



I-5 / SR-56 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Steering Committee Meeting Notes

December 18, 2008



To: Steering Committee, File

From: Marnell Gibson

Committee Members in Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Barbara Cerny	Torrey Pines CPB
Jan Fuchs	Carmel Valley CPB

Also in Attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Allan Kosup	Caltrans
Anna Cotton	Point Del Mar
Beth Fischer	Pardee Homes
Bob Diehl	Resident
Bob Lewis	Torrey Pines CPB
Brad Johnson	City of San Diego
Chris Johnson	Dokken Engineering
Darwin Cruz	Dokken Engineering
Dave Henderson	Resident
Dennis Ridz	Torrey Pines CPB
Gerard Lumabas	Dokken Engineering
Judith Hemenway	Del Mar Resident
Lois Stanton	Homeowner
Marnell Gibson	City of San Diego
Michael Foster	Torrey Pines CPB
Mike Young	Del Mar Villas Resident
Pat Whitt	Torrey Pines CPB
Paul Lasker	Del Mar Villas Resident
Priscilla Marquiss	Point Del Mar
Tony R. Harris	Planning Company Associates

LOCATION: Carmel Valley Library

SUBJECT: I-5 / SR-56 Interchange Project Steering Committee Meeting

1. Introductions

Steering Committee Representatives introduced themselves.

2. Review Meeting Minutes

There were no comments regarding the meeting minutes from the September Steering Committee meeting.

3. Respond to Email Inquiry (Torrey Pines CPB)

Allan K. provided the following responses to inquiries made by the Torrey Pines Community Planning Board (TPCPB) regarding the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project.

- 1) There are several locations along I-5 where Direct Access Ramps could potentially be used, including the Voigt Drive overcrossing and the interchanges at Carol Canyon, Manchester Avenue, Cannon Road and Oceanside Boulevard. The benefits of using this type of system at Via De La Valle to mitigate for special event traffic from the Del Mar Fair Grounds have not been studied.
- 2) The Los Angeles-San Diego Rail Corridor Agency's (LOSSAN) proposed vehicle/train parallel with I-5 would run from San Diego to Los Angeles. The proposed project is very preliminary, with conceptual alternatives having been identified so far. None of the alternatives will impact the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project.

Denis R. asked if LOSSAN is considering a combined road and train tunnel through the I-5/SR-56 area. Allan K. replied that a LOSSAN tunnel project would present the same engineering and construction challenges identified for the proposed I-5/SR-56 "Tunnel" Alternative. The alternative was considered but withdrawn because it required a significant increase in project cost to achieve a negligible reduction in noise impacts, and it had increased right of way impacts relative to the Direct Connector Alternative.

4. Alternatives Update

Auxiliary Lane, Direct Connector and Hybrid Alternatives –

Chris J. presented geometric exhibits for the Auxiliary Lane, Direct Connector and Hybrid Alternatives. Chris J. stated that there have been no changes to the Project alternatives since September's meeting.

Chris J. pointed out the addition of the existing stone column island locations to the Direct Connector Alternative exhibits. These stone column islands are designed to reduce the potential for liquefaction to occur due to ground motion during seismic events. They have a radius of 50 feet and extend up to 70 feet below the ground surface.

Michael F. suggested adding mainline lanes to SR-56 in the Auxiliary Lane and Hybrid alternatives to improve the traffic operations. John K. replied that additional lanes along SR-56 are proposed as part of the SR-56 Widening Project, which is independent of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project. The Year 2030

Reasonably Expected Revenue Network, as detailed in the Year 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), proposes 3 General Purpose and 2 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes (a “6+2” configuration) for SR-56 from I-5 to I-15.

Michael F. stated that additional lanes are not proposed for EB SR-56 in either the Auxiliary Lane or Hybrid Alternatives. John K. replied that the widening of SR-56 in the Direct Connector Alternative is necessary to accommodate for the proposed S-E and W-N direct freeway-to-freeway connectors. Although the additional lanes do enable operational improvement in the Direct Connector Alternative, their purpose is to safely and efficiently merge the S-E and W-N direct connector traffic into the SR-56 freeway system.

Michael F. stated that the lack of improvements on SR-56 East of Carmel Country Road will result in a traffic “bottle neck” that is more severe than that which currently exists. John K. disagreed and replied that improvements on SR-56 East of Carmel Country Road will be part of the SR-56 Widening Project.

An attendee stated that regional projects are prioritized based on policy set by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) as detailed in the 2030 RTP. Allan K. added that the goals of the preliminary studies currently under development for the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project are to provide the decision makers with sufficient information to make informed decisions.

Hybrid with Flyover Alternative –

Chris J. presented an exhibit for the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative. This alternative includes a proposed flyover structure connecting Eastbound (EB) Carmel Valley Road to the EB SR-56 fast lane, in addition to the Westbound (WB) SR-56 to Northbound (NB) I-5 (W-N) connector from the Direct Connector Alternative.

Chris J. stated that the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative is the fourth build alternative currently under consideration and provided the following advantages and disadvantages to this alternative:

Advantages

- Reduced right of way impacts over the Direct Connector Alternative along Southbound (SB) I-5.
- PM peak travel time savings of 3 minutes in the Southbound to Eastbound (S-E) direction over the Auxiliary Lane Alternative.

Disadvantages

- Non-standard decision sight distance at I-5 SB exit ramp to Carmel Valley Road.
- Non-standard decision sight distance at I-5 NB exit ramp to Carmel Valley Road.
- Requires use of non-standard lane widths along Carmel Valley Road.
- \$40-50 million increase over conventional Hybrid Alternative in Total Project Cost.
- Increased right of way impacts to parcels along WB Carmel Valley Road.
- Requires acquisition of Shell gas station on Carmel Valley Road.
- Requires outrigger bent for W-N connector span # 2.
- Requires tunneling behind Carmel Valley Road undercrossing abutments to provide pedestrian/bicycle access.

Allan K. stated that the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative addresses some of the Project’s purpose and need objectives by improving the travel times for both the S-E movement through the I-5/SR-56 interchange, and the North-South movements on El Camino Real. However, the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative does not address the inadequacies of the local street freeway-to-freeway movement in the S-E direction.

Action Item No. 1 – Caltrans to determine if the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative will be included in the Project Report (PR) and Environmental Document (ED).

5. Traffic Overview

Travel Time Exhibit –

John K. presented the revised Travel Time exhibit to the Steering Committee. The exhibit displays the existing and forecasted travel times for several routes that serve as connections between I-5 at Del Mar Heights and SR-56 at Carmel Valley Road.

Michael F. asked if there were additional traffic volumes assumed for the S-E and W-N movements in the Direct Connector Alternative. John K. confirmed that there are additional “attracted” volumes assumed for the S-E and W-N directions in Direct Connector Alternative, and that these additional volumes are not assumed for the No Build or Auxiliary Lane alternatives.

Priscilla M. asked if the proposed W-N connector will include a traffic meter. John K. replied that metering of the W-N connector will be included in the Traffic Study, as it serves as an effective method for managing the traffic demand on the I-5 corridor.

Action Item No. 2 – Linscott, Law and Greenspan (LLG) to complete the Traffic Volumes and Operational Analysis for the Year 2015 (Opening Day).

6. Visual Studies

2-D Visual Simulation –

Chris J. presented the 2-D View Simulation exhibits to the Steering Committee. The first was from a high point on the east side of the freeway looking north-west towards the I-5/SR-56 interchange and Point Del Mar/Portofino area. The second was from a parking structure north of Carmel Valley Road looking west toward the Portofino Circle area.

Chris J. stated that a total of eight key views will be studied as part of the Visual Impact Analysis (VIA) for inclusion in the ED.

An attendee stated that the visual impacts from the Torrey Pines State Natural Reserve are important to the community.

An attendee stated that the visual impacts associated with the Project are critical to homeowners, who need to disclose information about these impacts in home sales.

Action Item No. 3 – Estrada Land Planning to complete the draft VIA, including all key view simulations for the Project.

Allan K. stated that information about the various impacts for the Project will be made available with the release of the Draft ED, scheduled for public review in the summer of 2010.

7. Schedule Milestones

Chris J. asked attendees to review the Schedule Milestones handout. The handout lists the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project schedule milestones, along with the engineering and environmental studies required for the Project.

Dennis R. inquired regarding the schedule for the SR-56 Widening Project and wanted to know when construction would start. Allan K. replied that there have been no specific dates set and that the schedule is contingent upon funding for the San Diego region.

Priscilla M. asked when approval of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project will be made by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Allan K. replied that approval of the Project by the CCC will occur after approval of the Draft ED.

8. Next Meeting

The next Steering Committee Meeting will be held at the Carmel Valley Public Library on Thursday, June 18, 2009 at 2:00 PM.

NOTE: These minutes are the preparer's understanding of the items discussed at the meeting. If discrepancies are noted, please contact the preparer within three days of receipt.

PREPARED BY: Chris Johnson, P.E.