

Coastal Mobility and Livability Working Group (CMLWG)

DRAFT Summary Notes

Meeting No. 6

September 13, 2017

5:30 – 8:30 pm

Poinsettia Room, Encinitas Civic Center

505 S. Vulcan Avenue

Encinitas, California 92024

A copy of the CMLWG meeting agenda and packet may be viewed by the public in the Planning and Building Department lobby during normal business hours and on the City's webpage at <http://www.encinitasca.gov/CMLS>

1. AGENDA REVIEW

2. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/ACCEPT MEETING #5 NOTES

The CMLWG is comprised of thirteen (13) regular members. The CMLWG is also comprised of a representative from each of the City's Commissions to serve as ex-officio members.

Regular Members

1. Kellie Hinze, Leucadia 101
2. Brett Farrow, Cardiff 101
3. Tom Cozens, Encinitas 101
4. Jim Benedetti, Chamber
5. Richard Risner, Preserve Cardiff Rail Corridor
6. Jody Hubbard, Yes Rail Trail
7. Rahul Deshpande, Cardiff T.C.
8. William Morrison, Leucadia T.C.
9. Judy Berlfein, Bike/Walk Encinitas
10. Mikayla McFadden, Paul Ecke

Ex Officio Commission Members

1. Greg Drakos, Planning
2. Peter Kohl, Traffic and Safety
3. Joy Lyndes, Environmental
4. Judy Thum, Arts
5. Gabriella Gjata, Youth
6. Kris Stewart, Senior
7. John Gjata, Parks and Recreation

School

11. Robert Hemphill, Engaged Citizen
12. Ron Dodge, Engaged Citizen
13. Carmen Barnard, Latino/Hispanic

At this meeting, seventeen (17) members that have been formally appointed were present. Three (3) were absent, (Robert Hemphill, Gabrielle Gjata, and Judy Thum).

Regarding Summary Notes from Meeting No. 5, Ron Dodge mentioned that he would like to add in the discussion of the San Clemente audible warning system, that there were alternatives available (referencing sound levels).

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (15 MINUTES)

No public comment received.

4. PRESENTATION OF MEETING FORMAT

General overview was given and the existing conditions were addressed.

5. WORKING SESSION WITH CMLWG

Chen+Ryan presented the first draft of the Coastal Corridor Parking Study. See attached CMLS Working Group (WG) – Notes from Meeting #6.0 (Attachment A)

WSP started their presentation on the Rail Corridor Vision Study (see attachment). Due to time constraints, the CMLWG agreed to continue the discussion and schedule another meeting.

6. NEXT STEPS

- ** Additional Working Session (6.1) – September 18, 2017 (6:00 to 8:00p)
- Community Open House - September 27, 2017 (3:30 to 5:30 pm)
- CMLS Briefing to City Council – September 27, 2017 (6:00 pm)
- Meeting No. 7 – November 14, 2017 (5:30 to 8:30pm)
- Community Open House - November 29, 2017 (3:30 to 5:30 pm)
- CMLS Briefing to City Council – November 29, 2017 (6:00 pm)

7. PUBLIC COMMENT CONTINUED

Two people submitted speaker slips.

Julie Thunder spoke regarding how Cardiff is facing eminent construction, and that the time to act is now, because it's already started. She also mentioned that the public was told they were getting a crossing, and that one crossing is the priority.

The second speaker was Dave Kelter, and he discussed issues regarding the Quiet Zone, and that if there is crossing every ¼-mile with double-tracking, that that's a lot of horn. He wanted to know what is to be expected.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting concluded at 9:00 PM.

CML Working Group (WG) – Notes from Meeting #6.0 2017-09-13

Parking Study – Chen+Ryan

WG Parking Study Input

- Need to include more blocks in downtown Cardiff as part of the study, not just San Elijo
- Parking study, Page 21 - Provide the numbers for the parking loss along San Elijo, from Santa Fe to Birmingham Drive.
- Parking invites more cars, so this should be accompanied by a Traffic Study for the impacts of those cars
- How is parking a mechanism to guide growth?
- Address influence on specific plans and how we might need to change them
- Not enough time for all this info. Need more meetings. And meeting length is too long.
- Some of group is amenable to parking meters- get more clarity in the study about how parking can act as a growth management tool
- Is this a realistic parking count for rail corridor? (Chen+Ryan: Our estimate is based upon the number of cars that could park if they all parked perfectly along the length of the corridor)
- Quantify the number of parking spots lost in Cardiff along San Elijo with Coastal Rail Trail
- Include in the study the info received from the intercept surveys and identify where people are from (in city or outside), because Active Transportation methods won't help with people outside the City
- Provide current and future parking counts for:
 - current parking without the spaces in the NCTD right of way
 - current parking with the dirt parking in the NCTD right of way
 - current land use as built out and the parking demand related to that
 - the full build out of current land use and the parking demand related to that
 - the parking count of full build out of the 101 streetscape
- Consider adding a footnote in the report regarding the proposed bike lanes north of Santa Fe to D Street. The Traffic & Safety Commission previously voted to not construct the bike lanes and to preserve parking.
- Look at parking regulations as solution to address parking in the North 101 Corridor Specific Plan and Downtown Encinitas Specific Plan
- Concerns about the 300+ parking spaces proposed to be removed due to streetscape in Leucadia based upon the maximum worst case scenario. Can this parking number be modified to account for people that do not parking efficiently (straight within a space)?
- Can we document visitors versus residents utilizing parking along the corridor?
- Use lifeguard numbers for beach visitors as part of study
- Look into a free option for metered parking for residents?
- Create and emphasize parking strategies to protect the quality of life (i.e. residential permit parking, etc.) and some innovative parking solutions since this is high level vision study
- Numbers in dirt are not real
- Need more data on number of pedestrians at crossings

Rail Corridor Crossings

Existing and Proposed Crossing Locations

- Desire to move the rail to the I-5 Corridor
- Trench the rail
 - Open trench
 - Or tunnel? Preference generally seems to be a covered trench
- The more pedestrian crossings, the better
 - At-grade is cheaper, so that is the preference of some

WG Feedback

- The more crossings, the better
- More detail requested on what is driving the selected locations
- Request to expand on these items to lay out priority and schedule
- La Costa OK, but improve safety to access it because of the jog of Vulcan approaching La Costa is unsafe
- Bishop's gate is ok, but who is really going to use it? At-grade.
- Consider crossing at Andrew because lots of people will come from the east.
- Coordinate bus stop locations
- Consider moving the bus stop that is near Andrew to Bishop's Gate to make better use of a crossing at Bishops' Gate
- Grandview is one of the original four grade-separated crossing locations
- At-grade crossing at Grandview might be acceptable
- Slam-dunk location at Grandview
- Be aware that there may be horns blown at these at-grade crossings
- Construct the crossings so that they accommodate a future quiet zone
- Be equitable about the funding along the length of the corridor

Public Comment

- Cardiff is facing eminent construction – it's already started. Public was told they were getting a crossing. That one crossing is the priority. (Julie Thunder)
- Quiet Zone - If crossing every ¼-mile with double-tracking, that's a lot of horn. What is to be expected? (Dave Kelter)