

Coastal Mobility and Livability Working Group (CMLWG)

DRAFT Summary Notes

Meeting No. 6.2

October 2, 2017

6:00 – 8:30 pm (adjourned at 8:45pm)

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

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. Roberta Walker, 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, eighteen (18) members that have been formally appointed were present. Elena Thompson served as an alternate for Kellie Hinze, Roberta Walker for Brett Farrow and Kris Buchanan for Tom Cozens. Two (2) were absent, (Youth Commission Representative, and Judy Thum).

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (15 MINUTES)

No Public Comments.

4. WORKING SESSION WITH CMLWG

KTUA presented the first draft of the Active Transportation Plan Maps. See attached CMLS Working Group (WG) – Notes from Meeting No. 6.2 (Attachment A)

5. NEXT STEPS

Next meeting noted as October 10, 2017 for continued discussion and review of the ATP maps.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT CONTINUED

Two people submitted speaker slips.

Darius Degher spoke wanting to distinguish between two types of cyclists – sports cyclists & transportation/utility cyclists as each has unique needs that need to be addressed. Most of the improvements to date have accommodated the sports cyclists because they are better organized. An example is a shared road lane. The sports cyclist advocates this so they can ride faster, but it is not ideal or safe for a family or cycling with children.

Marty Benson spoke regarding the underpass at Encinitas Blvd and I-5 noting that is very dangerous to pedestrians and would like to create transportation opportunities for those utilizing the underpass at Encinitas Blvd. Also noted that scope of the study does not extend inland far enough.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting concluded at 8:45 PM.

CMLS Working Group (WG) – Comments from Meeting #6.2

2017-10-02

Active Transportation Plan – KTU+A

WG ATP Input

Chesterfield to Santa Fe

- As proposed by CRT: functions as needed walkway & alternative for staying on Vulcan.
- Options: Work a bike lane into this segment of San Elijo Avenue

WG Feedback

- Manchester, San Elijo and south on 101 needs to be looked at closer to address other connections.
- Consider connectivity to PWP plans to the east. Working Group did not necessarily support all of them, but realize they are likely to be built.
- Consider replacing the weak network links that do not provide enough protection for inexperienced riders and making them buffered, protected or away from the street.
- Concerned how signalization for bikes and peds will be handled at crossings or full intersections.

Agreements

- Working Group feels it should continue to have input on CRT (Santa Fe to Chesterfield) project design elements.
- Working Group would like to include westside CRT multi-use path (that was turned down by Coastal Commission) to be a proposed facility beyond ped-only aspect. This would be in addition to buffered bike lanes and realization that it will require both roadway and lane diets to fit.
- Working Group feels bike lanes on San Elijo from Chesterfield north to Santa Fe undercrossing are not needed due to limited ROW, parking impacts and CRT addressing this need.

Santa Fe to “G” Street or NCTD Parking Lot

- Stay in the NCTD Corridor: better travel experience / fewer conflicts with vehicles.
- Options: Come out to Vulcan at Santa Fe with buffered bike lanes or cycle tracks.

WG Feedback

- Since Vulcan is slightly wider than San Elijo to the south, some felt bike lanes should be added, while others indicated parking loss was not acceptable.

Agreements

- Working Group agreed CRT should remain in NCTD ROW from Santa Fe undercrossing northward to NCTD parking lot or south of temporary overflow parking lot at “G” Street.

“G” Street to Encinitas Blvd.

- Two-way cycle track on west side. May result in some parking loss and conflicts at driveways.
- Options: One-way cycle track on each side of roadway- reduces driveway conflict.

WG Feedback

- Concerns over two-way cycle track due to collisions and driveway conflict potential. Instead suggest two one-ways to avoid driveway conflicts where drivers generally expect bikes from one direction. In general, this person felt that two-way cycle tracks are not as safe as one-ways.
- East side cycle track suggested starting at F street northward, but was considered to be less safe due to number of active driveways between G and F.
- Multi-use path through parking lot was suggested but considered unsafe after discussion
- Concern expressed for why we have to consider a bridge at Encinitas if we can put a two-way cycle track down west side of roadway. This would be preferred but not feasible unless bus hub was replaced, moved or dramatically reconfigured.

Agreements

- Most of group suggested two-way cycle track on east side of roadway and dropping green lane in front of bus station to avoid conflicts with a relatively unprotected facility on west side.
- Working Group would like to see having all of cycle track on either east side or west side as two-way and would like to see what it would take to make this work to avoid the use of east-west bridge.
- Working Group felt that bridges, although expensive and likely to take more time to implement, would be worthwhile solutions and may be essential to make this segment function.

Encinitas Blvd. to Hillcrest

- Multi-use path on east side of track in NCTD ROW. Provides east side with circulation facility (min. walkway needed), creates looped system for options, less highway crossing for bikes getting to a west side multi-use path, drivers less likely to think cyclist have to be on nearby path, with west side parking, pedestrian use may be too heavy for bike use.
- Options: Shift path to westside at Encinitas Blvd., El Portal or Leucadia Blvd.

WG Feedback

- No specific concerns brought up other than desire to see Leucadia Streetscape and Parking concept overlaid on ATP plans to assure consistency and Working Group understanding.
- Not enough east-west connections are shown, whether trail, walkway or bike facility.

Agreements

- Working Group agreed that having multi-use path on this side of rail line was logical and beneficial. Hillcrest undercrossing could be an east-west connecting point, and/or path could continue to La Costa.

Hillcrest Crossing to La Costa

- Multi-use path on west side of track in NCTD ROW. Makes the connection at La Costa simpler if switched to the west side of tracks.
- Options: Continue multi-use path up to La Costa and connect on each side of bridge.

WG Feedback

- Some were concerned about how multi-use paths can safely cross existing streets.

Agreements

- Working Group supports east side multi-use path with caveat that east-west connections and crossings be integrated, including showing Leucadia 101 streetscape for further evaluation.
- Extending multi-use path northward to La Costa was supported. Consultant was asked to look at feasibility of making this connection at and under La Costa bridge over rail line.

3rd/ Melrose from Encinitas Blvd. to El Portal

- Switch from existing bike lanes to bike boulevard, creating a by-pass route to Coast Highway. Turn stop signs to cross streets and provide at least one vehicular diverter.
- Options: Connect to Encinitas Boulevard eastward to new bridge and facilities on Vulcan or to Coast Highway.

WG Feedback

- Some were concerned that this is not a great street to ride particularly due to steepness.
- Some agreed that having people end their bike ride on 3rd Street at Encinitas Boulevard is not a great connection due to vehicle traffic volumes.
- Some felt that 3rd Street was not well used, but a good route that some take.

Agreements

- Working Group ask that we not consider 3rd Street bike boulevard as proposed because of hill, skinny streets and need for diverter, but that we should look at this closer and bring this back with some other options including Sylvia and Neptune where some people do ride, even though they involve more out of direction travel.

General Notes

WG Feedback

- Some streets shown in the Level of Traffic Comfort Analysis (i.e. Saxony, MacKinnon, Cerra, Requeza) and should be classified as less comfortable than shown, even LTC level 4.

Other Comments:

- Prioritize recommendations (i.e. long-term, mid-term, short-term)
- Prioritize easy safety improvements first (i.e. paint)
- Adopted ATP makes City more grant eligible.
- Provide lighting on designated routes.
- Provide east-west connections wherever possible.
- Consider Pole Road as part of Solana Beach route connection.
- Consider making Manchester (north of San Elijo) a one-way street with the left over space made into a multi-use path.
- Narrow lanes, install buffers and rumble strips globally, across town