

**CORONADO TUNNEL COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
Wednesday, December 20, 2006**

**Police Facility, 700 Orange Avenue
Community Meeting Room**

Minutes

1. ROLL CALL:

Attendees: Sut Clark, Art Osborne, Steve Clarey, Margaret Pimpo, Lou Smith and Bill Huck

City Staff: Jim Benson

Consultant: Brian Pearson, Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)

2. Oral Communications: Mr. Clark reminded the commissioners that they should be looking for a new commissioner to replace Al Ovrom who was elected to the City Council and can no longer serve as a commissioner. Mr. Ovrom, however, was appointed to be the Council representative to the Tunnel Commission. Mrs. Pimpo reported that she has spoken to two individuals who have not gotten back to her. Her goal is to have a confirmation or a nay by the next meeting.

Mr. Benson said that the City wrote a letter to Capt. Gaiani and Capt. Giorgione asking that they provide appropriate Navy support to the SR-75 PR/ED documents when available. The verbal response to the City Manager is that they and Adm. Hering don't have the authorization to do this and it has to go to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

3. Tunnel Commission Recommendations Regarding Value Analysis Study Recommendations for City Council Consideration at January 16, 2007 Council Meeting: Mr. Pearson discussed the schedule impact if the recommendations are accepted. In the past, the Navy and City reviewed the reports before they went to Caltrans. We have now proposed a parallel process and the additional work will not affect any milestone dates. Mr. Clarey asked if there would be an impact on the contract cost and Mr. Pearson responded that PB needs to go back into some of the environmental and technical reports and refine them. It will take approximately another \$250,000 and two months. Money will be transferred out of Task 10 to do this, resulting in no net increase to the PB contract.

Mr. Pearson advised that if either tunnel option is selected, PB would pursue design standards exceptions to bring the costs down.

Mr. Clark told the other commissioners that a recommendation on the VAS revisions will be made to the City Council on January 16. The purpose of today's special meeting is for the Tunnel Commission to make a recommendation to the Council.

- a. Value Analysis Study (VAS) Alternative No. 1.1 – Design Refinement of Alternative 3 – Grade Separations at Third and Fourth Streets at Orange Avenue: In its

present configuration, this alternative has cross-sections so wide that 60 properties would have to be taken. A solution developed in the VAS would be to reduce the width by lengthening the underpass structure and eliminating most of the property takes. The problem is that it would require that some streets become cul-de-sacs and some homes would lose roadway vehicle access, but would have alley access. Two properties would be landlocked. The idea is to drop Alternative 3 as originally designed and replace it with the revised version. The PDT felt that the revised form should be retained for the environmental document.

Mr. Clark stated that Alternative 3 does not respond to the Purpose & Need Statement. If the grade separation becomes the preferred alternative he will be against it even if there is money to do it, but not another alternative. It would divide the town even worse than it is now. The traffic would be able to move at pretty high speeds to the base and it would be unsafe for pedestrians, schoolchildren and other vehicles. If this were to be done nothing else would ever be done. He's also reluctant to spend money studying an alternative that may ultimately be rejected.

Mr. Benson advised that to take it out now would leave the whole study vulnerable. In the long run, someone could challenge the EIR because this alternative was eliminated. He's concerned because traffic has not been as bad as it was, for instance, in 2002. If we cannot get the money for any of the tunnel options, is there an alternative that will alleviate traffic? It would be a disservice to the community if it comes to 2012 and it's apparent there won't be a tunnel. He said that based on 60 takes being unacceptable, there's a rationale for changing Alternative 3. Caltrans wants to drop the original Alternative 3 because of the takes. In the revised version, Caltrans' objection is gone.

Mr. Pearson said that when you have a broad enough selection of alternatives it gives the decision-makers enough choices to make a selection. He said there would need to be a very explicit reason why Alternative 3 was dropped from further consideration. This alternative meets two objectives of the Purpose and Need Study: (1) It improves access to North Island; and (2) It improves mobility. However, it does not meet the other objectives. It would be roughly a \$50 million project, not including the cost to address the ten impacted properties.

Mr. Smith said we're at a manageable number of alternatives now and if we don't look at all of the various options we could be challenged that we didn't do due diligence.

Mr. Clarey felt it was premature to drop the refinement of this alternative and Mr. Huck agreed with Mr. Benson's comment about disservice to the community. He felt this should continue to be explored.

b. Value Analysis Study Alternative No. 2.1a – Addition of Alternative 4B – Double-Deck Four-Lane Cut-and-Cover Tunnel: The construction method would be to first construct a final road surface and then excavate below. It would essentially take the cut-and-cover tunnel and stack two boxes with travel in opposite directions. The roof of the box would be raised to become the top of the roadway. There would be slurry walls and a structural section across the walls. There would be two lanes permanently westbound and two eastbound. The plan would be to leave the current alternative in as 4A and add this new concept as 4B. We suggest that 4A be matched to the existing Navy gate and that 4B utilize the east portal Navy security check

While 4B is more costly than 4A, this version is around \$50 million less than the twin bore tunnels and is also less expensive to maintain as it does not require the daily switch to lane directions.

Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the City Council drop the original Alternative 3, accept the modified Alternative 3 and add the new Alternative 4B. Mr. Huck seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Future Meetings Schedule:

a. Next Regular Meeting – Thursday, January 11, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. in the Police Department Community Room.

b. City Council Meeting – Tuesday, January 16, 2007, 3:00 p.m. (status report/action on SR 75/282 Project Report and Environmental Document)

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