

Steering Committee Minutes
June 25, 2005

Steering Committee Members

Mark Price	Alpine
C.T. Davis	Bonsall
Kurt Levens	Borrego Springs
Jo Ellen Hucker	Descanso
Jim Russel	Fallbrook
Jim Callahan	Jacumba
Jack Shelver	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks Valley
Joe Chisholm	Pala-Pauma
Terry Glardon	Pine Valley
Thell Fowher	Potrero
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Jack Phillips	Valle De Oro
Andy Washburn	Valley Center

Planning Commissioner

Bryan Woods, Steering Committee Chairman

Staff

Ivan Holler, Deputy Director
Cecille Caballes, DPLU Staff
Mike Robinson, DPW Staff
Bob Goralka, DPW Staff
Rosemary Rowan, Planning Manager
Bob Citrano, Planner
Stephanie Gaines, Planner
Larry Hofreiter, Planner

Public

Harry Christenson, Fallbrook
Keith Beher, Rancho Santa Fe Association
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, East San Diego
Assoc. of Realtors
Mary Allison, USDRIC & ECPOA
Charlene Ayers
Shirley Fisher, Jacumba
Scott Molloy, BIA
Scott Lamb, Alpine
Sachiko Kohatsu, County District 3
Lucille Goodman, Pine Valley
John Ingalls, Rancho Santa Fe Irrigation
District
Larry Glavinic, Valley Center
Lael Montgomery, Valley Center
Jon Hick, Valley Center

I. Action Items

Meeting Commenced 9:10am

Russell: inquired about slope dependency. Wants to remind everyone that the Steering Committee has voted to have Village densities as slope dependent.

Holler: stated there has been no change to slope dependency for some time, staff does not support it in the village areas, but this group can put it on the next agenda.

Woods: made motion to add slope-dependency on the agenda for the next steering committee meeting, Jones: seconded. **Motion Passes.** 12 Ayes: 0 Oppose: 1 Abstain.

Phillips: requested to have minutes published as soon as possible. Phillips: made motion to trail last meetings minutes. Russell: seconded. **Motion Passes.** 12 Ayes: 0 Oppose: 0 Abstain.

II. Recent Board Actions

Holler: clarified two maps. The Board accepted staff's recommendation on one map, DRAFT Land Use Map June 2005. The Board also made some changes on a second map, the Board Alternative Map or BAM map. A full project level analysis will be conducted on both maps.

Washburn: asked what opportunity the Board will have to pick and choose between the two maps.

Holler: replied the Board has the ability to pick and choose.

Russell: asked what map shows the commercial changes on two properties in Fallbrook?

Holler: replied the Board map.

III. Informational Presentation / Discussion

Rowan: gave 25-minute presentation on Road Network Planning.

Holler: clarified two points. 1) Expect to see deficiencies because we are calculating existing on the ground network against future population. 2) Options to address deficiencies include proposing new roads, widening existing roads, changing the land use & reducing the development potential.

Levens: inquired about minimum design speed?

Robinson: stated that design speed is a capacity question, it is not all science and some of it is art.

Glavnic: encouraged the group to be open to new options to address transportation problems, as opposed to perpetuating so-called "solutions", and the old way of thinking. For example, if something comes down from SANDAG.

Washburn: inquired about the State requirement for "balance"? He asked if that translates specifically to LOS?

Robinson: stated some of the funding we get, i.e. gas tax, will be tied to the LOS we produce. Ultimately, the carrot for producing a balanced network will be funding.

Holler: stated accepting a lower level of service has limited application. Accepting a lower LOS on a State Hwy will not work, but it would work on a main-street. The Board policy is to stay at LOS A-D.

Washburn: pointed out the difference between the state and county methodologies. He stated the County's methodology seems to hide ADT's.

Holler: stated that schools will inevitably fail two times a day.

Chisolm: asked if the County classifies state highways.

Holler: replied yes.

Russell: asked if downgrading a classification effects LOS.

Robinson: replied yes. To a degree we have to compartmentalize our roads, even though different roads may operate slightly differently.

Russell: asked how you treat private roads that are essentially, de facto public roads.

Holler: responded: I don't have a good answer for you right now. You all know the nuances of the community. Where you have things like that, we need to know that information. Want to make model as accurate as possible.

Phillips: stated our biggest congestion problems occur because of the LOS at intersections. How can we consider LOS projections, when they don't consider KEY intersections? Traffic signals should also be considered when we look at congestion.

Robinson: responded, "Jack is right". Every time you add a traffic signal, you are affecting the LOS. It's hard to anticipate, with projected traffic increases, where and what traffic signals will need to be added.

Rowan: clarified that traffic signals are accounted for in the model and DPLU staff verified that those signals exist on the ground.

Phillips: thought an intersection analysis should be included.

Price: had four general comments: 1. In regards to standards, he felt it was better to use the standard which shows the greatest impact, be that either the state or county. 2. He thought there should be a study, required alternative, or penalty when a road is removed from the circulation element. He referenced the east/west connection originally planned from I-15 to I-5. 3. As a general comment, he was concerned that we are moving acceptable LOS from C to D. 4. Finally, he thought changing land use to respond to a failing level of service might be the best option.

Holler: stated that land use needed to be established before the road network because a land use distribution is needed to create a model. He also prefers changing the land use as the last option to address failing roads because so much time has already been spent on land use. However, if it's the preference of the community, than we can look at that.

Christenson: asked if the group has the opportunity to change the tools in the toolbox.

Woods: replied yes.

Hucker: asked if we remove a road from the CE, how does it affect maintenance?

Robinson: responded, "As long as it's a public road, the County will maintain it".

IV. Action Items: CE Road Classifications

Phillips: stated he does not want the mapping criteria move forward to Board prior to having the Steering Committee formally review it.

Holler: agreed to put mapping criteria on the next agenda. He reassured the group that the document will not go to the Board before the Steering Committee acts on it.

Woods: suggested combining the presentations on agenda items IV. And V.

V. Discussion Item: CE Road Classifications

Citrano: emphasized the Roadway Classifications document is a *Work-in-progress* and we are here today to work with you on the classifications. He presented road information for towns, suburban areas and large villages and stated staff is requesting feedback on these items.

Gaines: presented information on the rural road standards. Staff is requesting the group to take a formal action on the rural road standards.

Woods: emphasized these are tools to be used in your communities.

Levens: asked if he could address flaws in the model today.

Rowan: said that her and Aaron will work with them on specific Borrego Springs issues.

Levens: inquired about the elimination of the recreational pkwy classification – particularly for Palm Canyon Drive the recreational pkwy classification seems to be an appropriate road.

Holler: stated this classification would not be appropriate, because the 100 ft. ROW is not pedestrian friendly.

Chisolm: Scenic Hwy classifications seems to be a good way to classify things. There has to be a different way of handling a road that has a high traffic count that should not have the capacity it has. Interested in having a wider median that was depressed, as opposed to elevated, particularly for storm-water management.

Goralka: The County has a separate Scenic Highway Element. Right now it has priority routes, and has not been implemented as well as it could have. Roads with hills that have high traffic counts is probably an instance where one would want to look for alternative routes.

Holler: Where you have existing roadbeds with a median, unless there is drainage, we are typically going to pitch it to the sides not the median. But, for newly proposed roads, your suggestion may be a good option to include. It doesn't always have to be a special condition - we would like to put tools in the toolbox to meet your needs.

Jemmott: We need classifications in-between 50,000 and 13,000 ADT threshold capacity.

Rowan stated if development patterns are rural and semi-rural – four lane classifications are also available.

Russell: There should not be parking on rural roads, and all of your classifications allow for parking. We need additional right of way for areas with intersections. Just two travel lanes, rural burm, and median.

Rowan: You are referring to a rural minor road, with a smaller ROW.

Goralka: ROW at intersection, can get additional turn lanes in footnote.

Woods: Lets task staff with developing an additional classification.

Robinson: The 8 ft in rural areas is identified as a recovery area for safety. We may be able to develop something different, but we don't refer to that as a parking lane, but as a recovery lane.

Fowler: wanted to clarify that we can classify a portion of a road, as a Town Collector.

Goralka: Yes, but we need to know specifically where those locations are within the Town Center.

Fowler: When can we expect to see some improvements to our roads?

Robinson: Typically, 5 years is our CIP, but if it's a safety issue, it may affect prioritizing.

Fowler: Don't want to see stop light at 94 and 188.

Robinson: Refer you to CALTRANS – we are not aware of it.

Glavnic: asked if we are heading for a standard or a guideline?

Holler: replied, a Standard.

Glavnic: suggested putting language in stating that when capacity gets high, we require the community to upgrade road. Also suggested putting in visual and texture requirements for Town Center roads.

Price: noted Alpine Blvd. is a Town Collector, but the capacity is far above the thresholds. Community wants Alpine Blvd. to be bicycle friendly. He thinks the document should specify that parking is parallel parking only, not diagonal. Also, suggests that staff give the chairs an opportunity to bring information back to their community.

Jones: added that she likes to hear other communities and their concerns.

Phillips: suggested as a solution to provide information to the planning/sponsor groups sooner. He was prepared to vote on them today, because he received the information a week ago.

Emphasized that we've been working on this for 7 years, which is far too long.

Pointed out that when a median is put on a roadway it means a sterile, paved piece of pavement in San Diego County. We have been tried to get landscaped medians, but the County won't

maintain it, so they won't build it. Wants the group to visualize it as it is. Addressed thresholds and minimum design speeds. Concerned we're placing standards on built roads that are incorrect. Should probably be higher because you're working on an 84' ROW.

Woods: clarified that the design speed indicated was a "minimum".

Phillips: Pointed out that is "designing for accidents", setting up a situation for dangerous roads. You'll never get highway patrol to enforce, because people will drive faster.

Jones: asked how staff came up with a Town Collector, the 40 mph seems too fast.

Goralka: DPW determined capacity, to reduce friction and accommodate space to get car out of "cruise traffic". Discussed difference between rural light and light collector design speeds.

Woods: stated we don't have a designation that addresses your concern. We have a Town Collector that brings traffic into town. Sounds like you want a Town Road that has lower design speeds.

Lamb: thought the term Rural Town Collector is probably not appropriate, when you look at a town collector as it exists today. He questioned the speed limit and turn radius and suggested changing the minimum turn radius for a Town Collector. He pointed out that a raised median should probably be added to a Town Collector as well. Wanted to see option for wider parkway.

Callahan: asked if there is an established criteria regarding access for the collector roads?

Robinson: said every property is guaranteed at least one access. Quality of Access is important as well. But those things are already established.

Russell: disagreed with Jack about changing the design speed. He does not want to increase or see the minimums for design speed increased.

Levens: asked for clarification of minimum speed and its relation to design speed?

Robinson: said that traffic safety relates to minimum design speed and there is a correlation between design speed and speed limit.

Christenson: said that road planning relates more to intersections, and less to land use.

Woods: Called for public comments.

Montgomery: in reference to Valley Center, she said design speed should not be the same throughout the road, and we should be able to differentiate it. Also, everyone should keep in mind that there are traffic problems have solutions that don't involve roads, for example, school buses.

Vick: stated that DPW does not pay attention to the community plan. I think it would be a good idea to look at DPW as guidelines, and the community plans as standards. If a community plan calls for a landscape median, than DPW should acquire funding to build it. We are fighting DPW to slow down traffic along Valley Center Road. Suggests everyone look at Mainstreets – a document put out by CALTRANS.

Woods: requested DPW to come back with some suggestions regarding traffic calming.

Ayers: offered Interest Group information.

Smith: Asked DPW to bring forward board policy, if there is one.

VI. Action Item: Next Meeting

Tentatively scheduled for August 20, 2005.