

Steering Committee Minutes
August 20, 2005

Steering Committee Members

Scott Lamb	Alpine
C.T. Davis	Bonsall
Bill Collins	Borrego Springs
Larry Johnson	Campo/Lake Moreno
Tim McMaster	Crest Dehesa
Kathy Goddard	Cuyamaca
Joe Ellen Hucker	Descanso
Harry Christiansen	Fallbrook
Dan Neirinciox	Jamul-Dulzura
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Gil Jemmot	Twin Oaks Valley
Lucille Goodman	Pine Valley
Thell Fowler	Potrero
Rua Petty	Rainbow
Helene Radzik	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Steve Stonehouse	Sweetwater
Jack Phillips	Valle De Oro
Andy Washburn	Valley Center

Planning Commission

Bryan Woods, Steering Committee Chair

Staff

Ivan Holler, Deputy Director
Rosemary Rowan, Planning Manager
Bob Goralka, DPW Staff
Tom Harron, County Counsel
Michelle Yip, DPLU Staff
Larry Hofreiter, DPLU Staff

Public

Brian Siefker, Southwest Co.
Keith Betner, Rancho Santa Fe Assoc.
Jim Whalen, Alliance/Rancho Guejito
Jack Vandover, Crest/Dehesa
Ray Ymzon, Sweetwater Civic Assn.
Carolyn A. Dorroh, Ramona
Liz Stonehous, Sweetwater
Charlene Ayers, Ranters Roost
Dutch Van Dierendock, Ramona
Larry Glavnic, Valley Center

Meeting Commenced at 9:05 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

I. ACTION ITEM: Minutes

Phillips: Move to approve minutes dated December 4, 2004.

Collins: Seconded.

Woods: **Passed unanimously.**

Phillips: Move to approve minutes dated June 25, 2005

Collins: Seconded.

Woods: **Passed unanimously.**

Woods: I would like to trail Item #4 relating to slope reductions because Jim Russel requested that item be brought back and he is not here today.

Phillips: I'm concerned this will go before the Board of Supervisors without having the discussion. .

Woods: Guarantee that won't happen. We plan on meeting again within a month, and we don't have a Board date yet scheduled.

II. ACTION ITEM: Road Standards for Backcountry Communities and Rural Lands:

Rowan: Referred to Road Standards handout, which focuses on place-based standards.

These roads could be used in other locations, but they are intended for backcountry communities. We needed roads for different purposes. For example, we needed a road type that was appropriate for regional connectors, such as Hwy 94 or Hwy 79.

One of the issues we are trying to address is the rural character. Rural Mountain & Rural Minor have smaller road-beds. Also addresses safety issues, such as wildfire safety.

Appendix D contains preliminary information on roads with gates that would be emergency roads. These would probably not be CE roads, but roads found in the community plan.

Rowan: These are standards, but we will also be working on a design manual. This will focus on trails, pedestrian walkways, how to deal with the edge of the road etc.

Rural Town Collector: Designed for Town Centers. Has continuous turn-lane.

Rural Collector: Designed for state highway system. Rural Mountain & Rural Minor designed for lower traffic volumes, not major roads.

What we want today is did we get it right?

Woods: Could you differentiate between speed limits and design speed?

Rowan: Design speed is a defining feature in any road standard.

Goralka: Design speed must take into account, what the anticipated speed a driver will go, and is different than the speed limit. Design speed should generally be higher than the posted speed. We do not want to necessarily lower the design speed to improve safety. You want to design the road for anticipated speed.

Jemmot: Since the speed limit has to be set at the 85 percentile of free-flowing traffic. How do you reduce the speed limit if the design speed isn't fairly low?

Goralka: It is more of an art. Traffic calming measures, enforcement measures, or intersections can be used to slow people down.

Phillips: Treatment of these standards is exemplary – because you are using roads we are familiar with. Pictures are especially helpful. Referring to the handout, do you intend to keep both the rural light collector & the light collector?

Rowan – Probably, yes.

Neirinciox: I understand you will be handling trails and bikepaths later on - my question is how much later on? You really need to look at cyclists & pedestrians.

Rowan. Understood.

Goralka: The public road standards addresses the road width, the travel way. The County will handle bicycle lanes with the bicycle master plan, which will have an additional 5 ft of width. It's not the road width, as it is the bicycle lane.

Woods: Asked Goralka to explain CIP.

Goralka: The CIP is the implementation portion of the plan that has funding associated to get projects built.

Neirinciox: I understand CIP

Fowler: I'm concerned about Hwy 94. Does the County or the State handle that road?

Rowan: We are responsible for planning for that road.

Smith: Planning Group looked at this and we think additional ROW for trails need to be addressed up-front. The only other issue was that our group wants to do away with private roads altogether.

McMaster: People ride bikes on roads with no bike paths. How do we resolve it?

Phillips: State law allows people to ride bikes. My request is that the CE specify a different set of standards for roads that are on an approved Bicycle Master Plan and/or Trails Master Plan, such as an overlay. So that when a developer comes in to develop, he knows what roads should be. But I do not think we should change all the road classifications to accommodate for bike lanes, because on some roads it is just dangerous.

Christiansen: In our area, 12' road w/ 8' shoulder – we do not want to see this continuous parking. We don't mind the roadbed width - we just don't want it paved. Some appreciation should be given to the segment widths. Concerned about threshold capacity – it is not the road, or the traffic necessarily, but the friction. Labels and volumes are a problem.

Hucker: We did not know at that time, that the CIP dealt with bike lanes.

Woods: I suggest you meet with Bob Goralka after the meeting.

Holler: In reference to the “overlay” process that Jack mentioned, that is exactly how we want to approach it. Harry, you brought up a plethora of things including operational issues. I want to clarify, what you have before you, is the road classes for backcountry and rural lands. Take them in context - they are tools in the toolbox. We're not talking about applying these yet. These are what are on the table today.

Rua: What qualifies a road as a CE Road? What is the implication of classification.

Goralka: A circulation element road is primarily used for trips from community group to community group or regional trips. They are usually for longer trips and higher volumes. Our non-ce roads are approx. 4,500 trips or less. But, you might want to keep it on the CE if it is “key” for circulation. We also have local public roads available. We have CE Roads Mapped, but we also have local public roads, which is a through public road that is not gated.

Rowan: One of the key features of a circulation element road is that it is part of a whole network of connected roads. We are trying to eliminate dead-end roads.

McMaster: We have roads on the CE that are not roads.

Holler: This is true. There are CE roads that are built, and there are also paper roads that are not built. We frequently get requests to remove paper roads from communities. Our challenge is that removing roads does not improve the traffic.

Woods: This is an action item. Please express your support on page 5.

Phillips: Make a motion that the Steering Committee accept this as the road standards for the rural communities and rural portions of the communities.

Lamb: Seconded.

Jones: On the Rural Town Collector, will an 8' foot shoulder be wide enough for public transit.

Goralka: Usually an 8' shoulder will be wide enough, it's the parking and the ability to pull-off which is an issue.

Rua: R-4, as an example, ROW = 84ft, R-5 is ft, why is that wider because it is impossible to get that entire ROW. In terms of threshold capacities we are way above, on those roads.

Goralka: In terms of thresholds, we started with 2 lane roads, and looked at the Highway capacity manual that contains adjustment factors and made adjustments. In terms of R-4 and R-5, the Rural Mountain has a wider right of way that gives us the ability to adjust the alignment and curves depending on the slope/topography. Once its built we may not need all of the right-of-way.

Lamb: I asked for an option that has a 28' Pkwy to play with for trails etc.

Jemmot: Another thing about the Pkwy is like S6 on Palomar, where it falls off. So having some dedicated space helps. I would also like to clarify, these are minimum ROWs. If there are places where you anticipate wider you can use the swell.

Rowan: Good point. This type of information will be in the design manual.

Christiansen: Concerned about being bound by these roads, because we are more of an semi-rural community.

Woods: You are not bound by it. We will be developing road standards for more urbanized area.

Radzik: We have a number of failing roads in Ramona, and I'm concerned a vote from Ramona would send a message that this is something we agree with.

Woods: No. These are just classifications that backcountry and rural communities can use. There will be additional classifications developed for semi-rural communities such as Ramona.

Holler: This item does not directly apply to your LOS problems.

Smith: Can you give the definition of Rural in this context?

Rowan: Primarily Backcountry communities, and area's with Rural Lands.

Woods: Called for a vote, to approve backcountry road standards listed on page 5. Motion carries unanimously.

Whalen: I think these should be guidelines, not standards.

Holler: No, these are standards. Your comments are noted, but you were not here for the discussion of design speeds and I can follow-up with you on that.

Betner: A major concern for Rancho Santa Fe is to have the roads fit the character of the community.

Holler: That's a good point. The challenge that we have is to try to maintain the character while balancing safety and accommodating traffic. I wish I had a mo

Goralka: Standards are met to be the starting point. The parkway accommodates several things, such as utilities, walking area, and clear space.

Break at 10:15

III. DISCUSSION ITEM: Draft CE Policies

Woods: This is an opportunity to discuss policies noted in the Draft CE Policies handout. This group has voted on policies A-E. But, pages 2 and 3 are policies recommended by the Interest Group. Because this group has already voted on policies A-E; we are here today to discuss policies recommended by the interest group. I ask that you number them 1 through 10.

Smith: Item #10 is duplicative of D; and Item #5 is out of our purview. I make a motion to delete both of them.

Phillips: Seconded.

Woods: Motion passes unanimously.

Jones: Items #3 and #6 are the same. Item #7 seem the same as item #2.

Jones: Motion to eliminate #7 because it is duplicative of #2.

Collins: Seconded.

Woods: Carries unanimously.

Jones: Motion to eliminate #6 because it is the same as item E.

Phillips: Second.

Jemmot: Another reason to get rid of it is it says 'establishing public transit centers in planned higher density areas'. Building roads before anything goes in is not an intelligent use of funds.

Woods: Carries unanimously.

Phillips: Motion to add items #3 and #4 to Steering Committee policies.

Jones: Modify item #3 to add phrase "and historic and scenic areas".

Phillips: Accept modification.

Petty: Seconded motion.

Christiansen: Modify #4, add "and Community Character".

Phillips: Accept Modification.

Petty: Accept Modification.

Woods: Motion carries unanimously.

Smith: Motion to add item #1 to Steering Committee policies.

Christiansen: Seconded.

Jemmot: How about take out "planned".

Holler: I would recommend against that.

Jemmot: You want to build the roads first, and then build the housing? What if the roads of failing today?

Woods: The downside of what your saying, Gil, is that it would shutdown all growth in the County because you cannot fix what is on the ground today.

Smith: The County just implemented TIFF, what does it take to get asphalt on the ground?

Phillips: In response to “planned growth”, it’s not saying build the roads and they will come. I can understand the trepidation. It says, in response to that planned growth, you have to build roads. But roads would not precede submitting maps.

Harron: I would agree with that.

Neirinciox: **I think the word timely is a problem. Lets take out the word “timely”.**

Smith: **I agree with that.**

Christiansen: **I accept that modification.**

Jemmot: Does planned growth mean part of the General Plan? Are we going to start building roads to serve everything that is in the General Plan, because we can’t serve what is on the ground today?

Harron: We interpret plan to mean “approved”. We want the roads built, when those trips hit the road.

Jemmot: Than it should say that.

Holler: I’m very comfortable the way this is written. . Remember this is a policy that is implemented through other ordinances.

Smith: I have every confidence in DPLU and DPW that money will go to build the roads that need to be built.

Woods: **Motion carries with one opposition.**

Jemmott: **Opposes.**

Jones: **Motion to eliminate item #2.**

Jemmot: **Seconded.**

Phillips: This may work in the urbanized communities. But, it will not work in the backcountry communities. It may pose a problem when people are on the road, they need to be on the road, but then we try to get them off the road.

Rowan: I think this policy seems appropriate for Town Center Planning... I think this has to do with more of a design in Town Centers that allow you to walk.

Woods: Well, that is already covered in item E. Plus, in backcountry communities no more than 15% of people work in the town.

Petty: In our plan, are we planning for light rail? For example, do our policies have the potential to accommodate transit along I-15.

Woods: I think item E and Item C covers it.

Woods: **Motion carries with on abstention.**

Smith: **Abstains.**

Smith: **Motion to eliminate #8, because it is covered in policy C.**

Jones: **Seconded.**

Woods: **Motion carries unanimously.**

Smith: My only comment on item #9, not in our community.

Phillips: SANDAG is starting to use these definitions to prevent giving state funds to areas that don’t fall within their definition. I think we should take out the word “incentives”.

Woods: Does item E already reference the planning of these nodes, when and where appropriate?

McMaster: **Motion to eliminate #9 because it is duplicative in Item E.**

Jones: **Seconded. Should not be a Policy.**

Woods: Motion carries unanimously.

Glavnick: There is some new transportation technology being developed. I think we need to look at new technology. I would like a policy that said something along the lines of looking at and embracing new technology.

Phillips: Motion that we do not accept any of the interest group revisions on our items A-E.

Smith: Seconded.

Stonehouse: Statement on D. We also need to maintain the trails.

Smith: Moot point because the system has already been established.

Woods: Motion carries unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM: Village Residential Designations

Item trailed to next Steering Committee meeting.

V. PROGRESS REPORT: Equity Mechanism Development / Contract with American Farmland Trust

Holler: We have retained the American Farmland Trust, to work on Equity Mechanisms, in conjunction with our MSCP plan. I think it will work more with Purchase of Development Rights, but it would not preclude TDR's. This is just a quick update. When we have more information, we will bring that back to you.

Washurn: Will it be linked to the adoption of GP2020?

Holler: I do not know if it will be formally "linked", but it will brought back to the Board probably in conjunction with GP2020.

Jones: As your consultants bring forward your proposal. We looked at a TDR program to preserve a creek, but the dilemma of where they wanted to transfer the development too, was also in a rural area. So, when they look at the TDR's, there needs to be a mechanism in terms of where the new development goes.

Johnson: Do you have some sort of a timeline?

Holler: I don't know that particular part of the Scope, but I'd be happy to get back to you.

Woods: Do I have any comments from the audience?

Van Dierendock: I feel comfortable with the recommendation. I feel very comfortable with planned growth policy. Also, comfortable with PDR program and I think it is easier than TDR's.

Whalen: I just want to say that I've successfully completed a TDR program. We found it only works within communities.

Jones: Is this consulting the group the same that has come in a couple of years ago.

Holler: No.

VI. ACTION ITEM: Next Meeting

Woods: Next Meeting? Tentative date set for October 22, 2005.