



MINUTES

SAN MARCOS CREEK SP OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING

VALLEY OF DISCOVERY ROOM
CITY HALL, 1 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2014 – 5:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Steve Kildoo (Chair) called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

Present: City Staff - Jerry Backoff, Planning Division Director; Mike Edwards, Public Works Director/City Engineer; Norm Pedersen, Associate Planner; Karem Elhams, Principal Civil Engineer; Paul Vo, Principal Civil Engineer; Lisa Kiss, Office Specialist III
Committee Members - Steve Kildoo (Chair), Betty Ferguson, Richard Hyde, Juanita Hayes, Jim Hernandez, Shawnele Morelos, Joseph Bear, Brian Smith, Howard Arnold (arrived late)
Absent: Dean Tilton, Dean Nelson

In Audience: Jim Broach, Michael Lipits, David Dunn, Mark Baker, Wyatt Kerr, Dan Deaver, Jordan Jacobs-Smith, Sabrina Severino, Feben Yohannes

1. Introductions

Introductions were made.

2. Approval of Minutes – 11/13/13

Action:

Jim Hernandez moved to approve the 11/13/13 minutes as presented. Seconded by Brian Smith and carried by a unanimous vote.

3. Infrastructure Plan (Phase 1) – Update

Edwards: Discussed Infrastructure Plan/Developable Pad Area. The SMC District Engineering Master Plan is being developed. This will allow perspective developers to get needed information. The plan reviews grading, drainage, utilities, streets and development pads and how they all work together.

Morelos: Asked the percentage of completion?

Edwards: 50% on Master Plan. First phase Infrastructure Plan. It's about a \$47M project. City received \$27M Federal bridge funds grant, for two bridges. There's been quite a setback with the loss of redevelopment agency that was going to fund it. City received \$1M grant to pay for the Creekside Promenade. Development pads (shown) will be created and ready to build. Blue hatched area (shown) will be left open, as was discussed at the last meeting, until a new bridge is built at Hwy 78.

Hernandez: Asked what the open area will look like?

Edwards: A dip in the pads, a temporary grassy open space. The street won't be able to go through, but the Promenade will go through. It will be attractive.

Hernandez: Inquired about the bridge at Hwy. 78?

Edwards: There are four culverts that cross Hwy. 78 that are too small. They can pass a 5-year storm, but any larger, the water will go down the off-ramp, down San Marcos Blvd., and eventually back to the Creek.

Elhams: Displayed the large map that shows the 100-year flood area.

Kildoo: Asked the timeframe?

Edwards: It's a \$40-50M project. Not sure how to pay for it. The State and SANDAG will have to pay when they widen the highway to add the HOV lanes. It will probably take 10-20 years. City will look for grant funds. Unable to fulfill the whole vision of the Creek District until this is done.

Kildoo: It stops the connection between Grand and Via Vera Cruz.

Edwards: If developers come in they'll have to partially improve Creekside Drive. City will put in basic infrastructure. Portion of Discovery Street (pointed out) will be raised about 8 feet above elevation to accommodate bridges. Discovery will be widened to 4 lanes between Via Vera Cruz and Grand. A flood wall will go in a portion of it. There will be a trail. Red cross hatch area expands the creek wetland habitat. Work will be done in two phases. There will be an 80 acre wetland preserve, with removal of invasive species, enhancement, conservation easement and preserved in perpetuity.

Smith: Timeframe for Discovery?

Edwards: Mid to late 2016. Via Vera Cruz Bridge is first, then Bent Ave. Bridge. Two-year construction window.

4. Pink Historic House Relocation Project – Update

Edwards: The historic house must be relocated because it's in the floodway. Part of it is dry-rotted and termite infested. The main part is salvageable. It's being stabilized and a new permanent foundation is in place at the proposed location (shown).

Hernandez: Inquired about moving it to Walnut Grove Park?

Edwards: It was studied; however, the plan is to make it a part of the new, public Discovery Park. The historic house will be a feature of it. The City is obligated under the permit to restore it. There is no choice. Did consider a possible caretaker residence, but it hasn't been decided.

Ferguson: Asked how far it's being moved?

Edwards: 800 feet west.

Morelos: Inquired if that's out of the floodplain?

Edwards: Yes, it sits above floodplain & City owns the property. There was a house there previously that was demolished.

Hayes: Asked when it will be moved?

Elhams: Two to three weeks.

Hyde: Inquired about cost for pad?

Elhams: \$150K.

Edwards: Will cost more for restoration.

5. Stormwater Management Alternative Compliance within the Restored/Expanded Wetlands

Edwards: Currently, there isn't any storm water BMP's in the entire district. It's a hodgepodge of development, built before standards were in place. Beyond a 2-year flow, it spills over its banks. A big part of the permit and plan is how the City deals with storm water. The channel creates a storm water/water quality benefit to the entire watershed. Water is slowed down, bio-filtration, natural uptake and filtering goes on. The Creek and Lake San Marcos are considered "impaired" water bodies by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). They are nutrient impaired. The channel is designed from a habitat and water quality standpoint. It's more broad and natural.

Hernandez: Asked if it's known how much water comes through at various times of the year?

Edwards: As part of the permit, the City had to model for 2, 5, 10, 25 and 100-year storms. It starts to spill over at 5-year and 100-year takes up the whole channel. Development pads and Discovery Street are built above that elevation.

Hayes: Asked what is projected year for 100-year?

Dunn: Now in drought cycle & dryer than usual.

Edwards: Grading of channel is carefully crafted to deal with both dry and wet cycles. There was a lot of ground monitoring done. It will thrive as a wetland even during dry years.

Smith: Asked the level of impairment?

Edwards: Once impaired, it's impaired. The key is what? They get listed for various types of pollutants. The City's is nutrients.

Smith: Commented that he'd like an 11x17, because it's hard to read.

Edwards: General storm water permit put into effect by RWQCB, development must treat storm water now and manage it on site. "Alternative compliance" allows City's/entities to set up a water quality treatment "bank" to help them. City is exploring it now with the resource agencies, and believes that the channel can become one of those areas. There's possibility of an in-lieu fee program, to create credits in the channel, to sell to developers. Must determine how much storm water treatment is in there. If a developer has to give up 25% of their space, they may purchase credits, and get a higher development yield. City is just beginning to explore and hopes to take advantage of it.

Morelos: Inquired about credits?

Edwards: Equivalent treatment values. It's a complicated formula, how much nutrients to offset development. New permit requires development to implement water quality facilities, examples are rain gardens, bio swales in Promenade, BMP's. This will be a dramatic improvement for water quality.

6. Overview of Current Project Processing

Pedersen: Discussed the approved projects.

- a. Main Street Plaza – Approved for mixed use, 90,000 commercial/office, 428 market rate apartment units.
Processing Administrative Specific Plan Amendment & Site Development Plan Modification for Parking Standard Modifications
- b. The Promenade @ Creekside – Approved for 11,000 commercial, 42 affordable units.
- c. Eastgate – Approved

Backoff: Commented that the City got through the issues with redevelopment. Promenade went through tax credit and came in second. Eastgate will try to get 4% tax credits and should be able to do so.

Ferguson: Inquired about the timeline?

Backoff: Not known. Predicated on tax credit award. Must perform per their time frame. Main Street is a private development. Mark Baker (in audience) can provide update.

Pedersen: Currently processing SPA for Main Street Plaza, to change parking standards within Creek SP area. Reduce width of parking spaces in parking structures. Standard from 9' to 8.5', and compact from 8.5' to 8'. Driveway aisles reduced 24' to 23' for standard, and 24' to 22' for compact. Increase compact spaces from 20% to 35%. Currently, 65% of top selling cars qualify as compact per proposed standard for compact spaces.

Hayes: Commented that you can't get out of your cars.

Backoff: Staff looked at turning movements and felt it was a minimal change. The original Creek District realized parking structures. A small change would be incentive for developers to build a parking structure.

Kildoo: Asked if there's anywhere in town with those standards?

Hyde: Commented that when he goes to Costco off Nordhal, he sees the oversize parking spaces filled with compact cars. They still want the standard sized spaces. Two-door cars are becoming more popular and those doors are a lot longer, making it harder to get in/out. Was recently in Anaheim where the hotel had a lot of compact spaces. All standard spaces were filled and he had to park far away. In theory it works, but bottom line is compact cars will use the standard spaces. Then, SUV's will have to cram into compact spaces.

Ferguson: SUV's can't get in. Where will they park, the street? Don't care about the 65% sales, she doesn't believe it. Every other car is a SUV in CA. It's poor planning. Impact is on those who live there and finding a place for their cars.

Backoff: Looked at other cities and it seems to work. There are cities with smaller spaces.

Ferguson: It will be a disaster on side streets.

Arnold: Agree with comments, but, parking structures are needed and we should do whatever we can to incentivize development. It makes a difference. Think it's a good effort and a way to reduce costs.

Backoff: Next trend is automated parking structures. W. Hollywood has one, not sure how they work.

Hyde: They have them in Japan.

Ferguson: NY too.

Backoff: Takes less land & cost.

Ferguson: Asked if that will be an additional expense?

Backoff: Automated is not a requirement, just an opportunity because it might be more economical. Need to follow up on the W. Hollywood one.

Bear: Pointed out that there's several in Balboa/Newport Beach on the peninsula.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Mark Baker, HB&A Architects: The developer doesn't want to design a project that has inaccessible parking. Commercial customers won't come back. Structured parking is \$15,000-\$30,000 a space. It's difficult to make it work financially. 65% of top selling cars are compact and the percentage is going higher. Each residential unit has a full-size space allotted to them and it's all assigned parking. Commercial users have spaces with fewer compacts. Some cities have standards that are smaller than what they're asking for. ULI recommends what they're proposing.

Pedersen: There's a SP Amendment for Main Street Plaza - SDP modification. It's for a revised parking layout to reflect the proposed parking standards changes.

Kildoo: Asked the approval process, Planning Commission and/or City Council?

Backoff: SP Amendment goes to both Commission and Council, unless it's a minor or administrative, and this is not. There will also be clean up actions to do that are related to the Agencies actions. Because of the timing & financing, the parking-related amendment will be taken first by itself and the others later.

Hernandez: Inquired about timing?

Pedersen: June or July.

7. Future Potential Projects

Pedersen: Pointed out E-Z Living property, Tahir & City-owned on Via Vera Cruz.

Backoff: Looking at informal proposal for the City-owned property.

8. Basic Philosophy of District-wide CFD 98-02 & PFF Programs

Edwards: Need to decide how to pay. The City has robust development fees, so must be careful. The Creek District does require infrastructure. Some developers will build portions and

it will be funded by them. Other costs could be paid for with PFF programs, which City is just beginning to think about. It would act as a funding mechanism to construct infrastructure. CFD would fund maintenance of infrastructure. A district-wide CFD spreads maintenance costs over many development projects.

Hernandez: Relative to CFD, there's a bit of contention with Congestion Management CFD. Asked if any idea how big a CFD area to maintain items?

Edwards: Traditionally, 98-02 takes care of City-wide. Component just deals with site specific infrastructure. For example, Palomar Station, must deal with street landscaping, lighting, bridge across Mission, trees, irrigation, trash receptacles, Special Improvement Area (SIA), every development has one. It's a special tax on the tax roll. Ranges $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of assessed valuation, and it's passed on to residents of developments. There's a limit on how high they can be. Boundaries will be Creek District itself. They'll annex into SIA, shifting burden from City to residents and businesses gradually.

Kildoo: It's no different than what was discussed during the planning process.

Edwards: Correct.

Kildoo: Most assumed a core agency and everyone would contribute.

9. San Marcos Blvd. Multi-way Project Update – Multi-way Concept Alternatives

Kildoo: Commented that there's a lot of confusion regarding Multi-way concept. Some people think its Creek District related. It's not happening tomorrow.

Smith: Asked Mark Baker if they were engaged before the dissolution of RDA?

Baker: Yes, way before.

Smith & Baker: Continued to discuss project.

Smith: Understand City negotiations are confidential.

Baker: During recession, the cost & labor went down, but now we're out of it and costs are going up.

Smith: Cost of funds/interest rates?

Baker: Project is privately funded, so not so impacted by interest rates. If parking amendment is approved, owners are ready to move forward.

Smith: Asked if they're involved in alternative storm water treatment compliance in terms of credits?

Edwards: It's not been discussed with them and it's not complete. Their project started long ago. It depends on timing; they might be able to take advantage. He indicated that Baker's project adjusted their development plan when complete streets evolved & they've been very good to work with. The District is a vision that is long term and takes time to achieve. It will be primarily built by developers. Discussed project history: When Specific Plan adopted in '07, it didn't think of San Marcos Blvd. It was thought to be a 6-lane arterial. After the 2012 General Plan (GP) process/update & Mobility Element was adopted, the GP put in mixed-use zoning on N. side of San Marcos Blvd. The Mobility Element envisioned a Multi-way Blvd. It's a significant departure from 6-lanes. City received two planning grants to help further the vision and is working with RBF as a consultant, and a non-profit "Walk San Diego." Project Study area shown, Discovery Street to just beyond Bent Avenue. Discussed multi-modal. Primary emphasis is on pedestrian, bicycle and transit & lower on traffic. There will be six lanes on Rancho Santa Fe Road, to get through to SR-78. The decision was already made.

Backoff: This will help the private sector to redevelop.

Edwards: San Marcos Blvd. will keep 4-lanes and a frontage road.

Morelos: Asked if Hwy. 78 is expanding at some point and what is the timing?

Edwards: Yes, they're on independent tracks. San Marcos Blvd. will be built in segments over the next 20 years. City is hoping it occurs around the same time, maybe 10 years. The highway is a state project, so can't predict. GP envisions Discovery Street being widened and extended as an arterial. Want it to be attractive to those driving downtown, not as a through-route. Constraints were identified. Workshops held, a walk audit and there's an on-going survey. Looking at build-out in 2035. Developed a concept and went to Traffic Commission. They asked that we come back with more background information. Plan to go to Planning Commission, then City Council for approval.

Hayes: Inquired about the bridge over San Marcos Blvd.?

Backoff: Still in the plan.

Edwards: Also looking at alternative, maybe several at-grade crossings instead. Workshop #1 was attended by 27 people, residents & business owners. Sought general input, concerns, improvement wanted. Held a Walk Audit, 12 people attended and walked the corridor. Currently doing an on-line survey, 116 surveys returned. Most support change on San Marcos Blvd. Encouraged the Committee to take the on-line survey that's available for another week. Discussed the three concepts that have been developed: A). Consistent with GP. Has frontage road on N. and S. sides that don't go through main intersections, more ingress/egress,

landscape, two-way dedicated bike lane on S. side, angled parking on S. side, parallel parking on N. side, Sharrows in frontage road for westbound bikes. 35 mph range, w/frontage road 15-20 mph range. B). Similar and consistent with GP. Has frontage roads that go through the intersections, are continuous. Right turn restrictions. Can enter frontage road in a couple gap areas. This doesn't have 2-way bike lanes. Green bike lane on N. side in frontage road, separated by median. Shared lane on N. side. Pluses and minuses to both. C). No frontage road and was eliminated from consideration. Not consistent w/GP. Workshop #2 was held last month with 54 attendees. Comments cards were available. It was very interactive. Also did outreach at last Sunday's Street Fair. Discussed Alternatives Comparison shown on PowerPoint.

Hernandez: Asked if there will be the countdowns at crosswalks?

Edwards: Yes, received a grant. Will install on Rancho Sant Fe Rd., and relocate on San Marcos Blvd.

Hayes: Asked the speed beyond Grand Avenue?

Edwards: There are design issues on how to transition. E. and W. end will be 6-lane. Want to slow it down through downtown area. Discussed potential challenges and conflicts. They are solvable. Staff prefers Alternative B. Reduces number of conflicts, more parking along corridor, opportunities for landscape and public space.

Hernandez: Hopes they get to see what type landscape is used. VWD is encouraging drought tolerant.

Edwards: Want to have street trees/shade. There are choices requiring less water. (Video shown of what Alt. B would look like). Believe there'll be more bikes in the future. Need to minimize potential collision points. Asked if anyone has a preference at this point?

Kildoo: Need more time to review.

Hernandez: Asked if there will be more workshops?

Edwards: No. Scheduled for Traffic Commission in May, where they'll ask Commission to make a formal recommendation at that time.

Hayes: Asked where the on-line survey is?

Edwards: Will e-mail the link. It's also on City webpage, under What's New/Projects, etc.

10. Public Input

Jim Broach: Inquired about the timed cross walks and the all-way, diagonal type?

Edwards: Tried it at Knights Realm, but found the students needed to be corralled. City obtained a Federal grant for a pedestrian bridge at Rancho Santa Fe and San Marcos Blvd., w/elevator at high school. It was a 3-year process. Prefer pedestrians out of the intersection as there are 80,000 vehicles a day.

Smith: Has questions for next meeting: How is City collaborating with other municipalities? How coordinating and impacts to other long-term plans in City?

Backoff: They're inter-related. GP was the last old document.

11. Adjournment/Next Meeting

Kildoo: Next meeting: August 13th at 5:00 PM.

Backoff: Staff will check room availability and confirm date.

Kildoo: Adjourned 7:04 PM.

ATTEST:

Lisa Kiss
Office Specialist III