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Translating Section 106:

Building Consensus among Multiple Responsible Parties For the Doyle Drive Replacement Project in the Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark District
Built in 1936, the 1.5 mile long Doyle Drive is the primary highway and transit linkage through San Francisco between counties to the south (San Mateo and Santa Clara) and to the north (Marin and Sonoma). It carries 144,000 weekday travelers.
Current Condition

• Non-standard lanes
• Lack of a barrier separating opposing traffic flows,
• Lack of shoulders for use by disabled vehicles, maintenance crews, and emergency and enforcement vehicles.
• High accident rate.
• Structure that support the elevated roadway has significantly deteriorated due heavy traffic and salt air. With the current situation, Doyle Drive may be vulnerable to earthquake damage.
Muwekma Ohlone

Amah-Mutsun Ohlone Constanoan

Chochenyo Ohlone

Pajaro Valley Ohlone Indian Council

Indian Canyon Band of Costanoan/Mutsun Indians
Project History

- Early 1970's California Department of Transportation plans for improving Doyle Drive
- 1973 Draft Environmental Statement (other studies followed)
In 1992 San Francisco Board of Supervisors established Doyle Drive Task Force to:

- consider the Caltrans alternatives
- develop a consensus on the preferred replacement alternative
Political Context:

• vigorous debate about the project among San Francisco neighborhoods affected by its use

• the imminent closure of the Presidio by the US Army.
1993 Task Force recommendations to the Board of Supervisors reflecting:

- reconciliation of Caltrans requirements,
- the needs of the new Presidio National Park,
- environmental concerns, and
- community expectations.
San Francisco County Transportation Authority 1996 Doyle Drive Intermodal Study recommending the following features for the replacement project:
• A center divider barrier to eliminate head-on collisions;
• Direct vehicular and transit access to the new Presidio National Park;
• Design to expand views of the Golden Gate Bridge and the National Park and increase safety;
• Expanded transit, car pooling and alternative commute options; and
• Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies for toll collection, vehicular safety enhancement, and transit schedule coordination.
ALTERNATIVE 2 - REPLACE & WIDEN

NORTH Bound

SOUTH Bound

37.8 (126')

3.0 (10')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.0 (10')

10.8 (36')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.6 (12')

3.0 (10')

0.6 (2')
Doyle Drive in the view shed
Doyle Drive in the view shed
San Francisco Palace of Fine Arts
Presidio of San Francisco
National Historic Landmark
When the Spanish arrived in 1776 the San Francisco peninsula was the territory of people called the Ohlone.
For the next 218 years the 1480 acre Presidio served as a military post under the flags of Spain (1776-1822), Mexico (1822-48), and the United States (1848-1994).
As a U.S. Army post, the Presidio protected commerce and trade, and played a logistical role in every major U.S. military conflict from 1848 until closure. World events and those on the home front - from military campaigns to the rise of aviation, from World Fairs to natural disasters - left their mark on the Presidio landscape.
On October 1, 1994, the Presidio became part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Since 1998, the Presidio has been jointly managed by the National Park Service and the Presidio Trust.

The Presidio Trust is a special public-private governmental agency tasked with managing most of the buildings of the Presidio and making the park financially self-sufficient by 2013.
NHL Contributors
Section 106 Studies
With Multiple Responsible Parties
Administrative Challenges

Schedule influenced by:

• piecemeal funding
• condition of the facility
• local political commitments

Project nominated to Register of Priority Projects (Executive Order 13274)
Continuity and corporate memory are difficult to maintain for a project with such a long time frame.

During this period staff have left or retired from every major responsible agency during this period (2 SHPOs, FHWA, Caltrans and Presidio Trust) as well as the Western Regional Office Director for the National Trust, an important consulting party.
There can be confusion about roles and responsibilities.

The SFCTA is managing project, but actually most of the work is done by a team of consultants. Caltrans acts for FHWA which has responsibility for engineering and regulatory standards. National Park Service and Presidio Trust are land owners with 106 responsibilities as well as standing relationships with consulting parties.
Each agency has its own mission. Each transportation development agency and steward agency has distinctive approaches.

Building consensus therefore is critical to achieving Section 106 compliance given the different Section 106 “cultures” involved.
FHWA and Caltrans approach Section 106 more prescriptively and decision-making operated in a hierarchical fashion.

The NPS and the Presidio Trust evidently have a practice of dealing with Section 106 programmatically. Their project purposes and needs thus include the commitment to avoid and mitigate, whereas FHWA must document effects before considering mitigation.
The transportation agencies assumed that the steward agencies possessed complete assessments of their historic resources. However, the San Francisco Presidio is a complex historic property and the proposed undertaking required considerable survey and evaluation.
Survey and Evaluation

- Old nomination information necessitated survey of Cold-War structures
- NHL only confirmed archaeological sensitivity—it was not an inventory
- Cultural Landscape to be yet to be defined (nine sub periods of significance)
During archaeological survey Ohlone consultation observed a mixture of FHWA and National Park Service protocols.
Effects Analysis Issues

• Timing of Involvement of Interested Parties
• Linear versus Iterative Model
• Level of Detail
Approach to the circulation pre-decisional information to Interested Parties

Though the responsible agencies met with interested parties (such as the National Trust, Fort Point and the Ohlones) there was a question about the circulation of draft reports before SHPO review given that all build alternative had adverse effect.
Linear Workplan/Iterative Process

During the Finding of Effect stage the Presidio Trust and National Park Service have suggested design changes that have changed design alternatives.

Agencies similarly have different approaches regarding the Treatment Plan.
Effects on Individual Buildings
Building 106-
1909 Band Barracks
Doyle Drive designed to limit access to avoid conflicting with function of the Army’s Presidio (and designed in response to topography).

The Presidio Trust property owner wants access. This and other concepts such as the parkway alternative highlights the challenges of adaptive reuse and the ironies inherent in such an effects analysis.
Cultural Landscape Issues

What constitutes boundary erosion of both a park and NHL? The analysis needs to synthesize the loss of buildings, loss of buildings that constitute boundaries, loss of hardscape and greenscape, and changes to the historic topography, such as the bluff that separates the upper and lower post.
Figure 22b
Mason Street/Palace of Fine Arts—Alternative 2—No Detour, Looking West
Note the absence of warehouses 1182, 1183, 1184, and 1185.

Figure 22c
Mason Street/Palace of Fine Arts—Alternative 2—with Detour, Looking West
Note the absence of Buildings 201, 204, and 230 and changes in topography.

Figure 22e
Mason Street/Palace of Fine Arts—Alternative 5—Circle, Looking West
Figure 20b
Halleck Street—Alternative 2 – No Detour, Looking South
Figure 20c
Halleck Street—Alternative 2 – with Detour, Looking South
Note absence of Buildings 201, 204, and 230 and accompanying network of streets.

Figure 20d
Halleck Street—Alternative 5, Looking South
The End
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