PROJECT WORKING GROUP ROSECRANS CORRIDOR MOBILITY STUDY

JANUARY 11, 2010

Agenda

- Call to Order
 - Purpose of PWG & Mission Statement
 - Approval of Minutes
- Public Comment
- Review of Project Goals & Objectives
- Cost Estimates
- Implementation Plan
- Community Group Meetings
- Closing Remarks Next Steps



69 A B



1. Call to Order





Purpose of PWG

69 A A

The PWG is comprised of residents and business owners from the Rosecrans Corridor communities of Old Town, North Bay and Peninsula. All member were appointed or nominated to serve as representatives of the PWG through their involvement_{in the} community or in community based organizations.

Members are responsible for disseminating information about the project to the community by providing monthly updated to their respective organizations and distribution of event information.

The PWG is not a decision making body and will not be voting on issues. The purpose of this group is ^{to}provide guidance of the project technical team and City staff.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Rosecrans Corridor Mobility Study Project Working Group is to provide recommendations to the City of San Diego about potential community sensitive solutions to improve vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility in the Rosecrans Corridor study area.

The Working Group will serve as a forum for collaboration, the discussion of issues and exchange of ideas between City, military and all affected communities toward improving mobility and promoting urban beautification.



6000





2. Approval of Minutes







3. Public Comment







4. Review of Project Goals & Objectives







5. DRAFT Cost Estimates





Cost Estimates

- Construction Costs
- Contingency (25%)
- Bond (2%)
- Field Orders (25%)
- Mobilization (2%)
- Administrative (25%)
- Design (25%)
- Environmental (15%)



888

Cost by Improvement

ROSECRANS COORIDOR STUDY ESTIMATES

Area 1									
Area	Construction	Contigency (25%)	Bond (2%)	Field Orders (25%)	Mobilization (2%)	Admin (25%)	Design (25%)	Environmental (15%)	Total
Improvement A	\$304,325	\$76,091	\$7,609	\$95,402	\$7.809	\$95,102	\$95,102	\$57.061	\$737.986
Improvement B	\$446,188	\$111,547	\$11,155	\$159,434	\$11,155	\$159,434	\$139,434	\$83,660	\$1,082,007
Improvement C	\$689,431	\$172,373	\$17,237	\$215,465	\$17,237	\$215,466	\$215,466	\$129,280	\$1,672,016
Improvement D	\$485,430	\$121,358	\$12,136	\$151,697	\$12,136	\$151,697	\$151,697	\$91,018	\$1,177,169
Improvement E	\$113,185	\$28,231	\$2,829	\$35,364	\$2,829	\$35,364	\$35,364	\$21,218	\$274,425
New Transit Stops	\$2,000	\$500	\$50	\$625	海50	\$625	\$625	\$375	\$4,850
Future Road between Kurtz and Sports Arena	\$304.325	\$76,031	\$7,603	\$95.102	\$7.608	\$95,102	\$95.102	\$57.061	\$737.986
Total Ares 1	\$2,344,925	\$586,231	\$58,623	\$732,789	\$58,623	\$732,789	\$732,789	\$439,673	\$5,686,443

Area 2									
Ares	Construction	Contigency (26%)	Bond (2%)	Field Orders (26%)	Mobilization (2%)	Admin (25%)	Design (25%)	Environmental (16%)	Total
Improvement F	\$225,486	\$56,371	\$5,637	\$70,464	\$5,637	\$70,464	\$70,464	\$42,279	\$546.803
improvement G	\$125,112	\$31,273	\$3,728	\$39.098	\$3,728	\$30,098	\$39,098	\$23,459	\$303.397
Improvement H	\$47,040	\$11,760	\$1,176	\$14,700	\$1.176	\$14,700	\$14,700	\$8,620	\$114,072
Improvement !	\$74.941	\$18,735	\$1,874	\$23.419	\$1,874	\$23.419	\$23,419	\$14,051	\$161,732
Improvement J.	\$7,500	\$1.875	\$188	\$2,344	\$188	\$2,344	\$2,344	\$1,406	\$18,188
Total Area 2	\$480,079	\$120,020	\$12,002	\$150,025	\$12,002	\$150,025	\$150,025	\$90,015	\$1,164,191

Area 3									
Area	Construction	Contigency (25%)	Bond (2%)	Field Orders (25%)	Mobilization (2%)	Admin (25%)	Design (25%)	Environmental (15%)	Total
Improvement K	\$105,545	\$26,386	\$2,639	\$32,983	\$2,839	\$32,983	\$32,983	\$19,790	\$255,94
Improvement L	\$276,767	\$69,192	\$6,919	\$86,490	\$6,919	\$86,4.90	\$56,490	\$51,894	\$671,15
Improvement M	\$20,1,196	\$50,299	\$5,030	\$62 874	\$5,030	\$62,374	\$62,874	\$37,724	\$187.59
Improvement N	\$118;381	\$29,595	\$2,960	\$36,994	\$2,960	\$36,994	\$36,994	\$22,196	\$287,07
Improvement O	\$8,500	\$2,125	\$213	\$2,656	\$213	\$3,658	\$2,658	\$1,594	\$20,61
Total Area 3	\$710,388	\$177,597	\$17,760	\$221,995	\$17,760	\$221,996	\$221,996	\$133,198	\$1,722,69

	Area 4								
Area	Construction	Contigency (25%)	Bond (2%)	Field Orders (25%)	Mobilization (2%)	Admin (25%)	Design (25%)	Environmental (15%)	Total
Improvement P	\$23,924	\$5,981	\$598	\$7,476	\$598	\$7,476	\$7_476	\$4,486	\$58,015
Improvement Q	\$48,492	\$12,100	\$1,210	\$15,126	\$1,210	\$15,126	\$15,126	\$9,075	\$117,374
Improvement R	\$84,507	\$21,127	\$2,113	\$26,408	\$2,113	\$26,408	\$26,408	\$15,845	\$204,930
Improvement S	\$35,570	\$9,142	\$914	\$11,428	\$9.14	\$11,428	\$11,428	\$6,857	\$38,682
Improvement T	\$40.060	\$10.015	\$1,002	\$12,519	\$1,003	\$12,519	\$12,519	\$7.511	\$97,146
Improvement U	\$175,000	\$43,750	\$4,375	\$54,688	\$4 375	\$54,688	\$54,688	\$32,813	\$424.375
Improvement V	\$7,500	\$1.875	\$188	\$2,344	\$188	\$2,344	\$7,344	\$1,406	\$18,188
Total Area 4	\$415,962	\$103,991	\$10,399	\$129,988	\$10,399	\$129,988	\$129,988	\$77,993	\$1.008,708

Construction: \$4M Additional: \$5.4 TOTAL: \$9.4



6. Implementation Plan





Implementation Plan

- Short Term: 1 5 years
- Medium Term: 5 10 years
- Long Term: 10 20 years
- Beyond 20 years
- Not Included in Implementation Plan



000

Table 11.1

Implementation Plan

Improvement	Short-Term (0-5 years)	Medium-Term (5-10 years)	Long-Term (10-20 years)	Beyond 20 Years	Not Supported				
Elements of Mobility Study					-				
Area 1				_					
A. Moore Street Median	X								
B. Sidewalks & Bicycle Lanes on Rosecrans	to Transit Center								
- Sidewalk and Curb improvements	X								
- Restripe with single left turn lane a Rosecrans and Hancock	t X								
 Restripe for dual left turn lanes a Hancock and modify signal phasing 	t		x						
C. Extension of Sports Arena	Extension of Sports Arena								
- Preliminary Engineering	X								
-Design & Construction		X							
- Transit Priority Treatments			X						
- Reconstruction or Reconfiguration o Intersection	f			x					
D. Rosecrans & Midway Intersection Improve	ments	1							
- City Project	X			-					
- Full Improvement		X							
- Transit Priority Treatments			Х						
E. Remove Parking & Stripe Bike Lanes or Rosecrans (Midway to Nimitz)	¹ X								
Area 2									
F. Modify Signals									
- Roosevelt	Х	-							
- Womble	Х								
G. Intermittent Medians and Northbound Lef Turn Lanes	t	x							
H. Widen Bicycle Lanes through Area 2 (ir	1	x		Ì	Ì				

000

Implementation Plan





8. Community Meetings





Presentations

- 15 minute Powerpoint Presentation
- Focus on Elements of Study within the Planning Area
- Requesting Input on Concepts from Community Groups
- Requesting Official Vote from:
 - Old Town Planning Committee (Jan. 13th)
 - North Bay Community Planning Group (Feb. 17th)
 - Peninsula Community Planning Board (Feb. 18th)



 $\Theta \Theta \Theta \Theta$

Scheduled Meetings

ORGANIZATION	DAY/DATE	TIME
Point Loma Association (Areas 2 – 4)	Wednesday, January 13	7:30 a.m.
Old Town Community Planning Committee (Area 1)	Wednesday, January 13	3:30 p.m.
Old Town Chamber of Commerce (Area 1)	Wednesday, January 20	8:30 a.m.
North Bay Community Planning Group (Area 1)	Wednesday, January 20	3:00 p.m.
Peninsula Community Planning Board (Areas 2 – 4)	Thursday, January 21	6:30 p.m.
La Playa Heritage (Area 4)	Tuesday, February 9	2:30 p.m.
Peninsula Chamber of Commerce (Areas 2 & 3)	Tuesday, February 9	5:30 p.m.
P3 (Area 2)	Friday, February 12	1:30 p.m.
		1. 11-

North Bay Community Planning Group FOR OFFICIAL VOTE	Wednesday, February 17	3:00 p.m.
Peninsula Community Planning Board FOR OFFICIAL VOTE	Thursday, February 18	6:30 p.m.



9. Closing Remarks/Next Steps







Final Concept Plan





Elements of Selecting an Alternative

0000

				2016		
Cor	nsistency v	vith Community Plan		and and a		
Mok	cility Asses	sment				
	Resolution of Existing Issues					
	Potential Benefits					
	Potential Impacts					
	Feasibility					
Cor	nmunity Ir	nput		E		
Cos	;†		н			
	Yes	H High (More than \$1M)				
10	Neutral	M Medium (\$100 - \$1M)	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	a car		
	No	L Low (less than \$100)		E.		

Moore Street Median Closure to Prohibit Left-turns

A

800



Moore Street Median Closure to Prohibit Left-turns

A

0000



Accident History 45 Reported (1999 – 2009) 3 Pedestrian Involved (1 Fatality)

- 7% Pedestrian
- 20% Rear-End
- 40% Right Angle
- 20% Side Swipe
- 13% Other





Moore Street Median Closure: Traffic Recirculation Pattern

A



RBF

Provide Bike Lanes and Sidewalks to Improve Connection to Transit Center (Camino Del Rio to Pacific Highway)



Consistency with Community Plan	
Mobility Assessment	
Resolution of Existing Issues	\bigcirc
Potential Benefits	\bigcirc
Potential Impacts	\bigcirc
Feasibility	\bigcirc
Community Input (Like = 52.7%)	\bigcirc
Cost	Μ

B





Improve Pedestrian Access: Install Traffic Signal & New **Crosswalks** at Rosecrans/Hancock $\Theta \Theta \Theta \Theta$

B

Consistency with Community Plan Mobility Assessment Resolution of Existing Issues **Potential Benefits** Potential Impacts Feasibility

(Like = 52.7%)

Μ

Community Input

Cost

Extend Sports Arena Boulevard East of Rosecrans

What about this left turn?



С

000

NORTH





Mid- to Long-Term Rosecrans & Midway D **Improvement**: Intersection Improvements **BBB Provide dual left Extend left turn** turn lanes lanes 6000 Consistency with Community Plan Mobility Assessment **Resolution of Existing Issues** Provide right-Potential Benefits turn pocket Potential Impacts Feasibility Community Input (Like = 67.3%)Н Cost

Preliminary Recommended Stripe Bike Lanes from Π **Improvement**: Midway to Lytton **0000** Consistency with Community Plan Mobility Assessment Resolution of Existing Issues **Potential Benefits** Potential Impacts Feasibility Community Input (Dislike = 50.9%) AREA Cost ECRANS

Modify Signals at Dumas/Roosevelt and Zola/Womble to Improve Access





Ξ

@@@@

Intermittent Medians and Left-Turn Pockets Improve Traffic Flow & Reduce Side Street Delay

Consistency with Community Plan	
Mobility Assessment	
Resolution of Existing Issues	
Potential Benefits	
Potential Impacts	
Feasibility	
Community Input (Like = 42.4%)	
Cost	N





Widen Bicycle Lanes from 4 to **Preliminary Recommended** H 6 feet by Reducing Median Improvement : Width **Existing Right-of-Way to** remain the same EXISTING EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE Consistency with Community Plan Mobility Assessment Resolution of Existing Issues Potential Benefits Potential Impacts 6' SIDEWALK BIKE PARKWAY SIDEWALK 11' 6' 11' 11' 11' 11' 11' Feasibility PARKWAY BIKE TRAVEL TRAVEL MEDIAN TRAVEL TRAVEL TRAVEL LANE LANE LANE LANE LANE LANE LANE Community Input (Dislike = 59.0%)104 L Cost





Relocate Transit Stops from Porter/Udall to Farragut/Voltaire to be Closer to the Crosswalk

J


CITY POLICY

"City staff coordinates with SANDAG/MTS to help provide safe and accessible transit stops. In recent years a number of key transfer points have been consolidated at off-street transit centers which have fewer pedestrian conflicts with through traffic, thereby improving safety. Where possible, bus stops are located on the far side of an intersection to provide better motorist visibility of passengers getting on and off the bus and crossing the street."

City of San Diego Council Policy No. 200-07 (April 2009)



@@@@



Restripe Corridor to Include 6' Bicycle Lanes Northbound & Southbound 000

PRISTADSED

Bitelane



Consistency with Community Plan	
Mobility Assessment	
Resolution of Existing Issues	
Potential Benefits	
Potential Impacts	\bigcirc
Feasibility	
Community Input (Dislike = 62%)	
Cost	L

Re-stripe roadway within the existing Right-of-Way to provide bicycle lanes



K

Landscaped Medians Restrict Side Street Access, Reduce Delay & Improve Flow

Consistency with Community PlanMobility AssessmentResolution of Existing IssuesPotential BenefitsPotential ImpactsFeasibilityCommunity InputCostH





O

(H) (A)



COUNCIL POLICY ON PEDESTRIANS

"Pedestrian accidents account for only four percent of the total traffic accidents in the City of San Diego. Unfortunately, they also account for a disproportionate 34 percent of all citywide traffic deaths."

City of San Diego Council Policy No. 200-07 (April 2009)









N

0000







Restripe Talbot with Signal Modifications



P

Provide left-turn lane at Talbot and add crosswalks 10'

Complete Sidewalks on West Side of Street to Provide ADA Accessible Route

Q

000

Consistency with Community Plan		
Mobility Assessment		
Resolution of Existing Issues		17
Potential Benefits		
Potential Impacts		
Feasibility		
Community Input (Like = 40.3%)		
Cost	M	The Participant
		1/2003

Install Curb Extensions at Owen and Bessemer to Improve **Pedestrian Visibility and Reduce Crossing Distance** 0000

Mobility AssessmentResolution of Existing IssuesPotential BenefitsPotential Impacts	e e	A CONTRACTOR	
Potential Benefits Potential Impacts			* 215
Mobility AssessmentResolution of Existing IssuesPotential BenefitsPotential Impacts	1		Con Str. 12
Resolution of Existing IssuesPotential BenefitsPotential Impacts	\bigcirc	mmunity Plan	Consistency with C
Potential Benefits Potential Impacts			Mobility Assessmer
Potential Impacts	\bigcirc	g Issues (Resolution of Exis
	\bigcirc	(Potential Benefits
Feasibility	\bigcirc	(Potential Impact
	\bigcirc	(Feasibility
Community Input (Dislike = 42.9%)	\bigcirc	(Dislike = 42.9%)	Community Input
Cost	Μ		Cost



R

CITY POLICY ON PEDESTRIAN MARKINGS

"Special pedestrian signs and pavement markings "PEDS" may be installed in advance of pedestrian crossings at relatively confined locations or randomly over a substantial distance. Signs and markings may also be used in isolated areas where pedestrian crossings are unexpected and advance warning to motorists is desirable. The following urban guidelines are recommended:

- There should be an identified pedestrian crossing problem
- Roadway should be classified as a through street
- Vehicular volume should be greater than 10,000 ADT
- Pedestrian crossing volume should be greater than 10 pedestrians during the peak pedestrian hour

City of San Diego Council Policy No. 200-07 (April 2009)





Median Islands at Armada Reduce Traffic Speeds Buffer Parked Vehicles (southbound)

S

0000

F	

CURVE

		4
2	Consistency with Community Plan	\bigcirc
	Mobility Assessment	
	Resolution of Existing Issues	
	Potential Benefits	
	Potential Impacts	
	Feasibility	\bigcirc
	Community Input (Dislike = 67.7%)	
	Cost	Μ
	COMPOSITION OF THE OWNER OF THE O	

Install Traffic Calming Devices to Reduce Traffic Speeds:

Chokers

Consistency with Community Plan	
Mobility Assessment	
Resolution of Existing Issues	
Potential Benefits	
Potential Impacts	
Feasibility	
Community Input (Dislike = 61.3%)	
Cost	Μ

Install Traffic Calming Devices to Reduce Traffic Speeds: Mini-Roundabout @ McCall

	1.2.15	and the start of
Consistency with Community Plan	\bigcirc	TRACE
Mobility Assessment		
Resolution of Existing Issues	\bigcirc	
Potential Benefits		3
Potential Impacts		
Feasibility	\bigcirc	
Community Input (Dislike = 70.1%)		an bind
Cost	Μ	120
	F	- 1
-	-	I



U



Consolidate Transit Stops To Correspond with Proposed Traffic Calming or Pedestrian Crossing Features



Cost	L
Community Input (Like = 42.6%)	
Feasibility	
Potential Impacts	
Potential Benefits	\bigcirc
Resolution of Existing Issues	\bigcirc
Mobility Assessment	
Consistency with Community Plan	\bigcirc



NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT

"City staff coordinates with SANDAG/MTS to help provide safe and accessible transit stops. In recent years a number of key transfer points have been consolidated at off-street transit centers which have fewer pedestrian conflicts with through traffic, thereby improving safety. Where possible, bus stops are located on the far side of an intersection to provide better motorist visibility of passengers getting on and off the bus and crossing the street."

City of San Diego Council Policy No. 200-07 (April 2009)



 $\Theta \Theta \Theta \Theta$