

Mira Mesa Community Plan Update

Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting – Mobility Existing Conditions Report

June 17, 2019

- Alex Frost (Project Manager) gives recap of Community Plan Update (CPU) efforts to-date, an update on the CPU schedule, and introduces Claudia Brizuela and Pedro Valera (Mobility Staff) and folks from Kimley-Horn (Consultant). Project Manager notes that number one community concern during community outreach was mobility and traffic congestion. Guiding principles for mobility include draft goals, statewide goals, and City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP).
- Mobility Staff shows regional travel forecast model. Existing conditions is complete, working on mobility concepts, future conditions mobility study, traffic impact study, and the final mobility element of the CPU. Demand, quality, connectivity, and safety of ALL modes of transportation are being explored. There is a section in Mobility Existing Conditions Report (MECR) for all modes regarding these. MECR looked at 92 intersections, 144 segments, and 133 ped crossings.
- Fallow railway connections being explored – property owner contacted for rails to trails – in early talks, but they plan to keep much of their rails – there are some with potential. City staff is having early conversations. Board member asks if there is map of potential railways – Mobility Staff says we could put together at a future meeting.
- City is looking at alignment study of Carroll Canyon road extension to see what modes of transportation could be accommodated along Carroll Canyon Road. Audience member asks about fields / active parks for 3roots – Chair shows planned parks for 3roots on map and notes that this meeting is regarding mobility. Mobility Staff introduces Mychal Loomis from Kimley Horn (Consultant).
- Consultant notes that mobility demand is “a balancing act” – presentation will look at four major modes: pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and private vehicles; presentation will cover goals of each modal network and give examples of implementation tools and locations.
- 3 travel lanes, a bus lane, a bike lane, parking and transit would require 132’ wide – 8 lane freeway. There isn’t enough space, so tradeoffs must occur. We cannot do it all on one roadway, but we can do some things on some roadways.
- Pedestrian opportunities and constraints shown map is displayed – goals for ped enhancements: spot treatments for safety, reduced crossing distances, address gaps in network, first and last mile connections, etc.
 - Spot treatments: curb extensions that reduce crossing distance and enhanced visibility. Ideal where parking already exists. Potential locations: Camino Ruiz, Black Mountain Road, Westview Parkway, Pacific Heights Boulevard, Westonhill Drive. Chair asks if this is like the equivalent of another parking space at the corner in terms of space – consultant says yes, where it is usually red-curbed anyways.
 - Lead pedestrian intervals: give pedestrians a few seconds head-start. Good where there is heavy turning traffic. Mira Mesa Boulevard, Calle Cristobal, Camino Ruiz, and Miramar Road would be good for this. Chair asks for further explanation on lead time – consultant says when pedestrians get a cross sign 3 to 7 seconds before drivers get a turning light (and ‘no turn on red’).

- Rapid flashing beacons: enhanced visibility for pedestrians. Board member asks what the possibility is for this in the middle of Mira Mesa Blvd across from the high school. Consultant responds that the problem with this type of treatment on a 3 lane thoroughfare is that there is double threat: some people won't stop – others will stop, but other drivers go around them at high speeds and cause a greater hazard for pedestrians. Board member notes that they have seen these before with an actual red light instead of simple flashing beacon. Consultants will study.
- CPU will investigate closing sidewalk gaps where feasible. Pedestrian bridges are one example for busy intersections, but pedestrian volumes need to be met for a 4-hour time period, which is very difficult to meet. There are other City thresholds for pedestrian bridges that are difficult to meet as well.
- Bicycle opportunity and constraints map is displayed. Mira Mesa Blvd is a “high-stress bicycle facility” for cyclists. Goal for future proposed network to provide low stress routes to schools, parks, and retail – the goal is to manage traffic volume and streets on minor corridors for cyclists and ensure that lanes don't end abruptly like on Mira Mesa Blvd. Chair notes that more bike lanes should have been built when the community was developed.
 - Consultant shows existing bike network and proposed class IV bikeways (vertical level of protection instead of just horizontal) – provide access into and out of community safely, and then dispersing onto lower-stress residential streets. From each direction there should be at least 1 class IV lane. Board member asks if this involved removing parking from Black Mountain Rd – yes, that is a tradeoff. Chair says that there was an issue with this 35 years ago there was an issue with this – we need parking for people using parks, particularly by the parks – we cannot remove parking without allowing people to park. Consultant notes that there are already buffered bike lanes north of Mira Mesa Blvd, so no tradeoffs there. Westview connects Miramar Transit to north of community.
 - Consultant shows Class II and III bike lanes – Camino Ruiz and Pacific Heights Boulevard class II; Aquarius, Capricorn, Salem, Hillary, and a route through Miramar. Class I connections looking into possibility of small trail on north side at vernal pools at Challenger.
 - Possible bike intersection treatments: bike boxes, bend out and two stage left turn, and protected intersection. Tradeoff is eliminating right turn lanes and right turn on red. Mostly occur where bike network overlaps along MM Blvd.
- Transit: there are decent regional connections but limited connections within Mira Mesa. Express busses are widely used during peak hours, as well as Miramar College transit. This community could lead in new technology and new forms of transit. Smaller areas could be independently served by micro-transit – large community is difficult to serve with large transit, but on micro-transit could happen a bit easier.
 - SANDAG 5 big moves – still lots of questions about technology and plan, but trying to keep up. This is where region is heading, so we need to stay up with it.
 - Mobility hubs: Sorrento Valley Coaster Station identified. Other potential locations: Miramar College, Mira Mesa Blvd/Camino Ruiz, Black Mountain Rd, Genetic Center Dr, Lusk Blvd, Carroll Canyon Rd. Chair asks likelihood of Sorrento Valley mobility hub – could be part of relocation, so maybe down the road.

- Transit signal priority: queue jumps, stop enhancements – all along key corridors. Sorrento Valley Skyway in the future, so we are including. Skyway has potential in this community due to topography. Chair likes this idea but asks if it is real. Yes, it is real, and it is implementable, so it is just a matter of funding and planning.
- Vehicle constraints. Even with good bike, walk and transit, folks are still going to rely on vehicles. Overcapacity on main streets lead to more traffic on side streets. Collisions analyzed in recent 5-year period. 3 of the fatal fifteen intersections were in community
 - Travel time: showing am and pm peak by direction. Parking data is also collected in community. Goal is not to widen roadway, but how to use tech to make more efficient. Want to find roadways to invest in vehicles. Mira Mesa Blvd and Miramar Road come to mind. Adaptive signal time is rolling out in SD – i.e. adapting traffic signals to take into account volume and travel time.
 - Flex lanes: when you use lanes in non-traditional ways: parking lanes sometimes, and also carpool lane, depending on time of day. Freeways use this for carpool / transit. Parking patterns may offer some opportunity.
 - Traffic calming in residential areas: traffic diverters (don't allow cars to cross main street, e.g. Texas Street) and traffic circles. Board member notes that they looked at traffic circles for Hillery / Greenford, but the intersection is too small for a proper circle – traffic is slow. Not trying to slow down, trying to get them through community.
 - Curbside management is big for vehicles too. Commercial loading zones, transit drop off, Uber / Lyft, etc. Controlling the curb as much as possible. Getting drop off internal instead of on street to keep traffic moving.
- Consultant says that we are trying to review what we have learned and get feedback to see if folks like where we are heading. More details in the fall.
- Next steps: we are in mobility concepts and gearing toward developing future concepts. Looking at urban design and land use to get comprehensive look at how we can see this area transform in the future. Summer 2020 to have future conditions mobility study and draft Mira Mesa Community Plan. Open for discussion.
- Board member says that there was a conversation between MTS and tech companies to get their employees to use busses 10-years ago. Qualcomm was there, and they asked why busses had no wifi – if wifi was on busses, they would incentivize busses. Folks would get onto busses and check email and save time – 10 years later and still no wifi? Also encouraging people to walk – part is psychological, because there is no barrier. Could we add planters or do something? No room for grass or trees, but maybe others.
- Mobility Staff notes that bike network would help and could be other places for more vertical treatments. Chair says Mira Mesa Blvd near mall would benefit from this. Mobility Staff says that eliminating so many curb cuts are necessary. Miramar road would be good for cycle track says Justin. Mobility staff is considering a 2-way cycle track along Miramar rd. – would be elevated bikeway or pavement markers. Board member asks about possibility of a wall. This is an extreme measure – we have to be mindful of how transit and bike network will interact, especially where transit stops meet bike lanes. Marines on south side of Miramar Road do not want a sidewalk, but are open to cycle track.
- Board members notes issue of high school students going from parking lot to park area or Starbucks: there is funding for a pedestrian bridge on Black Mountain Rd – wants to pitch

moving it to in front of the high school: had preliminary talks with school district, but don't have enough earmarked for full span. Bridge needs to be higher because of main thoroughfare. Study should be done to switch funding to go to high school, or some type of pedestrian improvement at the high school. Project 56 is the Black Mountain road bridge.

- Chair has comments: the report refers to one high quality route– the derelict bridge that was built to get students from the neighborhood to a school – now transients live there. There is talk of tearing it down. Also talks of improving visibility – supposed to put lights higher up so that they cannot be destroyed. Audience member notes that the bridge is ugly.
- Consultant says that the main problem with pedestrian bridges is that people really don't use them – high school students would probably still run underneath the bridge. Consultant notes that bridges need to be in the right spot for the right reason to work. They are very often not effective – several across the city where people go under instead of over. Board member notes that bridge is only one solution – look at overall improving crossings for pedestrians.
- Audience member notes that scooters are a problem – docking stations are a new innovative technology and City should use this company. This is a litter issue.
- The Chair notes amazing amount of statistics in the report, but difficult to view and capture where the problems are in the community. For example, report shows huge traffic delay at Santa Fe and Mira Mesa Blvd – that is where it starts backing up, but nothing wrong with intersection. Cars diverting from main blvd to side streets is an issue. Carroll Canyon Road will help some. Miramar Road backing up like it does, no reason for. Need to get traffic through.
- Consultant notes that the Coaster Station intersection is an issue – beyond the scope of this CPU because it is outside of plan area but looking at first mile / last mile connections to stations.
- Chair notes that Mira Mesa is good overall for pedestrians – biking is difficult because it wasn't considered much when the community was built.
- Board member notes that these changes are great, but we need transit first. We need infrastructure first, or people will not get out of their car. City needs to spend billions to get the infrastructure.
- Audience member suggests that we that these are community feedback sessions and the community hasn't had a chance to speak. Chair notes he didn't intend to restrict conversation to the Board. Audience member says that the report did good job stating poor existing conditions. Going forward, more work should be done on ideas for network. Specifically, suggest not enough emphasis on quality of existing resources and specificity to Mira Mesa. Approach is more resources based upon existing demand – people aren't walking where it is bad, but that is where we need the improvements – a more distributed approach instead of clustering around intersections that are heavily used. Lots of low cost and small things that could have a disproportionate affect. Audience member does not agree that Mira Mesa is walkable – will not walk on Mira Mesa Blvd, and nowhere else to go because the neighborhoods aren't connected. More emphasis on good, flat, wide-open trails, and pulling people away from current major thoroughfares. Quality: a lot of people can't walk along the sidewalks in neighborhoods with driveway dips. Who is choosing where money is going and how do we get more? Chair responds that it is City Council – CPGs advise, but Council adopts. Encourage audience member to send specifics to City. Miramar Rd isn't good for walking because you can't cross streets. Audience member notes that this is most of Mira Mesa. What does the community do to get more money. Mobility Staff says grants, general fund money, etc. Once Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP)

is created, we have developers paying their share of impact fees toward public facilities and also are able to ask for funds from grants and general fund. Main objective is to identify projects and study feasibility. Board member notes that it needs to be in the CPU, and then PFFP, then identify funding. Chair says most of community has been built out this way. Audience member suggests extended workshop time. Could take 4 meetings, 3 hours a piece.