessary upgrades.

However, as it appears that the decision to rebuild Doyle Drive has probably already been taken and it is a matter of merely selecting what alternative should be adopted, I would opt for Alternative 2, Replace and Widen, Exhibit 2-26 on page 2-39. I strongly disapprove of, and oppose, Alternative 5 - Presidio Parkway, with the tunnels, Exhibit 2-29 on page 2-45. My detailed comments are as follows: 1

ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO BUILD, Exhibit 2-23

Contrary to one of the reasons for justifying the proposals, the surface does not need attention and it is in a far better condition than much of the 101 in Marin Country along which I travel. Widening the lanes, in my opinion, will probably not reduce accidents, but increase them. It is not the width of the lanes that create accidents, but the speed at which motorists drive. If the speed cannot be controlled in the narrow lanes, then I dread to think what the speeds will be with wider lanes. (A shoulder will certainly be required to cope with the increased number of crashes.) Despite the much publicized accidents when they do occur, the accident rate on this stretch of road is minimal. There is rarely a backup due to an accident, and during my fourteen years of commuting, there has rarely been a backup due to an accident. There have been more accidents on the 101 up to San Rafael than on Doyle Drive.

Additionally, should this Alternative not he adopted, a number of the mature trees lining the existing Doyle Drive will need to be felled. Leaving Doyle Drive as it is, with seismic upgrades as necessary, will have the least impact on the historic buildings, and nature and character of the Presidio. If not, the beauty of the Presidio will be lost forever.

ALTERNATIVE 2 - REPLACE AND WIDEN - Exhibit 2-29

My comments relating to Alternative 1 apply to this Alternative as well. However, as mentioned in my opening statement, if it is the intention to proceed with the reconstruction, then Alternative 2 appears to be the best alternative.

ALTERNATIVE 5 - PRESIDIO PARKWAY, WITH TUNNELS Exhibit 2-29

This proposal is the worst choice and should certainly not be adopted.

This alternative clearly affects the nature and character of the existing Presidio and it original historic purpose. There will be unacceptable destruction of buildings and the environment. [The foregoing comments also apply to Alternative 2.] The DEIR itself acknowledges the adverse effects of this proposal, citing 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(1). Once the Presidio grounds and buildings are destroyed, they will be gone forever. They cannot be replaced or reintroduced. I would imagine that all of the tourists to San Francisco visit the Bridge, and most also visit Marin Headlands, Muir Woods and the rest of the National Golden Gate Recreational Area. The views from Doyle Drive are probably unequaled - the beauty of the Bridge and the Bay when traveling North, and the view of the Bay stretching across to the East Bay, the Presidio itself with its beautiful green landscape, buildings, and National Cemetery, as well as Pacific Heights and the rest of the City, must create a memorable and lasting impression on any tourist. To build Doyle Drive with two tunnels, will destroy this image completely, and is just preposterous. 1 Cont

Apart from the aesthetics, building two tunnels in an area of possible liquefaction leaves a lot to be desired. I certainly would not want to be in one of these tunnels when the next earthquake strikes. Additionally, as previously mentioned, I envisage that with wider lanes, motorists will speed through the tunnels (that's if there is no backup during the rush hour which has been created by the reconfiguration of the surface road/traffic lights to accommodate the Lucas Arts Center). A pile-up in the tunnel leaves the possibility of one vehicle catching fire, and the rest of the cars being involved in a fiery crash inside the tunnel, with the occupants of the cars not just being injured but burned to death.

I do hope that the entities involved will consider the Alternatives very thoroughly and carefully before proceeding with any reconstruction of Doyle Drive.

J. H. Patrick

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Patrick, H.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted.	1552
1	Comment noted.	1551

From: Rebecca Pearson [Rpearson@hansonbridgett.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 10:34 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Retain historic Letterman Pool

To Whom It May Concern,

As a triathlete and a woman living in a household with a 6 year old, I can personally attest to the need to retain the Letterman/Presidio YMCA Pool. There is a shortage of affordable, quality pools in San Francisco where athletes can train and children can engage in healthy activity.

While we support needed improvements to our transportation system, our household would be at severe loss if the Letterman/Presidio YMCA Pool was closed, even for a short period of time. We request that alternatives be considered that will accommodate regional transit needs while maintaining an important recreational facility in San Francisco. 1

Please keep San Francisco athlete- and kid- friendly by:

* Retaining historic Letterman Pool and rejecting the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative.
* Retaining adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users.

I am unable to attend the hearing on February 15, 2006, due to a prior commitment. I would appreciate it if you would take my feedback into consideration when making a decision.

Regards,

Rebecca S. Pearson
Associate
Hanson Bridgett Marcus Vlahos Rudy LLP

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Pearson, R.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1526

From: marcia peterzell [marcia.peterzell@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 2:25 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Comments on the proposed elimination of the Letterman Pool

Friends,
I am writing today in order to plea with you not to tear down the Letterman Swimming pool. I believe the YMCA will survive and they would build another pool with money that you would give them. However, Letterman is a true relic of the old San Francisco which is diminishing in space. The pool Works and to tear it down in order to expand Doyle Drive is putting convenience today rather than saving history of significance for the future. 1

Please reconsider this plan.

Retain historic Letterman Pool (Building 1151) and reject the Circle Drive option under the Parkway Alternative.

With hopes,
Marcia Peterzell

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Peterzell, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1537

RECD APR 03 2006

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
MARIE ANNE BURKHARD MARCH 21, 2006	Marie Anne Burkhard	2940 BRODERICK ST.	—	346-7203
DAVID BARCROFT 3/21/06	David A Barcroft	2934 BRODERICK ST	dbarcroft@sidewalk.com	576-4401

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
Karen Goss	[illegible]	2830 Broderick St	kbgoss@pacbell.net	441-6225
Richard W. Goss	[illegible]	2830 Broderick St	rwgoss@pacbell.net	"

RECD APR 03 2006

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
MARIE ANNE BURKHARD MARCH 21, 2006	Marie Anne Burkhard	2940 BRODERICK ST.	—	346-7203
DAVID BARCROFT 3/21/06	David A Barcroft	2934 BRODERICK ST	dbarcroft@sidewalk.com	576-4401

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
Karen Goss	[illegible]	2830 Broderick St	kbgoss@pacbell.net	441-6225
Richard W. Goss	[illegible]	2830 Broderick St	rwgoss@pacbell.net	"

2934 BRODERICK

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
C. GRIFFITH TOWLE	C Griff Towle	2850 BRODERICK		(415) 931 2798
DORINE WOODS TOWLE	Dorine Towle	2850 BRODERICK	drtowle@earthlink.net	

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
Alejandra Longarini-Gutierrez	Alejandra Longarini-Gutierrez	2844 Broderick St		292-6113
Albert Gutierrez		2844 Broderick St		292-6113

PETITION

We petition the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Department of Parking and Traffic, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, CalTrans and the Federal Highway Administration, and all other Federal, California and San Francisco authorities involved in the design, approval and implementation of the Doyle Drive, as follows: (1) Implement Alternative #2 (Replace and Widen); (2) If not, make the following changes on Alternative #5 (the parkway plan alternative): (a) The entrance into Marina Boulevard from Doyle Drive to remain with the same configuration as exists as of 2/1/2006; (b) The northbound entrance from Marina Boulevard to Doyle Drive to be changed back from one lane to two lanes; (c) Cut off the Gorgas slip from Gorgas into Lyon and Francisco Streets; and, (d) Lyon Street and the land that belongs to the Recreation and Park Department and the City and County of San Francisco between Richardson and Bay to remain as is.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
JACK BERTGES 3/31/06	Jack Bertges	2820 BRODERICK	JBERTGES@SBCGLOBAL.NET	415-273-2054
JoAnn Bertges 3/31/06	JoAnn Bertges	2820 Broderick	jnbertges@sbcglobal.net	415-474-5272

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Petition 12 Signatures

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Elements 1, 3, and 4 have been incorporated into Alternative 5. Element 2 would require the taking of additional park land.	1457

Leroy Saage, Project Manager
Project Manager DEIS/R COMMENT
%S.F. County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Ave.#26th Floor
S.F.,Ca.94102

REC'D MAR 3 1 2006

Dear Mr. Saage,

As a neighbor(merchant) of their Marina/Cow Hollow of S.F.,
I am requesting that you change Alternative 5(Prededio Parkway) in the following four ways:

1. That the Marina Blvd entrance from Doyle Drive be retained to the existing configuration and as of 2-1-2006 as it is depicted in Alternative#2(Replace and Widen)
2. The entrance from Marina Blvd into Doyle Drive be retained to the as of 2-1-2006. As shown in the Replace and Widen(Alternative 2)
3. Cut off the Slip ramp from Gorges that travels into Lyon and Francisco Streets
4. Lyon Street and all City Land between Richardson,Bay and Doyle remain the same as it was on 2-1-2006.

If all of these changes cannot be made. then I prefer Alternative#2. (Replace and Widen)

Thank you,

cc. Marina - Cow HOllow Neighbors and Merchants. page 3

PETITION

WE ARE PETITIONING THE MAYOR, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,S.F.COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC, S.F. MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ,RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO,CAL TRANS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,AND THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ON ALTERNATIVE 5(THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) FOR DOYLE DRIVE.THEY ARE -(1) ENTRANCE INTO MARINA BLVD FROM DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED TO REMAIN WITH THE SAME CONFIGURATION AS EXISTS AS OF 2-1-2006.(2) THE NORTHBOUND ENTRANCE FROM MARINA BLVD INTO DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED FROM ONE LANE INTO TWO LANES.(3) CUT OFF THE GORGES SLIP FROM GORGES INTO LYON AND FRANCISCO STREETS.(4)LYON STREET AND THE LAND THAT BELONGS TO THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BETWEEN RICHARDSON AND BAY TO REMAIN AS IS. IF THESE CHANGES CANNOT BE MADE, WE WANT ALTERNATIVE 2 OUR PREFERRED PREFERENCE.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
Brooke Sampson 3/29/06	for [illegible]	2645 Filbert St	brookecampson@yahoo.com	415 921 6267
Chris Bradley	" [illegible]	2611 Filbert St.		415-776-7814
Neil Russach 3/29/06	Neil Russach	2651 FILBERT ST		415-931-4464
Terrance M Daughtry 3/29/06	Neil Russach	2655 Filbert St		415-567 1721
Kerri Zaldastani	[illegible]	2699 Filbert St.		415 929 1800
CAROL COPSEY	Carol Copsey	2761 Greenwich St SF 94123		415/567-8525

PETITION

WE ARE PETITIONING THE MAYOR, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,S.F.COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC, S.F. MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ,RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO,CAL TRANS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,AND THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ON ALTERNATIVE 5(THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) FOR DOYLE DRIVE.THEY ARE -(1) ENTRANCE INTO MARINA BLVD FROM DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED TO REMAIN WITH THE SAME CONFIGURATION AS EXISTS AS OF 2-1-2006.(2) THE NORTHBOUND ENTRANCE FROM MARINA BLVD INTO DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED FROM ONE LANE INTO TWO LANES.(3) CUT OFF THE GORGES SLIP FROM GORGES INTO LYON AND FRANCISCO STREETS.(4)LYON STREET AND THE LAND THAT BELONGS TO THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BETWEEN RICHARDSON AND BAY TO REMAIN AS IS. IF THESE CHANGES CANNOT BE MADE, WE WANT ALTERNATIVE 2 OUR PREFERRED PREFERENCE.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
3/1/2010 GEOFF WOOD	G. Wood	2758 BAKER ST.	GGWOOD@AOL	563-5983
Grace Blakely	Grace Blakely	2725 filbert		
KRIST Kristi Jake	[illegible]	2719 "	KRIST@redcap.com	921-3606
Don Mouhead		2715 Filbert st. SF		921-7280
Diana Mayer	Diana J. M	2865 Broderick St. SF		94123
CHRISTINE CULLENS	Chris E. Cullens	2710 Filbert St. San Francisco, CA.		94123

5641116659

PETITION

WE ARE PETITIONING THE MAYOR, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,S.F.COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC, S.F. MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ,RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO,CAL TRANS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,AND THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ON ALTERNATIVE 5(THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) FOR DOYLE DRIVE.THEY ARE -(1) ENTRANCE INTO MARINA BLVD FROM DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED TO REMAIN WITH THE SAME CONFIGURATION AS EXISTS AS OF 2-1-2006.(2) THE NORTHBOUND ENTRANCE FROM MARINA BLVD INTO DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED FROM ONE LANE INTO TWO LANES.(3) CUT OFF THE GORGES SLIP FROM GORGES INTO LYON AND FRANCISCO STREETS.(4)LYON STREET AND THE LAND THAT BELONGS TO THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BETWEEN RICHARDSON AND BAY TO REMAIN AS IS. IF THESE CHANGES CANNOT BE MADE, WE WANT ALTERNATIVE 2 OUR PREFERRED PREFERENCE.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
3/30/06 Michael J McNamara	MJ McNamara	2774 Filbert St		
MELISSA McNAMARA	Melissa McNamara	2774 Filbert St		
George Stephan	G St	2901 Baker	owner Presidio Mart	
Suzanne Russack	Suzanne Russack	2651 Filbert	S.F. Ca. 94123	
Mary W. Grames		2901 Broderick St.	S.F. 94123	
Barbara T. Stuart		2736 Filbert St	94123	
3/30 Dixon R. Harris, JR		2700 Filbert St		94123

PETITION

WE ARE PETITIONING THE MAYOR, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,S.F.COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC, S.F. MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ,RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO,CAL TRANS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,AND THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ON ALTERNATIVE 5(THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) FOR DOYLE DRIVE.THEY ARE -(1) ENTRANCE INTO MARINA BLVD FROM DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED TO REMAIN WITH THE SAME CONFIGURATION AS EXISTS AS OF 2-1-2006.(2) THE NORTHBOUND ENTRANCE FROM MARINA BLVD INTO DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED FROM ONE LANE INTO TWO LANES.(3) CUT OFF THE GORGES SLIP FROM GORGES INTO LYON AND FRANCISCO STREETS.(4)LYON STREET AND THE LAND THAT BELONGS TO THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BETWEEN RICHARDSON AND BAY TO REMAIN AS IS. IF THESE CHANGES CANNOT BE MADE, WE WANT ALTERNATIVE 2 OUR PREFERRED PREFERENCE.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
(3/30/06)				
MICHAEL G. MUELLER	Michael G Mueller	2710 Filbert St, SF 94123		(415) 775-4528
PEGGY BLAIR	[illegible]	2700 FILBERT ST, SF 94123		3/30/6

REC'D MAR 31 2006

PETITION

WE ARE PETITIONING THE MAYOR, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,S.F.COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC, S.F. MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ,RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO,CAL TRANS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,AND THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ON ALTERNATIVE 5(THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) FOR DOYLE DRIVE.THEY ARE -(1) ENTRANCE INTO MARINA BLVD FROM DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED TO REMAIN WITH THE SAME CONFIGURATION AS EXISTS AS OF 2-1-2006.(2) THE NORTHBOUND ENTRANCE FROM MARINA BLVD INTO DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED FROM ONE LANE INTO TWO LANES.(3) CUT OFF THE GORGES SLIP FROM GORGES INTO LYON AND FRANCISCO STREETS.(4)LYON STREET AND THE LAND THAT BELONGS TO THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BETWEEN RICHARDSON AND BAY TO REMAIN AS IS. IF THESE CHANGES CANNOT BE MADE, WE WANT ALTERNATIVE 2 OUR PREFERRED PREFERENCE.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
JEAN CARAMATTI 3/13/06	Jean Caramatti	2636 Chestnut St SF 94123		346-3795
Gina Haran 3/18/06	Gina Haran	2060 Filbert St SF CA 94123		776.7132
ADA CARAMATTI 3/18/06	Ada Caramatti	2062. FILBERT ST SF. CA. 94123		931-5732
Amy Haran 3/24/06	Amy Haran	2466 Chestnut St. #102 SF. CA. 94123		415.810.1039
Julie Franceschi 3/24/06	Julie Franceschi	67 Pixley St SF, CA 94123		563-0769 ~~[illegible]~~
~~BARBARA~~ GUERRERO 3/24/06	Barbara Guerrero	2068 FILBERT ST SF, CA 94123		346.3060

PETITION

WE ARE PETITIONING THE MAYOR, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,S.F.COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC, S.F. MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ,RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO,CAL TRANS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,AND THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ON ALTERNATIVE 5(THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) FOR DOYLE DRIVE.THEY ARE -(1) ENTRANCE INTO MARINA BLVD FROM DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED TO REMAIN WITH THE SAME CONFIGURATION AS EXISTS AS OF 2-1-2006.(2) THE NORTHBOUND ENTRANCE FROM MARINA BLVD INTO DOYLE DRIVE TO BE CHANGED FROM ONE LANE INTO TWO LANES.(3) CUT OFF THE GORGES SLIP FROM GORGES INTO LYON AND FRANCISCO STREETS.(4)LYON STREET AND THE LAND THAT BELONGS TO THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BETWEEN RICHARDSON AND BAY TO REMAIN AS IS. IF THESE CHANGES CANNOT BE MADE, WE WANT ALTERNATIVE 2 OUR PREFERRED PREFERENCE.

PRINTED NAME & DATE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
LILLIAN BOTTALI 3-24-06	Lillian Bottali	2064 FILBERT ST SF, CA 94123		931-7530
JIM GUERRERO 3/24/06		2068 FILBERT ST. SF - 94123		218-0828 (C)
Jean B. Hayes 3/25/06	Jean B. Hayes	2646 Chestnut St SF 94123		346-4992
Denise Wall 3-25-06	Denise Wall	2660 Chestnut St SF 94123		931-5070
Richard J. Wall 3/25/06		2660 Chestnut St S.F. 94123		931-5070

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Petition with 32 Citizens' Signatures

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Elements 1, 3, and 4 have been incorporated into Alternative 5. Element 2 would require the taking of additional park land.	1302

Lindsey K. Phillips
1346 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California 94109-1724

February 12, 2006

Mr. Leroy L Saage, PE
Doyle Drive Project Manager
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage,

I have been a member of the San Francisco Presidio YMCA for a number of years and have derived a great deal of pleasure from using Letterman Pool. In fact, the primary reason I joined the Presidio YMCA was the pool and the Y's varied schedule of water aerobic classes, as well as its nearness to my home and the availability of parking. Other workout and sports facilities in the city are much more expensive to join than the YMCA and most either do not have pools or do not have organized pool programs. Because the pool is handicapped-accessible and has nearby free parking, it can be used by a variety of people who might not otherwise be able to use a swimming pool and benefit from its therapeutic effects. 1

I would also like to note that many families use the smaller pool as a means of teaching their children to swim, either on their own or through organized classes. Again, the cost is minimal. Such classes are, I believe, open to people who do not have YMCA memberships. Hundreds of children learn to swim at the facility every year.

For these reasons and many more, I would like to see Letterman Pool (Building 1151) retained and see the rejection of the Circle Drive option under the Parkway Alternative. 1 cont

Sincerely yours,

Lindsey K. Phillips

Lindsey K. Phillips

REC'D FEB 14 2006

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Phillips

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1237

Name: James Ream
Organization/Agency: See text
Address: 3385 Clay Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94118
E-mail: reamail@sbcglobal.net

Comments:
As past vice-president of the San Francisco Landmarks Advisory Board and an architect, I have observed issues on the preservation of historic resources in San Francisco since 1977. Many worthy resources have been saved, and many non-worthy saved, just because they were old.

The nation's historic preservation legislation was born in the wake of the massive demolition of urban buildings, good and bad, following World War II. The resulting legislation slowed this destruction but created a climate where age alone was equated with historical value although just as many mediocre buildings were built in the past as are built today. The result has been the compromise of worthy projects that could benefit today's world through fear of removing something that might be considered historic.

When the military post became a national park, hundreds of buildings were rated historic because they were part of the post and not because of any intrinsic value. But this effort to preserve the identity of this park as a fort obstructs the optimum development of its new identity as a great national park. A classic example of obsolete identity preservation is the attempt to retain Buildings 201 and 204. These generic wood-framed box buildings are examples of standard military construction seen in forts across the country and are in poor repair. If the army had decided to remove them prior to their departure, I believe not a descent would have been heard. To have them force a compromised plan for Doyle Drive would be a costly mistake. 1

Please keep the best reaiization of the Parkway Plan primary in the final decision process, a plan which will benefit countless visitors to the park for decades to come.

James Ream, FAIA

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Ream, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The properties in question are significant under Section 106 and NEPA and must be considered in the process. The project team worked with the Presidio Trust regarding building preservation.	1631

From: Joshua A. Ridless [jridless@ridlesslaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 4:24 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman POOL @ Presidio YMCA

As an active user of the Presidio YMCA Pool, I am adamantly against any plan that would result in even a short term closure of the Letterman Pool. 1

Best regards,
Josh

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Ridless, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1542

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: ELLIOTT ROBBINS Date: 2/6/06

Address: 2028 BEACH ST

SF (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ (Area Code Number) Work Phone: _____ (Area Code Number)

E-mail: e_robbins@hotmail.com Company: _____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

ALTERNATIVE #5 1
for our parks; for the neighborhood

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☒ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: E. Robbins (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1149

REC'D FEB 08 2006

FHWA Caltrans

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Dick Robinson Date: 2/6/06

Address: 2033 Jefferson St.

San Francisco (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 931 8750 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: 415 773 3565 (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: Robinson27@aol.com Company: Cushman & Wakefield (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

1 Approval and construction of Alternate 5 may do for Crissy Field, the Presidio and the northern entrance to the City' what the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway did for that side of the City.

The long term benefits are substantial and will immediately be appreciated upon completion.

2 Can we afford the project? If the money is actually there and appropriated, especially in the 13-14/13-14 timeframe. This is an imposing project that we MUST do!

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Robinson

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1235
2	Project cost estimates will need to be updated to reflect cost saving design options and construction staging measures. The SFCTA is currently studying the feasibility of a toll facility to off-set the project costs. Phased construction and other methods exist to finance the project. See Section 1.7 Funding and Programming.	1236

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Claudia Roehl Date: 2/6/06

Address: 2443 Francisco Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ Area Code Number Work Phone: _____ Area Code Number

E-mail: Claudia@roehl.us Company: _____ Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Thank you for this presentation. We appreciate your open communication.

With over 30 families on our block and a few of the adjacent streets, we would prefer (a) Alternative 2 (with Detour Option) and our second choice of (b) Alternative 5 (with the Diamond Option and Hook Ramp Option). 1

In addition, I completely agree with the Merchant Road Option. Even with the $8.6 mm addition cost, tourism revenue would satisfy this cost in a relatively short time. 2

Thank you again! Claudia Roehl

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: C. Roehl (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1145
2	Preference for the Merchant Road Slip Ramp noted.	1146

Norman Rolfe
2233 Larkin St. #4
San Francisco, CA 94109
(415)775-9167
FAX (415)775-9167
e-mail normrolfe@juno.com

March 30, 2000

To: Lee Saage
From: Norman Rolfe
Subject: Doyle Drive EIS/EIR

Here are some subjects that should be covered in the Doyle Drive EIS/EIR.

Methods of reducing automobile traffic to what can be handled in six lanes or less - without so-called transition lanes that seem to grow into full length additional lanes. Things that should be studied are improvements in public transportation to the Presidio and through it to and from S.F., as well as intra-S.F. traffic that allegedly uses Doyle Drive. This would include improved Muni service in the affected corridors, improved ferry and bus service to and from the North Bay, including even rail service on the NWP right of way to Larkspur, coordinated with ferry schedules of course, close coordination between the Presidio's internal public transportation system (they better have one). You might even look into extending the Muni F Line to the Presidio, although this may turn out to be too controversial and you may wish to duck it. I may be getting into mitigation measures here, but I think these are all things an EIS/EIR must discuss. 1 2

Discussion of the environmental impacts would of course extend to the effects Doyle Drive traffic has on surrounding neighborhoods. "Surrounding neighborhoods" should include ones that are not adjacent to the Presidio but are affected by Doyle Drive traffic, for example, the Van Ness Corridor, Downtown S.F., the Marina and Richmond Districts, Fishermans Wharf, The Embarcadero, et al. 3

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Rolfe

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	A purpose of the project is to maintain the existing capacity on Doyle Drive and improve the operations and safety of the roadway.	1352
2	This Purpose and Need of the Project is to replace an aging state highway. Other studies are underway to examine the feasibility of the alternatives suggested in this comment, such as improved ferry and bus service, rail service on the NWP, the operation of the Presidio shuttle system and a possible F line extension; ways to implement and fund these projects would be addressed in those studies.	1820
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. Transportation impacts based solely from this project were not detected.	1821

Name: Gary Romain
Organization/Agency: ActivSpace LLC
Address: 819 North 49th Street
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip: 98103
E-mail: gromain@activspace.com

Comments:
ActivSpace is the Lessee of Buildings 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186. Our lease is for 60 years and we plan to perform a complete historic renovation of the structures. They will be converted into "ActivSpaces" - rental units for artist, crafts people and small businesses to work and create. The Facility will also include a café and historical displays.

We support Alternative 5. We believe it offers the best balance of enhanced economic activity and environmental quality.

1. It enhances the planned growth at the Presidio. The Mason Street Warehouses are a key component of future Presidio Growth. Situated at the Marina Gate, they provide a key link between the Presidio and the surrounding community. Alternative 2 limits this growth by limiting access to the Presidio in general and the Mason Street Warehouses specifically. By widening Doyle Drive, parking and access are severely limited. Alternative 5 provides direct access to the Presidio which enhances economic activity and provides better circulation and parking at the important Marina Gate/Mason Street Corridor. 1

2. The positive visual and aesthetic impacts are also significant. Great effort and expense has gone toward upgrading and rehabilitating Crissy Fields. The Parkway option expands this important view corridor and connects Crissy Fields, the Bay, the Main Post and the Letterman Complex.

3. It also seems clear Alternative 5 will improve water quality in the important Golden Gate Recreation Area at Crissy Fields and thereby significantly enhance this important natural habitat. Moreover, Alternative 2 appear to significantly degrade the quality of the storm water runoff, which will almost certainly have a detrimental impact on this important natural habitat.

In short we support alternative 5 because it provides significant environmental, aesthetic and economic advantages. It is a rare that we can "have our cake and eat it too", but this alternative seems to offer the best of all worlds - improved economic and environmental conditions!

Thank you for considering our comments.

Gary Romain
President
ActvSpace LLC
819 North 49th Street #400
Seattle, WA 98103
gromain@activspace.com

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Romain, G.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted	1630

Name: Keith Saggers
Organization/Agency:
Address: 2310 Powell Street #305
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94133
E-mail: keithspedicabs@sbcglobal.net

Comments:
Bicycle access to Golden Gate Bridge and future light rail possibilities 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Saggers, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The replacement of Doyle Drive does not impede the implementation of the Presidio's Bikeways and Trails Master Plan. The restoration of the project area will be planned in coordination with the Presidio Trust. The project has also been design so as not to preclude the extension of light rail into the Presidio.	1647

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: MARIE+JACK SAROYAN Date: FEB 6, 2006

Address: 3637 BAKER ST

SF (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: (415) 931-8204 (Area Code, Number) Work Phone: (Area Code, Number)

E-mail: jsaroyan@att.net Company: (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

2 VOTES FOR ALTERNATIVE V (5)
TUNNEL PROVIDE FOR BETTER VIEWS
OF WALKERS, RUNNERS, CYCLISTS, etc

1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Saroyan (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1147

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Rebecca Sarkoyan Date: 2/6/06

Address: 2490 Chestnut St. #201

SF CA 94123

City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ Area Code Number Work Phone: _____ Area Code Number

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ Organization or Affiliation

2032

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Alternative #5 should be adopted by the SFTA

1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: R. Saroyan (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1148

From: Faye Schulte [faschulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2006 8:48 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Presidio YMCA Pool

I just wanted to express my concern over the potential closure of the Presidio YMCA pool during the work on Doyle Drive. The pool is the only pool is this area of the City so it should stay open and accessible during the construction on Doyle Drive. As a resident of the Marina and frequent user of the pool, I would be very upset and inconvenienced if it were closed. And I hope, that there is no consideration given to permanently closing the pool. It's a beautiful pool with historic character that should not be destroyed. 1

Faye Schulte

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Schulte, F.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1555

Name: Rachel Susanne Sears
Organization/Agency: Hypercat Racing
Address: 1346 Merced Street
City: Richmond
State: CA
Zip: 94804
E-mail: hypercatracing@hotmail.com

Comments:
Please retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users. The pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Sears, R.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted. Detailed design of parking facilities affected by the project would take pedestrian circulation, traffic safety, and parking access into consideration. Such design will be developed as part of the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of the project.	1634

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: FRANCES BRIAN SEABINOFF Date: 15 FEBRUARY 2006

Address: 1998 VALLEJO ST, #4

S.F. (City) CA (State) 94123 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415) 441-4241 (Area Code / Number) Work Phone: _____ (Area Code / Number)

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

ALTERNATIVE 2 IS THE BETTER ALTERNATIVE - CHEAPER, LESS IMPACT ON ALL SURROUNDING AREAS. 1

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE "Y" POOL WOULD BE A GREAT LOSS TO THOSE OF US WITH DISABILITIES - MY DOCTOR RECOMMENDED THAT I USE THE POOL - IT HAS BEEN A GREAT HELP. I DON'T THINK I CAN REPLACE IT IN SAN FRANCISCO - DON'T TREAT IT AS A TRIVIAL MATTER - GO TO THE POOL AND SEE THE NUMBER AND VARIETY OF PEOPLE IT SERVES - ALL AGES ALL CONDITIONS. 2

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: F. Serbinoff (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 2 noted.	1038
2	In July 2006 Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will be preserved.	1039

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Joni Sethmeier Date: 2/6/06

Address: 451 Marina Blvd

SF 94123

City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: 415 929-0789 (Area Code Number) Work Phone: (Area Code Number)

E-mail: Company: (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

Like Alternative 5 Seems well thought out 1

+ we need an off ramp into the Presidio VERY important 2

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Setthemiei[sic] (020606)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1150
2	Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway Alternative, has recently been identified as the Preferred Alternative. The Diamond Interchange configuration of this alternative provides access from Doyle Drive to the Presidio.	1151

From: Irene Solomon [filbert@pon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 9:45 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Problems with Alternative 5

I am amazed the the Transportation Authority and the Presidio Trust would even consider demolition of the Presidio swimming pool. The pool is used extensively by people of all ages, the healthy, those needing physical rehabilitation, as well as competitive swimmers. At at time when obesity and Type 2 Diabetes are major societal health concerns, when Americans are being urged to increase their exercise, removal of the pool is clearly detrimental to the public interest. 1

Alternative 5 as outlined does not serve the public well. Quite the contrary, it would impact unfavorably on the traffic patterns and quality of life in the neighborhood. Further, there has been inadequate attention to the historical preservation issues raised by the proposed destruction of multiple Presidio buildings. I urge you to select Alternative 2 and consider the public's request for an extension of time to discuss the environmental implications of the two proposals. 2

Irene L. Solomon, M.D.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Soloman, I.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1549
2	A 30-day extension was granted on the original comment period. Preference for Alternative 2 noted. The Programmatic Agreement prepared for this project which was developed in coordination with numerous participating agencies outlines the measures for the treatment and mitigation of impacts to historic resources (see Section 3.2.11 and Appendix I).	1550

From: Speakman, Sarah [SSpeakman@seyfarth.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 2:53 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Save Letterman Pool

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to encourage those in charge to keep Letterman pool open during the Doyle Drive contraction. I leave in the Marina area and use Letterman pool for water running and Masters swimming. This is the only public pool in the area that offers these programs. Were Letterman to close, I would have to commute up to the JCC (private) or Koret (also private). This would increase traffic congestion, make me late for work and cost me more money. Please make alternative plans so that I, and the rest of Letterman community can continue to enjoy the pool. 1

Sarah Speakman

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Speakman, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1520

From: TC Stellanova [tc@rawthought.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 10:38 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Cc: enolarama@yahoo.com
Subject: Letterman Pool

Hello,

I am a triathlete and member of the Presidio YMCA who uses the Letterman Pool for swim practice at least three times a week. Letterman Pool and the Presidio YMCA Aquatics Program provide an indispensable cornerstone of the San Francisco aquatics community and should not be shut down.

I definitely understand that the streets and highways in and around the Presidio are outdated and in need of improvement; however, I hope that while you're considering plans for improving these streets that you only consider plans that keep Letterman open and accessible throughout construction. Too many seniors, injured athletes, and families with children rely on the services Letterman provides to justify making the pool inaccessible for any length of time. 1

Thank you,

Todd C. Stellanova
tc@rawthought.com

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Stellanova, TC

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1517

From: Michael Strunsky [Mikes@gershwin.com]
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 12:33 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments

To: Leroy L. Saage, PM

From: Michael & Jean Strunsky
2457 Bay Street
San Francisco CA 94123

Subject: Comments; DEIS/R

Date: 31 March, 2006

We believe the Doyle Drive Plan, Parkway Version, as presented, will create a disaster of traffic congestion in the residential neighborhoods of the Marina and Cow Hollow. We think the plan substantially underestimates the projected traffic flow and capacity of Lombard Street. 1

We also strongly oppose any plans to change the configuration of the existing intersection at Doyle Drive, Richardson Street, and Lyon Street. (The residents of Lyon Street, between Richardson and Bay Streets, who all oppose any changes to that block, have been assured, as late as 30 March, 2006, by Michael Alexander, Keith Kawamura, and Michael Painter, who we believe are representatives of the planning process, that no changes will be made. We hold them to that promise). We believe the Presidio Swimming Pool should remain; it is a vital neighborhood-accessible asset which must not be sacrificed for the benefit of the profit-making Presidio Trust or the Lucas organization's bay views. 2 3

We support the plan to widen and retrofit the existing Doyle Drive, including upgrading and maintaining the existing ramps to Marina Boulevard. Smooth and continuous traffic flow to Marina Boulevard (without the Parkway Version's proposed new traffic lights and circuitous right and left turns) is vital to all San Francisco neighborhoods' sharing of the existing and future heavy traffic flow burdens. We also support the plans for the rehabilitation of the Palace of Fine Arts as presented by the San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department on 30 March, 2006. We oppose any Doyle Drive plans that would conflict with the Palace of Fine Arts plans 4 5

Michael and Jean Strunsky

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Strunsky, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Comment noted. To address this concern, the parameters of the traffic study was expanded into the neighborhoods. No additional impacts from this project were depicted.	1614
2	Comment noted.	1615
3	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1616
4	Comment noted.	1617
5	Opposition to Alternative 5, which would be in conflict with the proposed entry drop-off/turnarounds on Palace Drive, is noted.	1618

From: Swanson, Edmund [Edmund.Swanson@ucsfmedctr.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 2:54 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman pool

I would like to see the Letterman pool kept in use during construction. 1

Thanks Ed Swanson

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Swanson, E.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1518

From: Dr. Jim Taylor [jim@drjimtaylor.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 10:21 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Save the Presidio Y pool

It would be travesty to close the Presidio Y pool.

Retain historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative. Retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users. 1

Make sure the pool stays open during construction. The pool is heavily used by families and children, swimmers, and triathletes.

Jim Taylor, Ph.D.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Taylor, J.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1559

From: Thompson, Katherine [Katherine.Thompson@Schwab.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 11:19 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Save Letterman Pool

I am writing to express my strong support for the retention of the Letterman Pool in the Presidio. While not a huge swimmer myself, I recognize the pool as a key community resource, used by YMCA members and many others in the community. There are very few places to swim in San Francisco, and it is a shame to eliminate such a nice facility which is so heavily used by families, people recovering from injuries, children learning to swim and many for general exercise needs. I hope you will adopt a Doyle Drive option which will allow the Letterman Pool to continue its place in the health and fitness of San Francisco. 1

Kathy Thompson
Schwab Technology
Finance & Corporate Admin Technology (FCAT)

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Thompson, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1516

Richard D. Tilles
1975 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California, 94123

April 17, 2006

Mr. Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Lee:

Thank you for producing a very impressive document. I am writing comments as a San Francisco citizen living in a neighborhood affected by the Project, not with any affiliation to the Presidio Trust.

Naturally, I support the Parkway Alternative, which is the only one that fulfills the project's purpose and need while keeping the Presidio as a jewel in the properties of the GGNRA. Regarding variants:

- I support the diamond interchange at Girard Road; I can't see any benefits to justify the Circle Drive's taking of a valuable and historic building and potential for driver confusion. 1
- Also, although I see some benefits in the Merchant Road slip ramp, they probably are not enough to make up for the cost and disruption to the Park to justify this project. The very minor change of adding a stop sign for traffic entering the Bridge Plaza from Merchant Road will alleviate much of the current congestion and should be instituted immediately.
- I have no preference regarding the hook or loop ramps at Veteran's Boulevard.

Once the Parkway Alternative is selected, my primary concerns are with traffic flow during the construction process. The Transportation Management Plan needs to be developed well in advance of actual construction with input from the Park and surrounding neighborhood groups. Two items are particularly important: 2

- The option of closing connections between Doyle and Veteran's Boulevard during the entire construction process (p 3-72) should be instituted. This will not only save money and time in the process but it will reduce overall traffic on the roadway during construction, making it much easier to handle temporary detours, lane closures, etc. Traffic to and from the Golden Gate Bridge needs to use Doyle Drive; traffic from the Richmond and Sunset districts have other good alternatives. 3
- Closing Halleck Street for the virtual duration of the construction process (Page 3-71) will significantly disrupt operations in the Park. No access to Crissy Field between Lyon Street and McDowell Street is likely to have major 4

impacts. The TMP needs to look into ways of retaining north-south access on Marshall Street or a temporary road. 4 Cont

My limited reading of the document turned up a few other miscellaneous comments and questions:

- P. 3-49: Parking requirements during the construction period need to be analyzed in a lot more detail, as there are potential shortages that affect the trust's mission for financial self-sufficiency. 5
- P. 3-54: Regarding the Merchant Road slip ramp, why does the report say that no residential building would be removed under either option? 6
- P. 3-195: Discussion of noise insulation for Building 106 says that "participation by FHWA and/or Caltrans is normally limited to publicly owned buildings", implying that Building 106 would not be eligible. Yet what is Building 106, but a publicly-owned building? 7

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to a speedy resolution of environmental, design and funding issues so that a very important project for the City and the Presidio can proceed as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Richard Tilles

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Tilles

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 and the Diamond Interchange noted.	1367
2	The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be developed well in advance of actual construction with input from the Presidio Trust and surrounding neighborhood groups. See Appendix K of the FEIS/R for the draft TMP.	1368
3	The closure of connection between Doyle and Veteran's Boulevard during construction are evaluated in the DEIS, as indicated by the comment. A potential negative consequence identified with the closures is the possible increase of traffic around the Toll Plaza. The Transportation Management Plan will need to manage traffic diversion strategies, especially for traffic from the Richmond and Sunset Districts during the project.	1369
4	The revised construction staging will reduce the closure of Halleck Street to an estimated 24 months. During the period that Halleck Street is closed, it is proposed to maintain a pedestrian/bicycle connection in the general location of Halleck St. The location of the connection will need to be determined in the detailed design and coordinated with the actual construction activities.	1370
5	The Parking Impact Analysis and the Addendum evaluated potential unmet parking demand based on information available at the time the analysis was prepared. As the Doyle Drive project progresses, parking needs will continue to be assessed as building use in the Presidio may vary considerably over time.	1371
6	The text under the Alternative 5 Permanent Impacts discussion in Section 3.2.6 was clarified, however, the Merchant Road Slip ramp was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative.	1372
7	It is true that Building 106 is a publicly-owned building. As stated in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures for noise of Section 3.3.5, the use of insulating windows will be discussed with the Trust as an optional abatement means. Consideration of the historic integrity of the buildings will also be considered. No change to the document is required.	1373

Name: George Torgun
Organization/Agency:
Address: 748 Page St Apt 7
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94117-2426
E-mail: georgetorgun@yahoo.com

Comments:
As a San Francisco resident and frequent recreational user of the Presidio, I am writing in support of Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway Diamond Option, in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report for improvements to Doyle Drive. 1

The Presidio is a natural and cultural treasure that deserves to be managed in a way that places a high value on its status as a National Park and historic landmark. While Doyle Drive may have been originally designed to provide efficient access to and from the Golden Gate Bridge, the impacts of noise, pollution, and poor aesthetics must now be important considerations and strongly favor transforming Doyle Drive from a freeway into a parkway. This is especially important given the expected increase in the use of this roadway and the Presidio itself in the next few decades; a superhighway running through a National Park would greatly diminish the experience of this magnificent resource for everyone.

Given that I cover quite a few miles running and hiking through the Presidio, I am also concerned with pedestrian access during (and following) the reconstruction of Doyle Drive, which could take several years. I am hopeful that access from one side of the roadway to the other will be maintained to the greatest extent possible. 2

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important project.

George Torgun

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Torgun, G.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1687
2	Access from one side of Doyle Drive to the other will maintained during construction although locations of access will shift during the course of construction as certain activities may necessitate the temporary closure of certain crossing points. Details of such closures will be finalized with the final construction staging plans. Permanent access across Doyle Drive will be available following completion of the new roadway.	1688

From: Mark Tricarico [marktricarico@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 11:26 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Presidio Letterman pool

To Whom It May Concern,

I am the father of a young girl living in the city. Over the last several years, my daughter and I have greatly enjoyed access to the Presidio pool. With already too few options for affordable swimming in the city, the closing of the Presidio pool would be a tremendous loss for both athletes who train there as well children who enjoy swimming there. Improving our transportation system is certainly a worthwhile endeavor, however to do it at the expense of much needed recreational facilities would be quite detrimental. Please, consider alternatives that could accommodate transit needs while preserving a facility that brings great joy and important recreational opportunities to our children. 1

Thank you.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Tricarico, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1533

March 30, 2006

RECD APR 0 3 2006

Leroy L. Saage, Project Manager
Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments
c/o San Francisco Transportation Authority
100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Saage,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important project. As you know, the south access to the Golden Gate Bridge (Doyle Drive) runs through one of the most scenic areas of Presidio National Park. It is imperative that park values and natural resource plans be preserved.

I am a frequent visitor to the Presidio and have been a volunteer there since the earliest days of the restoration of Crissy Field and Marsh. As you might expect, I am quite concerned with the impact of the Doyle Drive construction process on this heavily visited area as well as its impact on the Presidio as a National Historic Landmark District.

My initial impression upon reviewing the DEIS is that the economic costs associated with Alternative 2, Replace and Widen, and Alternative 5, the Presidio Parkway are not measuring equal features. Alternative 5 includes an underground parking garage, semipermeable roadbeds and a catchment system for roadway runoff. Two years ago, the costs of both alternatives were presented to the public as roughly comparable; the DEIS now shows a difference of $140 million. What has changed in that period? 1

That being said, I favor Alternative 5 with the simpler Hook Option as being more compatible with Presidio National Park. However, this alternative is not without concerns.

I am concerned with the excavation of the bluffs along the project area. Many of these bluffs contribute to the unique plant life in the Presidio and should be preserved wherever possible. I would like to see consideration to moving the roadway out away from the bluffs. 2

Then there are impacts on the potential expansion of Crissy Marsh and upcoming project involving the restoration of Tennessee Hollow:

- The location of the proposed underground parking garage is unclear and is not specifically shown in DEIS. However, its position at the eastern end of the park would appear in an area generally identified for potential Crissy Marsh expansion and/or where a restored Tennessee Hollow creek system would connect with the marsh. I would like to see consideration for eliminating the underground garage. 3
- The low causeway at the eastern end of Doyle Drive is much lower than the current roadway. Raising the height of the causeway would allow movement of both people and wildlife. Raising the causeway may also mitigate some of the effects of roadway lighting and noise to the surrounding neighborhood as well as allow some street level parking reducing the need for an underground garage. 4

- One of the permanent impacts of Alternative 5 as stated in the Land Use and Planning section is that the area for marsh expansion would be reduced. This is unacceptable and efforts should be made to minimize any loss. 5

Other areas of concern

- As mentioned above, consideration should be given to eliminating the underground garage. The permanent effects of Alternative 5 on parking states that 118 spaces would be lost, yet this alternative proposes to mitigate the loss by a 500-space underground garage. While the garage is proposed to also serve the Palace of Fine Arts, the future use of the structure is unknown at this time. One way to add additional parking without an underground facility is to raise sections of the roadway. 6
- Consider mitigating storm water runoff by creating wetlands to treat the pollutants. 7
- The loss of historic structures under Alternative 5 seems unreasonably high. Every effort should be made to preserve the historic structures by realigning or raising the roadway. 8
- While visual and aesthetic values may be of interest to drivers using Doyle Drive, the main purpose of a road for them is transportation. Park values and safety should not be sacrificed for driver aesthetics. There possibility exists that an attractive view from the roadway with shoulders could distract drivers and create accidents. 9

The Presidio is a precious resource to all citizens of the Bay Area. Please continue to work closely with representatives of the National Park Service and the Presidio Trust whose charge is creating and maintaining the most visited urban park in the country.

I also understand that you have been working with community representatives, including the environmental community, to develop a plan to address as many concerns as possible. This is a welcome and important step, and I applaud that collegial and constructive activity. Please continue to work with this community to protect the values of Presidio National Park as stated in project purposes: "to preserve the natural, cultural, scenic and recreational values of affected portions of the Presidio."

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sharon Tsiu

Sharon Tsiu
167 23rd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Tsiu (033006)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Project costs may vary based on availability and market price of materials. Costs presented in Section 2.7 are in 2011 dollars.	1399
2	Comment noted. The Preferred Alternative includes refinements in order to reduce disturbance to the existing bluff. Impacts to plant species can be found in Section 3.4.3.	1400
3	The underground parking lot was eliminated and not an element of the Preferred Alternative.	1401
4	The design workshop on 3/22 addressed these issues and considered them in the alternative refinement.	1402
5	It is correct that Alternative 5 would reduce the area into which Crissy Marsh could expand. During the project alternative development stage, all efforts have been made to minimize impacts to the greatest extent while meeting the goals of the project.	1403
6	The underground parking facility was eliminated and is not part of the Preferred Alternative.	1404
7	If Option 2 (described in Section 3.3.1 of the FEIS/R) is selected as the preferred and feasible runoff management option, then on-site land-based biofiltration, detention, and infiltrations measures will be considered and evaluated for specific application to this project. Without pretreatment, wetlands can be problematic as urban runoff treatment features because of the accumulation of pollutants and the exposure of fauna that uses the wetland to these pollutants.	1405
8	The Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures discussion in Section 3.2.11 of the FEIS/R was enhanced to describe the process used to minimize the loss of historic structures.	1406
9	Comment noted. The roadway is being designed to meet all safety standards.	1407

Name: Sharon Tucker
Organization/Agency:
Address: 906 Noe Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94114
E-mail: sharon@tucker-elie.com

Comments:
I strongly support Alt 5, the parkway plan, and applaud SPUR for the years of effort undertaken on this issue. I'm confident that remaining concerns, including fears that too little daylight will get to the marshland, can be overcome. 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Tucker, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1685

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: STEVE TYSON Date: 1-18-06

Address: POB 470097

SF 94147-0097
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ Area Code Number

Work Phone: 415 922-7085 Area Code Number

E-mail: _____

Company: _____ Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

NEED BIG SOLUTION TO THRUWAY FOR S.F.
2 BIG TUNNELS
PRESIDIO TO DALY CITY TUNNEL
PRESIDIO TO EAST BAY TOLL PLAZA

SURFACE FREEWAY IS NOT HAPPENING
IN S.F. THERE IS ONLY ONE ALTERNATIVE 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: S. Tyson (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	A thruway for all of SF is beyond the scope of this project. This project is focused on replacing Doyle Drive.	1025

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Unknown Date: _____

Address: _____

City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ Area Code Number Work Phone: _____ Area Code Number

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

1 Please keep in mind that tunnels offer very difficult situations to many people who cannot tolerate closed in spaces!!! Also if an accident occurs within a tunnel – as often happens – there is an additional hazard of carbon monoxide poisoning to others stuck in their cars, and if fire erupts it will be a major disaster killing many trapped people in their cars. Needless to say we oppose the design.

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Unknown (021506)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Tunnels would be designed to meet all safety standards. Opposition to Alternative 5 noted.	1037

From: Ken Voorhees [kenvoorhees@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 10:26 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: Letterman Pool Closing

I have been using the Letterman pool on a regular basis since 1997 and do not want to see it closed for Doyle drive construction. Please leave my pool alone! 1

Ken Voorhees

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Voorhees, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1540

Name: Kay Voyvodich
Organization/Agency: KV Associates
Address: 870 Market St Suite 758
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94102
E-mail: kay@kvassociates.net

Comments:
As a long-time visitor, observer and participant of activities at the Presidio, I have reviewed the DEIS/R for Doyle Dr. It is excruciatingly clear that Alternative 5 is the ONLY design that meets project objectives -- a simple and obvious choice considering the cumulative benefits it offers - safety, flow, aesthetics, impact and overall effect. 1

The Circle Drive Option provides an appropriate national park site entrance from San Francisco offering a microcosm of everything the Presidio has to offer - great views, historic buildings and the natural environment. The Circle Drive Option states in its design, "You Are Now Entering a National Park -- Slow Down!"

The Circle Drive Option also has the least impact on the beautiful Palace of Fine Arts - historically, an important part of the Presidio. How wonderful to be able to re-unite these two properties. What an opportunity! Anyone who has spent even a minute in that area of the Presidio contemplates how one might resolve this awkward division of property for both cars and people. I hope this design will include some way to offer foot traffic access across Doyle Drive as well. Michael Painter's context sensitive designs should also be carried out into the final engineering and applied throughout this legacy highway design project. Let's take this one-time opportunity to "do it right." 2

The Hook Ramp Option has many similar positive characteristics to the Circle Drive Option - lower environmental impact, more consideration to historic buildings, more cost effective, etc. This is such a better option than The Hook Drive which should not even be provided as an option. 3

The Merchant Road slip ramp offers marginal improvement for a big expense - both financial and to the park environment. It also encourages more driving - not a very environmentally sound recommendation. That said, as a frequent user of the Golden Gate Bridge, modern traffic management systems would most likely provide a far greater positive improvement and what I would assume would be much less cost - not to mention less impact on the park itself. It would also provide more security for the bridge and Doyle Drive. 4

It is an egregious oversight to not include the tireless efforts of Michael Painter in the draft environmental statement. Whatever the results, credit should go to where credit is due. Please correct this in the final report. 5

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Voyvodich, K.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Support for Alternative 5 noted.	1662
2	Comment noted. The Circle Drive Option was not included in the Preferred Alternative.	1663
3	Preference noted.	1664
4	The Merchant Slip Ramp was not selected as part of the preferred alternative.	1665
5	Michael Painter is acknowledged in the Final EIS/R.	1666

Name: Suzette Wallace
Organization/Agency:
Address: 65 Cervantes Blvd., Apt #8
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
E-mail: sukiwallace@hotmail.com

Comments:
Under the proposed plans, what would become of the cherished Pet Cemetary and the neighboring stables and equestrian ring? 1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Wallace, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The Pet Cemetery and equestrian facilities will not be impacted by the replacement facility.	1642

REC'D MAR 31 2006

March 30, 2006

Leroy Saage, Doyle Drive project manager

I would like to submit my thoughts about the article in The S.F. Chronicle, "Plans for fixing Doyle Drive take many twists and turns."

1. the most dangerous problem to address is improving the safety when cars emerge from the 10? lanes at the toll booth and try to converge into two lanes.

2. forget improving the view - Drivers should not be distracted from keeping their eyes on the road.

3. forget "improved" cyclist & pedestrian access to the Presidio and Crissy field. They already have access by car, bicycle or bus.

4. Most important "the plan ~~could~~ would also require the Presidio pool to be demolished." ... "And the pool could be rebuilt with those funds." "Could be" does not mean will be - And where would a new pool be built?

5. the area surrounding the YMCA pool was totally refigured and constructed within the last six months. So why the demolition of the pool now!

. tunnels - Two of them! Excuse me why?? !!

. What does a "psychological barrier" between Crissy field & the Presidio have to do with improving the safety of Doyle Drive?

7. continued Chris Powell of the Presidio Gate Recreation area says "It's not inviting." Since when does Doyle Drive have to "be inviting."??? forget "Scenic Views" Be realistic. What is the psychological barrier?

8. What NOISE pollution?

9. Why does Doyle Drive include Halleck Street?

10. I live near the Presidio on Baker at Union Street. Naturally I do not welcome more traffic into the neighborhood 3

In conclusion, I recommend you concentrate on the merging traffic after it leaves the toll booth and tries to jockey into two lanes. This is the dangerous area. Also, put up speed limit signs of 35 mph while driving on Doyle Drive. 4

Please - do not destroy by demolition the much needed YWCA swimming pool. George Lucas was allowed to take away the parking places for the pool - they were turned into part of his landscape design. 5

Why does the entire Doyle Drive have to be replaced? Only fix what needs fixing. Sincerely

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: J. Wanvig

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	The toll both operations and design are not a part of the this project although improving the overall safety of Doyle Drive is one of the major objectives of the project.	1297
2	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1298
3	To analyze any potential impacts on neighborhoods, the traffic study was expanded beyond the original parameters studied in the DEIR/S. The results of this expanded analysis are presented in the FEIR/S. No adverse impacts from this project onto the neighborhoods was indicated.	1299
4	The purpose of the project is to maintain operations. Altering speed limits or changing the posted speed limits is not part of the project.	1300
5	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond Interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative, therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will be preserved	1301

→ MAIL THIS FORM(to be received by march 1, 2006, TO:

DOYLE DRIVE DEIS/ COMMENTS
c/o San Francisco Co. Transportatio Authority

COMMENT CARD

100 Van Ness Ave., 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

RECD MAR 01 2006

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: Judy Wessing Date: 2/27/06

Address: 2355-12th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116-1907
City State Zip

Optional Information

Home Phone: (415) 664-5067 Work Phone: —
Area Code Number Area Code Number

E-mail: — Company: —
Organization or Affiliation

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

1 Option 5 looks best.
I favor: medians or split road
2 landscaping, lots
traffic calming, ↓ speed
hook ramp (not loop)
dedicated lane for merchant road access

Best of all is Michael Painter's modified option of #5!

I have 2 aesthetic concerns re: this MONUMENTAL roadway
3 (1) noise reduction (freeway roar is miserable for pedestrians, cyclists, cemetery mourners etc.)
(2) views – not just from the freeway but OF the freeway (or not) from the hilltops or

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

4 from the water or water's edge.

☑ I would like to receive future project updates.

I am looking for curves, cut & fills and landscaping to hide it or make the elevated sections sculpturally gorgeous.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Wessing

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Preference for Alternative 5 noted.	1244
2	Comment noted	1245
3	Comment noted.	1246
4	The visual analysis evaluated the visual effects of the proposed build alternatives from 19 different viewpoint throughout the Presidio including the waters edge (Crissy Field viewpoint 9), and from hills or more distant points (Calvary Stables viewpoints 10 and 17 and Main Post viewpoint 19).	1247

From: Steve Wilbur [steverwilbur@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 8:43 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: keep the pool open

I vote to keep the Letterman Pool open now and during construction. The city needs pools and this is a great one.

- Retain historic Letterman Pool and reject the Circle Drive Option under the Parkway Alternative. 1
- Retain adequate, convenient and safe parking for Letterman Pool during the 3-year construction period to ensure access to all users.
- the pool is heavily used by families and children, runners and triathletes.

thank you,
Steve Wilbur, swimmer

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Wilbur, S.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1519

COMMENT CARD

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE – DOYLE DRIVE

Thank you for your interest in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive Project. Please provide your comments regarding the alternatives, impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the DEIS/R.

If you would like to submit comments on the DEIS/R, please include your name and address.
(Please print clearly.)

Name: DAN WING Date: JAN 18, 2006

Address: 1235 LEAVENWORTH ST.

S.F. (City) CALIF. (State) 94109 (Zip)

Optional Information

Home Phone: _____ (Area Code Number) Work Phone: _____ (Area Code Number)

E-mail: _____ Company: _____ (Organization or Affiliation)

Comments on the DEIS/R for the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge – Doyle Drive:

THE "NORMAL" WIDTH OF A VEHICLE LANE IS 12 FT. – ~~IS THER~~ DOES A FORMULA EXIST FOR HOW MANY LIVES WILL BE LOST FOR A SUBSTANDARD SIZE LANE? – (10 FT). 1

Comments must be received by Wednesday, March 1, 2006. Comments can also be submitted online at **www.doyledrive.org**, emailed to **doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org** or mailed to Doyle Drive DEIS/R Comments, c/o San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

☐ I would like to receive future project updates.

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: D. Wing (011806)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Although there is no proven formula to equate lane width to lives, much research has been done comparing lane width and traffic safety. The data suggests a relationship of decreasing accidents with increasing lane width up to 11-12 feet. Research does not support the idea that further increase in lane width would benefit traffic safety.	1024

Name: brian wong
Organization/Agency:
Address: 221 Mirada Ave
City: San Rafael
State: CA
Zip: 94903
E-mail: bwong@lucasfilm.com

Comments:
Hi- I just saw the news of the potential to have the Presidio Pool closed. As an employee of Lucas and a participant of Team in training, I heavily rely on the pool for all my workouts and physical therapy needs. It is the most convenient to not have to drive somewhere, compete for parking and pool lanes during the lunch and evening hours. Three years is quite a long time for this area not to have access to a pool. The demand put on other pools would decrease the popularity of swimming to workout as well as the access would be dramatically changed to wait " in line" to share a pool lane. I realize that expansion is needed, but at what cost to the community? Please, please see if there is an alternative. Traffic is worse, off ramps need improvement but the people in this area who come to use this pool would be the most affected by its loss. 1

Thank You. Brian Wong

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Wong, B.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1643

3/17/06

REC'D MAR 21 2006

Dear Mr. Saage,

As a resident of the Marina / Cow Hollow area of San Francisco, we are requesting that you change Alternative 5 (Presidio Parkway) in the following four ways:

1) That the Marina Blvd. entrance from Doyle Drive be retained to the existing configuration as of 2/1/06 as it is depicted in Alternative 2 (Replace and Widen)

2) The entrance from Marina Blvd. into Doyle Drive be retained to the existing configuration as of 2/1/06 as depicted in the Replace and Widen (Alternative 2)

3) Cut off the Slip ramp from Gorges that travels into Lyon and Francisco Streets

4) Lyon Street and all City Land between Richardson, Bay and Doyle remain the same as it was on 2/1/06.

If all of these changes cannot be made, then we prefer Alternative 2 (Replace and Widen).

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert C Voss. Jr.

cc: Marina / Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants

1

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Woss (031706)

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	These elements have been incorporated into the refinement of Alternative 5, except for the two lane for Marina. One lane will remain and the right of way will be reserved for a possible future additional lane.	1828

From: Pamela Zacharias [pam@pamelaphotography.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 11:24 AM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: letterman pool

Hi,

I am a triathlete who uses the letterman pool 3x per week. I am requesting that the letterman pool NOT be closed during the Doyle Drive project. Many of my triathlete friends also use this pool, as well as many families, kids, seniors etc... The swim coaches are also excellent. Closing the pool would result in a huge loss to me and to the entire Presidio community. 1

Thank you for considering my opinion,
Pamela Zacharias

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Zacharias, P.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1530

From: mehran zakerin [zakerin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2006 5:51 PM
To: doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org
Subject: save pool

to whom is concern:

please save letterman pool I am using this pool about 8 years swimming and exercise in the pool is part of my life the best part . Also this beautiful pool is best pool in san francisco we have to keep it as the way it is , thank you for your help to save my life. 1

sincerely
mehran zakerin

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Zakerin, M.

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	In July 2006, Alternative 5 with the Diamond interchange option was selected as the Preferred Alternative therefore Building 1151 (YMCA Pool) will remain intact.	1531

MARGARET KETTUNEN ZEGART
118 HIGHLAND LANE
MILL VALLEY, CA 94941

REC'D APR 0 3 2006

March 30, 2006

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

100 Van Ness Avenue, 25th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

Att: Lee Saage

doyledrivecomments@sfcta.org

RE: South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge, DOYLE DRIVE CORRIDOR

Dear Caltrans Planners, Partner Agencies; concerned citizens and Authority Board Members;

In reviewing the clear and handsome presentation, the *Citizen's Guide to the Draft Environment Impact Statement Report,* December 2005, I did not find reference to safety concerns that, to me, seem responsible for the nomenclature, "Deadly Doyle". I reviewed documents of the December *DEIS*'s two volumes and related Appendixes but these issues seem to need to be addressed:

Safety

° The bridge approach from Lincoln Avenue (Presidio); a split between bus and tour bus visitor entry bridge parking area, is dependent upon courtesy and familiarity – which usually works,- but?

° The lane entry from this approach onto Doyle Drive's extension is to a northbound lane entering tollgate. Haste, speed and self-centered driving characterize ongoing traffic that swerves into the lane appropriate for exiting vehicles from the Presidio. An high accident risk occurs too frequently.

A mitigation might be a surface treatment of roadway lane that alerts the caring driver to keep to the left of the entering lane. Bot dots; tire tread noise patterns and perhaps pavement color differentiation for lanes; using both auditory and visual signals – as well as the traditional signing which is frequently ignored. – are low cost but may be helpful if a curb / barrier is not designed to resolve this critical problem. 1

° Calming design using loops for slowing traffic to a safe and closer to posted speed limit seems an important criteria in a choice between the diamond and loop designs (Alternative 5) and adding the 2

° Merchant Loop as a choice would benefit weave conditions northbound on US 101 between the Park Presidio on-ramp and Merchant Road exit ramp would be eliminated which is an essential safety factor. For those concerned with travel time, the tunnel travel can gain seconds. 2 Cont

° Travel time comparisons between alternatives would be helpful. Alternative 5 might be considered to mitigate loss seconds that might occur with loop designs? If so? The Presidio Parkway alternative might well to mitigate any suspected the delay for the hurried commuter since the view slowing tourists will be under grounded a portion of the trip – and safety again would be a benefit of loop choices. Alternative 5 and Merchant Street delay of 10 – 13 seconds and the circle loop of 39 seconds should be considered a safety calming benefit and a Parkway joyful experience. 3

° Driving minutes for alternative and options should be addressed in the EIR. [I did not locate in Appendixes] since efficient commute time is a factor in Doyle Drive use as drivers do disregard safety choices in lane selection. 4

° Toll both Fastrak only lanes placement should be reconsidered and an enlarged depiction of these would be helpful in the EIR or in an Appendix for the traffic entering northbound 101 and Marina area destinations. 5

°Lane width changes should be eliminated if possible and a visual explanation of the resolution to the problem of "current Presidio access for northbound traffic cannot be accommodated due to geometric concern for traffic safety. (*Summary*. P. viii) 6

°Could grade separated interchange concepts developed and depicted as a component of the Parkway alternative (as at Girard Road, (p. x) and Veterans Blvd merges? 7

° The Presidio Trails and Bikeways Plan elements' safe access that are possible from, through, along, under and over Doyle Drive should be mapped; addressed in the *DEIS* with both Alternative's impacts - for example, Park Boulevard Trail would be possible with the Merchant Loop while the Tennessee Hollow Corridor trail, Golden Gate Promenade and Presidio Promenade offer more opportunities for coordinating non-motorized planning with the Alternative 5. 8

Design choices

Alternative 5 also seems the preferred choice since this will give the view options essential to the Presidio Trust's choice of its Main Post restoration goals and development focus of the Bay and hills of Marin. The Lucas complex Public Health area (Thornberg) focus on the Golden Gate

Bridge; and the light needed for degraded area restoration of the Tennessee Hollow habitat are possible with 5.

Guidelines to preserve and increase historical views should be depicted in the DEIS (p. 3-9). This choice with the Merchant Loop and Circle loop (rather than diamond lanes) should be evaluated in the context of this focus: A redesign of Doyle Drive shall be a part of, as well as an adjunct to, the National Park, within the Presidio, a Parkway rather than a freeway while maintaining the function of the Doyle Drive Corridor to serve as a part of the regional and city transportation. 9

Historical Respect: New buildings framing the Main Post may replace architectural loss of Commissary and other historical structures square footage or elsewhere (adding perhaps in a future reconfiguration of structures in Fort Scott) since replacements for buildings lost is a mitigation considered in Presidio Planning processes. Historical activities can be recognized by exhibits and by reconstructed areas of wide interest, i.e., early Mexican settlement. Significant past events and uses can be recalled through celebrations and activities along and under the passageways of a Parkway designed Doyle Drive and loss of historical groves of trees – or some trees in this preferred option may be considered in the overall correction of the 1883 concept of crowning the Presidio ridges and defining borders and covering shifting sands with uniform plantings of exotic trees that would appear as a continuous forest with a contrast of forest height .. ."... in order to make the contrast from the city seem as great as possible, and indirectly accentuate the idea of the power of the government." (1883 philosophy of Major W, A, Jones, U. SD. Army Engineer.(*Summary of the Proposed Presidio Vegetation Management Plan*, p. 3)

The Doyle Drive Corridor Parkway alternative would continue this historic defining height intent as well as provide for by its tunnel the important Tennessee Hollow habit restoration and view corridors and historical path connections recreational focuses between the Main Post cultural resources, the Hospital area and Crissy Field with its water related recreational opportunities.

° Rather than traditional, mundane substructure support systems, the columns could utilize creative cement structure methods contemporary with architects Felix Candela or Santiago Calatrava. Required deep pilings and tunnel "dig and fill" methods can compliment the vegetation management soil preparation for appropriate native plant communities' development.

°The circle loop option would make the better entrance for the residents of the Presidio, safer traffic flow for the adjacent Marina neighbors and a major entry design signature for the easterly Presidio approach. This should be discussed in the DEIS. 10

° **Habitat Restoration and consistency with Presidio land and water scapes.** The landscaped median is preferred to integrate park areas with circulation and would enhance this to a major scenic thoroughfare. The Presidio is enriched by its "Tapestry of Natural and Historic Landscapes". Too, Doyle Drive can be enhanced with new low native plantings for the median, whose choice reduce forthcoming long term care and would integrate with restoration of the Presidio's vegettion. Seasonal survivors with little maintenance care, this restriction to an appropriate native plant palate would also prevent exotics and Mediterranean / Australian drought tolerant plantings which have been used in past Caltrans medians and roadsides from seeding and spreading. 11

° Existing exotics should be removed as well at this time. Use of the Presidio plant nursery should be used by CalTrans in order to preserve the genetic integrity of the Presidio's plant communities. Best plant choices for these adverse factors of wind and light, etc., should be indicated in the DEIR with appropriate attention to specie selection. 12

(Cross section used in the *Citizen's Guide* (p.6) and DEIS unfortunately show median trees and should be revised in text / illustration for low plantings which preserve views and survive winds, 13

°The Merchant loop slip ramp option would permit removal of 1:15 acres of non-native introduced forest and ornamental plantings. Add in text that this allows a positive impact for surrounding restoration of appropriate, early historical plant life beyond the disturbed 0.50 acre of scrub. This would offer very visible positive demonstration project for the 0.49-0.67 acre of sand soil and differing specie for the serpentine inclusions. 14

° Viaduct studies for the high 66' - 115' sections of Doyle Drive over passing some Presidio areas should be studied for shadow impacts and the lowest 26' – 33' sections also should be evaluated with the new Global Warming data, adjusting for probable rising Bay water in this century as oceans may rise 8' to10'. A flood accommodation chart paralleling water levels with Doyle Drive Corridor's time line use is needed. 15 16

° A 26' retaining wall for the Veterans Boulevard exchange should be diminished. Design components of 4 sections with hanging native plantings and textured, toned cement to reduce its impact as a mitigation or other methods should be depicted and described. 17

° Non-point pollution mitigations in parking areas and their comparative effectiveness in the loop options paved surfaces should be provided. 18

° The loop choice for Alternative 5 makes a safer and major easterly entrance possible to the park. Design concepts should address emergency egress / access for the tsunami potential evacuees of the Presidio, Marina residents. 19

° Lighting in the tunnel should be reflective and that encourages drivers' alertness. Elsewhere shielded night illumination and focused Parkway lighting to minimize adverse light impacts. At trail connections lighting modifications should be suggested that diminish adverse impacts for bird and wildlife connections. I didn't find a discussion in the DEIS or appendix of this "furniture" or light fixture design and signing appropriate to the National Park Presidio style when possible by Caltrans 20

Sincerely,

Margaret Kettunen Zegart

Margaret Kettunen Zegart

Margaret Kettunen Zegart

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Zegart

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
1	Appropriate context sensitive design elements will continue to be investigated.	1822
2	Comment noted.	1823
3	Travel time comparisions between alternatives was included in the Final Traffic and Transit Operations Report but was not included in the FEIS/R. Travel time is not a recognized safety element, this is achieved through the physical design features of the roadway which are done on the basis of safety. A major objective of the project is to improve the traffic safety on Doyle Drive which is accomplished through proper design.	1303
4	Travel time comparisions between alternatives was included in the Final Traffic and Transit Operations Report but was not included in the FEIS/R. Congested travel time is not a recognized safety measure, as traffic safety is a necessary design feature in all alternatives and applies to all time periods.	1304
5	Project definitions do not include the toll plaza area. It is in the jurisdiction of the GGBHTD.	1305
6	The current access to Gorgas from NB Richardson was only approved by Caltrans as a temporary measure and needs to be removed as part of the replacement project.	1306
7	Further interchange concepts will not be evaluated. The footprint of Alternative 5 has been designed to minimize the impacts on the park.	1307
8	Information, such as maps, on bike routes within the Presidio is provided in the Presidio Trails and Bikeways Plan. The Final EIS/R will keep the existing text description of the bike routes.	1308
9	As discussed in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.2.10, the design guidelines for restoration of temporarily affected areas will follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (National Parks Service, 1995).	1309
10	Preference for the Circle Drive Option noted.	1310
11	Landscaping will be coordinated with the Trust's Vegetation Master Plan (VMP).	1824
12	Removing existing non-native plants, before the project begins, is the ongoing stewardship responsibility of the NPS and the Trust. In its own revegetation program the project will, of course, use the nursery as much as possible, but specific plant selection for revegetation will be made later, as part of a Revegetation Plan to be developed during the final design phase of the project.	1311

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
DOYLE DRIVE

Comments on the Doyle Drive Project DEIS/R

Reviewer: Zegart

Reviewer's Comment Number	Response	Database ID
13	Planting will be done in consultation with the Presidio Trust and in accordance with the Trust Vegetation Management Plan.	1312
14	The commenter notes that 1.15 acres of non-native vegetation would be removed, which is true, but that removal doesn't really allow for a positive impact since that area would be permanently lost to any vegetation, native or non-native. The Merchant Road Slip Ramp was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative and thus this impact will not occur.	1313
15	Shadow impacts have been studied see Plans and Policies section under the PTMP discussion of Section 3.2.1 of the FEIS/R. Global warming data is not applicable at this scale; in any case, eight to ten feet of sea level rise would render the roadway unusable. A brief discussion of climate change is provided in Section 4.4.1.	1314
16	Potential flooding impacts, which would be mainly related to coastal flooding hazards, are discussed under Permanent Impacts in Section 3.3.1. The mitigation measures required to protect the project from flooding are presented in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures of Section 3.3.1. A flood chart is not considered necessary.	1315
17	The recent design workshops have investigated ways to preserve more of the existing bluff and reduce retaining wall heights from 26' to 10-20'.	1316
18	The parking facilities among the build alternatives are relatively similar to each other. Best management practices would be required for all parking facilities so that runoff will be treated prior to discharge. The BMPs selected would have to comply with the requirements of the Presidio Trust Storm Water Management Plan (under existing regulations).	1317
19	An emergency response plan for the facility will be developed. Emergency response for the surrounding area is beyond the scope of this study.	1318
20	Lighting will be designed to minimize glare. It is anticipated that conceptual design guidelines will be developed to address these issues.	1319