

DRAFT

**COASTAL RAIL TRAIL
Project Working Group Meeting
July 31, 2013**

Members in Attendance

Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Association
Debby Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon
Janay Kruger, University Community Planning Group
Karin Zirk, Friends of Rose Creek

City and Agency Staff/Consultants in Attendance

City Staff

Abi Palaseyed, City of San Diego
Nitsuh Aberra, City of San Diego
Mel Millstein, City of San Diego

Agency Staff

Chris Carterette, SANDAG

Consultants

Pete Ritchey, Nasland Engineering
Larry Thornburgh, Nasland Engineering
Mike Singleton, KTU+A
Mark Carpenter, KTU+A
Dick Rol, AECOM
Kristen Byrne, MJE Marketing Services

1. Call to Order

Abi Palasayed called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. Those in attendance introduced themselves and their affiliations.

2. Meeting Notes from April 10, 2013 meeting

Abi noted that copies of the draft meeting notes from the April 10, 2013 meeting were available on the sign-in table. He asked the members to review the notes and provide any changes or corrections by Friday, August 2. The notes will be considered final after that date.

3. Meeting Overview

Abi reviewed the topics to be covered at the meeting and the input that we are hoping to obtain.

4. Review Project Goals/Benefits

Chris Carterette from SANDAG provided a review of the goals and benefits of the Coastal Rail Trail project so that Project Working Group members could keep the goals in mind as they are commenting on potential alternatives. The overall goal is to create bicycle facilities that attract people to bicycling as a transportation choice. The way to do this is to create lower stress bicycle facilities (less traffic) that make a larger number of people comfortable with bicycling.

5. Summary of Public Workshop #1

Mark Carpenter from KTU+A provided a summary of the first public workshop, held May 29, 2013. The public was presented with background information about the project goals and benefits, as well as a range of segments in the project area to consider as part of future alignments. The public was asked to comment on these proposed segments and identify any other segments that should be analyzed.

Mark showed a graphic with additional segments added by the public at the workshop. In addition to these identified segments, the following is a summary of input that was received:

- Direct route along I-5
- I-5 to Gilman and UCSD
- Alignment along Regents Rd.
- Alignment along Torrey Pines Rd.
- Alignment from Sorrento Valley north
- Avoidance of Rose Canyon
- Alignment should have community connections (employment, parks, schools, etc.)

6. Quantitative Segment Analysis

Mark explained that since receiving input from the Project Working Group and the public at the last workshop, the technical team has been working to do a quantitative analysis of all of the segments identified. He explained the evaluation approach used to rank the various segments.

Mark reviewed each criteria identified by the Project Working Group and explained how each criteria was weighted to score the 95 individual segments. He then showed a graph and a map for each criteria category to demonstrate how each segment ranked in each category. He also explained that just because a segment does not score well, it doesn't mean that the segment will be eliminated from consideration. It could still be part of an alternative alignment, but may not contribute more than a connection between segments.

Working Group members posed the following questions and comments:

- Will you take future transit stations into account when looking at transit connectivity?
- Did you consider Park & Rides in terms of connectivity?
- We can give you a current traffic study that will show you current traffic volumes, road sizes, LOS, etc.
- One of the problems occurring in our region is that bicycles are riding in car lanes. The problem occurs when it is a high volume street and it slows traffic.
- Are you trying to get rid of "low hanging fruit" to reduce the number of segments?
- It seems like the campus areas should be safe. Why do they show as yellow?
- Voigt Drive shows as unsafe, but that will be a transit route and carpool route. It might be able to accommodate a bike facility.
- It doesn't seem as if you have weighted environmental impacts heavily enough. We are trying to hold onto all the open space we can and want to make sure that it is heavily weighted. We are chipping away at Rose Canyon piece by piece and we have to stop that.
- What do you mean by "spillover lighting?"
- Why didn't you count street lights as spillover lighting?

DRAFT

- Wouldn't cost of ROW and biological mitigation impact specific segments?

7. Potential Alignment Alternatives

Mark then shared a number of potential alignment alternatives that could be considered for more detailed analysis. He indicated that the technical team recommends that the original URS alternative be carried forward to serve as a baseline of comparison to other alternatives. He indicated that the team wanted to hear from the Project Working Group members about whether these alternatives are appropriate to carry forward, whether there are other alignments to analyze, or adjustments to any of the potential alternatives presented.

Mark reviewed each of the eight potential alternatives, and then opened it up to comment from the members. It was noted that UCSD has commented that they are not completely comfortable with alternatives that go through campus.

Alternative 3

- In general, this options seems to get cyclists away from the core traffic areas. We really need input from the Bicycle Coalition on this.
- Routes through Roselle Canyon and General Atomics property are steep. Some people like to use it as a mountain bike route now, but may not be appropriate for street bikes. It also sends you through the Sorrento Valley Road interchange.

Abi noted that there is a grade separation project being considered at Sorrento Valley Road that would move the Coaster station.

- Some thought we should leave this alternative in because of the safety of the route.
- Some disagreed because it goes too far out of direction and a class 1 through Roselle Canyon should have a big penalty.

Alternative 4

- The good thing about this alternative is that traffic in La Jolla Colony is much less intense than on Gilman.
- What private open space are you talking about, the La Jolla Colony park?
- It has advantages in that it is adjacent to La Jolla Colony and the shopping center.
- It could prove difficult getting ROW from UCSD. Concern was voiced about getting an agreement from UCSD in time to make this alternative work.
- The team will need to talk to La Jolla Colony about this alternative.
- Could be a nice alignment and if the stars align it would be a nice addition to that area.

Alternative 5

- Some opposed this alternative because of Roselle Canyon impact and the out of direction travel. Also, UCSD property would be a challenge.
- Which segments on UCSD property are included in the Campus Master Plan? Do we have access to this information?

Alternative 6

- This alternative doesn't have any benefit over alternative 4.
- This also has out of direction travel.

Alternative 7

- This one stays out of UCSD entirely (as does alternative 1).
- If the path is on east side of I-5 and you want to avoid UCSD, you can't avoid open space.

Alternative 8

Mark explained that this alignment along the rail corridor does not provide the connectivity that we are looking for. He posed the question about whether the team should even carry this forward for analysis. It is likely to score very low.

- You would have issues with the military because of proximity to Miramar.
- It is very steep and could have habitat impacts.
- If I am using this to commute, it is miles out of my way. It seems like more of a recreational rider trail, but not one that would encourage people to use a bicycle as alternative transportation.
- All agreed that we can eliminate this alternative.

The group agreed to drop alternatives 3 and 8 from further analysis. It was also noted that another alternative that was dropped was a facility attached to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project aerial structure.

Mark explained that the next step is to give a detailed analysis to each of the alternatives. This information would be brought back at the next meeting for review by the Project Working Group to narrow it down to the top few alternatives.

Each of these alignments would be compared against the URS alignment that was previously studied.

The group discussed the importance of ensuring that there is representative attendance at the next PWG meeting, since important decisions will be made on alternatives to move forward. They also discussed the meeting time and indicated it would be helpful if meetings started later so participants don't have to miss work.

8. Public Comment

No public comment was offered.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.