

RECEIVED

SEP 10 1948 Sept. 8, 1948.

City Engineer

City Manager

City Manager

Petition of residents of Ocean Beach for further consideration of location of bridge to Mission Beach.

1. The enclosed petition requests that the City Engineer be instructed to make a thorough study, and an estimate of the cost of a high bridge or a tube across the entrance of Mission Bay. The making of a thorough study and estimate would involve the expenditure of considerable time and funds. Before undertaking such a study, consideration should be given to readily available facts to determine whether or not the expenditure is warranted.

2. In the actual operation of a port such as the deep water part of Mission Bay, it is essential that craft have unrestricted access at any hour of the day or night. The characteristics of a bridge across navigable waters, such as this channel would be, must by law be determined by the War Department after holding public hearings. Representatives of the War Department have stated that such a bridge would have to have a minimum clearance of 125 feet and a minimum span of 300 feet. With normal approach grades of 4 per cent, the total length of such a bridge would be about 6300 feet as compared to about 2250 feet for the proposed bridge between Ventura Point and Sunset Point. The engineering firm of Sverdrup and Parcel have prepared a careful report and estimate on the latter bridge in the amount of \$1,868,000. By ratios, the bridge at Ocean Beach would be about \$5,200,000 plus extra concrete in the piers of main bridge and approaches due to increased height, plus cost of right of way for approaches through residential and business property at each end of the bridge. While no definite designs for piers have been made, very rough computations indicate additional concrete due to increased height would be on the order of \$750,000. A considerable amount of real estate would have to be acquired for approaches at each end. A considerable amount of this has already been built upon for both residential and business purposes. Figuring 4700 lineal feet 75 feet wide as a minimum, would require 352,500 square feet, or the equivalent of 141 lots 25 x 100. It is probably that lots, buildings, access rights, etc., would cost a minimum of \$500,000 with the probability that it would run considerably more. The above figures total \$6,450,000.

3. The length of tube required to give adequate cover between top of tube and the dredge bottom of the flood channel and Bay channel with approach grades of 4 per cent, would approximate 5400 feet. I have not made a search of engineering literature to find out what similar tubes, if any, have been constructed in recent years, and their costs. However, I have been informed by representatives of the Army Engineers that the tube built in 1928 connecting Alameda and Oakland, cost about \$1,300 per lineal foot for the covered sections and about \$600 per foot for the open section. There would be about 1600 feet of open section and about 3800 feet of closed section for a tube at this location. On this basis, without correction for difference in prices, the cost would be \$7,040,000. As costs have at least doubled in the meantime,

To: City Manager

-2-

Sept. 8, 1948.

the costs under present conditions would approximate \$14,000,000. Incidentally, the tube referred to has only two traffic lanes, which is not adequate for modern traffic.

4. I wish to emphasize that the figures given above are not to be considered as accurate estimates, but are sufficient for the purpose of indicating the general magnitude of the project. Should the City be in a position to handle a project of this size, more accurate estimates should be secured. As pointed out in the first paragraph, the preparation of adequate preliminary plans and estimates would involve the expenditure of a considerable sum.

A. K. Fogg
City Engineer

AKF:CM
cc: Mr. Rick
Mr. Allen

July 15, 1948

Tom J. Allen, Engineer,
Mission Bay Development,
San Diego, California.

Dear Tom:

In answer to the Bay Park Planning departments request for a statement from this Club regarding a low, high or medium bridge across Mission Bay from Sunset Point to Ventura Point it was the unanimous agreement among the Club's directors as expressed at their meeting of July 14, 1948, that the only answer could honestly be: - No Bridge at all, from Sunset to Ventura Points, when the present bridge at the entrance is removed next year. The long discussion brought out the following points which may be of interest to you since they were expressed by men who represent not only yachtsmen, but business men, professional men and property owners.

First, from the standpoint of the ardent sailing yachtsmen the ideal place to live, work and play is on or near a large well protected body of water with easy access to the ocean. Here his boat will be safe, he can sail his races and cruise leisurely with his family, he can go outside to race, to fish or to cruise and he knows his yachting companions from other cities can come in to visit him just as he can go to visit them safe in the knowledge that an easy to enter harbor is waiting for him. This, plus the proper facilities of docks and moorings have never failed to create a large boating public. On the other hand no closed-in body of water, either naturally or closed by man, has ever been known to develop a healthy or prosperous boating public. Men will not invest money in boats or a boating business on or around a salt water lake.

Second, only a 50 or 60 foot clearance bridge would assure the untrammelled development of Mission Bay into a great yachting harbor and we do not believe that the tremendous cost of such a structure would be warranted. A tube under the entrance would of course solve the problem but this too would be an unwarranted expense. We humbly offer the following reasons for this. The difference of

driving to the Amusement Center via Crown Point and Pacific Beach drive or via Ocean Beach from the Junction at the Drive-in theatre is approximately seven minutes, with no bridge and if Grand Avenue were paved it would be less. The people directly affected are those south of the Amusement center in Mission Beach and those in Ocean Beach who wish to drive north. Most of the traffic going into town from La Jolla would use the Crown Point way or the highway 101 route if a freeway existed through Pacific Beach. Mission Boulevard could never be enlarged to handle more traffic as it is mostly business buildings with no possibility of parking which makes it a one car road most of the way. Why spend two millions of dollars or even a quarter of a million dollars on a temporary bridge, put the money into a freeway around the bay. We do not believe that the South end of Mission Beach or the North end of Ocean Beach will suffer from lack of a bridge and point to the property values of Newport and Balboa to which one must drive several miles from the main highway, property values we might point out which are directly dependent on boating facilities and an open harbor.

We might also add that even though present plans call for a deep water yacht harbor outside of the proposed bridge that this will be the last thing to be developed perhaps many years from now. Also it is remote from centers of interest and business. There is no doubt that with the bay left open Mission Beach will want a community wharf, Pacific Beach will want the same, the same is true of the North East corner of the Bay. We cannot foresee exactly how large a harbor or how many hundreds of yachts or even small naval vessels may use this bay in the future, but as yachtsmen with an awareness of the nautical possibilities of both business and pleasure we urge that no barrier be placed across Mission Bay.

Sincerely,

MISSION BAY YACHT CLUB

By

Stuart J. Bryson,
Director.

DOCUMENT NO.

FILED

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

JUL 1 9 1948

382385

JUL 24 1948

20325

JUL 20 1948

389782

DOCUMENT NO. _____

JUL 19 1948

FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

open harbor. which are directly dependent on boating facilities and an from the main highway, property values we might point out

We might also add that even though present plans call for a deep water yacht harbor outside of the proposed bridge that this will be the last thing to be developed perhaps many years from now. Also it is remote from centers of interest and business. There is no doubt that with the bay left open Mission Beach will want a community wharf. Pacific Beach will want the same, the same is true of the North East corner of the Bay. We cannot foresee exactly how large a harbor or how many hundreds of yachts or even small private vessels may use this bay in the future, but a yachtsman with an awareness of the nautical possibilities of both business and pleasure we urge that no barrier be placed across Mission Bay.

MISSION BAY YACHT CLUB

Sincerely,

BY

Stuart J. Bryson,
Director.

*Communication
from Mission Bay
Yacht Club -
nothing Copy of
letter to M. B.
Fryman re Bridge*

Carl

week

JUL 20 1948

JUL 27 1948

90352