

**CORONADO TUNNEL COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
Thursday, March 23, 2006**

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

Minutes

1. ROLL CALL:

Attendees: Sut Clark, Steve Clarey, Al Ovrom (left at 5:25 p.m.), Lou Smith, Art Osborne, Margaret Pimpo and Bill Huck

Absent: Casey Tanaka (City Council representative)

City Staff: Jim Benson, Gail Brydges and Ed Walton

Consultant: Brian Pearson, Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

3. DISCUSSION ITEM: Consideration of Adding Navy's Proposed Alternative for Analysis in the State Route 75/282 Transportation Corridor Project Report and Environmental Document (PR/ED).

Mr. Pearson distributed two documents (copies attached to these minutes), "SR 75/282 Transportation Corridor Project Alternatives Re-Definition Options/Issues" and "Options for Existing Tunnel Alternatives 4 and 5."

"SR 75/282 Transportation Corridor Project Alternatives Re-Definition Options/Issues" outlined the following issues:

1. Concept Design for Proposed NASNI Tunnel Alternative (East Portal Security Gate/Restricted Access) – This is not a detailed design, but a satisfactory restricted access design that will work. The east portal will be pushed slightly west, four security gates will be added and no trucks will be permitted (due to there being no truck inspection facility to satisfy the Navy's security requirements). PB would like the design to accommodate midday bi-directional traffic. Based on forecast traffic modeling and the amount of processing done at the gate, at any one time there could be 52 vehicles queuing up at the gates which could be processed without backups on the bridge. If backups appear, vehicles could opt to stay on the surface streets. This design will include a bypass lane so vehicles not intending to go to the base or rejected by security can merge with other surface traffic. This portal would be constructed by cut-and-cover technique over Glorietta Boulevard with the bore

starting just beyond Glorietta. At the other end, as traffic surfaces, we will want to make sure it fits with McCain and this can be done. This additional design work will probably add three to six months to the schedule and FHWA may require a new Notice of Intent with new alternatives definitions.

2. Caltrans Policy Implications for Federal Facility (Restricted Access Connections) – There are two implications here: (1) In Caltrans terminology, this is an “access control facility” from the end of the bridge to the portal. Under Caltrans regulations you cannot make a connection from a public road to an access control facility. Caltrans said that FHWA would probably be willing to change their definition of controlled access to move from Glorietta Boulevard to the tunnel entrance; and (2) If there is an access control facility, it would have to be a City/Navy project for designing, constructing and funding. Caltrans and FHWA would not be involved. As a general rule you cannot use FHWA funds for projects not serving the general public.
3. Possible **Options** for Reconfiguring Existing Alternatives 4 and 5
 1. Alternatives 4 and 5 remain as currently defined. Refine west portal in preliminary engineering only for selected preferred alternative to better meet NASNI requirements.
 2. Refine west portal for Alternatives 4 and 5 only as required for a better fit with the Third Street Gate to reduce construction impacts and better meet NASNI requirements. A refinement to Alternative 4 would be early daylight.
 3. Major redesign of west portal for Alternatives 4 and 5 to conform to proposed Third Street Gate and better meet NASNI requirements:
 - Alt. 4 – Early daylight (convert from “S” curve; only for cut and cover option)
 - Alt. 5 – Loop (would add about \$25 million to the construction cost)
 4. Remove west portal from NASNI for Alternatives 4 and 5 and locate in Fourth Street east of Alameda. This would take the Navy out of the project because it would not be on Navy property.
 5. Relocate Alternative 5 to Third Street to provide an improved west portal at the Third Street Gate to create three alternatives. This is outside the footprint of the current study and PB would have to re-scope, re-notice and change the footprint. About one-and-a-half years’ work would be lost and there would be a whole new set of impacts. The three alternatives would be:
 - Alt. 4 – Cut-and-cover tunnel on Fourth Street
 - Alt. 5 – Bored tunnel on Fourth Street
 - NASNI option
 - Alt. 6 – Bored tunnel on Third Street
 - Existing east portal

The Commission discussed splitting Alternative 5 into two sub-alternatives: 5A would be a bored tunnel and 5B would be a bored tunnel with restricted access. 5A would require a revised Third Street Gate and west portal.

Ms. Pimpo moved to add a security gate at the east portal for a new alternative, Restricted Access Alternative 5B, and Mr. Smith seconded the motion. It passed unanimously, with Mr. Ovrom being absent.

Mr. Smith then moved to refine the west portal design for Alternative 4 to early daylight and add a new design for Alternative 5A to reduce construction impacts and better meet NASNI requirements. Mr. Huck seconded the motion. It passed unanimously, with Mr. Ovrom being absent.

5. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting concluded at 6:20 p.m.

Approved:

Jackson S. Clark, Chairman