ITEM NO. 3

California

CITY OF OCEANSIDE

COUNCIL AND CDC WORKSHOP

SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

NOT OFFICIAL
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL

ADJOURNED MEETING 4:00 PM COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Mayor
Jim Wood

Deputy Mayor
Vacant

Councilmembers
Jack Feller
Esther Sanchez
Jerry Kern
Chuck Lowery

City Clerk
Barbara Riegel Wayne

Treasurer
Gary Felien

City Manager
Peter Weiss

City Attorney
John Mullen

The adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council was called to order at 4:06 PM, Wednesday, September 1, 2010.

4:00 PM - ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Wood, Councilmembers Kern, Sanchez, Lowery and Feller. Also present were City Manager Weiss, City Attorney Mullen, Records Manager John Guthrie and City Clerk Wayne. Kathy Baker led the Pledge of Allegiance.

WORKSHOP ITEM

1. **CDC: Consideration of the Mission Avenue Improvement Concept Plans for the area generally bounded by Clementine Street, Cleveland Street, Seagaze Drive, and Mission Avenue**

KATHY BAKER, Redevelopment Manager, stated the item is the improvements proposed for Mission Avenue roughly from Horne Street to Cleveland. Mission Avenue has been discussed for a number of years. More recently in 2002 the City Redevelopment Agency did complete a Pedestrian Master Plan Study that we called Walkable Communities. It was basically the downtown from Seagaze to Civic Center and from Horne Street to the railroad tracks. As part of that study we looked at how we could make it a lot more pedestrian friendly downtown and, as a result of the study, we did do many improvements downtown, mostly west of Coast Highway, which included landscaping, bulb-outs and some minor improvements. Part of the recommendations from that plan also was to look at slowing down traffic on Mission Avenue and more walkable/friendly. In order to accomplish this, we realized we needed to do significant street and infrastructure improvements, such as landscaping, bulb-outs, lighting, upgrades, potential new traffic signals, signage and street furniture.

In 2005 the City did contemplate doing a one-way couplet. We were looking at taking Pier View down to 2 lanes going westbound, roughly from Horne Street to Coast Highway, and then taking Seagaze down to 2 lanes eastbound from Coast Highway up to Horne. We were going to do a 6-month trial and then, depending on how that went, take Mission down to 2 lanes. That would have allowed us to do the improvements to

the sidewalks, etc. That project was put on hold at that time for many reasons and, in hindsight; it was a good thing because shortly after that we approved several significant projects in the downtown, such as the Belvedere Project on Horne, the Oceanside Beach Resort and the 5 downtown CityMark blocks. The reason that's significant in terms of timing is because once we had all of these projects approved, we had traffic studies and circulation analysis and now we can take another look at Mission and ask if all of this works with the proposed development.

In 2009 we hired a group of consultants, which include Kimley-Horn and Associates and the Lightfoot Planning Group.

To highlight the financing of this, the Redevelopment Agency did issue Redevelopment Bonds in 2003 that are to be paid back with future tax increment money. Redevelopment Bond money can only be used for infrastructure projects such as this and they can only be used in the Redevelopment Project Area. We have several million dollars sitting in these Redevelopment Bond monies and we're looking at putting in between $1,500,000 and $1,700,000 in this project, as well as the community beach restroom project. We have a major storm drain project that we're doing downtown and a parking lot that includes the Coastal Rail Trail.

She passed out a couple of documents/emails that CDC has not received.

SCOTT COLVIN, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (KHA), 401 B Street #600, San Diego, stated we've been at this for quite some time now. He used computer graphics to show the different documents and groups that have been referenced throughout this project. We've taken bits and pieces from every document and group and tried to morph them into what we're putting forth today. Slides showed what some of the improvements could look like on Mission Avenue when they are all finished.

When KHA was selected, the scope of the project was narrowed down to collecting as much data as possible and included all of the historical information. We did a full traffic model and analysis for the entire corridor and network. We did an Environmental Constraints Analysis, geotechnical, drainage and a number of different technical issues. We focused on the concept development of this and then went out to the community. We focused on 5 alternatives and took a number of them back out to the community with our recommendation.

Some significant events we have gone through on the project have included a couple of community meetings and presentations to the Transportation Commission, Bicycle Committee, Arts Commission and Redevelopment. From June 15th on we have gotten approval from each group on our preferred alternative, which is Alternative 3.

From a traffic perspective we went through an evaluation of a number of different options. Alternative 1 was to do nothing, with some minor improvements. Alternative 2 was taking Mission Avenue from 4 lanes down to 2 lanes. Our preferred Alternative 3 is creating a one-way couplet along Mission Avenue, which would be 2 lanes heading westbound and 2 lanes heading eastbound back up on Seagaze. Alternative 4 is using a one-way couplet down Pier View but bringing traffic back up Mission. Alternative 5 is using Pier View and Seagaze as the couplet, taking Mission Avenue down to 2 lanes. A graphic showed the alternatives.

We spent a lot of time looking at the drainage areas and the existing infrastructure and trying to find ways to incorporate both complete and green streets into this project and to save some money by not having to extend the infrastructure all the way up the corridor on Mission Avenue. By doing that we are proposing a series of bio-swales or rain guards all the way throughout the project. As the water flows from Horne down toward the ocean on the west end of the project, we are going to try to capture, through a series of sea walls, bio-swales and different ways, the low-flow water as it comes down. A percentage of the water is actually captured, treated and will percolate down into the ground. It's a new green sustainable method and will help us

not have to take the infrastructure and storm drains all the way to Horne Street.

Regarding the geotech, we had Kleinfelder do a preliminary geotech report to let us know if what we are proposing is possible. We wanted to know what the material is like; is it suitable for percolation and infiltration. The summary said yes.

We did a preliminary Environmental Investigation Report to understand what kind of environmental document this is going to take. We found that, because the improvements all stay within the right-of-way and because of the different circulation changes, we will likely go through an Initial Study, which will likely result in a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the improvements on the project. Through a series of technical studies that will be taking place during the Initial Study, that's the end result for the environmental piece.

Then we took a step further and tried to focus on what's out there today. What are we thinking about changing and what do we want to keep in place. We did an Existing Conditions Analysis of just about everything that's out there. We started looking at the roadway network. A graphic showed the roadway network today where Mission Avenue is the main stretch down the middle with Pier View to the north and Seagaze to the south. We looked at the streetscape conditions to see what the pedestrian's experience is like today. We also looked at the trees, sidewalk paving, crosswalk paving, alley crossings, traffic signals, the street lighting, the bike racks, bus stops, benches and trash receptacles. As we went through these we compared them with what was evaluated before in some of the groups, such as the Landscape Ad Hoc Committee or some of the walkable community studies. Signage was a big one; understanding the signage, the way-finding and the storefront signage. We looked at increasing parking, bollards and utilities.

Once we came up with concepts we wanted to get it back out to the community to get input. We did a series of community outreach meetings. The first one was a presentation of the findings, which incorporated and included our preferred alternative. We got a lot of great feedback. We put out flyers and held workshops. The initial Landscape Ad Hoc Committee was one they built off of that already had a lot of momentum.

The first community meeting was more of a finding of traffic and simulation of what we think the proposed network is going to look like with alternatives. At the second community meeting with a lot of the same faces we presented the preferred alternative and really got into what this was going to look like. We looked at a lot of the different elements and listened to the input. We had posters and exhibits on the walls and really talked through and listened to comments.

The presentation to the Transportation Commission is where we talked through a lot of the different alternatives and there was recommended approval for Alternative 3 as well there. The Bicycle Committee and the Economic Development Commission recommended moving forward with the preferred alternative. We explained to the Arts Commission that there is opportunity for public art, depending on how the budget works out and they supported Alternative 3. The Redevelopment Advisory Committee recommended approval 6-0. Beyond these meetings was working closely with City staff and getting different departments involved.

We tried to keep up with the media outlets using the City website, where we tried to post our presentations and community comments. Oceanside Magazine has had some articles on the project. There have been a number of emails and voicemails that we have tried to keep track of and respond to.

The vision of the project that we kept moving forward was revitalization, walkability, improve safety, balance traffic and benefit local businesses and residents. We wanted to make sure we kept this vision all the way through.

Graphics showed color-coded pictures of each different alternative and he analyzed benefits and drawbacks of each alternative (I-5) as depicted showing some simulations for each.

We evaluated roundabouts at Mission and Clementine, Seagaze and Coast Highway, and Mission and Coast Highway. We focused on Alternatives 3 and 5 as narrowed down. The analysis showed every roundabout we needed to put in would have to be 2 lanes, which would double the size of it and they physically were constrained and would not fit. With all the locations, the biggest issue was capacity. The roundabouts on Coast Highway will back up well into the other intersections.

We did a parking summary. We looked at parking for every alternative and as we focused on Alternative 3 we did an analysis showing we will be adding 27 parking spaces along Mission Avenue. Reverse-angle parking was a concept we wanted to bring up because it's been a new and different design and there are a lot of positives for it. One of the most common causes of accidents is backing out of stalls. Alternative 3 can work with regular-angled parking or with reverse-angle parking. We got positive and negative comments from people regarding reverse-angle parking. One of the community comments was that in Alternative 3 when you are going one-way down Mission Avenue with 2 lanes, can all of the vehicles, i.e. fire trucks, buses, make all the turns. So we looked at turning templates for every movement for vehicles making the necessary turns and set the curbs accordingly.

Throughout the project we've looked at a number of different ideas with bus stops. We identified the existing bus stop locations on Mission Avenue, Seagaze and Coast Highway. In recent meetings and with more information from NCTD, we've taken it a step further to try and solve how we can make the buses work with Alternative 3 (the one-way couplet). We have a solution we think will work. A computer graphic showed the different bus routes. We are proposing a bus-only lane on Seagaze so as you come north on Coast Highway there would be a bus-only left turn lane at the signal. Also the same accommodation from the other direction. We will be looking at finalizing other proposals as we move forward.

The traffic study proposes what the traffic signal network will look like in the build-out year. When we do the ribbon cutting on opening day there will be a new traffic signal at Mission and Tremont, and Mission and Cleveland. Further down as development continues, there is a potential for a traffic signal at Seagaze and Ditmar, but that won't be in on opening day.

The preferred Alternative 3 is the best option because it creates increased sidewalk width for larger gathering areas and outdoor seating, etc. There are walkable areas for people to go in and out of businesses. It creates a green street feel all the way down. This creates a significant difference in pedestrian safety as well with bulb-out locations, etc. Increased visibility and slowing down of vehicles is a traffic calming effect. There will be improved signage for the vehicles, pedestrians and storefronts, addressing that with more street trees and more flexibility in street signage. It adds parking spaces and public art opportunities. A computer graphic showed the landscape concept plan as described.

Each intersection has enhanced pedestrian improvements and bulb-outs. There are a series of trees, wider sidewalks and low-impact development areas. There are a number of opportunities for new street benches, trash receptacles and different seating arrangements. Computer graphics highlighted the improvements block-by-block with way-finding signs, benches, outdoor seating cafés, accent trees, bike racks, green street fixtures, proposed brick crosswalks, etc. Proposed street lights will be able to hang plants or banners from them, as well as being wired for light/sound. He also showed examples of paving and seat wall concepts with planters.

One of the questions was how wide does the street need to be to accommodate angled parking, whether reversed or normal. Once we get into final design we will work

through the details of that. It will likely be 16 feet, which is the standard angled parking dimensions and then the two 12 foot travel lanes. There is a large area on the left-hand side for seating. He further showed street furniture, etc.

All of the existing palm trees will remain along the corridor. There are also a number of trees proposed throughout the project. There are different types of storm water drain features proposed throughout the project.

He thinks this accomplishes the Vision's goals.

Public input

JIMMY KNOTT, 127 Sherri Lane, stated this is one of the few improvements he likes. It still bothers him that it's on the taxpayer's back. Even though it comes out of Redevelopment Bond funds, someone has to pay it back. He would like to see the public/businesses be able to purchase a bench, trash can, seat wall, etc., or be able to purchase banner space on the street lights, do electronic boards to purchase ads, etc.

The presentation didn't show the traffic impacts when the high school starts or lets out. Civic Center could be another option for re-routing traffic. The plan is good and he loves the idea of reverse-angle parking.

HOWARD LA GRANGE, 2575 Jason Court, had served on the ad hoc committee about 10 years ago when the project first started. He also serves on the Economic Development Commission (EDC) and is Co-Chair of the Oceanside Bicycle Committee. He stated that neither the EDC nor the Bicycle Committee endorsed the plan as stated due to the one-way versus two-way street on Mission Avenue. The two-way street is preferred by the Bicycle Committee and the EDC requested that the consultants consider a two-way street versus the one-way street. The one-way street coming back on Seagaze was not a preferred route coming back to the freeway. It also adds 5 additional traffic signals for $1,250,000. Also, travelers on a two-way street see the businesses twice. On a one-way westbound they only see businesses once. The EDC and the Bicycle Committee thought it was paramount that level of service (LOS) should not dictate the type of planning we do for walkable communities. The important thing is getting this project done to help the economic viability of the downtown/Mission Avenue people. These people have waited 10 years to get this project done. He urged Council to press on with this project with two-way streets.

LARRY HATTER, 2344 Littler Lane, property owner in downtown and President of the Church of God Homes, reminded Council that in the 70's there was turmoil; there were 26 bars in a 6 square block area. In the 90's we had to remove some of the unsavory people downtown. He is a property owner downtown because he is trying to take back downtown and make it a better place to live and do business. He asked that Council adopt Alternative 3A and make it happen now. It is his opinion that it is the most important thing we can do next to the Hotel and CityMark.

ROBERT GLEISBERG, 1936 Palmer Drive, is speaking as a citizen. This goes back to 2002 when this study was started. Council is the Community Development Commission and development means making decisions to make the community better. He feels this is an issue about kids. We are visioning changing the whole outlook/perception of this area to make it something kids can remember for the rest of their lives.

In 2002 the City called this a walkable community. Then in November of 2008 Council put out a Request for Proposals (RFP). On April 8, 2009, Council approved a professional agreement with KHA to do the study. The study has been done and staffed. Staff has been thorough with all of the provisions, legal ramifications and details. After 10 years we should be able to make a decision on this. If there are minor details in there, like which way to do the parking, those should be able to be adjusted after Council makes the decision to go forward with Alternative 3A. There is no logical

reason to go back and study any more alternatives.

This is Redevelopment money; not General Fund money. There might be some minor things coming out of the General Fund budget and the General Fund is having some difficult times right now but this is bond money that's already been approved. We are talking about our own economic stimulus package. If this is approved tonight, the whole mindset of the business community changes. Approve 3A.

JOHN DALEY, 631 South Coast Highway, stated almost 40 years ago he was on the City's first Redevelopment Committee. We were the oldest Redevelopment agency in North County. We put out to the community that we were going to change downtown and make a difference and yet we've neglected to do so many of those changes. Council has the opportunity tonight to step up and do something many other communities that have Redevelopment have already done and will make a great deal of difference to the downtown. It will create changes and people are afraid of change. Clearly this has been studied for much longer than 10 years. We all know this will take us to a much better place. Council should vote in a way that makes this happen. Tonight needs to be the decision making night; not putting it off for more studies or saying part of this or part of that. Alternative 3 is the preferred choice. The traffic studies show that it's the correct change to make. It's the most viable possibility to make those businesses along Mission Avenue more successful. Mission Avenue looks exactly the same as it did 50 years ago, with a few buildings being gone. It's time to act.

KIM HEIM, 701 Mission Avenue, has worked on downtown revitalization for 10 years. This downtown corridor that represents our central business district is in desperate need of a reapportionment of the roadway so it can accommodate a vibrant commercial activity. This plan has got contemporary technologies built into it and will create a roadway that will move traffic calmly and will be the first step toward beginning to build an investment with the associated property owners on this corridor. He looks forward to a final phase of planning on this and would encourage Council to direct staff to include all of the property owners/tenants in planning this project block-by-block. Our period of Redevelopment is rapidly coming to a close. Our Redevelopment Agency is soon to sunset and the funding is in place. We're in the throes of a fairly deep recession and this corridor is in extreme need of revitalization. He urged Council to vote for Alternative 3A.

CAROL CARR, 11305 Carmel Creek Road, San Diego, is a member of the Oceanside Bicycle Committee and is here in support of the remarks already made to Council by Howard La Grange. She encouraged Council to keep the back-in angled parking as she believes it is the safest solution for both bicyclists and pedestrians. She also believes the goal is to make Mission Avenue a walkable community and if there are changes to Alternative 3A based on an LOS that only looks at cars moving faster, than that is the wrong direction to go in. LOS should treat cars, bicyclists and pedestrians as equal roadway users. A walkable community should be good for all users, not just cars.

TOM JACQUES, 607 Mission Avenue, real estate broker, stated if the City is able to provide some infrastructure improvement in this time when everyone needs a little help to survive and be profitable, he believes we will be able to attract some new good tourist-serving businesses into this area and the pioneers and people who have been there a long time will begin seeing some profitability in their businesses. If this project can get off the ground now, it would help us move in the right direction now; we need the stimulus.

KATHY KEEHAN, P.O. Box 34544, San Diego, Executive Director of the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, stated the Bicycle Coalition is not taking a formal position on this specific project but we do have positions on elements of the project overall. She supports doing something on Mission and making this walkable with slow traffic and a better business environment. We like the idea of the green streets with water drainage and the traffic calming but want to know the speed. The back-in diagonal parking is an

excellent idea. The one-way couplet is a problem for cyclists because cyclists will ignore it. The fact that so many signals will be instituted is a concern as well. She would like to know if the bicycle and pedestrian movements were considered in the traffic analysis. There are no shared-lane markings on this, which is an easy thing to include. Council needs to do a bicycle/pedestrian/transit/automobile LOS for this project. We are asking that as Council moves forward you do the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analysis but analyze some of the other alternatives in the EIR as well and include bicycle/pedestrian/transit/automobile LOS in that analysis before you get down to making the pavement changes. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines no longer require that automobile LOS drive your environmental analysis.

PETE PENSEYRES, 6535 Indian Trail Way, is on the Transportation Commission and is Co-Chair of the Bicycle Committee. When this project came before the Transportation Commission there was a little bit different information than was presented tonight with respect to the number of traffic signals. We were told at the time that there would be 2 or 3 more and then at the meeting it grew to 5, which was also repeated at the Bicycle Committee meeting. There are 4 traffic signals there now and this would add 5 more for a total of 9 in a distance of less than one mile. Besides the costs, this would create some problems with traffic flow. He also believes that LOS simply for motor vehicle traffic is no longer required and you should consider LOS for pedestrians and cyclists. With respect to safety, neglecting the opportunity to use one-lane roundabouts, which are included in the Coast Highway Vision Plan, is disturbing. The one-lane roundabouts would eliminate the traffic lights outside the Redevelopment Area. The road diet is needed; the reverse-angle parking is a great way to go. There are ways to get around any back-up that might occur by using other surrounding streets. Use the one-lane roundabouts and eliminate the one-way, two-lane couplet.

ARTHUR BIERLE, 30530 Mesa Crest Road, Valley Center, serves on the Bicycle Committee and has Parkinson's disease. He has big concerns with the plan for the cobblestone walkway because of his Parkinson's disease. It's rough riding over them on a bicycle, walking over them or using a wheelchair. There are a lot of designs that can be used to make a smooth colorful walkway there.

RICK WRIGHT, MainStreet Oceanside, 701 Mission Avenue, stated the MainStreet Oceanside Board of Directors has voted unanimously to recommend Alternative 3A today.

JIM SCHRODER, 4020 Wooster Drive, serves on the Economic Development Commission and has been involved in the Tourism Advisory Board. Everyone is excited about seeing this project completed, but it has to be done right. One of the things that's been overlooked is we have a wonderful impression coming into the City but nothing when leaving town on Pier View. People are spending good money and this has to be equally addressed. When people go on vacation they judge a community by the first 35 to 40 seconds when you pull off the freeway and come into it. When you're leaving and that street has no landscaping and maybe some undesirable problems, buildings less decorated, etc., that impression is just as important. He urged Council to take a look at that. It's important to do this right. Bicycles, etc., have to be incorporated. He favored the two-way. If Alternative 3A is chosen, you need both directions upgraded.

JERRY RUGG, 301 Mission Avenue #305, is in support of Alternative 3A. He was initially concerned about the buses on Mission Avenue but that has been addressed tonight. He is a bicyclist and shares some of the concerns about access to Mission if it's only one way. He wouldn't back away from this alternative on that alone; however, it may mean we have to look at doing something more bike favorable on Pier View or Civic Center.

MIKE BULLOCK, 1800 Bayberry Drive, supports improvements on Mission but would recommend that Council stick with the Coast Highway Vision approach. Oceanside is blessed with a grid that reduces driving and travel distances between

locations. Now we're going away from that and proposing to make Mission Avenue a one-way street.

We also learned at the visioning that we can move cars with roundabouts in less lanes at lower speeds just as well as with stoplights. Extra lanes are needed to stack cars if you have the stoplights, but not with roundabouts and it's better to use that space for parking cars and room for bikes.

The consultant stated that Mission would go from 4 lanes to 2 lanes and that's not true. The Coast Highway Vision always made a point that the road diet was not from 4 to 2; it was from 4 to 3. Therefore you had that middle lane for left-turning cars in order to stop cars from blocking the left-turning lane.

We have a total disconnect between what was concluded for the Coast Highway Vision and what these consultants said. As much as he wants a decision made as soon as possible, he thinks we have to reconcile that. The consultant mentioned the heavy traffic on Coast Highway and yet the consultant thought that the traffic circles would work there. If we go with this one-way approach, it's going to wreck the Coast Highway Vision.

LARRY TAYLOR, 301 Mission Avenue #201, Taylor Group Inc., engineering firm, thinks this is an outstanding piece of work, recognizing there are some disparities between some of the elements of the Coast Highway Vision Plan and this plan. He is wholeheartedly in favor of Alternative 3A and he encouraged Council to move forward on it as quickly as possible. This will make it an easier decision for other businesses to move here in the future if we have a downtown of this caliber. He encouraged the reverse-angle parking and is happy to see the consideration of the bus-only lane on Seagaze. It might be worth looking at bringing in northbound Coast Highway buses on Topeka with some reconfiguration. It wouldn't be difficult to do and would take a lot of traffic off of Coast Highway. He thinks the concerns of people departing on Seagaze are kind of unavoidable with this plan and hopefully it will encourage improvement on Seagaze rather than discourage people from coming back. He thinks Pier View is a great candidate for a future pedestrian mall. He encouraged moving forward with the couplet on Mission and Seagaze.

DAWN ROTUNDO, 715 North Tremont, stated in 2007 she opened her first business on Coast Highway and in 2009 she opened her second business, a new spa, on Mission Avenue. We are vested. She thinks that the attrition going on right now is scarier than change. Tonight is an opportunity for everyone to wrap our arms around change and see it as a positive thing.

Public input concluded

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ has been working on this and attending conferences about livable cities and how to make our cities the kind of place where people want to live/work/shop. Her vision for Oceanside's downtown future is more people living, working and shopping; an exciting downtown with less cars, more cyclists, more pedestrians, more people-friendly public climate-friendly transportation and creation of a pedestrian-oriented shopping mall. We could possibly close Pier View Way and model it after Santa Monica where people are shopping and spending their money. We need low-maintenance landscaping on the sidewalks, no medians, opportunities for public art, no angled parking and no one-way streets. It needs to be a safe and fun place to live, work and shop.

One thing she hears repeatedly at conferences and in cities is making cities bicycle friendly with separated bike paths. She wants to make sure that we maintain our coastal city character. This is an opportunity to put Oceanside on the map and make it the most bicycle friendly city in the County and more marketable for tourists. She shares people's enthusiasm for making something happen right now. The business community has been working on a business district. She would like to see a separated

bike path and doesn't think one-way streets are the right way to bring people to the downtown. At no time at any conference did they ever suggest one-way, especially in a city our size. We're trying to get people to feel like this is their community. The whole issue is the use of space; make it livable. We need to make it so in the future, when we have better modes of public transportation it will easily fit in there as well.

She gets the sense that more people are getting off of the freeway going west, so she would suggest we have 2 lanes going west and 1 lane going east and have a separated bike path. She wants to see outdoor patios and things that make Oceanside a fun place with public art. She recommends getting to the idea of improving Mission Avenue and making it somewhere people want to come.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN asked if staff could address some of the questions that were brought up.

MS. BAKER stated the majority of the comments that she wrote down relate to the LOS issues as they relate to CEQA.

MR. COLVIN stated this is a new opportunity with CEQA with sustainable communities and other things. The problem now with incorporating LOS into this project is it is the way that traffic studies and traffic is evaluated within Oceanside. To be able to use that, the cities do have some flexibility; it is not an adopted law yet. SANDAG is a front-runner in this right now but they're not a lead agency. It's up to the local municipalities to do this so right now Oceanside reviews its traffic studies and evaluates by segment and intersection LOS.

MS. BAKER stated it's her understanding that if we were to consider other factors as well as LOS that would have to be included for any and all projects. You can't just segment a portion of the City and only evaluate it that way.

MR. COLVIN replied that's correct. It would need to be passed for all projects moving forward.

MS. BAKER stated all residential and large commercial developments would be considered the same way.

DAVID DiPIERRO, Traffic Engineer, stated with SANDAG it is part of updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and is looking at these strategies too. It's something that SANDAG is discussing at this point with other cities and eventually as the RTP gets updated, we'll see these strategies brought forth to other cities in the County.

CITY MANAGER WEISS stated for the purpose of what Council is doing today he would advise to ignore LOS. Council needs to look at how many lanes and which way they want this to go. If that is what Council wants and we have unacceptable LOS and the benefits of the project are such that they outweigh those impacts, we'll make overriding findings. The key for Council should be what do you want the downtown to look like.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN wants to move forward tonight with Alternative 3A. He knows it's not the perfect plan, but there is no such thing as the perfect plan. We shouldn't sacrifice the good for the perfect. We need to move forward with a plan that most people agree with. We should make the crosswalks pedestrian and wheelchair friendly. We can't have the cobblestones; they have to be flat and pleasant.

Ms. Keenan stated the bicyclists will be ignoring the law and we see that every weekend. He isn't going to make a decision based on people who ignore the law. They will have to follow the law like everyone else.

The City Manager said to ignore LOS, but we need to understand that most people are going to get here by car and they aren't going to come if they can't get in

and out with their car. This is not to move cars faster; it's to move cars easier so people can come here, find a place to park and get out of their car. If they can't do that, they won't come. The reverse-angled parking is safer for everyone involved. We will have some challenges with that but we need to move forward.

He **moved** to adopt Alternative 3A and move forward as quickly as possible. What is the timeline; when do we start seeing things happen?

MS. BAKER responded if the recommendation is to go forward with 3A, we would need to do a General Plan amendment to modify our Circulation Element to take it from 4 lanes to 2 lanes. We would be processing those documents, as well as a Coastal permit and other CEQA documents. Concurrently, we would consult with KHA, who would have to do an amendment to their contract to do construction drawings. We can't do that until we get a decision. As soon as we get a decision tonight, we would come back with a contract to go forward with construction drawings, CEQA and the General Plan amendment. Hopefully, that would take between 9 months and a year. In a best-case scenario we could be under construction a year from now or it could be more like 18 months.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN doesn't think we should start in the middle of summer because a lot of these businesses make their money then; perhaps around November and see how much we can get done before May. Mission Avenue is a heavily traveled street, so what's the plan if we shut it down.

MS. BAKER has talked at length with some of the merchants about this and at no time do we envision Mission being closed down altogether. We would probably do it in segments and would have to bounce back and forth on either side of the street. Our intention is to keep the public sidewalks open and some kind of lane/path so the whole segment of Mission is not closed down. We would definitely not do construction in the middle of summer. Historically, January is a good month because it's kind of a slow month anyway. We intend on going block-by-block and meeting with all of the property and business owners. Each property owner and segment is going to be slightly different and we want to try and make it as painless as possible.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN stated if CityMark construction starts to take off in the middle of this, it's going to be a big mess too. How is the sequencing going to go?

MS. BAKER responded that hasn't been resolved yet.

Regarding comments on using Seagaze to leave town, **COUNCILMEMBER KERN** stated if this project works well, we will see an improvement in properties on Seagaze. Unfortunately, we don't have the money to do everything at once. People are going to come into town on Mission Avenue but they aren't going to leave on Seagaze. They're going to spread out and go down Pacific Street and out through Wisconsin. Hopefully they will go north into the Harbor and then leave via the Harbor. He doesn't think we're going to see the amount of traffic on Seagaze that we see on Mission Avenue. He likes the one-way street because it actually doubles the length of our business district downtown by bringing people in and back.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER seconded the motion.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY went to at least 6 of the preliminary meetings for this as a resident and looked through the book. He also participated in some of the smaller meetings; the Landscape Ad Hoc, the Bicycle Committee and the Arts Commission meetings and he is very enthusiastic about this. He hopes we acknowledge more of these elements so they can link together rather than having to demo one to start work on the other one. He agrees with getting something going. He had already heard about people in wheelchairs being concerned about the crosswalk paving. It does slow down traffic but it impedes easy access for people in wheelchairs.

He liked that we used San Luis Obispo as an example of a tree-laden downtown area. He would also like to see that we include in Alternative 3A retaining a two-way street and that we integrate the Coast Highway Vision Plan into it. We need to have clear consideration for bicycles. He would also like to see native landscaping be prominently featured in this, not just a part of it; that it be native versus drought tolerant versus potted plants due to maintenance.

Will we have to actually take bond debt to do this or do we have it saved up in our Redevelopment money that the State hasn't taken from us?

MS. BAKER responded yes we have the money already put aside in a capital account for this project, so we don't have to go into debt for this project.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY asked how much it will cost. With the addition of 5 traffic signals would that make it more? He had previously heard it would be around $1,700,000.

MS. BAKER clarified that in the early plan we may have considered doing 5 signals but we're only proposing 2 signals. At total build-out there may be a third one on Seagaze. The figure is about $1,700,000.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER recently read they are trying to bring in smaller buses. That would be a big right turn onto Seagaze. He's concerned that making that turn with a 34 or 40 foot bus would be difficult. He likes the back-in parking but isn't sure this is the right place. We're talking about patio dining all the way down that street and he's not sure who wants a car sitting there idling in front of their restaurant with exhaust blowing in faces while people are eating so he's reluctant on that idea. How difficult is it to convert this back to one lane in each direction at some point in the future?

MS. BAKER responded if Council went forward with 3A with the one-ways and at some point in time, especially if we see an overall decrease in people using their vehicles, we wanted to go to one lane in either direction, it would seem to be a matter of paint and retraining.

MR. DiPIERRO responded that's correct. Where there are traffic signals we'd have to redesign the approach lanes and some hardware would have to be installed. If we went back to a two-way, with the design of the landscape, widening of sidewalks and bulb-outs, we would be stuck with a 2-lane, 2-way street and then capacity issues would come into play.

MR. COLVIN stated they've somewhat spaced out where the reverse-angle parking will be and where the large outdoor dining or seating areas would be so you actually wouldn't always have a car right where you are enjoying your coffee or food.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER stated there are people that are dead-set against the widening of Interstate 5 (I-5), thinking everything should be public transit. He can guarantee that Coast Highway would be horrendous if we didn't do the widening on I-5 and that's 10 years away at best. We're probably going to be looking at some pretty heavy traffic on Coast Highway for the roundabouts and maybe we can think about that in 10 years. He's glad to hear there are plans to be friendlier with the businesses for their signs. We desperately need some improvements. Can we put arrows on the streets?

MR. DiPIERRO believes so. Those arrows go next to where there are designated parking stalls. We certainly do it where there is parallel parking. There is supposed to be, according to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Devices (MUTCD), 11 feet from the curb and with angled parking it's going to be about 16 feet. He would have to follow up on that.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER heard about this angled parking and thought it was really a good idea, but is concerned if you're sitting there eating and smelling the exhaust. He would like to go ahead with this but look at how that back-in parking will work.

MR. DiPIERRO stated there are advantages of having the reverse-angle parking. One is when you back in to the parking stall and open up the back doors and you have kids, you can direct kids to the sidewalks instead of onto the street. Also, when you are loading groceries or other products into your trunk you're doing it from the sidewalk versus in the street. When you are pulling out into the travel lane you have a much clearer vision of pulling out instead of backing into the travel lanes. There are more advantages to having this versus disadvantages, other than the smog from the mufflers of the vehicles. Possibly the landscape can be designed to deflect the smog coming from those spots if there is angled parking in front of those places. The sidewalk is supposed to be a lot wider in this design too.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER agrees. It seems like a great idea for El Corazon and all of the parking we're planning out there but he's having a little anxiety about this.

[Recess was held from 5:56 to 6:05 PM]

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY asked if there is any way to do the traffic in both directions and still put roundabouts if the traffic is slowed down and we don't have this single-traffic flow direction.

MR. DiPIERRO studied the 1-lane roundabouts and we don't have the capacity with the overflow of traffic as it cues up. If you look at the analysis there was one location where we needed about 2,000 feet of storage capacity because of the traffic that backs up and we only have 300 feet between blocks. There are signals along Coast Highway every 300 feet, so eventually it could be 4 or 5 blocks down the street that traffic's backed up because of these 1-lane roundabouts.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY stated then Mission would be backed up to the freeway.

MR. DiPIERRO reiterated the only way to do it would be a 2-lane roundabout but in order to do that, we'd have to start looking at private property acquisitions.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated we can have the sidewalk and then a bike path and then the parallel parking and that would give us equal placing for the cyclists as well as pedestrians. We want people to be walking and going slow. That is what we are trying to accomplish and if we can get staff to get a quick turnaround on this so we can have that as our plan, than we've got a great place for Oceanside. It would be the only place that would have this kind of bicycle friendly activity.

MS. BAKER stated right now we have angled parking on both sides of Mission. If on one side of Mission we went to parallel parking, that might be able to accommodate a dedicated bike path. That would reduce the number of parking spaces but it might be the same as what's out there today. Right now we're picking up an additional 27.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ wanted 3 lanes; 2 going west and 1 going east, the sidewalk, a bike path and the parallel parking.

MS. BAKER stated we can't accommodate all of that.

CITY MANAGER WEISS stated that what Councilmember Sanchez just described is not one of the alternatives. If Council would like to see that as an alternative, then we would need to go back and revise some of the plans to make sure everything fits. If that's what Council would like to see, then he recommends having

staff go back and revise Alternative 3 to accommodate 2 lanes westbound, 1 lane eastbound and separated bike paths. We could put those exhibits together but we would need some time to do that.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ wants to do this once right. This is what she wants to see.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN thinks we can come to some resolution by addressing how we accommodate the one-way streets with the bike path. If we have angled parking on one side and parallel parking on the other side, we can put the bike path on the side of the parallel parking, going one direction and the other bike path going the other direction would come back on Seagaze. That way we don't have the bike path on both sides so people will not go against traffic and we can put white arrows showing the direction. With that we can accommodate the bikes and have a good compromise for everybody. We will be losing some parking when we go from angled to parallel. We do have some parking structures coming down the road so there will be more parking in the downtown anyway.

MS. BAKER thinks it would be a wash if we were to go down that path because right now with Alternative 3A we pick up 27 parking spaces, so if we got rid of the angle on one side we still have some parking spaces but the net would be a wash. We'd have what we have out there today or close to it.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN thinks direction would be for 3A with an adjustment to the parking to make sure we have the bike path. We can work on whether we reverse the angle or not.

MAYOR WOOD came into this meeting leaning toward Alternative 1 because of the two-way street. He's had most comments from most people outside of the downtown area saying they don't want one-way. Now he is getting opinions from other Councilmembers and the audience that have changed his mind to Alternative 3. Now that we're modifying Alternative 3, it looks a little bit like Alternative 1.

There is no doubt that one of the things is to make a better downtown for tourism, businesses and lifestyle with walking. All of the alternatives were a step in the right direction. He is concerned about the one-way street and where the buses turn. The consultant came up with a plan to move buses to another location and not downtown. The idea of some of those benches or tables being provided by businesses is good; i.e. having the public involved in buying a bench. He also likes the idea of the LED signs which can be changed in seconds. We could also have people buy space on those signs for their business/events.

He's not very happy about the reverse parking. He can see seniors and some other people who might have a little difficulty backing into a vertical parking space. It's easier to back out than to back in. We will have to do something about beautifying the streets people will use to leave town. He also loves the idea of shade trees and the whole concept. This design would really change the image of downtown. Is this I-5 friendly to people coming off the freeway?

MR. DiPIERRO is not sure how to answer that. As you're coming off I-5 and entering Oceanside you will be seeing the ocean in front of you. With a lot of people coming into town, that was one of the benefits of having the one-way going westbound is the view people have as they enter Oceanside. As far as the analysis, we really didn't take it back as far as the freeway goes; it was from Horne to Cleveland.

MAYOR WOOD stated beautifying that section is going to be important. We're a bronze star bicycle friendly city and he would like to see it bumped up to at least silver and preferably gold by doing things like having a lane for the bicycles. He was concerned about voting for Alternative 3 because of the one-way but we can modify Alternative 3 to make everybody happy; have 2 lanes west and 1 lane east. If one side

has to be parallel parking and one side vertical that's fine, as long as we have bike paths on that street or adjacent streets, but preferably Mission.

He made a **substitute motion** to have 2 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound with separated bike paths.

MS. BAKER stated there are 2 other alternatives that consider two-lane direction. Alternative 1 is 4 lanes with minor improvements such as bulb-outs at the various intersections. We've never looked at 3 lanes and KHA has more than exhausted their contract so we'd have to do an amendment to their contract and they would have to give us a price to study an alternative that we never contemplated. It would be more of a modification to Alternative 1.

MAYOR WOOD stated we were going to have 3 lanes anyway; one was going to be a left-hand turn pocket. With 2 lanes going west, at least you have an alternative if somebody is making a turn to go to the number 2 lane westbound.

CITY MANAGER WEISS stated if that's what Council would like to see, then his recommendation would be to direct staff to prepare a revised streetscape plan; create a new alternative to present to the community and bring back to Council. If you want 2 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound, we would have to go back and redo that. We recognize it would be a change to their scope of work but we would negotiate something and try to get it all to work and expedite it.

MAYOR WOOD stated if we do any of this, he wants it ASAP. If this wasn't possible, he would be voting for Alternative 3A but he thinks it's possible.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ seconded the substitute motion and add no cobblestone on crosswalks.

MAYOR WOOD responded those minor things can be addressed.

CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN stated this is a major change and even though this is a workshop, the rules and procedures still apply so you have a motion that's on the floor that's been seconded and he would recommend Council go forward on that and if it doesn't carry, then Council could vote on the substitute motion. That would be a better procedure.

RECORDS MANAGER GUTHRIE clarified that the motion as amended by Councilmember Kern was to approve Alternative 3A as modified to adjust the parking for a bike lane and direct staff to proceed with final construction designs.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER asked which side of the street and where would the buses go.

MS. BAKER responded we would have to figure out which side makes the most sense. Her guess is for the bike lane it would be the north side. In terms of the buses, there is currently a bus stop in front of the Transit District that would stay there. Regarding the bus circulation on Seagaze, we'd still be able to do the proposal that the consultant presented.

CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN stated Council would be directing staff to go forth with processing the various permits and entitlements, along with the environmental documents, and then bring all of that back. Clearly, whatever you direct would not be final. The permits would be put together, the environmental review would be done and then it would come back to Council.

CITY CLERK WAYNE asked if the second concurred with the modified motion.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER responded yes.

Motion failed 2-3; Mayor Wood and Councilmembers Sanchez and Lowery – no.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY asked if a bicycle lane is going to take up the same space as an auto lane approximately.

MR. DiPIERRO responded no.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY stated because this other motion has 2 bicycle lanes in it plus 3 lanes of traffic and 2 lanes of parking, which is a total of about 7 lanes.

MR. DiPIERRO stated if we end up doing the 2 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound with the bike lanes, we're looking at 5 foot bike lanes on either side. It would be 10' so that would be close to a 12 foot travel lane.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY asked how that fits onto Mission Avenue; it could eliminate the sidewalks for all these lanes.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated if you eliminate the angled parking and make that parallel parking, that will increase the space.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY stated but there is no room for sidewalks then.

MR. DiPIERRO stated right now its 56 feet curb to curb. So if you have three 12 foot travel lanes that is 36 feet, and another 5 feet of bikes on either side, that's 46 feet. That leaves 10' left over and you have parking on one side which is 8 feet. That leaves 2 extra feet if we go with this design. We have to study it before we could do anything.

COUNCILMEMBER LOWERY asked if there would be room there for 2 lanes for parking, 2 lanes for bicycles and 3 lanes for traffic with no room for sidewalks.

MR. COLVIN stated if we go with the idea for 2 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound with bike lanes on each side, all we would have to do is restripe Mission Avenue as it is today. You wouldn't make any changes.

MAYOR WOOD asked if we need 2 bike lanes or just one.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated we could do one if that's what fits.

MR. COLVIN stated even if you only have one you would widen the sidewalk by 2 to 3 feet on each side only, so you wouldn't accomplish the project goals. The best alternative that was discussed was if we kept Mission Avenue as 2 lanes westbound, added parallel parking on one side and a bike lane; that wouldn't give you a lane coming back. The other way doesn't fit and the project goals are completely thrown out the window then.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ thinks we could do a separated bike path on one side if you give up one lane.

CITY MANAGER WEISS stated we have not put a plan together to look at what it is you're asking us to do. He recommended if Council wants 2 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound and separated bike paths, then give staff the direction to prepare a revised plan that we will present to the community and bring back to Council so we can see how it would lay out. Council doesn't have to approve that alternative tonight, just give us direction to prepare it.

MAYOR WOOD stated that's his **restated motion**. Is there still a second on that?

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ responded the second concurs.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER gives up. This change is needed.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN asked what the heck are we doing. We had all of these people with months and months of studying to come up with a plan, we hired a consultant and then we get up on the dais and we want to change all the plans and redesign it. We could have just had a workshop with the 5 of us and designed Mission Avenue and it would have saved thousands of dollars. Everyone had input to this point and didn't say anything about wanting 2 lanes and 1 lane. Now we get to this point today and suddenly we're going to redesign everything, extend the consultant's contract and start over. This is ridiculous and wrong.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ has been saying this to staff and has been talking to the community. She is discouraged this came out without that alternative. She doesn't know why she wasn't considered but we have this opportunity to have a better process. This is consultant driven and she doesn't appreciate those things. She believes we can do this. If it's one bike path, than that's great.

Motion failed 2-3; Councilmember Kern, Feller and Lowery - no.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN moved to approve Alternative 3A, with parallel parking on one side with a bike lane included. Then we can work out the details as we move along about the angled parking and the buses.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER seconded the motion.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated she has been talking about a separated bike path and making Oceanside bicycle friendly for years. If you listen to anything on livable and child-friendly cities, it is bicycle friendly and that's what we need to do tonight.

[Recess was held from 6:36 to 6:43 PM]

MAYOR WOOD stated most of the comments he got from the City is that everybody wanted a two-way street and that's why we are trying to modify it and make it work. It's not just about the downtown businesses; other people have to come here too so it was the compromise.

CITY CLERK WAYNE clarified the motion is to approve Alternative 3A and adjust the parking on one side to include a bike path and direction to staff to proceed with the final construction design [including bus circulation as presented].

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ has been talking to a lot of people who are against a one-way. We need to have two-way and think in terms of the future and not just now. We've been told that it would be very difficult to change. It was put on hold and here we are again. The biggest issue is a one-way or two-way; we seem to be committed to a separated bike path. She doesn't know why that was taken off and her requests continued to be thrown out.

MR. COLVIN stated throughout the process from the community and staff, the bicycle lane was not included as a separate independent bicycle lane.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated it is important for us to maintain what our character is and she is asking for a no vote on this.

MAYOR WOOD stated the people in the City wanted a two-way street. If this is what downtown wants, that's fine, but he's not sure the other resident of Oceanside will be happy.

He will support what the audience wants even though he thinks it should have been a two-way street.

Motion was approved 4-1; Councilmember Sanchez – no.

2. **Public Communication on City Council Matters (off-agenda items) - None**

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR WOOD adjourned this meeting at 6:48 PM on Wednesday, September 1, 2010. [The next regularly scheduled meeting is on Wednesday, September 8, 2010, at 3:00 PM].

ACCEPTED BY COUNCIL/CDC:

Barbara Riegel Wayne
City Clerk, City of Oceanside