

# ROSECRANS CORRIDOR MOBILITY STUDY

## PROJECT WORKING GROUP

### MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** November 16, 2009

**Location:** NTC Command Center, Room 4  
2640 Historic Decatur Road, San Diego, CA 92106

**Attendees:** See Attached Sign In Sheet

---

#### **AGENDA DISCUSSION:**

**1. Call to Order (6:45 p.m.)**

PWG Chair Gary Halbert called the meeting to order.

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Gary asked if any PWG members had comments, edits, or additions to the October 19, 2009 PWG draft meeting minutes. A comment was made to check the Caltrans presentation for the ramp connecting I-5/I-8 with Jefferson Street. It was confirmed that an offramp is proposed in the I-5 Corridor Study. Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes.

**3. Public Comment**

Gary asked for any non-agenda public comments and the following comments were presented:

*Comment:* There is a proposed modification in Area 2 to widen bike lanes. I have not seen this before and heard it was done at the request of the Bicycle Coalition. Why was this added so late in the process? There is no room to widen bike paths.

*Response:* Clarification - The widening of the bike lanes would not widen Rosecrans or require additional right-of-way. The width of the street would not change. Re-striping the median from 14 to 12 feet would provide two more feet in the bicycle lane between Lytton and Dumas.

**4. SANDAG Presentation on Regional Bike Plan**

A transportation and land use planner from SANDAG discussed the Regional Bike Plan currently underway. SANDAG is currently developing a county-wide bike plan to improve the bicycle connections and facilities throughout the region. A map of

existing and proposed regional bike facilities was displayed. Bike facilities are often viewed as unnecessary, however the SANDAG representative explained the need for bicycle facilities. If facilities are not provided, bicyclists will either ride in the street alongside vehicular traffic or on the sidewalk alongside pedestrians. Both alternative options (street or sidewalk) are not safe because drivers are not typically looking for bikes on the sidewalk and there is conflict between pedestrians and bikes.

Along Rosecrans, there are existing bicycle lanes in Areas 2 (Lytton to Nimitz) and 4 (Canon to Kellogg), but no bicycle lanes in Areas 1 (Taylor to Lytton) and 3 (Nimitz to Canon), thereby creating significant gaps in the bicycle network. It was explained that providing a continuous path is important for bicyclists to prevent weaving on and off the sidewalk or within motorist travel lanes.

*Comment:* When parking is taken away to accommodate medians, adding bike lanes will further constrain drivers. There could be negative impacts to both vehicles and bikes. Bikes do not belong on Rosecrans.

*Response:* Bikes have a legal right to use the road and cannot be prohibited from roads other than freeways. Even if a parallel route is provided and encouraged, bicyclists cannot be stopped from riding on Rosecrans. In addition, bike lanes are needed and will be used on routes that provide access for where cyclists need or want to go. There are not many alternate ways to get to the Old Town Transit Center without using Rosecrans. Since many shops are located on Rosecrans, bicyclists would eventually use Rosecrans even if a parallel route is provided.

*Comment:* This will cause large community concern. When parking was taken out for the medians, it was to provide two-lanes on Rosecrans. Adding wider bike lanes, traffic will feel cramped, plus buses use Rosecrans and it would feel very tight, especially in areas with no landscaped medians.

*Response:* There is enough existing room for 11-foot travel lanes to provide wider bicycle lanes. Regarding the buses, cyclists face the same dangers as motorists and must accommodate the buses as motorists do.

*Comment:* As a bicyclist, there are not many ways to get around this area. Area 1 is a hostile bicycle environment and there are many other bicyclists in that area since it is near the Transit Center. Those existing bicyclists will ride in that area if they are accommodated (with bicycle lanes) or not. Scott Street is a good alternate parallel route for Area 3, but there is no good alternate route in Area 1. Also,

it is very hard to get through Sports Arena intersection, especially southbound on Rosecrans.

*Response:* The project team is currently looking at different alternatives such as bicycle boxes, which provide bicyclists with a jump start in front of vehicular traffic at a signalized intersection.

*Comment:* Public comment to this project has stated the dislike for bike lanes in Areas 1 or 3. In Area 3, there is no room. In Area 1, there are too many cars. Bike boxes are a good idea but people will continue to turn on red or other habits that are dangerous for bicyclists.

*Response:* Bicyclists along Rosecrans decide where they will travel and highly depends on each individual's skill level or experience.

*Comment:* Scott Street is a good idea for a bypass bike lane, but some blocks have diagonal parking and may not work for bike lanes.

*Comment:* If you put bike lanes in Area 1 it will create monumental traffic jams. The idea is very dangerous and likely to cause fatalities.

*Comment:* If bike boxes were installed it would require No Right Turn on Red, which would cause traffic delay through Area 1.

*Comment:* Going east from Camino del Rio up to Pacific Highway, there is room on the north side for a bike lane. But beware of the speeds in the area and prevent providing bicyclists with a false sense of security.

*Comment:* In Area 1, there is a developable property which may accommodate a Class I bike facility. This area is freeway-like so it would be ideal to completely separate bicyclists from vehicular traffic. Heading northbound, a Class II bike lane may work but southbound is much worse, so Class I may be better in that direction.

*Comment:* Reminder that there is a Transit Center in Area 1 and bicyclists need connections to there to get where they want to go.

*Question:* Would it be safer to sign bicyclists to use the sidewalk? Why can't they be prohibited from the road like skate boarders?

*Response:* No. Bikes have the same rights to use the road as a motorist. Some use the sidewalk if they feel more comfortable, but cannot be prohibited from using the roadway. State law gives cyclists the same rights to the road as motorists, except on freeways. In addition, we would not qualify for any funding if cyclists are excluded.

*Question:* Would we have a higher probability for getting funding if we include bicycle facilities?

*Response:* Yes.

*Question:* How about bike lanes on only one side of Rosecrans?

*Response:* Bike lanes on one side would invite wrong-way travel on the road, which is illegal. It is also dangerous because motorists coming out of a driveway may not see a bicyclists approaching from the wrong direction.

*Question:* What about a two-way separated facility, like on Friars Road?

*Response:* It is uncertain if the two-way separated facility is growing more popular. However, it would need to be separated by a berm (like the Friars facility) and be designed to address issues with driveways and visibility.

*Comment:* Consider putting the two-way bike facility on northbound Rosecrans at Camino del Rio/Rosecrans, towards Rosecrans where there is a slip nose. Bikes can have that space and require motorists to go around the median – instead of going straight they would make a right at the island.

*Response:* This idea would only provide a facility in one direction and does not address southbound traffic.

*Comment:* We need to avoid inviting too many bicyclists in Area 1 – they will probably get hit.

*Comment:* A large part of the problem is that many bicyclists do not obey traffic laws – they run lights and stop signs and weave through traffic, which may be very dangerous.

*Comment:* Take Barnett instead – south on Pacific Highway onto Barnett to get to Lytton. This would avoid Area 1 on Rosecrans.

*Response:* A study was done and is currently being reviewed by the City. There have been discussions about making Enterprise connect across to Midway onto Barnett. This is still in the works.

## 5. Update on Projects & Outstanding Issues

- **Parking in Old Town.** There are no plans to change the parking lot at the Transit Center now or in the future (no plans for a structure).
- **Rock Church.** The project team is working on the comments to send to the Rock Church and will be requesting responses.
- **Sports Arena.** Rosecrans project team members met with representatives from Sports Arena. The Sports Arena representatives were not overly concerned about the intersection modifications because they typically use other routes. Sports Arena staff are working with City of San Diego to improve signage to and from the facility.

- **Navy.** The project team is compiling the final set of comments to send to the Navy for comment.

*Comment:* This study should include that providing shuttles would require a structure off-site (such as at the Old Town Transit Center) because there is no room for parking (for park & ride) otherwise.

*Response:* This group should recommend that the Rosecrans study include a structure be built for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for shuttle service. We need to identify a location to recommend where a structure is built.

*Comment:* The Navy should stop putting money to provide parking on-site and should invest in solving the problem off-site.

*Comment:* Suggestion to build a structure near the post-office where there is an existing vacant structure.

*Comment:* Suggestion to provide park & ride facilities at the dirt lot across from Fiesta Island.

*Comment:* Suggestion to build a parking structure at the boat ramp since it is nearly always empty.

*Comment:* A suggestion of caution was given – wherever parking is provided, there will be more traffic congestion around it.

## 6. **Review Results of the Third Workshop**

Dawn reviewed the activities and results of the third workshop held at NTC on Thursday, November 12<sup>th</sup>. Stations were set up around the room Open House style that showed the project process thus far, a corridor overview, the preliminary recommended improvements in each of the study areas, and the long-term regional projects in the area. A survey was provided in the guidebooks handed to each of the attendees. Over 100 people participated in the workshop. By the end of the evening, 93 surveys were turned in.

A table summarizing the survey results was provided. The results were broken into two categories: “responding” and “not responding.” “Responding” refers to survey questions where either “like”, “neutral”, or “dislike” was circled on the survey. “Not responding” refers to survey questions where no selection was made.

Concepts liked by a majority (> 50%) of responding participants included:

- Sidewalks & Bike Lanes to Transit Center\* (\*many participants commented they supported the concept of the sidewalks but not the bicycle lanes)
- Rosecrans & Midway Intersection Improvements
- Modified Signals (Roosevelt & Womble)

- Relocation of Transit Stops (Area 3)
- Long Term: Bicycle Boulevard (Area 3)
- Restripe Rosecrans & Talbot

Concepts disliked by a majority (> 50%) of responding participants included:

- Bicycle Lanes on Rosecrans/Parking Removal (Area 1)
- Wider Bicycle Lanes (Area 2)
- Stripe Bicycle Lanes (Area 3)
- Median Islands at Armada
- Chokers at Qualtrough & Kona
- Mini Roundabout at McCall

**7. Presentation and Discussion of Preliminary Recommended Alternative**

Dawn reviewed each of the concepts included in the Preliminary Recommended Alternative and asked the PWG to fill out surveys from the Open House. The PWG Chair recommended that the PWG vote openly as a group and it was agreed to do so. The results of the PWG vote are provided below.

**PWG Survey Results**

Preliminary Recommended Improvement		Like	Neutral	Dislike
<b>AREA 1</b>				
A	Moore St Median Closure	9	1	0
B	Sidewalks & Bike Lanes on Rosecrans to Transit Center	9	0	1
	Signal at Hancock	2	5	3
C	Extension of Sports Arena & Assoc. Roadway Changes	4	2	4
	Recommended for Future Study	9	0	1
D	Rosecrans & Midway Intersection Improvements	7	3	0
E	Bicycle Lanes on Rosecrans & Removal of Parking	8	0	1
	(Long Term) Grade Separation of Rosecrans/Sports Arena	1	5	3
	(Long Term) Realignment of Sports Arena/Camino del Rio	4	2	3
	*(Long Term) Regional Parking Facility	8	1	0
<b>AREA 2</b>				
F	Modified Signals at Dumas/Roosevelt and Zola/Womble	9	0	0
G	Intermittent Medians with Northbound Left-Turn Access	2	4	3
H	Wider Bicycle Lanes (Lytton to Roosevelt)	8	0	1
I	Side Street Curb Extensions to Reduce Crossing Distance	4	2	3
J	Consolidation & Relocation of Transit Stops	9	0	0
	(Long Term) Bicycle Boulevard on Evergreen & Locust	8	0	1
<b>AREA 3</b>				
K	Re-stripe to Add 6' Bicycle Lanes	8	0	1
L	Landscaped Medians & Left-Turn Pockets at Intersections	8	0	1

<b>Preliminary Recommended Improvement</b>		<b>Like</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Dislike</b>
M	New Traffic Signal at Emerson	7	1	1
N	Side Street Curb Extensions to Reduce Crossing Distance	4	1	4
O	Relocation of Transit Stops to Signalized Intersections	9	0	0
	(Long Term) Bicycle Boulevard on Locust	8	0	1
<b>AREA 4</b>				
P	Re-stripe Intersection of Rosecrans & Talbot	9	0	0
Q	Complete Sidewalks on West Side of Street	8	0	1
R	Curb Extensions at Owen and Bessemer	7	1	1
S	Median Islands at Armada (at the curve)	3	2	4
T	Chokers Near Qualtrough and Kona	3	2	4
U	Mini-Roundabouts at McCall	2	0	7
V	Consolidation of Transit Stops	2	6	1

\*Added by request of PWG

Comments provided during the discussion of the Preliminary Recommended Alternative included the following:

- A) Need signage on Hancock if median is put in with turn allowances.
- B) Signal at Hancock would have two turn lanes and parking on Hancock would be eliminated. Protected-Permissive signal phasing was preferred. It was discussed that the signal should be installed when it is warranted in the future, however there is an existing need for a crosswalk there. If cost is an issue, installing the signal should be a lower priority. Implement more urgently-needed projects first. If parking is eliminated on Hancock, it could negatively impact the businesses in that area.
- C) Turning on Hancock will be backed up if Sports Arena changes. Should not circulate traffic around Hancock and should consider Kurtz instead. The proposal to extent Greenwood would be unnecessary if Sherman is carried through. Eliminating the left turn onto Sports Arena prohibits access to the Staples shopping center. Instead of directing traffic from Rosecrans to Camino del Rio to turn left onto Hancock and around to Sports Arena, create a loop to right at the Sports Arena/Rosecrans intersection. The most important part of extending Sports Arena is to provide an additional north/south corridor. Consider an off ramp from I-5 connecting to Greenwood.
- D) The high cost was questioned. The cost of the improvements for the intersection is high because it requires purchasing some right-of-way and constructing the median.
- G) Medians in Area 2 are not worth putting in if community is against it and access is not a severe problem. May be considered at critical locations only. The median was originally supposed to extend the length of

Rosecrans, but the residents opposed this. This will create ill will to solve a non-problem. Consider identifying only the most critical locations to implement.

- I) Hardly any parking would be lost from installing curb extensions because the curb extensions would be installed where there is existing red curb. The curb extensions could be landscaped or concrete.
  - K) Proposal to put an 11-foot number one lane and a 12-foot number two lane. Businesses may not be happy with bike lanes because it will cause traffic impediments for vehicles going in and out of businesses. Having bike lanes would make pedestrians feel safer because there is a buffer between them and traffic. Caution of reducing lane widths here because there are a lot of fast-food restaurants/driveways in Area 3.
  - L) Can't close access to Avenida de Portugal because of the parade route. Incorporate landscaping in Area 3 wherever feasible.
  - Q) A resident mentioned that the City may not own all the land to install sidewalks in Area 4 and would require purchasing property to do so. There is plenty of room for sidewalks – it is not acceptable to have a major thoroughfare with no sidewalks.
  - U) Mini roundabout may work better at Nickel instead of McCall. A major complaint in this area is speed, so roundabout may help.
  - V) Consolidating transit stops is acceptable so long as it does not discourage transit ridership.
- Long Term Options) Grade separation at Sports Arena is being removed from the community plan. Consider satellite parking options.

The next steps of the project will include presenting the project to local planning groups.

## 8. Next Meeting

*Due to the holiday season, there will be no PWG meeting in December.*

**Date: Monday, January 11<sup>th</sup>**  
**Time: 6:45 p.m.**  
**Location: NTC Command Center**

## 9. Meeting Adjourned at 9:09 p.m.