

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

4.22 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION (TR)

CONTENTS

- TR-1. *Caltrans Encroachment Permit*
- TR-2. *Cumulative Traffic Volumes*
- TR-3. *Geographic Distribution of Cumulative Traffic*
- TR-4. *Weekend Analysis*
- TR-5. *Implementation of Mitigation Measures*
- TR-6. *Level of Detail and Indirect Consequences of Mitigation Measures*
- TR-7. *Proximity to Golden Gate Bridge*
- TR-8. *Presidio Employee and Resident Transportation Needs*
- TR-9. *Further Mitigation for Lincoln/Merchant Intersection*
- TR-10. *Travel Demand Assumptions*
- TR-11. *Traffic Analysis: Existing Conditions*
- TR-12. *Traffic Safety*
- TR-13. *Construction Traffic*
- TR-14. *Study Intersections for Traffic Analysis*
- TR-15. *14th Avenue Gate*
- TR-16. *Effects of Additional Traffic on Surrounding Neighborhoods*
- TR-17. *Prevention of Traffic from Using Recreational Routes*
- TR-18. *Mason Street*
- TR-19. *Access to Palace of Fine Arts*
- TR-20. *Need for a Helipad*

TR-1. Caltrans Encroachment Permit

Caltrans notes that the Trust should apply for an encroachment permit for any work or traffic control within the State's right-of-way.

Response TR-1 – The Trust appreciates the reminder. Prior to doing any work within the State's right-of-way, the Trust will acquire an encroachment permit from Caltrans.

TR-2. Cumulative Traffic Volumes

The CCSF Planning Department and several individuals suggest that the EIS does not clarify the contribution of the Presidio land use alternatives to the cumulative traffic volumes and identified transportation effects, particularly for intersections outside the Presidio's boundaries. Commentors also request that the source of cumulative traffic volumes be explained, particularly with respect to assumptions for the Doyle Drive project, inclusion of Letterman Digital Arts Center (LDAC) projected traffic volumes, and distinction between traffic associated with the Presidio land use alternatives and other regional growth.

Response TR-2 – AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes in 2020 were based on a combination of projected land uses, including the LDAC, and assumed growth rates from existing traffic volumes. First, the expected increase in employees, residents and visitors associated with land uses throughout the park for each alternative was calculated and converted to traffic volumes. Then, the existing cut-through traffic was assumed to increase to between 40 and 51 percent of the total weekday traffic volume at Presidio gateways, based on trip pattern data obtained from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) Travel Demand Model. Finally, for external intersections, or intersections beyond the Presidio's boundary, traffic turning movements not entering or leaving the Presidio were assumed to annually increase 6 percent in the AM peak hour and 11 percent in the PM peak hour. These growth rates are based on data from the SFCTA Travel Demand Model. The same travel demand forecasting model is also being used in the analysis for the Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study, thereby providing consistency between the two projects.

Overall traffic volumes in the cumulative condition thus include traffic projected as a result of employment and population growth in the City as a whole and not just that associated with the Presidio. At the gateway intersections, the PTMP alternatives would contribute 4 percent to 16 percent to the total 2020 AM peak hour traffic volume and 4 percent to 17 percent to the total 2020 PM peak hour traffic volume. The PTMP Background

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

Transportation Report has been revised to include the project's contribution to cumulative traffic volumes and growth in traffic volumes.

TR-3. Geographic Distribution of Cumulative Traffic

The CCSF Planning Department, the SFCTA, and others request more detailed information regarding the geographic distribution of Presidio-based trips. Commentors also suggest changes to figures in the Draft EIS.

Response TR-3 – The distribution of AM and PM peak hour traffic is based on data from the SFCTA's Travel Demand Model. The distribution of traffic to the Presidio gates during the PM peak hour is shown in Table 4-1 of the PTMP Background Transportation Report. Table 4-1 also indicates the percentage of PM peak hour traffic at each gate expected to be cut-through traffic. This information is summarized below for the No-Action and Final Plan alternatives.

During the PM peak hour, 51 percent of the total gateway traffic is expected to be comprised of cut-through traffic with the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000). With the Final Plan Alternative, 43 percent of the 2020 PM peak hour gateway traffic is expected to be cut-through traffic.

Figure 1 in the Final EIS has been changed to correctly label I-680. Figure 27 in the Final EIS has also been corrected. Figure 31 in the EIS has been revised to show Golden Gate Transit (GGT) routes as well as Muni routes and to show the locations of Muni and GGT bus stops within the study area.

TR-4. Weekend Analysis

The CCSF Planning Department, the SFCTA, and others suggest that analysis of weekend traffic conditions should be included in the Final EIS, based on the combined trips to Area A and Area B. Commentors cite Table 3-7 in the PTMP Background Transportation Report as indicating a higher number of weekend person trips than weekday person trips.

Response TR-4 – Peak hour weekday conditions were used because an analysis of peak hour weekday conditions provides a more conservative analysis than peak hour weekend traffic conditions. (In other words, it is the time of greatest impact.) This is because the total number of daily vehicle trips

made on a weekday by employees, residents and visitors is expected to be greater than that on a weekend day. This assumption is consistent with the analysis and findings of the 1994 GMPA (Presidio Transportation Planning and Analysis Technical Report, July 1994, page IV-62).

In addition to total weekend daily traffic volumes being less than total weekday daily traffic volumes, weekend traffic volumes are less concentrated within a given time period and are more dispersed throughout the day. Weekday traffic volumes tend to be concentrated in the commute periods, yielding the highest hourly traffic volumes during the peak hour of the morning and afternoon commute periods (typically around 10 percent of the daily total traffic). Thus, the traffic analysis for the EIS was based on the highest expected hourly traffic volumes, which occur during weekday commute periods. The EIS analyzed study intersections during both the AM peak hour and PM peak hour.

Table 3-7 of the PTMP Background Transportation Report to the Draft EIS was entitled "Existing and Future (2020) External Daily Person Trips to Area B by Alternative." However, this table includes visitor trips only, or excludes resident trips and employee trips, as described in the preceding paragraph. The title of the table has been revised to read, "Existing and Future (2020) External Daily Visitor Trips to Area B by Alternative."

TR-5. Implementation of Mitigation Measures

The CCSF Planning Department and other commentors express concern that the Trust does not have the ability to implement mitigation measures for traffic impacts outside the Presidio's boundaries, as some of these intersections are outside the Trust's jurisdiction. Commentors also request that the Final EIS describe the phased implementation of mitigation measures, and how these mitigation measures will be coordinated with development of the LDAC and the reconstruction of Doyle Drive. The CCSF Planning Department also comments "The last sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 319 states that 'The existing roadway between Gorgas Avenue and Lyon Street would be reconstructed as a one-way roadway.' Is this roadway under the jurisdiction of the Presidio?"

Response TR-5 – The ability of the affected roadways to carry the forecasted traffic volume is estimated by means of the intersection operational analysis.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

Intersections expected to operate at substandard levels of service (LOS E or F) in 2020 identify locations where the transportation network would need to be improved unless increased trip reduction measures should be implemented to decrease traffic volumes.

The traffic mitigation measures identified in the EIS address the cumulative effects of Area A and Area B (including LDAC), other growth in San Francisco and the reconstruction of Doyle Drive. The Trust will monitor traffic volumes, and as critical turning movements at the study intersections approach a point that would cause the level of service at the affected intersection to deteriorate to LOS E or F, the Trust will either implement the measure identified in the EIS, or coordinate with the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic or the NPS to implement the mitigation measure. Where intersections fall outside the Trust's jurisdiction, the decision to implement the identified mitigation measure cannot be made by the Trust. Through coordination with agencies with jurisdiction, the Trust and those agencies would determine their respective contributions to the cost of implementation.

The Trust has been working collaboratively and successfully with the City and State on projects addressing intersections outside control of the Trust. For example, the Letterman Complex Final EIS identified major intersection changes at Richardson Avenue (U.S. Highway 101) and the Trust is currently implementing this project with those two agencies.

The proposed reconfiguration of the roadway between Gorgas Avenue and Lyon Street is within Presidio property, and the proposed change from two-way operation to one way has been shown to not negatively affect the operation of the intersection of Lyon Street/Francisco Street.

TR-6. Level of Detail and Indirect Consequences of Mitigation Measures

The Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD), the Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action and other commentors suggest that the EIS include more detail on the transportation improvements needed to support the Presidio land use alternatives. The CCSF Planning Department submits that some of the described traffic mitigation measures have consequences that are not fully addressed in the EIS, such as removal of on-street parking to provide a turn lane that would mitigate the operation of an intersection. One

commentor suggests that traffic signals do not mitigate an increase in traffic volume and the corresponding effect on noise, air quality and effects on the surrounding neighborhoods. The same commentor also submits that traffic signals would increase the speed of vehicles entering the park.

Response TR-6 – The mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIS include improvements to key intersections that would effectively enhance the operation of the study intersections as described in the EIS, given each alternative's land use scenario. As more buildings are occupied, and as cut-through and background traffic volumes grow, the Trust will work with the City, the NPS and the GGBHTD to implement planned improvements to the transportation network when needed.

The EIS has been revised to address the potential effects of proposed mitigation measures, including the number of parking spaces that need to be removed in order to provide turning lanes and the effects of signaling intersections and Presidio-generated traffic on other nearby intersections. The number of study intersections has been expanded to include other intersections that could potentially be affected in a similar manner as those included in the initial study. As a result of expanding the number of study intersections, four additional mitigation measures were identified.

In many cases, traffic signals would mitigate the operation of study intersections to an acceptable level by reducing overall delay for motorists. Reduced delay for motorists at the study intersections would mean that automobiles would spend less time idling in queues, and therefore would yield improved air quality and less noise pollution. Traffic signals accommodate vehicular traffic more efficiently than STOP signs because they can adapt to changes in travel patterns and traffic conditions that occur throughout the day. Speeds would not increase substantially, although some traffic would not need to stop at the signal and would be able to maintain speed passing through the intersection.

TR-7. Proximity to Golden Gate Bridge

The GGBHTD states that the PTMP lacks detail on how it will incorporate in its transportation and land use plans the challenges and opportunities of its proximity with the Golden Gate Bridge.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

Response TR-7 – Proximity of the Presidio to the Golden Gate Bridge poses challenges and opportunities today, as it will in the future. Proposed land uses would not change the situation, and transportation investments are intended to ensure efficient access for all modes of transportation throughout the park. The Trust will continue to work with the GGBHTD and Caltrans to facilitate traffic flow on Doyle Drive and Park Presidio/Veterans' Boulevard and minimize cut-through traffic on Presidio roadways.

TR-8. Presidio Employee and Resident Transportation Needs

The GGBHTD notes that the PTMP will cluster housing close to work and major activity areas, asks how residents' and employees' circulation needs will be met, and asks if the internal shuttle, bicycling and walking will be the primary modes for internal trips.

Response TR-8 – In addition to improving roadways and intersections to carry the expected amount of traffic, the Trust will continue to provide internal shuttle bus service and improve bikeways and trails to make alternative modes of transportation more viable for travel to and within the Presidio. As noted by the commentor, many land uses of the Plan are well suited to non-automobile modes. The jobs-housing balance and clustering of housing with employment and other activities as described in the PTMP would help to reduce traffic and pollution and improve park operations, transit, and community policing. Bicycling, walking and internal shuttle bus service are expected to be significant modes of travel for trips internal to the park. The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program encourages Presidio residents and employees to carpool, ride transit, bicycle and walk.

TR-9. Further Mitigation for Lincoln/Merchant Intersection

The GGBHTD requests that the Trust identify further measures, if available, to improve traffic operations at the Lincoln Boulevard/Merchant Road intersection.

Response TR-9 – Mitigation for the intersection of Lincoln Boulevard/Merchant Road includes a traffic signal and realignment of the intersection where needed. The Trust believes that these improvements will substantially improve traffic operations at this location. As stated in the EIS,

this mitigation measure may not be warranted for several years. The Trust plans to implement interim changes to improve the safety of this intersection.

TR-10. Travel Demand Assumptions

The CCSF Planning Department requests that the EIS clarify assumptions used in the transportation analysis, including trip generation rates, jobs-housing balance and associated number of household work trips assumed to be internal to the Presidio, mode split, parking turnover rates and TDM program. The CCSF Planning Department also questions why its assumptions for many of these factors were not used.

Response TR-10 – The trip generation rates used in the transportation analysis were based on rates from various entities, including the City, Caltrans, and San Diego. The rates represent reasonable assumptions based on the likely employee densities and land uses proposed for the Presidio. The short-term parking turnover rates are based on turnover rates used for projects within the City and turnover rates used in the GMPA. The Trust has surveyed Presidio employees and residents to determine the current mode split, and the latest survey results indicated that the automobile/transit/other mode split for residents and employees is 67 percent/20 percent/13 percent and 71 percent/16 percent/13 percent, respectively. These surveys were conducted before the implementation of the internal shuttle bus service. As more buildings are occupied, and the TDM Program is advanced and parking fees are implemented, the future mode split is expected to yield more individuals shifting from automobile use to transit, bicycling and walking. The mode split provided on page 321 of the Draft EIS (63 percent auto, 20 percent transit and 17 percent bicycling/walking) is a composite of daily mode splits for all land uses.

The Presidio's live/work model strives to achieve a balance of people both living and working in the Presidio. The jobs-housing balance varies by alternative, with more balanced conditions under the Final Plan Alternative with a jobs-housing balance of 87 percent (i.e., 87 Presidio residential units for per 100 Presidio employees that would be willing and able to live in the Presidio). Currently, approximately 35 percent of Presidio households have at least one Presidio employee. By 2020 with the Final Plan Alternative, 2,060 of the 3,770 Presidio residents are expected to work in the park. About 29

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

percent of all household weekday trips of the Final Plan Alternative are assumed to be internal to the Presidio.

The Presidio's unique community environment, live/work model, and proposed mix of complementary land uses warrant separation of trips into internal and external trips. Internal trips, or trips that begin and end within the Presidio, are likely to have a different mode split than external trips (trips that begin in the Presidio and end outside the Presidio or begin outside the Presidio and end in the Presidio). For external trips, the number of trip ends corresponds to the number of trips, as opposed to internal trips where two trip ends represent one trip. Therefore, a reduction factor of two was applied to the number of the internal trip ends to avoid double-counting trips. For instance, if an individual lives and works within the Presidio and makes a trip from home to work, both the trip end generated by the person's home as well as the trip end attracted by the person's workplace would represent the same trip. A different internal trip percentage factor was applied to each land use category, with the resulting composite reduction being determined by the mix and intensities of land uses in each alternative. The resulting reduction factors ranging between 11 percent and 16 percent are deemed appropriate for the Presidio's expected community environment and planned live-work model.

The Trust's conservative motor vehicle trip reduction assumptions are associated with the commitment to implement an extensive TDM program including parking fees, an internal shuttle bus to provide transit services within the park, and required participation by tenants including specific trip reduction goals. It is not unreasonable to assume the success of this program to shift vehicle trips to other modes due to the incentives and disincentives of the program. U.S. studies have demonstrated that paid parking alone can reduce drive-alone commuting between 17 percent and 44 percent (average 25 percent) and the number of cars driven to work by between 14 percent and 28 percent (average 19 percent). In this manner, the PTMP analysis is also consistent with GMPA transportation analysis which shifted vehicle trips to transit due to the proposed TDM program, and with analyses undertaken by the City for reuse of the Hunters Point Shipyard.

TR-11. Traffic Analysis: Existing Conditions

The CCSF Planning Department submits that the Final EIS should explain why the findings of the traffic analysis for existing conditions differ from the

findings of the 1994 GMPA EIS, particularly at the intersections of Richardson/Lombard and Doyle/Marina/Lyon.

Response TR-11 – Table III-2 of the Presidio Transportation Planning & Analysis Technical Report: A Supplement to the GMPA indicated that the intersection of Doyle Drive, Marina Boulevard and Lyon Street operates at an overall LOS E during the PM peak hour. The traffic volumes used in the analysis for the GMPA were gathered in 1991, whereas traffic counts used for the PTMP were gathered in 2000. Traffic count data collected at this intersection throughout the years since 1991 have shown that the amount of traffic on the westbound through movement during the PM peak hour has decreased substantially, most likely due to the installation of STOP signs on Marina Boulevard in late 2000 and early 2001. The lesser PM peak hour westbound volume at this location yields a much-improved level of service at the intersection.

The intersection of Mason Street/Marina Boulevard/Lyon Street/Doyle Drive is actually two intersections that are within close proximity and have two different kinds of traffic control devices. The intersection of Doyle Drive/Lyon Street/Marina Boulevard is signalized and was analyzed with the appropriate methodology for signalized intersections as outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual. The intersection of Mason Street/Marina Boulevard/Lyon Street is an unsignalized intersection with Lyon Street being STOP-sign controlled, and was analyzed accordingly.

The GMPA indicated that the intersection of Richardson Avenue/Lombard Street carried 3,137 vehicles on the southbound approach during the AM peak hour in July 1991. Traffic counts collected for the Draft EIS indicate that the volume of traffic in this direction in the AM peak hour was 2,653 vehicles per hour in May 2000. However, traffic counts collected in 1999 for the Letterman Complex Final EIS measured 2,903 vehicles per hour in this direction. Therefore, the Final EIS has been revised to assume the higher volume of 2,903 vehicles per hour in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour for existing conditions. Analysis of the intersection in 2020 assumes a growth rate from the higher southbound traffic volume. The poor level of service on this approach is what resulted in an overall LOS E in the 1994 GMPA. With the volume reduced to its current level, the level of service for the intersection improves. However, the critical left-turn movement on Lombard Street westbound continues to operate at LOS F and is

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

a critical constraint. This is being mitigated in the short-term by a new intersection at Richardson Avenue and Gorgas Avenue (Mitigation Measure TR-1 in the Letterman Complex Final EIS), and in the long-term by the Doyle Drive project.

TR-12. Traffic Safety

A few commentors, including the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, suggest that the Trust should implement traffic calming measures and other engineering solutions to manage traffic within the park.

Response TR-12 – Although this issue is not directly addressed in the Plan, the Trust continuously plans and implements changes to the Presidio’s roadway system to calm traffic and improve safety conditions for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. Community input for such changes is solicited as part of the planning process for those improvements. The commentors are referred to the transportation section of Chapter Two of the Final Plan for further discussion.

TR-13. Construction Traffic

The GGBHTD suggests that the Final EIS should identify what impacts, if any, are expected from the increase in construction vehicle traffic near the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza.

Response TR-13 – The construction vehicle traffic associated with rehabilitation or new construction in the Presidio would likely use the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza to access the Golden Gate Bridge. The proposed Construction Traffic Management Plan (Mitigation Measure TR-26) would include measures to mitigate any potential impacts. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would include information on construction phases and duration, scheduling, proposed haul routes, permit parking, staging area management, visitor safety, detour routes, and pedestrian movements on adjacent routes.

TR-14. Study Intersections for Traffic Analysis

The SFCTA and the CCSF Planning Department suggest that future intersections with Girard Road should be analyzed in the Final EIS traffic

analysis since the proposed reconfigured Doyle Drive would have access from Girard Road.

Response TR-14 – Girard Road and intersections with Girard Road in the vicinity of Doyle Drive are being analyzed as part of the Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Project since the operation of intersections along Girard Road will largely depend on the design of the proposed interchange at Girard Road. The Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Project has included the land use assumptions identified for the PTMP, which will allow for the identification of needed improvements on Girard Road. Since the intersection of Girard Road and Lincoln Boulevard will operate largely independent of specific Doyle Drive design features, the Final EIS has added analysis of this intersection. As indicated in Tables 46 and 47 in Section 4.5, the intersection would operate at LOS B in both the AM and PM peak hours after mitigation.

TR-15. 14th Avenue Gate

The Planning Association for the Richmond questions the proposal to reopen the 14th Avenue Gate to vehicular traffic.

Response TR-15 – The 1994 GMPA recommended reopening the 14th Avenue Gate to automobile traffic and operating the 14th and 15th Avenue gates as a one-way couplet (14th Avenue inbound/15th Avenue outbound), and thus, this configuration constitutes the future No Action condition. However, in response to neighborhood requests, the Trust is committed to analyzing various alternatives for the potential opening of the 14th Avenue Gate. These alternatives will be reviewed with community groups and the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic. Any proposals for changes from the existing condition would be presented to neighborhood groups by the Trust, and since these changes would primarily be on City property, would have to be approved by the City as well as the Trust.

TR-16. Effects of Additional Traffic on Surrounding Neighborhoods

Several residents in neighborhoods surrounding the Presidio express concern that the increase in traffic traveling to and from the Presidio would threaten the stability of the buildings in the neighborhoods and exacerbate the already congested traffic conditions in their neighborhoods. One commentor claims

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

that the pavement section of 15th Avenue could not withstand the traffic volume currently generated by the Jewish Community Center (JCC) that travels through the 15th Avenue Gate.

Response TR-16 – In most cases, any increased delay or deterioration of intersection level of service due to the additional traffic generated by the EIS alternatives would be adequately mitigated by the mitigation measures presented in the EIS. These mitigation measures would ensure that the operation of the intersections is maintained at an acceptable level of service as determined by the City and that traffic delays are not excessive. The unmitigable operating conditions at three study intersections would occur as a result of cut-through traffic and regional traffic growth as well as the PTMP EIS alternatives.

The stability of buildings and pavement wear are functions far more related to the weight of vehicles than to their volume. Implementation of the PTMP will not substantially increase heavy vehicle traffic on internal or nearby streets. The 15th Avenue Gate has virtually no heavy vehicle traffic. Currently, traffic traveling through the 15th Avenue Gate is comprised of traffic traveling to and from the Public Health Service Hospital (PHSH) area, other areas of the park, and cut-through traffic. The Trust plans to reoccupy the PHSH area sometime in the future, and traffic volumes through the 15th Avenue Gate are expected to increase from current levels. After discussions with members of the residential neighborhood outside the 15th Avenue Gate, the Trust agreed to limit the amount of JCC traffic traveling through the 15th Avenue Gate as part of the JCC's TDM program. Since then, the Presidio Trust has monitored traffic traveling to and from the JCC, and found that JCC is complying with the limitations. The Trust is responsible for maintenance of pavement within the boundaries of the park; pavement outside the Presidio's boundary is the responsibility of the San Francisco Department of Public Works.

The Trust considers the 15th Avenue Gate a minor entrance/exit to the park. The Trust actively works to limit traffic utilizing this gate. However, the PHSH area is a part of the Presidio and access to and from the area via Battery Caulfield will be maintained.

TR-17. Prevention of Traffic from Using Recreational Routes

The CCSF Planning Department and San Francisco Tomorrow request that the Final EIS discuss specific steps to prevent Presidio and cut-through traffic from using shoreline recreational routes (i.e., Marina Boulevard).

Response TR-17 – The amount of traffic expected on Marina Boulevard in the future will be largely determined by the design alternative chosen for the reconstruction of Doyle Drive. The provision of an interchange on Doyle Drive at Girard Road will dramatically improve traffic access routes to the Presidio from the east, reducing traffic volumes through the Marina Gate, which would likely be used primarily by those traveling to Crissy Field (both Area A and Area B).

Cut-through traffic at the Presidio is detrimental to the park, and not just to shoreline areas. Although the Trust will attempt to curb cut-through traffic in the Presidio that should be utilizing other facilities, the use of park roads as cut-through routes is likely to continue. Park roads will be managed to provide access to park sites rather than accommodate cut-through traffic.

TR-18. Mason Street

The Golden Gate National Parks Association (GGNPA) and others suggest that the Trust consider moving Mason Street to the south to remove a physical barrier between Crissy Field and the Crissy Field Center.

Response TR-18 – The Trust is aware of this issue and will continue to coordinate with the GGNRA and the GGNPA to study the feasibility of routing traffic off Mason Street. Finding the most appropriate solution will require a detailed alignment study that is beyond the scope of this programmatic EIS. Potential solutions will be studied in the future, as indicated in Chapter Two of the Final Plan.

TR-19. Access to Palace of Fine Arts

The Exploratorium and another commentor request that the PTMP include a safer and more direct connection between the Exploratorium/Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

Response TR-19 – The Trust is currently in the final design stages for a new signalized intersection on Richardson Avenue that is farther northwest of the existing intersection at Francisco Street. The new intersection will provide a shorter crosswalk across Richardson Avenue at Lyon Street, substantially improving the pedestrian connection between the Palace of Fine Arts and the Presidio. The new intersection is part of Mitigation Measure TR-1 from the Letterman Complex Final EIS; construction is expected to be completed by December 2002. The Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study team is also considering improved vehicular access to and from the Palace of Fine Arts as part of the Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study EIR/EIS.

TR-20 *Need for a Helipad*

The San Francisco Medical Air Access Project is concerned that the PTMP does not address the issue of a medical helipad at the Presidio. (“For those of us who provide care to victims of critical illness and injury and in concern for the patients we serve, we are aware of the need for a helipad in this location and believe that the absence of any viable alternative has created a safety issue.”)

Response TR-20 – This concern is acknowledged. The GMPA states “the helipad [at Crissy Field] will be retained for military use, disaster relief, and emergency medical transport, but it may be moved to another location on the former airfield...” (page 89). Following adoption of the GMPA, the Crissy Field Plan included a provision for an emergency helicopter landing site to be built within the grassy knoll of the field in the original site. However, the NPS chose not to include a helipad in the final design of Crissy Field (Area A), either for medical transport or for emergencies.

There may not be other locations outside the historic airfield where a helipad can be safely accommodated without affecting the historic integrity of the National Historic Landmark District or the visitor experience. Nonetheless, the Trust would like to coordinate with the commentor to determine whether there may be suitable landing sites for use during disasters (such as an earthquake). Physical and operational requirements for the type of facility required for more frequent use would require a comprehensive needs assessment and detailed feasibility study. Such a study should assess sites outside the Presidio, closer to area hospitals.