

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **South Orange County Mobility Forum Update and Potential Alternatives Evaluation and Considerations**

Report from the Public Works Director/City Engineer concerning the South Orange County Mobility Forum update and potential alternatives evaluation and considerations.

Deputy Public Works Director Bonigut reviewed the contents of the Administrative Report, displayed photographs of the proposed alignments, and responded to Council inquiries. A hard copy of Mr. Bonigut's photographs are on file with the City Clerk.

Dan Bane, San Clemente, expressed opposition to any toll road alignment that cuts through San Clemente.

Lew Avera, San Clemente, stated he is opposed to any toll road alignment that cuts through the City; suggested that the only acceptable route for the toll road would be outside San Clemente through Cristianitos.

Following discussion, MOTION BY MAYOR BAKER, SECOND BY COUNCILMEMBER HAMM, CARRIED 5-0, to adopt Resolution No. 16-57 entitled A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, OPPOSING ANY FOOTHILL-SOUTH 241 TOLL ROAD EXTENSION ALIGNMENT THAT CUTS INTO THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE, INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES, with modifications as follows:

1. An additional Whereas is to be added to read as follows: "*Whereas, the La Pata extension opened in August 2016 and provides significant traffic relief in south Orange County; and*"
2. An additional Whereas is to be added to read as follows: "*Whereas, the I-5 widening project, scheduled for completion in 2018, adds additional traffic relief in south Orange County, and*".
3. After the phrase "NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of San Clemente does hereby resolve as follows", the following language is to be added in place of Sections 1 and 2: "any 241 toll road extension that cuts into the City of San Clemente, including the proposed routes."

Resolution No. 16-57 is to be submitted to OCTA along with a cover letter. Copies of the letter and resolution are to be sent to the following stakeholders: Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, and South County cities.

Council requested a map of property owned by the TCA within, and contiguous to, San Clemente.

Council requested a traffic study that addresses circulation in the City subsequent to completion of the La Pata and I-5 improvements.

MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER BROWN, SECOND BY COUNCILMEMBER HAMM, CARRIED 5-0, to affirm prior City Council opposition to any capacity-enhancing improvements to the current at-grade beachfront railroad track alignment within San Clemente, and support an alternative which will locate all existing and future rail services in a tunnel or in a suitable bypass alignment.



Agenda Item 9A

Approvals:

City Manager [Signature]

Dept. Head [Signature]

Attorney SL

Finance

AGENDA REPORT

SAN CLEMENTE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Meeting Date: September 6, 2016

Department: Public Works / Engineering
Prepared By: Tom Bonigut, Deputy Public Works Director

Subject: ***SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY MOBILITY FORUM UPDATE AND POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION AND CONSIDERATIONS.***

Fiscal Impact: None.

Summary: This report is to update the City Council on the progress of the South Orange County Mobility Forum and to seek City Council direction concerning several potential alternatives being evaluated in this process.

Background: In May 2015, the Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA) retained a consultant to analyze mobility concerns in South Orange County. The purpose of this *Community Ascertainment Study*¹ was to gather input and understand how to best work collaboratively with the South County communities to address regional mobility issues and needs. More specifically, the study sought to determine how the community defines mobility challenges related to traffic congestion and the I-5 freeway in South Orange County, identify priorities that should be addressed to reach consensus about potential mobility solutions, and determine what processes the community prefers for planning and decision-making related to its mobility needs. The City Council was briefed on the study and results during a special presentation at its March 1, 2016 meeting. Some key study conclusions included:

- There is a high agreement that an I-5 capacity problem exists, which diminishes the quality of life in South Orange County, but there is lack of agreement about the best approach to solving the problem as well as whether or not a solution should even be pursued. That said, any potential solution(s) should be comprehensive and likely include a combination of approaches.
- Achieving complete community-wide consensus to extend the 241 Toll Road is not a realistic goal because there are portions of the community who, on "principle," will actively oppose extension of the road.
- There is a lack of agreement about the value of consensus or how to build consensus, although a forum comprised of South County city elected officials (rather than including non-elected community representatives) was viewed as having the greatest potential for garnering community support and successful problem-solving.
- Problem-solving among elected officials will have greater potential for success and garnering community support if transportation planning representatives (e.g. OCTA, Caltrans, etc.) are actively involved in the process.

¹ The Community Ascertainment Study is available for review in the City Clerk's office.

- Providing an open, transparent, accessible, information-rich, credible, comprehensive public involvement process will be essential for achieving a collaborative solution.

Based on the study findings, TCA established a "South Orange County Mobility Forum" consisting of elected officials and staff from the County of Orange and South Orange County cities as well as representatives from OCTA and Caltrans. The stated purpose of this forum is to facilitate broad stakeholder engagement that will support an open and inclusive process to discuss and analyze current transportation opportunities and challenges to build a coalition for generally agreed-upon regional transportation solutions in South Orange County.

There have been five Mobility Forum meetings and one public workshop. The following summarizes the discussions of alternatives that has taken place thus far and offers staff's recommendations for City Council consideration.

Discussion: Potential Mobility Alternatives

The first Mobility Forum was held in March and consisted of various overview and background presentations. At the April meeting, several graphics were presented to illustrate "high-level" regional traffic modeling results of South Orange County roadway congestion for existing conditions, future Year 2035 conditions with existing infrastructure and Year 2035 conditions with planned infrastructure. The bulk of the April meeting was devoted to a brainstorming discussion to solicit possible strategies/projects that should be more thoroughly evaluated in a traffic model to assess how well or not those would help in addressing congestion, delay, mobility etc. An initial list of sixteen alternatives, termed "ideas," was developed, and then later modified to the following list of 15 ideas which are depicted in the two maps provided in Attachment 1:

1. Dynamic pricing on TCA facilities (i.e. set price at level that results in V/C ratio less than 0.8).
2. Increase train frequency (i.e. assume same train frequency as for north of Laguna Niguel station) where double tracks exist. This shows on the map as adding double tracks from San Juan Capistrano south through San Clemente into San Diego County.
3. Synchronize lights on additional arterials (i.e. apply this to all South County arterials). There would be no change for San Clemente as the arterials identified in the attached map in San Clemente have already been synchronized.
4. Add mobility hubs at train stations and other locations like Rancho Mission Viejo. In San Clemente North Beach would become a mobility hub.
5. Complete bikeways identified in the Orange County Bikeways Master Plan for Supervisorial District 5. This includes legislation to support Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) usage of bike lanes and mobility hubs to include electric bikes in recognition of south OC terrain. This idea suggests completing all bikeways in the 2009 Master Plan but only shows some of the bikeways listed in the plan for San Clemente.
6. Widen Ortega Highway to four lanes within San Juan Capistrano.

7. Widen arterials to the maximum identified in the Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH). For San Clemente, the only change to current streets per the MPAH would be to widen La Pata from four lanes to six lanes from Calle Saluda to the northern City limit. However the attached map suggests some changes to Avenida Vaquero.
8. Extend Avenida La Pata to Cristianitos Road (assumes 50 MPH, two-lane roadway).
9. Connect Ortega Highway at the San Juan Capistrano southern border to Avery Parkway and State Route 73.
10. Add I-5 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane from Avenida Pico south to San Diego County Line.
11. Add I-5 General Purpose Lane from I-405 to San Diego County Line.
12. Add I-5 High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane from I-405 to San Diego County with dynamic pricing.
13. Connect the 241 Toll Road to I-5 via alignment crossing Avenida La Pata (i.e. make local connection at La Pata and then connect to I-5 at the Avenida Pico interchange). Based on the map, this alignment would route the Toll Road extension through the Forster Ridge Open Space and then Marblehead Inland open space before connecting to I-5.
14. Connect the 241 Toll Road to I-5 via alignment crossing Cristianitos Road.
15. Assume 20% of vehicle fleet consists of automated vehicles.

The initial idea list included a potential alternative to widen Ortega Highway to four lanes from the Antonio Parkway/Avenida La Pata intersection to I-15, but this was *later dropped from consideration*.

The May and June meetings consisted of discussion of initial modeling of the various project ideas, which were grouped into six “packages” or related suites of ideas to evaluate. During the June meeting discussion it was acknowledged that the packages were developed to help simplify the comparisons on a more global scale but that the actual analytics and evaluations are complex. There was discussion of the need to test individual ideas instead of the initial package groupings, and initial results of this idea-specific analysis were provided at the August meeting (refer to Attachment 2).

Recommendations

Discussion of potential mobility solutions is continuing and additional Mobility Forum meetings and public workshops will be held. That said, the following offers some observations and recommendations regarding several of the specific potential mobility solution ideas discussed so far.

Idea 2 – Double-Tracking

Idea 2 noted above consists of double-tracking through San Clemente to “fill the gap” between existing double track segments which currently end in San Juan Capistrano and just south of San Clemente. At the first Mobility Forum meeting in April, double-tracking of the railroad was noted as a possible solution. At that meeting OCTA staff explained that passenger rail service north of San Juan Capistrano will be expanded by 1/3 over the next 20 years but south of San Juan Capistrano rail service is at capacity due to the single track. OCTA explained that in the early 2000’s a programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) included possible new double

railroad track under the I-5 freeway corridor, but the \$3 billion estimate rendered this an infeasible alternative.

During that EIR process the City Council submitted written comment stating that it would “stringently oppose any capacity-enhancing improvements to the current at-grade beachfront alignment within San Clemente, and would seek an alternative which will locate all existing and future rail services in a tunnel or in a suitable bypass alignment.” If increased rail capacity via double-tracking continues to be a potential alternative, the City Council should consider re-iterating its position that any such double-tracking not occur along the existing coastal rail alignment and that any map graphics should be revised accordingly.

Idea 13 – Extend 241 Toll Road via Avenida La Pata Corridor

This idea is very similar to the “Central Corridor” alignments evaluated in the EIR for the proposed extension of the 241 Toll Road from Oso Parkway to I-5 at Cristianitos Road. On January 5, 2010, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 10-01 (see Attachment 3) opposing the Central Corridor alignment and related variants. At the time these were specifically noted as the Central Corridor (CC), Central Corridor - Avenida La Pata Variation (CC-ALPV) and Alignment 7 Corridor – Avenida La Pata Variation (A7C-ALPV) alternatives. Given the past opposition to very similar alignments, the City Council may wish to consider affirming its opposition to the Idea 14 potential solution which is now being evaluated. A proposed Resolution to this effect is provided in Attachment 4.

Idea 14 – Connect the 241 Toll Road to I-5 at Cristianitos

This alternative essentially mirrors the “Far East” alignment (and several related variants) that were evaluated in the EIR for the proposed Toll Road Extension. An important note is that while all of the former Far East Toll Road extension options included an interchange connection at the eastern end of Avenida Pico (with the Toll Road continuing all the way to I-5), none of the options terminated the proposed extension at Avenida Pico. However, during original planning and evaluation of the entire 241 Toll Road in the 1990’s, there was an option to end the toll road at the eastern end of Avenida Pico. So far in the current Mobility Forum process this option has not been raised or discussed. Even so, the City Council may wish to consider proactively opposing such an option since it was not an alternative during the most recent Toll Road extension evaluation. A proposed Resolution to this effect is provided in Attachment 4.

Ideas 5 and 7 – Bikeways and MPAH Build-Out

Staff will need to obtain more information from TCA’s consultant to understand the extent of bikeway improvements assumed in their modeling within San Clemente, and clarification of MPAH improvements within the City, especially with respect to Avenida Vaquero.

Recommended

Action: STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT the City Council consider the following:

1. Affirm prior City Council opposition to any capacity-enhancing improvements to the current at-grade beachfront railroad track alignment within San Clemente, and support an alternative which will locate all existing and future rail services in a tunnel or in a suitable bypass alignment; and
2. Adopt Resolution No. _____ titled "A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, OPPOSING ANY FOOTHILL-SOUTH 241 TOLL ROAD EXTENSION ALIGNMENT THAT TERMINATES AT THE EASTERN END OF AVENIDA PICO OR CONNECTS TO INTERSTATE 5 VIA THE AVENIDA LA PATA/AVENIDA PICO CORRIDOR."

- Attachments:**
1. Maps depicting 15 project ideas/alternatives
 2. Project idea draft modeling results summary
 3. Resolution 10-01
 4. Proposed Resolution

Notification: None.

