

Final Minutes: March 18, 2015 meeting of the

TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

**Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement**

Kumura called the meeting to order: Present: Sandra Farrell (Secretary), Eric Chapman (Co-Vice Chair), Gil Jemmott, Karen Binns (Co-Vice chair), Tom Kumura, and Rob Peterson

**Review of Minutes** Binns moved for approval of the minutes. Peterson seconded and motion passed 6-0-0

**Public Communications, Presentations and Announcements:**

Linda Bailey of Newland Sierra offered to come out any time to provide an update on the project.

**Traffic Problems Along Buena Creek Road (BCR):** Murali Pasumarthi and Kenton Jones from the County of San Diego Department of Public Works presented data they gathered in response to complaints about Buena Creek Road, (BCR). Many residents were angered not only about congestion, excessive speed, oversized vehicles straying into oncoming traffic, and blind spots along BCR but also about safety issues created by the location of the County's Sprinter Station. BCR is used by pedestrians, to access the Sprinter station and the lack of any pathways along BCR to Sprinter Station put pedestrians in danger. One resident observed women and children climbing over fencing by the station to try to get to the station safely because walking along the road was too dangerous. Another resident said she had seen a man in a wheel chair trying to travel from the Sprinter Station east on Buena Creek Road. She expressed anger and wanted to know why the County's only Sprinter Station was so poorly designed to not provide safe access by pedestrians who must use either BCR or South Santa Fe to get to the station. Residents asked about the lack of money collected from developments and why these funds, TIF fees weren't available to improve BCR. One resident said the County had mistakenly called project generated traffic indirect impacts instead of direct impacts. The Traffic mitigation fee collected from indirect impacts didn't have to go directly back into the community where those projects were built. He believed this explained why the community had not seen any major improvements to BCR. He believed it was wrong for the County Planning Commission and Supervisors to be asked to make recommendations to approve projects based upon BCR being a four-lane Major road when no feasibility study had been done to see if widening the road to four lanes was feasible or made economic sense given the need for retaining walls and creek impacts which would be costly. In addition, he felt that even if the road was made into a four-lane major roadway it wouldn't address all the issues surrounding the Sprinter Station and the intersection at BCR and South Santa Fe. He and several others recommended changing the road classification. It was noted by reducing the road from four lanes to two lanes, given the existing easement, would allow space to execute the County Trails and Pathway Plan without condemnation of private property. Bottom line, residents felt BCR was not safe and wanted action. The County responded to each concern as follows:

1. Current traffic speed limit signs reflect use of the road. No reason to change speed limit at this time. Staff said it had done all it could do with paint and signs. They recommend residents contact Jimmy Gaffney at Oceanside Sheriff's station and request they do periodic monitoring of specific segments.
2. Because this is a mobility element road there is no load or truck size limit. BCR was designed years ago before many modern trucks and so it currently, in some sections, cannot

accommodate some trucks that pull trailers. The data shows trucks need to go into oncoming traffic or onto the shoulder to make some of the curves. The County will recommended placing signs on BCR along sections between Monte Vista and South Santa Fe warning that trucks over 25 feet cannot safely use the road.

3. Staff said it now has data showing backups in both directions from Santa Fe to Lone Oak Lane. They will look at measures to help with this issue.
4. Staff noted lack of money, topography, and Buena Creek make it difficult and costly to widen BCR to a point where it is currently classified as a major mobility element road.
5. Staff said it had input on the Sprinter Station and raised concerns but the community needed to take complaints to NCTD customer service ([creports@nctd.org](mailto:creports@nctd.org)).
6. Staff said it is responsible for the safety of the roads and County Staff agreed BCR would be a challenge to build out to four lanes. The County said the Sponsor Group needed to elevate the concerns and prioritize projects to get this issue on the Board's radar.
7. Staff said Caltrans was asking for safety improvement projects. They want to look at if a project will work for a grant to make improvements but these funds are limited.
8. Staff said they would seek money for additional improvements to increase the safety of pedestrians walking to the train station.

Farrell made a motion. "Due to the presence of the Sprinter Station and the lack of safe access to the Sprinter Station, and because large trucks cannot navigate the curves on Buena Creek Road safely, and because topographic and environmental constrains make it difficult if not impossible to widen Buena Creek Road, the Twin Oaks Valley Community Sponsor Group recommended changing Buena Creek Road from a four-lane Major Mobility Element Road to a two-lane Collector and that the County Trails and Pathways Plan be implemented immediately using the existing right of way." Chapman seconded. Motion carried 6-0-0

**Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for New Development (LEED-ND)** Oliver Smith of the Valley Center Community Planning Group gave a presentation about the County's workshop on "Thrive" and plans to re-interpret County policy LU-1.2 in the General Plan. Smith and Farrell who had attended County meetings on this issue, expressed concern about how the policy is interpreted will allow for village type development in areas outside those designated for urban or village development.

LU-1.2 states, "**Prohibit leapfrog** development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. **Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]**

LEED-ND has requirements that make new project be adjacent to existing urban projects. The County is looking at changing this to allow projects if they are within ½ mile of Mobility Element Road and people are concerned the County is considering eliminating the LEED-ND requirement that such dense projects be next to existing urban or village development. Smith felt it was important that anyone concerned show up to the April 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the County Board of Supervisors. Kumura asked for Comments

from Newland Sierra's representative, Linda Bailey who was at the meeting, and she said she was aware of the matter but had no comment. Smith felt the LEED-ND certification was very practical but it was defined for use in more urban areas. He said to prevent leap frog development the City of San Diego requires new development be surrounded on three sides with similar type development. Smith noted that the Lilac Hills Ranch would fail this test if it had been proposed in the City of San Diego.

A member of the community commented that some of the principles promoted by LEED-ND are not practical and pointed out San Elijo Hills Development of an example of a failed project which believed that by building homes, business would come and service the area. Instead, people living in San Elijo Hills are traveling to San Marcos and Carlsbad for many of their commercial needs.

Farrell felt that because the County has failed to complete the Community Plans for many of the communities, the General Plan as adopted was incomplete. In addition, she was concerned the County was coming up with a flavor of LEED-ND that does not actually follow the principles of LEED-ND as practiced by the Green Building Council. Some members of the TOVCSG hadn't attended the workshops and Kumura recommended everyone read the documents supplied by Smith as well as the Citizen's Guide to LEED-ND and be prepared to take action at the next meeting.

**Update to modify Twin Oaks Planning Area Boundary:** Kumura had reached out to the County for the current Twin Oaks Planning area and areas near the Sprinter Station map. Kumura explained to the County how people along the west end of Buena Creek Road felt they had no representation and wanted to be included in the Twin Oaks Community planning area. Kumura also said he believed land use matters near the Sprinter Station had an impact on the Twin Oaks area due to traffic along Buena Creek Road. Binns and Peterson expressed concern that taking in an area that is more dense would not be in keeping with the rural character of Twin Oaks. Farrell asked Kumura to ask Staff what would be the advantages and disadvantages of the Sponsor Group to take in the areas near the Sprinter Station. Kumura said he would try to get a map that showed the streets outside the Twin Oaks Planning Area for the next meeting.

**Group Business:**

Kumura reminded everyone about the March 31<sup>st</sup> date to have Form 700 into the County.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted, Sandra Farrell, Secretary**