

CORONADO TUNNEL COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC PRESENTATION

Thursday, April 10, 2003

MINUTES

1. ROLL CALL:

Attendees: Sut Clark, Art Osborne, Bill Huck, Betsy Gill, Steve Clarey, Al Hollingsworth, Al Ovrom and Casey Tanaka

City Staff: Jim Benson and Gail Brydges

Consultants: Brian Pearson, Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) and Lee Warnock, Hatch Mott MacDonald (tunnel subconsultant)

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

2. MINUTES: The minutes of the March 17, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. Update

- Task 9 – Public Outreach and Presentation Materials:

- Summary of Comments from March 25, 2003 Public Meeting: Mr. Benson said that, despite the projector bulb blowing out, the presentation went well. There was good response from the public (about 100 people), much better than at the EOC in the fall. The context was set that this was not a discussion about current traffic, but a long-term solution. Most people had good questions. Mr. Clark concurred that it was a constructive meeting. Ms. Brydges said that a SANDAG representative was in the audience and he was impressed with the broad range of comments. Mr. Clarey asked if there had been any interaction with the Navy and Mr. Benson replied that just this morning he and Ms. Brydges did a briefing on the project for Cdr. Rios. Cdr. Rios said he read through the entire MIS package over the weekend and said that some things had been clarified for him. Mr. Benson gave him the PowerPoint presentation and Cdr. Rios agreed completely that everything he knows about the Third Street Gate is that the tunnel can be compatible with it. Mr. Benson said he was also on the Kim Tolles cable TV show and it went well.

- City Council Public Hearing – April 15, 2003: A time certain of 3:15 p.m. has been assigned. There is an expectation that this will be done by 4:00 p.m. for a time certain presentation on the Glorietta Bay Master Plan. Mr.

Pearson distributed Task 4.4 Technical Memorandum – Evaluation of Alternative Strategies. The most significant single page is 17, which sums up the evaluation of each strategy against the five categories. There will also be a set of colored conceptual plans attached to the agenda package. The Council will be asked to consider advancing certain strategies into the Environmental Document and to select one preferred alternative to begin seeking funds for. Mr. Pearson suggested that the two-lane cut-and-cover tunnel be advanced as a bored tunnel rather than cut-and-cover. It appears that cut-and-cover and bored tunnels are closer in cost than previously thought. The bored is preferred because of the extreme impact of construction of the cut-and-cover technique. Mr. Clark suggested that the matrix include Strategy C as a bored tunnel.

- Revised Preliminary Estimated Costs: Mr. Pearson distributed Task 6.0, draft cost summary information, for the four strategies. Mr. Hollingsworth asked if the costs are inflated and Mr. Pearson said no, they are 2003 figures. Mr. Huck noted that on the strategy shown on page 4.1, last paragraph, indicates that no right-of-way is taken, but \$15 million for right-of-way is shown. Mr. Pearson explained that it should actually be labeled “Right-of-Way/Utilities” and that the cost is for the utilities. In the next version of Task 6.0, there will be added chapters for O&M costs and escalated costs. Mr. Hollingsworth said he felt it is hard to make a recommendation on the best alternative if costs aren’t considered. The best technology can be chosen, but what about the costs? His experience is that the financial concerns determine how a project ends up. Mr. Huck felt that this was not the time to discuss financial strategies because that cannot be discussed briefly.

- B. Public Presentation on the Major Investment Study (MIS) and Corridor Improvement Strategies: Mr. Benson said he and Ms. Brydges are meeting tomorrow with SANDAG officials Gary Gallegos and Pedro Orso-Delgado to specifically discuss TDM and TSM measures – how to get people out of their cars. He then gave a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the schedule. He said that the laydown area does not impact the Navy as much as indicated before because the major area has been moved to the foot of the bridge.

Mr. Pearson reviewed each strategy for the benefit of the audience. Mr. Hollingsworth wanted to make sure that the modified Strategy C is clear that it will improve in the bored tunnel version, and in fact, will cost less than Strategy D. Mr. Pearson said that in this case, cost would be traded off for bidirectional capability.

The meeting was opened for public comment.

Lou DeBeer, 845 E Avenue, asked if there are any figures on the O & M costs for each strategy and where the funds would come from. Mr. Pearson said it would be about \$6 million for each strategy and the assumption is that Caltrans would

take over. Mr. DeBeer asked if the traffic loading for 2030 was used for all the strategies and Mr. Pearson responded that it was and that only Strategies C and D accommodate the 2030 volumes at a fairly high level of service.

Pat Miller, 310 J Avenue, asked if, in terms of blowing stuff out, why couldn't it be blown toward North Island? Mr. Pearson said it must be blown out in the direction of traffic. Ms. Miller commented, regarding the 2030 projections, that it's been her experience that every projection she's seen in the past has been met many years before. Mr. Benson said that the overall 2030 projections in the SANDAG model (which the City must accept) is 0.2% per year for the Navy. The weakness in this model is not knowing what the Navy is doing and the Navy itself does not know what it will be doing in 10 years. Mr. Osborne pointed out that we will begin to approach bridge capacity and Strategies C and D will accommodate bridge capacity.

Ray Connelly, 345 B Avenue, said he appreciated the time and effort spent on this project and asked what's the legality on the tolls? He wondered if the State could put the toll back on the bridge to pay for the project. Mr. Benson said the State could put the toll back on immediately, for example, in a financial crisis. The City knows that the FHWA wants to see local participation, so we may want to consider that users of the bridge help contribute to the problem they make. The City will want to look at this in the upcoming financing options task.

Jayne Sult, 300 D Avenue, wondered why Third Street is shown still running two ways. Mr. Benson replied that this is one of the weaknesses of Strategy C. Ms. Sult noted that Strategy B has traffic going both ways and Mr. Clark said that B costs the most, has horrendous construction impacts and does not meet the 2030 volumes.

Pat Miller asked whether the North Island unions would offer support and Mr. Benson said the City will be working with the unions to get them to support a certain approach so they can talk to their elected officials. Unions can be a potent force.

- C. Consideration of Recommendation to the City Council on a Preferred Improvement Strategy and Other Strategies to Carry into the Environmental Review Process: A draft motion for the Tunnel Commission to forward to the City Council was part of the agenda package for today's meeting. Mr. Clark reviewed the draft motion and asked for comments. Mr. Osborne would like to see exploration of Strategy C carried forward as a bored tunnel. Mr. Huck said that if the cut-and-cover tunnel is removed, then the focus between C and D becomes reversibility. Mr. Osborne suggested adding "least disruptive during construction" to Strategy D. Mr. Ovrom suggested amending Strategy C to read in part ". . . drop from further consideration the cut-and-cover construction. Do carry forward the single-bored tunnel" Mr. Ovrom moved to amend the recommendation as discussed and to forward the amended recommendation to the

City Council for consideration. Mr. Osborne seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

5. Future Meeting Schedule: Thursday, May 1, 2003 at 4:00 p.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Approved:

Sut Clark, Chairman

Coronado Tunnel Commission
Recommendation to the City Council
April 10, 2003

The CTC makes the following recommendation to the City Council related to the Major Investment Study:

For Strategy A: Carry this strategy forward into the Project Report/Environmental Document stage due to its cost advantage while noting the serious concerns related to: (1) requirement for right-of-way acquisition; (2) insufficient additional traffic volume capacity; and (3) little to no improvement to neighborhood traffic impacts.

For Strategy B: Do not carry this strategy forward due to the impact of right of way acquisition and the extreme community impacts required during construction.

For Strategy C: Because of the serious impacts on the community over the four-year construction process, drop from further consideration the cut-and-cover construction method. Do carry forward the single-bored tunnel construction methodology due to the significantly reduced impacts during construction.

For Strategy D: Carry forward the twin-bored tunnels as the Preferred Improvement Strategy based upon the added capacity provided, capability to handle two-way traffic, flexibility of operation offered by separation of traffic lanes, overall best performance matched to the project objectives and the significantly reduced impacts during construction.