

4.27 DOYLE DRIVE (DD)

CONTENTS

- DD-1. *Coordination of Doyle Drive Construction with the PTMP*
- DD-2. *Traffic Impacts without Doyle Drive Project*
- DD-3. *Consideration of Doyle Drive Alternatives*
- DD-4. *Effects of Doyle Drive on Crissy Marsh and Tennessee Hollow*
- DD-5. *Provision of Parking under New Doyle Drive*
- DD-6. *Consideration of Loss of Parking Currently under Doyle Drive*
- DD-7. *Describe Connections to Doyle Drive*

DD-1. *Coordination of Doyle Drive Construction with the PTMP*

Caltrans, the CCSF Planning Department and others request that the Final EIS describe how phased construction of Doyle Drive would be coordinated with project phasing at the Presidio.

Response DD-1 – Phased construction of Doyle Drive is still being analyzed by the Doyle Drive study team. All plan alternatives being evaluated by the Trust assume complete reconstruction of Doyle Drive in less than five years, which is shorter than the 20-year PTMP time horizon. Detailed phasing of the Plan implementation is difficult to assess. Completion of Doyle Drive is evaluated, however, as part of the cumulative impact analysis of the Plan alternatives.

The Trust is closely coordinating its proposed projects in the Doyle Drive corridor area (e.g., Tennessee Hollow, possible Crissy Marsh expansion, Crissy Field Area B development) with the Doyle Drive reconstruction study team. Since all of the current Doyle Drive alternatives are confined to roughly the same horizontal alignment, no significantly different issues are expected in terms of overall land use planning in the Presidio.

DD-2. *Traffic Impacts without Doyle Drive Project*

Several commentors, including Caltrans, the CCSF, and the SFCTA, request that the Final EIS address the traffic impacts without the Doyle Drive project. The SFCTA states that Doyle Drive reconstruction should not be included in the No Action Alternative (GMPA 2000).

Response DD-2 – The reconstruction of Doyle Drive is a highway project sponsored by the SFCTA, Caltrans and the FHWA; its purpose and need relate to traffic and seismic safety. Although the Doyle Drive project would affect travel patterns to and from Area B of the Presidio because it proposes new access at Girard Road, the majority of the project would retain current roadway capacities and it is essentially independent of “build” – “no-build” land use decisions for Area B. No funding has been identified for construction of the Doyle Drive project, but substantial resources have been allocated towards its planning and design, and it is contained within the State’s 25-year transportation improvement plan. For these reasons, assumption of reconstruction in the No Action and other EIS alternatives is reasonable.

Traffic impacts without Doyle Drive reconstruction were tabulated for the largest of the Plan alternatives, Alternative D (Cultural Destination¹). This alternative was selected because it had the highest peak hour traffic generation of all the alternatives. The results of this sensitivity analysis have been included in the main body (Volume I) of the PTMP Background Transportation Report, and demonstrate that during both the AM peak hour and PM peak hour, the following intersections would require mitigation if Doyle Drive is not reconstructed as planned:

¹ For traffic purposes, Doyle Drive reconstruction is herein defined as those Doyle Drive alternatives that provide a direct new connection to the Presidio. All current Doyle Drive reconstruction alternatives except for No-Build and “Retrofit and Widen” provide a new interchange to an extension of Girard Road.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

	AM	PM
• #2 - Lyon/Lombard		X
• #3 – Richardson/Francisco	X	X
• #4 – Gorgas/Lyon/Francisco	X	X
• #28 – Lincoln/Kobbe	X	
• #31 – Lincoln/Merchant	X	
• #33 – Lincoln/GG Bridge Viewing Area		X

Mitigation would include an additional turn lane at Lincoln/Merchant, Lincoln/Kobbe and Lyon/Lombard, a traffic signal at Lincoln/Golden Gate Bridge Viewing Area, and removing stop signs from the major approaches at Gorgas/Lyon/Francisco. The intersection of Richardson/Francisco would not be able to be reasonably mitigated. These mitigations are not proposed by the Trust at this time because Doyle Drive reconstruction is planned and analyzed as a cumulative project (i.e., part of the future setting).

In terms of transit, bus routes serving the Presidio would be minimally affected if Doyle Drive is not reconstructed because of construction of the Richardson slip ramp project (Mitigation Measure TR-1) proposed in the Final Letterman Complex EIS. Transfers with Golden Gate Transit service would occur at current stops at the Golden Gate Bridge Plaza and at Richardson/Francisco. The Presidio shuttle bus service would provide regular connections with both of these stops. In addition, Muni buses would provide service to the proposed Main Post transit center through current gates. Tour buses would continue to access the park through the gates they are currently permitted to enter plus the new Richardson Avenue entrance and exit. Pedestrian and bicycle access would continue via the current paths.

Additional analysis of project impacts if Doyle Drive is not reconstructed with a direct Presidio access will be included in the Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study Draft EIR/EIS, which is expected to be published in fall 2002 by the SFCTA. The Doyle Drive project is using as input land use forecasts prepared by the Trust and consistent with the Final Plan Alternative.

DD-3. Consideration of Doyle Drive Alternatives

Several commentors including the CCSF Planning Department and the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) suggest that the PTMP EIS consider different alignments for Doyle Drive, its placement of a primary entrance point to the Presidio, and its effects on development patterns in the Presidio.

Response DD-3 – The Trust is a cooperating agency in the Doyle Drive Environmental and Design Study EIR/EIS and, in this capacity, has had considerable input in all issues relating to the project, particularly alignment alternatives and location of access points. In the matter of alignment, the primary concerns relate to conservation of the Presidio’s natural and cultural resources. This has dictated an alignment coincident with the current highway alignment, and a variety of vertical alignments have been and will continue to be studied as part of the Doyle Drive project. Though important to the park, these options are more properly studied as part of the highway project, and are largely independent of the issues assessed in this programmatic EIS.

The location of primary vehicular points of access to the Presidio is important and relevant to the land use and circulation alternatives presented in PTMP EIS. A variety of potential access locations were examined as part of the consideration of the Doyle Drive project, and all but the location at Girard Road were rejected. The Girard Road location was found to have the least impact on park resources and was located between the park’s major vehicle generating planning districts – Letterman and the Main Post. The effect of this new point of entry on development and circulation in the park was considered throughout the PTMP planning process.

One commentor suggested that direct access to Doyle Drive might obviate the need to reopen the 14th Avenue gate. Since that gate is primarily intended to serve local traffic in the vicinity of the Public Health Service Hospital, vehicle usage at that location would not be greatly affected by what happens vis-à-vis Doyle Drive.

DD-4. Effects of Doyle Drive on Crissy Marsh and Tennessee Hollow

Several commentors including the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, the Sierra Club and the Urban Watershed Project suggest that the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

Trust require the Doyle Drive alignment and ramps to allow for Crissy Marsh expansion and Tennessee Hollow drainage to the marsh.

Response DD-4 – The Trust and GGNRA have worked closely together to advocate for these important natural resource projects with the Doyle Drive study team. Most of this effort to date has focussed on Tennessee Hollow because the general location of the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor is known, and it crosses all Doyle Drive alignments.

The Trust, in its scoping comments to the SFCTA on the Doyle Drive reconstruction project (April 3, 2000) states that “Doyle Drive alternatives must be coordinated with the Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor restoration project.” To this end, the SFCTA has considered the Tennessee Hollow corridor as a given, and worked with the Trust and NPS in analyzing the impacts of various vertical alignments on the riparian corridor as well as potential methods for ensuring its viability.

Less effort to date has been spent on Crissy Marsh expansion because potential locations for expansion to the north have yet to be identified and because the horizontal alignments of the Doyle Drive reconstruction alternatives do not vary substantially. While the presence of Doyle Drive may constrain the range of possible marsh expansion alternatives, the Trust will continue to work with the Doyle Drive team in evaluating the impacts (if any) of the vertical highway alignment alternatives on marsh expansion as they develop.

DD-5. Provision of Parking under New Doyle Drive

The Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning and other commentors suggest that the Presidio Trust consider replacing parking spaces under the new Doyle Drive.

Response DD-5 – The Trust intends to provide sufficient parking to support proposed land uses in the most environmentally acceptable and cost-effective manner. At Crissy Field the Trust expects that many of the parking spaces

currently under Doyle Drive would be eliminated and may consider replacing some of that parking under a new elevated Doyle Drive structure if that configuration of the replacement roadway is selected. Once a preferred alternative for Doyle Drive is selected, the feasibility of providing associated parking will be examined in concert with advancement of the Doyle Drive designs.

DD-6. Consideration of Loss of Parking Currently under Doyle Drive

The SFCTA requests that the Trust clarify whether or not the loss of parking spaces currently under Doyle Drive has been incorporated into the future parking supply analysis.

Response DD-6 – The parking supply presented in the Final EIS assumes an overall net reduction in parking supply from what currently exists in Area B. Although much of the parking supply will likely be located where parking spaces currently exist, more specific future planning will refine the specific locations and layout of parking spaces. If the future design of Doyle Drive would not provide space beneath the structure for parking, there would still be adequate space to provide the proposed parking supply in other areas of Crissy Field.

DD-7. Describe Connections to Doyle Drive

The CCSF Planning Department requests that the Trust describe connections to Doyle Drive from the proposed major employment centers.

Response DD-7 – The Final EIS includes a description of the connection to Doyle Drive via a new interchange at Girard Road. This access point is consistent with alternatives being considered as part of the Doyle Drive planning process, and would connect to major employment centers via local streets such as an extension of Girard Road to Lincoln Boulevard, and Gorgas Avenue.