

**CORONADO TUNNEL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Thursday, January 11, 2007**

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

Minutes

1. ROLL CALL:

Attendees: Sut Clark, Margaret Pimpo, Lou Smith, Art Osborne and Al Ovrom (City Council representative)

Absent: Bill Huck and Steve Clarey

City Staff: Jim Benson, Gail Brydges and Ed Walton

Consultant: Brian Pearson, PB Americas, Inc. (PB)

2. MINUTES: The December 14, 2006 Regular Meeting minutes and the December 20, 2006 Special Meeting minutes were approved.

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: Mr. Osborne questioned the figures in the draft Risk Management Plan and wondered if they were valid. Mr. Pearson advised that they are based on broad assumptions. This will be on the agenda next month.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. Update:

1. Project Report and Environmental Document (PR/ED):

- Status of Technical Reports – Engineering/Environmental – The schedule is being revised to incorporate the new alternatives. This will delay delivery of the draft engineering report and draft environmental document, but PB will keep to the project schedule by having the Navy and Caltrans review documents concurrently rather than sequentially. Therefore, they'll hold to major project milestones. PB will be able to go full speed ahead after the City Council's Tuesday decision on alternatives.
- Value Analysis Study (VAS) Recommendations/CTC Recommendation to City Council (January 16, 2007) – An abbreviated version of the Value Analysis Study recommendations will be presented to Council. The Council will be given the Tunnel Commission's recommendations on the revised alternatives.
- Agency Coordination – Navy
 - ◆ Interagency Coordination Meeting – Nothing to report.
 - ◆ Navy Review Process and Timeline – See item below.

♦ Navy Response Letter – In October the City Manager sent a letter trying to encourage the Navy to direct their staff to review reports and plans. Captains Gaiani and Giorgione responded that the City will be getting a response from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (ASN). Staff from NASNI and NAVFAC confirmed today that they will continue to attend meetings, but said we may not get any response from them on report reviews until they have further direction from their superiors. The Navy may not respond until July when the draft is submitted.

Mr. Smith advised speaking to the local admirals and saying that the City should not have to wait two months to hear that a letter has been forwarded to Washington. The City should send a letter saying “Your delay costs the project money.” If the documents can’t be reviewed at the local level, assign someone at ASN to work on the project and cut out the middle man. Mr. Osborne expressed concern that the Navy made changes to the project and now they won’t review the reports.

Mrs. Pimpo asked what the implications of the Navy delay would be and Mr. Pearson responded that they can be really significant because PB might have to alter the tunnel alternative and the Project Report for public review. He’d like to see even preliminary Navy comments.

Mrs. Pimpo felt that it was critical at this juncture that either the City Manager or Tunnel Commission respond to the Navy’s letter. Mr. Smith felt that the critical reason to go back to the local officials is to tell them they have a responsibility to review the reports because delays will cost the project.

Mr. Ovrom said he understands that the Mayor is going to Washington, D.C. in February, so if the Tunnel Commission wants to say something, now is the time to do it. Mr. Smith observed that at this time the City is only asking the Navy to comment, not commit. Mrs. Pimpo agreed and said that the City has never suggested that the Navy is responsible to pay for any option. Mr. Benson noted that Alternatives 4B and 5B, which were created to put security on the bridge side of the tunnel, put Caltrans and FHWA in the position of saying “this is a private road to a Navy facility.” Mr. Ovrom suggested that if an alternative is built with the Navy gate outside the bridge, you could put tolls on the surface street because the objection to the tolls came from the Navy base unions.

Mr. Benson said he could communicate to the Mayor and City Manager that the Commission has concerns about the schedule and the impact to costs due to the Navy’s delay in reviewing reports. He’ll add a slide to the January 16 Council presentation indicating the Commission’s significant concern over the Navy’s letter; first, the slowness in responding to the City’s request to review reports and second, the financial aspect this has on scheduling.

2. Possible Relocation of USS Carl Vinson to NASNI: Mr. Benson said that the Navy will be developing their budget in February and if the Vinson is coming to Coronado there ought to be some money set aside to deal with the associated traffic. The Vinson decision is to be made by March or April.

3. Funding:

- 2007 Update of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Anticipate draft in May 2007; adoption in fall 2007 – SANDAG is in the process of updating the RTP. It will go to their Board this week and part of the presentation is some draft revisions to the constrained scenario. There have been some significant cost increases to projects. The City has an opportunity to have some numbers in by the end of January. We'll use the best numbers we have for Alternative 3, in particular. It changes a lot when you go from 60 parcel takes to 10 (including four potential landlocked properties that may need to be purchased).

Mr. Pearson said that construction cost escalation numbers growth is tracked by the Associated General Contractors organization. They recently issued an alert – in 2003/04 state and highway costs went up 30% and then went down to 8% the following year. This will probably level off to 6-7%, but this is per year. SANDAG is using 7.25% as the escalation factor for TransNet projects. PB now has cost estimates based on a conceptual design and this has resulted in refinement of the numbers. Things that have escalated are basic items like concrete, steel and asphalt. He said that the project contingency is being reduced to 20% because we now have some actual designs. PB will use the SANDAG escalation factor for all future numbers.

B. Reports and Discussion from Commission Members or Staff on Current Issues:

1. Status of Third Street Gate Project: The Navy acknowledges some problems with hardware delivery and they can't build some security features without this. The gate will now open in March or April. The City has 90% plans for the signals at Third and Fourth Streets at Alameda. Until the signals go in there will be stop signs and traffic control personnel when necessary. There is still work to be done on the drainage, but it is moving along.
2. Congestion Relief Working Group (CRWG) Project: The Capital Improvement Program Subcommittee agreed with staff to take out the bulbouts at D Avenue (there are already swales that take care of some of the problem). Mr. Smith suggested doing a prototype and gauging people's reactions. Mr. Benson said the project will go before Council for those types of comments, so Commissioners may want to attend the meeting (which is not yet scheduled) when this is discussed.
3. Vacancy on Coronado Tunnel Commission: Mrs. Pimpo reported that the two possibilities she was working on cannot make the commitment. She will continue to look for someone in the Cays. Mr. Clark said that last month he had mentioned that Dick Scharff was interested in volunteering for the vacancy and discussion ensued that because so many members of the Commission live along the corridor, it would be good to find someone who lives elsewhere. Mr. Benson advised that a couple of Councilmembers are also looking at this. If they have suggestions he'll have them contact Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark urged moving forward with this because of the need to have a quorum when the Commission wants to make a recommendation.
4. General Information Update: Mrs. Pimpo said that her husband is moving to Colorado, but she won't be relocating. She will be traveling back and forth, however, but will try not to miss Tunnel Commission meetings.

- C. Future Meeting Schedule: The next meeting will be Thursday, February 8, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. in the Police Department Community Room.
5. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting concluded at 5:15 p.m.

Approved:

Jackson S. Clark, Chairman