I-5 / SR-56 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Steering Committee Meeting Notes

November 15, 2007

TO: Steering Committee, File

FROM: Marnell Gibson

ATTD:

Name	Representing
Allan Kosup	Caltrans
Anne Marie Boyer	
Anne Harvey	Carmel Valley CPB
Arturo Jacobo	Caltrans
Barbara Cerny	Torrey Pines CPB
Barbara Isieski	
Bob Diehl	Resident
Bob Lewis	Torrey Pines CPB
Beth Fischer	Pardee Homes
Brad Johnson	City of San Diego
Carla Laporte	Homeowner
Chris Johnson	Dokken Engineering
Cindy Kinkade	EDAW
Claire Schmidt	
Craig Rustad	Homeowner
Daniel Brown	Homeowner
Deanna Spehn	Senator Kehoe
Diane Bluechel	Homeowner
Darwin Cruz	Dokken Engineering
Dave Nemecek	Homeowner
David Nagy	Caltrans
Frank Gaines	City of San Diego
Garian Rustad	Homeowner
Gerard Lumabas	Dokken Engineering
Ian Port	CV News
James O. Boyer	Homeowner
Jan Fuchs	Carmel Valley CPB
John Dean	Homeowner
Joris Gieskes	

Jude Siegfried	
Judy Hemenway	Homeowner
Karen Grant	Homeowner
Kerry Santoro	City of San Diego
Lois Stanton	Homeowner
Lucinda Batch	
Mary Hochleutner	Portofino Homeowner
Marnell Gibson	City of San Diego
Philip Raphael	
Scott Tillson	Carmel Valley CPB
Sherri Lightner	Self
Sherry Hendrickson	Homeowner
Sheryl Harvey	Self
Todd Bluechel	Homeowner
Richard Hochleutner	Portofino Homeowner

LOCATION: Carmel Valley Library

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

---

1. Introductions

Steering Committee participants introduced themselves. Marnell Gibson explained the purpose of the Steering Committee meetings. Marnell G. stated that the meetings provide a forum for input from community representatives, Community Planning Board members, the City and Caltrans. Marnell G. added that the meetings serve as a means of disseminating important information about the I-5/ SR-56 Interchange Project and that they are not a hearing process. Allan Kosup added that project development is a very long process with many interim decisions and Steering Committee meetings are meant to provide a working group in which information and input can be exchanged.

Allan K. stated that it was important to address issues such as the Purpose and Need for the improvements. The I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project is meant to improve congestion and travel time, as well as to provide accommodation for growth throughout the entire region. Once we determine which alternatives to pursue, we can then move forward with the environmental process.

A resident stated that when the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project had been discussed several years ago, the entire community was in opposition. Allan K. responded that the volumes, both current and forecasted, require that improvements be considered. Allan K. added that it is important to assess and compare the impacts of the various alternatives.

Philip Raphael stated that the current noise impacts are already in excess of the federal standards. Allan K. responded that the issue of noise impacts on the I-5 corridor is important and will be addressed.

Mary Hochleutner stated that Section 7, Paragraph 2 of the August 16, 2007 meeting minutes should have said, “in addition to mitigation for properties taken, will there be mitigation for the loss in property value of adjacent homes not under direct impact?” Arturo Jacobo responded that under federal guidance there can be no mitigation for adjacent homes which are not directly impacted.

2. Project Schedule Update

Chris Johnson stated that the draft Environmental Document (ED) submittal date for Caltrans and City review will occur later in 2008.

3. Traffic Study Updates

Chris J. clarified that the operational analysis is 80-90% complete for the 2030 Direct Connector Alternative only. Chris J. added that volumes and operational analysis for the 2030 No-Build Alternative and the 2030 Auxiliary Lane Alternative are in development and that we do not have a basis for comparison between each of the alternatives.

4. Project Notebook

Chris J. stated that one of the main purposes of the project notebook is to provide information about the progression of the project and some of the alternatives that had been considered in the process. Chris J. asked meeting attendees to take a copy of the project notebook and review/comment accordingly. Chris J. proceeded with a brief overview of the project notebook.

Purpose and Need

Chris J. stated that the technical studies in support of the statements made in this section are currently under development.

Feasible Alternatives

Chris J. provided a brief description of the Direct Connector and Auxiliary Lane Alternatives.

A resident stated that if the current project is designed for 2030, what will be done for 2050. Chris J. responded that it is standard practice to design for 20 years in the future.

Alternatives Considered & Withdrawn

A resident asked if there has been consideration for using a left exit for the southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 (S-E) connector. Allan K. stated that the evaluations of several alternatives that had been considered and withdrawn were made three to four years ago. Allan K. added that as we go through the project process and reveal more detail about the impacts, costs and benefits of each alternative, we might determine that old alternatives should be re-evaluated.

Bob Lewis stated that members of the community should focus on supporting the Auxiliary Lane Alternative since it offers a solution with minimal impacts.

Evaluation Matrix

A resident asked if there would be a numeric system for ranking the importance of individual criteria in the Evaluation Matrix. Chris J. responded that a mathematical approach for ranking criteria is difficult to use because the value assigned will vary by person.

A resident stated that the impacts to adjacent homes should be included. Chris J. responded that such impacts are incorporated into the Community Impacts section of the Evaluation Matrix and that the matrix is not intended for that level of detail.

A resident asked which agency is in charge of the project. Arturo J. responded that the project is a joint effort between FHWA, the City of San Diego and the State of California (Caltrans).

A resident asked if the San Diego City website could be updated to include helpful information and drawings for the project. Brad Johnson responded that such an update is currently under development.

5. Auxiliary Lane Alternative

Chris J. presented the Steering Committee with two exhibits illustrating the Auxiliary Lane Alternative. The Auxiliary Lane Alternative consists of an auxiliary lane and retaining wall from the southbound diamond I-5 on-ramp at Del Mar Heights to the Carmel Valley Road off-ramp, a modified NB I-5 on-ramp at Carmel Valley Road, and associated improvements to SR-56. Alternative 3B maintains the slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek Road along eastbound SR-56.

Chris J. stated that the Auxiliary Lane Alternative maintains the existing configuration of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange while at the same time increasing the capacity of the interchange. This is done through improvements to ramps at all five interchanges within the project limits, improvement of the Carmel Valley Road to I-5 intersection and the addition of an auxiliary lane along southbound I-5. Chris J. added that this alternative has minimal right of way impacts. There are possible property impacts along the Del Mar Heights southbound I-5 entrance ramp.

Philip R. asked if Chris J's statement includes noise impacts. Chris J. responded that the noise study is being pursued independent of the physical impacts.

Allan K. stated that the Auxiliary Lane Alternative provides improved service, however it is important to evaluate the cost versus benefit of each alternative.

6. Direct Connectors Alternative

Chris J. presented the Steering Committee with three exhibits illustrating the Direct Connectors Alternative. Alternative 2A, features a southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 structure beginning south of the last home along Portofino Drive and eliminates the slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek Road along eastbound SR-56. Alternative 2B, features the same S-E structure as Alternative 2A, however, maintains the slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek Road. Alternative 2B has an impact of approximately 0.7 acres to the Carmel Valley Restoration and Enhancement Project (CVREP) just to the south of SR-56.

Chris J. stated that the elimination of the slip off-ramp in Alternative 2A avoids impacts to the CVREP area.

Chris J. stated that there are significant right of way impacts along southbound I-5 for the Direct Connector Alternative.

Chris J. stated that the use of tieback retaining walls helps in reducing impacts to property and right of way. However it may be necessary to obtain easements for the construction and maintenance of the walls and their anchoring systems.

A resident asked if, from an engineering standpoint, the Direct Connector Alternative has the most capacity and is the most costly of the two build alternatives. Chris J. responded yes. The resident asked if there was a preferred alternative. Chris J. said that there was no preferred alternative. Allan K. responded that there are many agencies involved in the decision making process. Some of the agencies include the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), California Coastal Commission (CCC), FHWA, Caltrans and the City of San Diego. Allan K. said that the Steering Committee meeting is designed to allow input from the community.

A resident asked how high the S-E structure will be along Portofino Circle. Chris J. responded that the structure will be at approximately the same elevation as the homes near Portofino Circle.

A resident asked if community members will be informed of the project construction date. Allan K. responded that there is approximately one year between the draft and final ED and, assuming there is funding for design, the construction plans will take approximately two years to complete. Allan K. added that it is unlikely that the funding will be available within the next five years and, therefore, construction could begin no sooner than 2012.

A resident asked if there would be mitigation for improvements to homes made before property takes. Scott Tillson responded that there will be mitigation for property at the future property value, regardless of exact dollar amount invested for home improvements.

A resident stated that the North Crossover Alternative should be studied further. Scott T. responded that this alternative was dropped because instead of reducing impacts, it simply shifted them north of the Portofino area.

A resident stated that details of the project have not been made readily available to the public. Barbara Cerny responded that the Torrey Pines Community Planning Board disseminates information for and holds meetings

regarding the proposed I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project. Scott T. stated that the Steering Committee meetings have always been made open to the public. Scott T. added that the extent of the right of way impacts were not readily apparent until the last meeting, in mid-August.

A resident stated that the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project would only cause congestion to be shifted south to the I-5 interchange at Genesee Avenue. Allan K. responded that improvements at Genesee Avenue are currently under study.

7. Next Meeting

The next Steering Committee Meeting will be held at the Carmel Valley Public Library on Thursday, February 21, 2008 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.

I-5 / SR-56 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Steering Committee Meeting Notes

February 21, 2008

To: Steering Committee, File

From: Marnell Gibson

Committee Members in Attendance:

Name	Representing
Barbara Cerny	Torrey Pines CPB
Jan Fuchs	Carmel Valley CPB
Scott Tillson	Carmel Valley CPB

Also in Attendance:

Name	Representing
Allan Kosup	Caltrans
Anne Harvey	Carmel Valley CPB
Barbara Gieskes	Homeowner
Barry Billingsley	Homeowner
Bob Diehl	Resident
Bob Lewis	Torrey Pines CPB
Brad Johnson	City of San Diego
Burton Disner	Self
Carla Laporte	Homeowner
Carla Thomas	Homeowner
Chanelle Hawken	Council District One
Chris Johnson	Dokken Engineering
Cliff Hanna	Torrey Pines CPB
Darwin Cruz	Dokken Engineering
Dave Henderson	S.T.O.P.
Dave Nielsen	MNA
Deanna Spehn	Senator Kehoe
Dorothy Knox	Homeowner
Frank Gaines	City of San Diego
Gerard Lumabas	Dokken Engineering
Jason Parks	Homeowner
John M. Leach	Homeowner
John Wilson	Homeowner
Joris Gieskes	Homeowner

Karen Grant	S.T.O.P.
Karen Wilson	Homeowner
Karl Moch	Homeowner
Kerry Santoro	City of San Diego
Lisa Kakone	Homeowner
Lois Stanton	Homeowner
Marjorie Moss	Homeowner
Marnell Gibson	City of San Diego
Mary Hochleutner	Portofino Homeowner
Mary Jane Komisarcik	Homeowner
Martha Parks	Homeowner
Martin Surtes	Homeowner
Mike Kilcoin	Homeowner
Morton Printz	Torrey Pines CPB Alt.
Pat Whitt	Homeowner
Philip Raphael	Homeowner
Richard Hochleutner	Portofino Homeowner
Shankar	LLG
Sherri Lightner	Self
Shirley Bryden	
Susan Algaze	Homeowner

LOCATION: Carmel Valley Library

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

---

1. Introductions

Steering Committee Representatives introduced themselves. Marnell G. went over the agenda, which included the topics to be discussed and the corresponding time allotted for each. Marnell G. introduced the Draft Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities handout and explained that it is designed to be both informative and to provide better structure for the meetings. Marnell G. asked members of the Steering Committee to review and provide comments on the handout.

2. Review Meeting Minutes

There were no comments regarding the meeting minutes.

3. I-5 North Coast Project

Allan K. provided a brief description of the I-5 North Coast Project. He explained that the I-5 North Coast Project was expanding the capacity of I-5 from La Jolla to State Route 76, which is approximately 30-35

miles. The project design team has looked at multiple solutions including the use of transit, general purpose, high occupancy vehicle and managed lanes. A region wide system of managed lanes is currently being considered and that an example of that type of system is being constructed on I-15. A facility with managed lanes can be described as a "freeway within a freeway". Allan K. stated that Draft ED should be completed by the Summer of 2008. The I-5 North Coast Project is to be constructed in phases and is estimated to cost over 3 billion dollars. Allan K. pointed out that managed lanes provide an efficient infrastructure for transit and that the purpose of the project is to reduce congestion throughout the I-5 corridor. The proposed configuration from La Jolla to Carlsbad is 8 to 10 Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) lanes plus an additional 4 Managed lanes.

Allan K. stated that the after completion of the Draft ED, there will be public hearings to determine a preferred I-5 North Coast alternative. The California Coastal Commission (CCC), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) are all involved in this decision making process. Allan K. concluded his discussion by stating that the I-5 North Coast Project is considered a high priority by SANDAG.

4. Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities

Marnell G. read the general purpose section of the Roles and Responsibilities handout to meeting attendees. She stated that community concerns have been heard and these issues are being incorporated into the design for the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project. There will be a dedicated questions and answers period at the end of the meeting and asked meeting attendees to allow all presentations to be completed before questioning can begin. Attendees will be asked to submit a speaker slip and go through there community planning board representatives to address the Steering Committee during future meetings.

Marnell G. added that the alternatives that have been presented at previous meetings represent the largest possible project footprints. A new Direct Connector Alternative will be presented featuring a number of design modifications.

5. Review Current Project Alternative Exhibits

Chris J. presented the Steering Committee with three exhibits illustrating the Current Build Alternatives which are as follows:

I. The full standard Direct Connector Alternative 2A
II. The refined Direct Connector Alternative 4B
III. The Auxiliary Lane Alternative 3B

Direct Connector Alternative:

Alternative 2A represents the completely standard version of the Direct Connector Alternative, featuring a southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 (S-E) structure beginning south of the last home along Portofino Drive and an elongated Del Mar Heights to southbound (SB) I-5 on ramp. Alternative 2A has right of way impacts to parcels at the northern end of Portofino Drive, along Portofino Drive and at Portofino Circle.

Chris J. stated that we have modified some areas along SB I-5 were we could reduce the footprint of Alternative 2A and the result is a new variation of the Direct Connector Alternative. This new variation, known as Alternative 4B, features geometric changes to Alternative 2A which are an attempt to minimize right of way impacts to parcels along Portofino Drive. These geometric changes include adjustments to the Del Mar Heights to SB I-5 on ramp, moving the S-E connector exit ramp further south on I-5 and the use of non-standard I-5 lane widths near the southern limit of the project.

Chris J. stated that using a free right configuration for the Del Mar Heights to SB I-5 on ramp will likely eliminate full property acquisitions in the area. Moving the S-E connector exit ramp south in combination with the use of non-standard lane widths on I-5 enables significant reduction in right of way impacts to parcels along Portofino Drive. Chris J. pointed out the yellow line representing the existing sound wall along Portofino Drive for reference.

Chris J. stated that geometric features for Alternative 4B must go through an approval process at Caltrans to determine whether or not they are safe and acceptable, and that Alternative 4B is not the final alternative.

A resident asked how close the new Del Mar Heights to SB I-5 on ramp would come to the homes on Portofino Drive. Chris J. responded that the ramp stays within the State right of way.

Scott T. stated that there may be issues with queuing on Del Mar Heights with the use of a free right type of configuration.

A resident asked if any homes were impacted at the northern end of Portofino Drive. Chris J. responded that there are right of way impacts in the form of retaining wall easements which are required for both the construction and maintenance of retaining walls. Chris J. stated that a special type of retaining wall, know as a tieback wall, is proposed for the design. This type of wall will have smaller associated impacts than a conventional retaining wall because there is no need for extensive excavation behind the wall. Chris J. explained that tieback type walls use a system of anchors embedded in the soil which are encased with a grout material to provide the lateral residence needed to support the soil behind the wall.

A resident asked if designers had taken liquefaction into consideration. Chris J. responded that the potential for soil liquefaction is very low in this area and gave the example of the use of tieback walls for the Lomas Santa Fe Interchange Project in similar soil conditions.

A resident asked how tall the wall would be. Chris J. responded that it would be approximately 25-30 feet tall along SB I-5.

A resident asked if the proposed retaining wall would replace the existing sound wall along Portofino Drive and Portofino Circle. Chris J. responded that shifting the S-E structure to the south enables maintaining most of the existing sound wall along Portofino Drive and only the sound wall along Portofino Circle will need to be replaced. The proposed tieback wall will come close to the existing sound wall along Portofino Drive, however residents would essentially be maintaining there existing back yards. Chris J. added that the new location of the S-E connector exit ramp also reduces the S-E structure length by approximately 1200-1300 feet, reducing the total project cost.

A resident inquired about the elevation of the S-E connector. Chris J. used the Alternative 4B exhibit to explain that the S-E connector would begin to elevate just after the exit ramp and would reach a maximum height of approximately 50 feet as it crosses over I-5.

A resident asked if the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project takes into account the I-5 North Coast Project. Chris J. responded that the proposed improvements for the I-5 North Coast Project are assumed existing for the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project.

A resident asked if there would be a significant increase in noise. Chris J. responded that there are many ways to mitigate for associated increases in noise and that noise studies are currently being performed as part of the I-5 North Coast Project.

Chris J. explained that there are modifications to Portofino Circle in Alternative 4B, including shifting the street approximately 10-15 feet to the west and reconstructing the road where it parallels I-5. In addition, several I-5 mainline lanes have reduced widths in an attempt to minimize the impacts to Portofino Circle.

Morton P. asked if there were any home takes associated with the Direct Connector Alternative 4B. Chris J. responded that the need for full property acquisitions in Alternative 4B is yet to be determined.

Philip R. asked if there would be partial right of way acquisition for the property between the existing sound wall and I-5. Chris J. responded that there would be partial right of way acquisitions in that area.

In summary, relative to the original full standard Alternative 2A, the overall right of way impacts are significantly reduced in the refined Alternative 4B. The magnitude of the impacts associated with the preliminary design presented in August 2007 is no longer being considered. Furthermore, given where the team is in the project development process, footprints and associated impacts for the Direct Connectors Alternative are subject to changes as new information becomes available and the design is further refined.

Auxiliary Lane Alternative:

Chris J. stated that the Auxiliary Lane Alternative (Alternative 3B) maintains the existing configuration of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange and includes improvements to ramps at all five interchanges within the project limits, improvement of the Carmel Valley Road to I-5 intersection and the addition of an auxiliary lane along southbound I-5.

Scott T. asked about the impacts associated with the Alternative 3B. Chris J. responded that there are impacts in the form of retaining wall easements, as described earlier in the presentation, but the overall right of way impacts for Alternative 3B are very minimal. There are no impacts to Portofino Circle for Alternative 3B.

Scott T. asked if there are right of way impacts to the Shell gas station near the westbound SR-56 to northbound I-5 connector. Chris responded that there would only be aerial impacts to that particular business.

Allan K. stated that the next important step in the project development process is to determine which alternatives we want to bring forward in the environmental approval process.

A resident asked if we were considering a "hybrid" alternative which combines the direct connector for the west to north movement with a local street connection for the south to east movement. Allan K. responded that this option is currently being considered but that further study is necessary before the feasibility of such an alternative can be determined.

Scott T. asked if the eastbound SR-56 to Carmel Creek Road slip off ramp was going to be maintained or eliminated. Chris responded that either option can be carried forward and that this depends on whether or not impacts to the Carmel Valley Restoration and Enhancement Project (CVREP) are considered acceptable.

6. Review of Previously Studied Alternative Exhibits

Chris J. presented the Steering Committee with several exhibits illustrating the Alternatives Considered and Withdrawn.

North Crossover Alternative:

Chris J. described that the North Crossover Alternative proposes that the S-E connector cross the I-5 mainline just south of Del Mar Heights Road form the west side of I-5 to the east side of I-5. The proposed S-E connector would then run on grade and parallel to the proposed northbound bypass lanes before re-elevating to cross over the proposed westbound SR-56 to northbound I-5 (W-N) connector and tying into SR-56. This alternative has increased right of way impacts to parcels at the northern end of Portofino Drive. Chris explained that this is because of the need to maintain a standard divergence angle for the S-E exit ramp in combination with the Del Mar Heights to SB I-5 entrance ramp. Chris added that this alternative has significant impacts to businesses on the east side of I-5.

South Crossover Alternative:

Chris J. explained that the South Crossover Alternative proposes that the S-E connector exit from I-5 just to the north of Carmel Valley Road, make a "U" turn over I-5, and tie into SR-56.

Chris stated that the South Crossover Alternative maintains right of way impacts to the parcels along Portofino Drive and Portofino Circle. There were a number of different radii studied for the S-E connector in this alternative. The larger radius has increased impacts to the Los Penasquitos Lagoon while the smaller radius, which is half the larger radius, has a very low design speed and still has impacts to the CVREP. Chris J. added that a large section of the southbound bypass structure would have to be removed and reconstructed for this alternative, increasing the total project cost.

Morton P. asked if the South Crossover Alternative still had a "pinch point" near the intersection of Portofino Drive and Portofino Circle. Chris responded that the "pinch point" at this location is not eliminated in any of the Previously Studied Alternatives and that this is an important point.

A resident asked if narrowed I-5 lane widths are used in Alternative 4b. Chris responded that several lanes on I-5 have been reduced from 12 to 11 feet.

Loop Over I-5 Alternative:

Chris J. explained that the Loop Over I-5 Alternative proposes that the S-E connector exit from I-5 just to the north of Carmel Valley Road, crossing over Carmel Valley Road and then the southbound bypass lanes. The proposed S-E connector would then loop and run parallel to Carmel Valley Road while crossing over the southbound bypass, I-5, and the existing connector structures.

Chris J. stated that the Loop Over I-5 Alternative maintains right of way impacts to parcels along Portofino Drive and Portofino Circle. Several loops were studied for this alternative, ranging in radius from 50 meters to the standard 220 meters. The standard radius has increased impacts to the Los Penasquitos Lagoon while the smaller radius represents a serious safety concern and still impacts the lagoon. The S-E connector structure is extremely large in the Loop Over I-5 Alternative and added that, as with the South Crossover Alternative, a large section of the southbound bypass structure would have to be removed and reconstructed.

Loop Under I-5 Alternative:

Chris J. described explained that the Loop Under I-5 Alternative would run along an alignment similar to the Loop Over but would go under Sorrento Valley Road, the southbound Carmel Valley Road entrance ramp, the northbound Carmel Valley exit ramp and I-5 parallel to Carmel Valley Road. It would be very difficult to navigate the S-E connector alignment around the existing structural foundations in this area and that there would be a significant increase in the total project cost due to the need for several new bridges, extensive excavation and unique retaining walls.

Cliff H. asked if we were considering using a left exit for the S-E connector. Allan K. responded that the Federal Highway administration (FHWA) will not allow fast lane exits and entrances for freeway to freeway connections because studies have shown that they are dangerous. Allan K. added that Caltrans is moving towards eliminating all such existing ramps in the state.

Philip R. asked what alternatives are actually being considered viable. Chris J. responded that there are three viable alternatives, these being the No Build, Direct Connector and Auxiliary Lane Alternatives.

Philip R. asked why the Alternatives Considered and Withdrawn are being presented to the Steering Committee when they are clearly not viable alternatives. Marnell G. responded that the request was made by the community to further study the Alternatives Considered and Withdrawn and that we are presenting the results of these preliminary engineering studies.

Allan K. stated that this is a milestone. We need to decide which alternatives are feasible and infeasible so that we can determine which to bring forward for the completion of the Environmental Document (ED).

Scott T. stated that a 'hybrid" alternative should be studied and, if it is determined to be feasible, should be included in the ED. Scott T. asked which of the full standard Direct Connector Alternatives (Alternative 2A or 2B) is going to be included in the ED.

Morton P. asked what the impacts on the west side of I-5 would be for a "hybrid" alternative. Chris responded that the impacts would be similar to the Auxiliary Lane Alternative on the west side of I-5 and similar to the Direct Connector Alternative on the east side of I-5.

A resident stated that at a previous Steering Committee meeting, it was said that the FHWA would not allow the W-N connector to be constructed without the S-E connector. Allan K. clarified that both connectors have

to be studied and in the approved ED, however both do not necessarily have to be constructed. Allan added that we will study a "hybrid" alternative and we will need to determine whether or not it will be a stand alone alternative for the ED by the next Steering Committee meeting in May.

A resident asked if Alternative 4B was to be included in the ED. Allan K. responded that that has yet to be determined.

A resident asked if the narrowed I-5 lane widths that are used in Alternative 4B are also used in the Alternatives Considered and Withdrawn. Chris responded that they were.

Carla L. asked if Caltrans would commit to eliminating all impacts to homes. Allan K. responded that we are still in the preliminary engineering study phase and therefore no such commitment can be made.

A resident asked if we were considering an alternative similar to Alternative 4B which tunnels below I-5 in order to reduce noise impacts. The resident suggested that the local community mitigate for the increase in total project cost associated with a "tunnel" option. Chris J. responded that tunneling under I-5, as opposed to crossing over I-5, would be far more expensive and poses some significant design challenges.

A resident asked who is performing the work for the ED. Chris J. responded that the Dokken Engineering environmental sub-consultant EDAW is responsible for the work.

A resident asked if there are impacts to the CVREP in any of the feasible alternatives. Chris J. responded that there are impacts to the CVREP in the Direct Connector Alternative if the eastbound SR-56 to Carmel Creek Road slip off ramp is maintained.

7. Status of Traffic Studies

Chris J. stated that the Year 2030 Draft Traffic Study has been completed for the No Build, Direct Connector and Auxiliary Lane Alternatives. Chris added that it is currently being reviewed at Caltrans and that the report should be finalized soon. Allan K. added that we would like to put the results of the traffic study into an easily understandable format and then distribute them to the public.

A resident asked when the results of the traffic study would be available to the public. Allan K. responded that we would like to distribute the results by the next Steering Committee meeting in May and that the results will also be available in the Draft ED.

Cliff H. asked about the cost of the Direct Connector Alternative. Chris J. responded that estimated total project cost for the Direct Connector Alternative is between 200 and 300 million dollars.

Anne H. asked attendees to make final requests for any and all options that they would like to see studied before we determine which alternatives to move forward with.

Cliff H. stated that approach for determining the best alternative is to weigh the cost, impacts and operational improvements associated with each. Cliff asked how varying levels of LOS F would be translated for the public to understand. Allan K. responded that it is important to look at many issues in assessing the traffic

operational benefits of an alternative. He gave examples such as recognizing which intersections and street segments are most important, delay times and queue lengths.

A resident stated that the volumes coming from the south are far greater than those coming from the north and asked if this has been take into consideration, Allan K. responded that it has.

Morton P. asked if there was to be consideration for modifying the intersection at Del Mar Heights and the I-5 northbound ramps in order to prevent people from using the ramps to bypass congestion on I-5. Scott T. responded that drivers make those types of movements at all diamond interchanges and it is not practical to attempt to solve that problem. Chris J. stated that the traffic operations do not show any problems at that particular intersection.

Allan K. stated that the results from the 2030 traffic analysis, exhibits for the "hybrid" and "tunnel" alternatives, cross sections for Alternative 4B and a brief discussion on noise study procedures will be discussed at the next Steering Committee Meeting. He added that there will also be a discussion about which alternatives to bring forward for the environmental approval process.

A resident asked if the profile of Del Mar Heights was going to be altered. Gerard L. replied that it would have to be raised approximately 4-5 feet in order to provide clearance over the proposed northbound bypass extension in the Direct Connector Alternative. Chris J. added that the Del Mar Heights Overcrossing would need to be reconstructed to do this.

A resident asked if the Environmental Documents for the I-5 North Coast Project and I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project are being performed concurrently. Allan K. responded that the I-5 North Coast Draft ED would be completed by the middle of this year and the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project Draft ED would be completed by early 2009.

A resident stated that the community would like have the results of the noise studies made available to the public. Allan K. responded that these results would be made available to the public as part of each Draft ED.

Mary H. stated that the noise study for the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project should incorporate the managed lanes proposed in I-5 North Coast Project. Allan K. responded that this was being done.

Scott T. stated that attendees should take the time to familiarize themselves with documentation related to Environmental Impact Reports and Environmental Impact Studies in order to better understand what is incorporated into these types of documents. Chris added that this information is available on the Caltrans website.

Cliff H. provided a list of FAQ's which he wanted reviewed for accuracy.

A resident asked why, given the need for regional mobility, the No Build Alternative is part of the study. Allan K. responded that the No Build option is included in every Caltrans project and pointed out that the No Build has been the preferred alternative for many projects in the past. He added that the driving force behind

the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project is local street congestion in and around Carmel Valley and the large through traffic volumes on the I-5 mainline.

A resident asked if we should include a "hybrid" alternative in the ED. Allan K. responded that it is first necessary to study the cost versus benefits for a "hybrid" solution.

Philip R. asked if Caltrans could provide information pertaining to existing noise levels along Portofino Circle. Allan K. responded that this could be provided and asked Phillip to contact him via email.

8. Next Meeting

The next Steering Committee Meeting will be held at the Carmel Valley Middle School Performing Arts Center on Thursday, June 26, 2008 at 2:30 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.

I-5 / SR-56 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Steering Committee Meeting Notes

June 26, 2008

To: Steering Committee, File

From: Marnell Gibson

Committee Members in Attendance:

Name	Representing
Barbara Cerny	Torrey Pines CPB
Jan Fuchs	Carmel Valley CPB
Scott Tillson	Carmel Valley CPB

Also in Attendance:

Name	Representing
Allan Kosup	Caltrans
Anna Colton	Point Del Mar
Arturo Jacobo	Caltrans
Bob Diehl	Resident
Brad Johnson	City of San Diego
Calvin Walsh	Lightner
Chris Johnson	Dokken Engineering
Dan Brown	Torrey Pines
Darwin Cruz	Dokken Engineering
Frank Gaines	City of San Diego
Gary Levitt	Del Mar Mesa CPB
Gerard Lumabas	Dokken Engineering
Jayne Dowda	Caltrans
John Keating	LLG
Kerry Santoro	City of San Diego
Linda Brown	S.T.O.P.
Marnell Gibson	City of San Diego
Michael Page	
Priscilla Marquiss	Del Mar
Shankar Ramakrishnan	LLG
Sherri Lightner	Self
Susan Peachy	S.T.O.P.
Vicki Estrada	Estrada Land Planning

LOCATION: Carmel Valley Library

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

---

1. Introductions

Marnell G. reviewed the agenda, which included the topics to be discussed and time allocations. She asked meeting attendees to submit speaker slips to their community planning board representatives in order to address the Steering Committee. Marnell G. stated that Caltrans is the lead agency for the Project. Steering Committee Representatives introduced themselves.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

Marnell G. provided a brief overview of the purpose of the Steering Committee and the roles and responsibilities of attendees. She announced that there would be an open forum Public Meeting following the Steering Committee Meeting at 6 pm.

3. Review Meeting Notes

There where no comments regarding the Meeting Notes from the previous meeting.

Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative –

Chris J. explained that the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative was developed using the proposed southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 (S-E) horizontal geometrics from the Direct Connector Alternative. A profile for the alternative was developed to create a tunnel connection. The tunnel travels below I-5, Carmel Valley Road and the existing northbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 (N-E) connector and the westbound SR-56 to southbound I-5 (W-S) connectors. He stated that the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative requires the reconstruction of the N-E and W-S connectors because of impacts to the existing connector foundations. In addition, the tunnel would be impacted by the 100-year design storm and the groundwater table would be well above the tunnel roadway surface required a special design seal slab design and a pump station to remove water. Chris J. added that Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative costs are estimated to be $80 million more than the conventional Direct Connector Alternative. The reduction in visual and sound impacts may not justify this increase in total Project cost.

Scott T. suggested that the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative be moved into the category of Alternatives Considered and Withdrawn.

4. Review Purpose and Need

Allan K. stated that the next step in the project development process is to determine which alternatives should be formally studied during the environmental approval process.

Allan K. stated that one potential solution is the Direct Connector Alternative, however he emphasized that it is not the only solution. There are tradeoffs between each alternative, such as improved traffic flow vs. cost. Allan K. added that the alternatives have been refined and significant modifications have been made as a result of feedback from the community. We will use the evaluation criteria previously developed to assess each of the Project alternatives.

5. Alternatives Under Consideration Discussion/Review

Allan K. stated that there are four Alternatives which include:

I. No Build Alternative
II. Auxiliary Lane Alternative
III. Direct Connector Alternative
IV. Hybrid Alternative

Allan K. stated that the eastbound (EB) slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek Road has been eliminated from all of the Current Build Alternatives. The slip off-ramp was intended to be a temporary feature and its elimination alleviates safety concerns.

Direct Connector Alternative –

Allan K. stated that a new feature of the Direct Connector Alternative is the collector/distributer configuration that is proposed for westbound (WB) SR-56 between the Carmel Creek Road and Carmel Valley Road interchanges. This new configuration prevents drivers from accessing the W-S connector from the Carmel Creek Loop on-ramp.

Auxiliary Lane Alternative -

Allan K. stated that the Auxiliary Lane Alternative maintains the existing configuration of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange. This alternative proposes improvements to ramps, the addition of Auxiliary lanes at selected locations and improvements to Carmel Valley Road to provide additional capacity.

Scott T. asked if access to the W-S connector from the Carmel Creek Loop on-ramp is maintained in the Auxiliary Lane Alternative. Allan K. responded that access will be maintained.

Hybrid Alternative -

Allan K. stated that the Hybrid Alternative is a combination of the first two alternatives. The Alternative combines a direct connector for the west to north movement with the south to east Auxiliary Lane Alternative improvements.

Typical Sections -

Barbara C. asked how high the S-E connector would be relative to Portofino Circle. Arturo J. replied that the elevation of the connector is lower than the elevation of Portofino Circle near the middle of the street, and is at approximately the same elevation as Portofino Circle at the most southern portion of the condominium complex.

Arturo J. stated that we are studying ways to mitigate the impacts to Portofino Circle and introduced Vicki E. to discuss the Revised Site Concept for Portofino Circle.

Portofino Circle -

Vicki E. presented the Revised Site Concept for Portofino Circle. She stated that one of the main goals for the design was to minimize the impacts to the condominium parking and landscaping. The design features a one-

way Portofino Circle with the addition of landscape areas along the east side of the street. Vicki E. added that this is just one option for Portofino Circle and that the design will be refined based on feedback from the community.

Scott T. asked to Arturo to clarify that the impacts to Portofino Circle occurred for the Direct Connector Alternative only. Arturo agreed.

Priscilla M. asked what the maximum height of the S-E connector will be at several locations. Arturo J. replied that a visual simulation for the Project alternatives will be completed that will provide answers to questions regarding the height and visual characteristics of the S-E connector.

Allan K. stated that there is currently no preferred alternative and that a preferred alternative will not be determined until all of the technical studies have been completed and public input received.

Scott T. stated that there are significant restrictions at the Carmel Creek Road interchange for the Direct Connector Alternative and that the impacts/benefits associated with these restrictions must be assessed. Scott T. added that the elimination of the slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek Road is a concern. Allan K. stated that traffic impacts to the Carmel Valley area were considered in the development of the current configuration for SR-56. Allan K. added that the Project alternatives are works in progress and continue to be refined based on the results of our preliminary studies.

6. Traffic Overview

John K. presented the Traffic Operations exhibits to the Steering Committee. The exhibits displayed the results of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Traffic Study at key merges, diverges, weaves, segments and intersections for each project alternative. Severely Degraded Operations were represented in red, Moderately Degraded Operations are represented in yellow and Acceptable Operations are represented in green.

John K. explained that a total of 42 intersections where chosen for analysis in the Traffic Study. John K. added that the volume of vehicles that use the facility will roughly double in the next 20 years.

John K. explained that volumes have been re-routed due to the elimination of the EB slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek. It is assumed that 70% will use the northbound (NB) I-5 off-ramp to Carmel Valley Road, travel EB on Carmel Valley Road and use the WB SR-56 on-ramp from El Camino Real and 30% will use other routes.

No Build Alternative -

John K. stated that the No Build Alternative has extensive congestion.

Auxiliary Lane Alternative -

John K. stated that the Auxiliary Lane Alternative creates operational improvements when compared to the No Build alternative on the freeway segments, but has minimal improvement at the Carmel Valley Road diamond interchange.

Direct Connector Alternative -

John K. stated that the Direct Connector Alternative has acceptable or moderately degraded operations throughout the Project area.

Scott T. asked what the assumed configuration is for SR-56 in the Year 2030. John K. replied that SR-56 is assumed to be a "6+0" facility in the Year 2030 with three general purpose lanes in both directions.

Time Delay Exhibit –

John K. presented the Time Delay exhibit to the Steering Committee. John K. stated that we are studying a number of routes in Carmel Valley to determine both the existing and forecasted travel times through the I-5/SR-56 interchange. These routes connect SR-56 at Carmel Valley Road with I-5 at Del Mar Heights and can be described as follows:

- **Route A:** Westbound (WB) SR-56 to Northbound (NB) I-5 freeway route (Auxiliary Lane and No Build alternatives would use the Carmel Valley diamond interchange and the Direct Connectors alternative would use the proposed freeway to freeway connectors)
- **Route B:** WB SR-56 freeway exit at Carmel Valley Road, travel north on Carmel Valley Road through the local street intersections, turn left on Del Mar Heights Road and enter I-5 NB on ramp at Del Mar Heights Road.
- **Route C:** WB SR-56/Carmel Valley Road freeway route to exit at Carmel Country Road, travel north on Carmel Country Road through local street intersections, turn left on Del Mar Heights Road and enter I-5 NB on-ramp at Del Mar Heights Road.
- **Route D:** WB SR-56/Carmel Valley Road freeway route to exit at Carmel Creek Road, travel north on Carmel Creek Road, turn left on Carmel Country Road and travel through local street intersections, turn left on Del Mar Heights Road and enter I-5 NB on-ramp at Del Mar Heights Road.
- **Route E:** WB SR-56/Carmel Valley Road freeway route to exit at El Camino Real, travel north on el Camino Real through local street intersections, turn left on Del Mar Heights Road and enter I-5 NB on-ramp at Del Mar Heights Road.

These same routes will also being studied in the Southbound to Eastbound direction.

7. Noise Study Information

Jayne D. presented the Traffic Noise Abatement Process exhibit. Jayne D. went through the six process steps as follows:

1) *Identify Sensitive Receptors*
2) *Measure Existing Noise Levels* – Jayne D. stated that this step includes the calibration of the noise study model.
3) *Predict Future traffic Noise Levels* – Jayne D. stated that topography is an important factor in this step.
4) *Identify Traffic Noise Impacts* – Jayne D. stated that traffic noise impacts are predicted to occur when you have a Future Predicted Noise Level that approaches within 1 decibel (dBA) or exceeds 66 decibels.

5) *Consider Noise Abatement* – Jayne D. stated that a minimum of a 5dBA decrease in noise level must be attainable with reasonable cost vs. benefit.

6) *Determine Preliminary Reasonableness* – Jayne D. stated that the Noise Abatement Decision Report (NADR) would be completed by the Project Engineer.

Scott T. inquired about the difference between the dBA and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) units of measurement. Jayne D. responded that they are within ± 2 dBA of one another.

Jayne D. explained that a doubling of the noise level is equivalent to a 10 dBA increase while a doubling of the traffic level results in an increase of only 3 dBA.

Scott T. asked if we will be using Federal criteria to asses the impacts in the Environmental Document (ED). Jayne D. replied that we will be adhering to both State and Federal criteria.

Barbara C. asked if sound measurements are to be established adjacent to the highway or further west in the Del Mar community. Jayne D. responded that the measurements will be taken at the first or second row of homes adjacent to the freeway.

Priscilla M. asked if the measurements will be taken over a long duration. Jayne D. replied that the standard measurement is taken over 20 minutes during free flow traffic periods (i.e. traffic operating at Level of Service C).

8. Open Discussion for Steering Committee

Linda B. stated that there are currently no congestion problems for the S-E movement through the I-5/SR-56 interchange. Linda B. added that the forecasted traffic volumes may not be accurate and there may not be congestion in 2030. John K. replied that the forecasted volumes are based on the best information that is available.

Susan P. stated that the sound wall constructed on her property has been ineffective. Susan P. added that the sound wall was considered an enhancement to the property and resulted in an increase in her property tax. Jayne D. responded that the tax abatement had been requested from the tax assessor for these cases without success. Susan P. asked to be informed of any and all cost that property owners may be subject to as a result of the perceived enhancements/improvements.

Michael P. recommended exploring some alternatives to sound walls for noise mitigation. Allan K. stated that the topography of the area does not lend itself to a simple solution and alternative designs will be explored.

Dan B. stated that the construction of new highway facilities only perpetuates the growing transportation problem and that we should focus more attention on public transportation. Allan K. responded that public transportation is part of San Diego's RTP and is also considered when determining forecasted traffic volumes. Allan K. added that the RTP is approved by elected officials.

Allan K. stated that I-5 and I-15 are required to carry North County's traffic demand and additional parallel north-to-south corridors have been eliminated from planning due to the enormous cost of such projects.

9. Next Meeting

Scott T. asked what will be prepared for presentation at the next meeting. Allan K. stated that we are going to proceed on the Environmental Studies and the Time Delay Study will be complete.

Scott T. recommended relating noise levels to common sounds that the general public is familiar with. Jayne D. responded that a graphic would be prepared and distributed at the next meeting.

The next Steering Committee Meeting will be held at the Carmel Valley Public Library on Thursday, September 18, 2008 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.

I-5 / SR-56 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Steering Committee Meeting Notes

September 18, 2008

To: Steering Committee, File

From: Marnell Gibson

Committee Members in Attendance:

Name	Representing
Barbara Cerny	Torrey Pines CPB
Jan Fuchs	Carmel Valley CPB
Scott Tillson	Carmel Valley CPB

Also in Attendance:

Name	Representing
Allan Kosup	Caltrans
Anna Colton	Point Del Mar
Arturo Jacobo	Caltrans
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
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 where no comments regarding the meeting minutes from the June Steering Committee meeting.

3. Respond to Community Letters

Allan K. stated that several issue papers have been submitted to Caltrans by the Torrey Pines Community Planning Board (TPCPB) regarding the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project and provided the following responses.

1) The I-5/SR-56 No Build Alternative assumes that the managed lanes from the I-5 North Coast Project are constructed. The I-5 North Coast Project also has a no build alternative in which the managed lanes are not constructed.

2) The Visual Simulations are to be based on the key views that the Steering Committee decided on.

3) There are several other locations in the San Diego region where "missing moves" (i.e. missing connectors) are being studied.

4) There is potential for liquefaction in the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project area and this potential will be taken into consideration during design.

5) There are no impacts to homes along Del Mar Heights Road in any of the Project alternatives. However, there will be temporary traffic impacts associated with construction for the build alternatives.

Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative –

Chris J. explained that the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative was developed using the proposed southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 (S-E) horizontal geometrics from the Direct Connector Alternative. The tunnel travels below I-5, Carmel Valley Road and the existing northbound I-5 to eastbound SR-56 (N-E) and westbound SR-56 to southbound I-5 (W-S) connectors.

Chris J. stated that the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative has increased impacts to the Portofino Circle community because of the additional room required for construction of the tunnel. In addition, this alternative requires the reconstruction of the N-E and W-S connectors because of impacts to the existing foundations, and requires special construction/design because of the high local ground water table. Chris J. added that the design speed of the tunnel connection is significantly reduced in order to provide adequate vertical clearances both under and over the S-E alignment.

Allan K. added that the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative was dropped from further consideration because it has no reduction in right of way impacts and the reduction in visual and noise impacts may not justify the large increase in total Project cost.

Scott T. asked if the Direct Connector Tunnel Alternative was still estimated at an additional 80 million dollars more than the Direct Connector Alternative. Chris J. confirmed.

Scott T. asked what the estimated cost is for the Direct Connector Alternative. Chris J. responded that the Direct Connector Alternative has an estimated $225 million in construction cost, in addition to an estimated $70 million in right of way and support costs. The total Project cost for the Direct Connector Alternative is approximately $300 million.

4. RTP Process

Allan K. provided copies of the Year 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) handout to meeting attendees.

Allan K. stated that an estimated 1 million more residents will move in to the San Diego region over the next 20 years. The RTP assesses a number of issues related to this population increase, including housing and transportation needs for the region. Funding for transportation projects in San Diego is revenue constrained and is generated from both the federal gas tax and the region's Transnet sales tax. The region has approximately 41 billion dollars available over the next 20 years, but this number could realistically grow to 50-60 billion. Allan K. stated that approximately 80 billion dollars would be needed over the next 20 years to address all of the transportation needs for the region.

Allan K. stated that "missing" freeway connectors are being studied at a number of other locations in the region, including the I-5/SR-78 and SR-94/SR-125 interchanges. The projects listed in the RTP are prioritized based on need.

Dennis R. suggested that more effort is focused on reducing the number of single occupancy vehicles on the freeway systems by promoting carpooling and public transit rather than widening roadways.

Allan K. stated that projections in the RTP incorporate changes in the population's use of the various modes of transportation. Allan K. addressed the common questions regarding rising gas prices and greenhouse gas emissions and their effect on current and predicted traffic volumes. Allan K. stated that historically these issues have resulted in a flattening of the region's traffic volume vs. time curve, but have not resulted in any downhill trends.

Dennis R. stated that there has been a 17 percent decrease in the traffic volumes on I-5 in the Del Mar Heights area. Allan K. responded that the increase in traffic volumes over the next 20 years, whether as a result of 800 thousand or 1.2 million new residents, must be accommodated for.

Dennis R. asked how these trends in traffic volumes are incorporated into the final product of a project. Allan K. replied that trends are often difficult to assess, but the RTP is a "living" document, with revised versions being released every few years. The next release is scheduled for November of 2011.

Allan K. addressed the issue of the use of moveable barriers on I-5 to eliminate the need for further widening. Allan K. stated that moveable barriers are not a feasible solution for the I-5 corridor because the directional split is close to 50/50.

Barbara C. suggested that High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes are designated only during specific hours of the day, as is done in parts of the bay area. Allan K. responded that this approach is being considered, but may not prove to be a feasible solution for the I-5 corridor.

5. Traffic Overview

Travel Time Exhibit –

John K. presented the 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.

John K. stated that the existing travel times were established using pilot car studies in which the routes were navigated and timed during peak hour and mid day traffic conditions. These measured times were then compared to a traffic model to ensure accuracy.

John K. stated that the Direct Connector Alternative has a freeway route travel time of 6 minutes in both the south to east (S-E) and west to north (W-N) directions between I-5 at Del Mar Heights and SR-56 at Carmel Valley Road. The Auxiliary Lane Alternative has an additional 9 minutes in the am peak hour and an additional 15 minutes in the pm peak hour (Total travel times of 15 minutes and 21 minutes in the am and pm peak hours, respectively). The No Build Alternative has an additional 15 minutes in the am peak hour and additional 21 minutes in the pm peak hour (Total of 21 minutes and 27 minutes in the am and pm peak hours, respectively).

Bob L. stated that the local street connection between southbound (SB) I-5 and eastbound (EB) SR-56 and westbound (WB) SR-56 and northbound (NB) I-5 are problematic as a result of congestion on I-5. Bob L. added that the direct connectors do not improve regional mobility.

Allan K. stated that the travel time analysis focused on peak traffic hour conditions and, when assessing the costs/benefits of the Project alternatives, it is important that we also consider the time savings during off peak hours.

Traffic Volumes Comparison Exhibit –

John K. presented the Traffic Volumes Comparison exhibit to the Steering Committee. The exhibit displays the year 2030 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes for the three build alternatives, the No Build Alternative and the existing condition.

John K. stated that volume of traffic approximately doubles on SR-56 by the year 2030.

An attendee asked if there are plans for widening of the entire SR-56 corridor. John K. replied that the widening of the SR-56 corridor is included in the current RTP as a project separate from the proposed I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project.

John K. stated that the No Build and Auxiliary Lane alternatives have a year 2030 ADT volume of 80,000 vehicles per day along Carmel Valley Road.

Dennis R. asked if these where single occupancy vehicles. John K. responded that the ratio of single occupancy vehicles to high occupancy vehicles has been incorporated into the traffic volumes study in accordance with the percentages listed in the RTP.

6. Visual Studies

Wall Aesthetic Treatments –

Chris J. presented exhibits for the retaining wall aesthetic treatments from the I-5/Lomas Santa Fe Interchange Project to the Steering Committee. Chris J. stated that Dokken Engineering worked in conjunction with the Caltrans District 11 Landscape Department to develop the aesthetic treatments for the Lomas Santa Fe retaining walls. Local geologic formations, such as Del Mar Sandstone, were taken in context and transformed into architectural features for the retaining walls. Chris J. added that this was an attempt to reduce the starkness of the standard concrete faced retaining wall, and that the public was highly involved in developing this aesthetic design.

Bob L. asked if there are sound absorbing features incorporated into the wall design. Chris J. responded that there are not and that sound walls were constructed separately for the I-5/Lomas Santa Fe Interchange Project.

Bob D. stated that the wall is imposing and recommended breaking up the vertical features of the wall.

Allan K. clarified that the wall exhibits are an example of what the walls may look like for the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project and that further study is required.

Dennis R. stated that the sound issue is very important to the public.

2-D Visual Simulation –

Chris J. presented the 2-D view simulation exhibits to the Steering Committee. The first exhibit is an image of the existing view from eastbound Carmel Valley Road. The second exhibit is a simulation of the same view after the construction of the proposed connector structures.

Chris J. stated that several key views will be studied as part of the Visual Impact Analysis (VIA), which is one of several technical studies being developed for the Project.

An attendee asked if the VIA is part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Chris J. replied that results of the VIA will be incorporated into the EIR, but it is a separate document in itself.

Scott T. asked why the W-N connector is not shown in the view simulation. Chris J. replied that the W-N connector is too low to be seen from this particular location.

Arturo J. added that the view from Portofino Circle looking east will be added to the key views for the VIA.

Scott T. stated the original key views are public views and pointed out that the views from Portofino Circle are private. Arturo J. replied that the view from Portofino Circle will be added per the public's request.

7. Alternatives Update

Chris J. presented several exhibits illustrating the current build alternatives, which include the Auxiliary Lane, Direct Connector, and Hybrid alternatives. An exhibit illustrating the proposed Hybrid with Flyover Alternative was also presented.

Hybrid with Flyover Alternative –

Chris J. stated that the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative includes a proposed flyover structure connecting EB Carmel Valley Road to the EB SR-56 fast lane, in addition to the W-N connector from the Direct Connector Alternative.

Chris J. stated that this alternative has a travel time savings of approximately 15 seconds over the Hybrid Alternative in the S-E direction. However, the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative has a total project cost of approximately 70 million dollars more than the conventional Hybrid Alternative.

Arturo J. stated that Caltrans continues to be open to other solutions, such as the Hybrid with Flyover Alternative. Allan K. added that further evaluation was necessary to determine the feasibility of this alternative and it will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Hybrid Alternative –

Chris J. stated that Hybrid Alternative combines the W-N connector from the Direct Connectors Alternative with the S-E movement from the Auxiliary Lane Alternative.

Scott T. asked if the eastbound slip off-ramp to Carmel Creek is eliminated in all of the Project alternatives. Chris J. replied that it is eliminated in all of the Project alternatives.

Auxiliary Lane and Direct Connector Alternative –

Chris J. stated that the three dimensional design has been completed for the Auxiliary Lane and Direct Connector alternatives and that cost estimates have also been developed for both. He added that a significant portion of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project cost may be attributed to improvements proposed in the I-5 North Coast Project, and that the estimates are being revised to reflect this.

Scott T. pointed out the importance of identifying these costs so that the Project becomes more palatable from a funding standpoint.

An attendee asked how high the S-E connector would be at its highest point. Darwin C. replied that it would be approximately 50 feet above Carmel Valley Road at its highest point.

Chris J. presented the typical cross section exhibits, illustrating the height of the connector structures relative to the homes along Portofino Drive and Portofino Circle at several locations along I-5.

Chris J. explained that the box callouts on the Direct Connector Alternative exhibit provide detailed information for the proposed retaining walls, including wall location, surface area, length, average height and maximum height. Chris J. stated that the proposed SB I-5 retaining wall will have a maximum height of approximately 50 feet, and an average height of approximately 35 feet.

A resident asked if the 50 foot retaining wall is required in all of the Project alternatives. Chris J. replied that the retaining wall proposed in the Auxiliary Lane and Hybrid alternatives would be considerably smaller in this particular area.

Scott T. inquired regarding impacts to the commercial areas along the east side of I-5. Chris J. replied that parking/physical impacts to the commercial areas will be studied as part of the VIA

8. Alternatives Update

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.

Scott T. inquired regarding the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project. Brad J. replied that NOP was prepared in early 2005.

Chris J. explained that the Project Report (PR) is a compilation of engineering studies and documents that serves as a supplement to the Environmental Document (ED).

An attendee asked when the ED for the I-5 North Coast Project will be released for public review. Allan K. replied that the public review period for the I-5 North Coast ED is scheduled for June of 2009.

An attendee asked if there is a preferred alternative for the I-5/SR-56 Interchange Project. Allan K. replied that the preferred alternative has yet to be determined and, at this point in the process, there are no alternatives that stand out as clearly better solutions.

Dennis R. asked if the development of the Project's Noise Study could be accelerated so that homeowners can disclose noise related information in private property sales. Allan K. replied that the release of the I-5 North Coast ED will provide residents with this information in June of 2009.

9. Next Meeting

The next Steering Committee Meeting will be held at the Carmel Valley Public Library on Thursday, December 18, 2008 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.

I-5 / SR-56 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Steering Committee Meeting Notes

December 18, 2008

To: Steering Committee, File

From: Marnell Gibson

Committee Members in Attendance:

Name	**Representing**
Barbara Cerny	Torrey Pines CPB
Jan Fuchs	Carmel Valley CPB

Also in Attendance:

Name	**Representing**
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 where 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 inquires 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 Alterative 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.