

SOLANA BEACH CITY COUNCIL
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY

JOINT **SPECIAL** MEETING

MINUTES

6:00 P.M.
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2010

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
635 S. HIGHWAY 101, SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA
AND
TELECONFERENCE LOCATION (Councilmember Campbell) 709 Camino Santa
Barbara, Solana Beach, CA 92075 added 11/16 2:15 p.m.

The City Council acts as the City of Solana Beach Redevelopment Agency and the Public Financing
Authority.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Deputy Mayor Heebner called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Present: Heebner, Kellejian, Roberts, and Nichols.
Absent: Campbell.
Also Present: David Ott, City Manager
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney
Leticia Fallone, Deputy City Clerk
Dennis Coleman, Finance Director
Wende Protzman, Dir. Admin. Serv./Deputy City Mgr
Tina Christiansen, Community Dev. Dir.
Mo Sammak, City Engineer/Public Works Dir.

FLAG SALUTE:

Deputy Mayor Heebner led the flag salute.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

David Ott, City Manager, requested that Item C.2. (C.3.) be removed from the agenda and placed on a future agenda.

MOTION: Moved by Roberts and seconded by Nichols to approve the agenda.
Motion carried 4/0/1 (Absent: Campbell)

C. STAFF REPORTS:

Submit speaker slips to the City Clerk

C.1. I-5 North Coast Corridor Expansion Project. (File 0830-30)

1. Adopt Resolution 2010-158
 - a. Authorizing the City Manager to submit the review comments for the DEIR/EIS and the executive summary to Caltrans before the November 22, 2010 submittal deadline
 - b. Appropriating in the General Fund \$24,800 to Reimbursement Agreements revenue account and \$15,650 to the Engineering Professional Services expenditure account 001-6500-6510-6530
 - c. Authorizing the City Treasurer to amend the Fiscal Year 2011 Adopted Budget accordingly.

David Ott, City Manager, introduced the item. He stated that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR/EIS) was released in July for a ninety day public review period, that the comment period was extended an additional sixty days, and that the extension expired on November 22nd.

Mo Sammak, City Engineer, presented a powerpoint (on file with this report) on the results of the review of the Draft EIR. He stated that the I-5 would be extended 27 miles, that the project would cost between \$3.4 - \$4.4 billion dollars, that there were five alternatives to the project, he reviewed the difference between the use of buffers and barriers, the public workshops that took place in various locations around the City, and stated that Mike Hogan, City's Counsel, culminated all the City's comments into an executive summary.

Mike Hogan, City's Counsel, presented a powerpoint (on file with this report). He stated that hundreds of comments were received by the City on the insufficiencies of the Draft EIR and that all concerns about the document were culminated into a twelve page executive summary. He stated that the project was identified as being one of four possible projects, that the City was unaware of Caltrans intentions, and that the law required an agency to determine the project specifications so that the public could present views on the project. He stated that the project was at a 10% design stage, that the impacts of the project could not be identified until the project was further into the design process, that the

Draft EIR did not identify thresholds of significance of the impacts identified, that there were no standards in the document that considered whether the impacts were significant, that the project was projected to last for 38 years, that there was no scientific data to back-up comments in the document, that the document did not address the combined impacts of the project with other possible future projects, such as the proposed expansion of the fairgrounds, and that the mitigation measures proposed were not effective or enforceable. He stated that the document failed to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that would have less impacts on the environment, that Caltrans did not provide meaningful responses to the comments submitted by the City, and that the document should be re-circulated due to insufficiencies.

Mo Sammak, City Engineer, presented a powerpoint presentation. He reviewed additional significant issues identified by the City's consultants. He stated that there was no preferred alternatives provided in the document, that there was no analysis of the construction impacts, that the data used to analyze noise levels was out of date, that alternative 10 + 4 with barriers would result in the condemnation of six residential units, and that the Draft EIR did not address the visual impacts of the addition of soundwalls resulting from other proposed alternatives. He stated that air pollution was not addressed in the document, reviewed the fiscal impacts to the City for reviewing the Draft EIR, and that the City of Oceanside used some of the City's consultants which resulted in reimbursement to the City in the amount of \$24,800 from Oceanside for the shared use.

David Ott, City Manager, stated that Staff and Consultants expended a lot of time evaluating the draft EIR/EIS, that the documents were supposed to address impacts and mitigations of the proposed project, that comprehensive work was performed on the document and extensive revision of the document would be needed, and that the lack of a preferred alternative was a fundamental flaw in the document.

Paul Henkart stated that his house was along the lagoon, that information on the project was not provided to his neighborhood, that sound walls were wanted in his neighborhood, that he had not heard much about the proposed DAR (Direct Access Ramp) and Transit Center, that it would impact the Santa neighborhood, that some neighbors had reflective walls that reflected sound back to other neighbors, and that the City should consider regulations against reflective sound walls.

David Ott, City Manager, commented about the reflective walls, that an analysis had been completed, and that it was determined that the walls reflected noise back to neighbors.

Councilmember Roberts stated that the speaker invited him to tour the area and

meet some of the neighbors and requested whether comments regarding the DAR/Transit Center impacts to the Santa neighborhoods could be included in the City's comment.

Steve Goetsch stated that he was speaking as the Chairman of Citizens Against Freeway Expansion, that he was against the project, that the report was poorly written, unstable and ambiguous, and he complimented the Staff on the work done on the review of the report.

Stan Skripkus stated that he was disappointed with the Staff recommendation, that it was good that only 10% of the design was completed so that changes could still be made, and that it was great that 400 comments would be submitted to Caltrans so that Caltrans could use them in completing the final design.

Marion Dodson stated that the comments received at the meeting were well received, that the freeway expansion had been discussed for many years, that Caltrans had stated to her in the past that there would be no private property taken, that as the project progressed it had multiplied in size, that the project could be expanded within the existing right-of-way without taking any private property, that Caltrans should keep their promise of not taking private property, that there were many other things that could be done such as removing trucks from the freeway for a period of time in the mornings and evenings, and that alternative transportation should be reviewed.

Austin Foust, Austin Foust Associates, responded to Council's question regarding the benefit of capacity increase, that the freeway expansion would allow for an additional 30,000 - 50,000 cars in the carpool lane, that there were other alternatives that would produce better results at less cost, and there was a lot of money expended for the capacity that would be gained.

Allan Disler stated that he was opposed to the expansion project, that alternatives were possible, that there was a Chinese mass transit system model that was possible, which was in effect in China, that he felt that the majority of road use was for single passengers due to a lack of transportation alternatives, that offering mass transit would remove a large amount of passengers off the road, that the majority of people traveling on the I-5 were traveling further than La Jolla and further than Oceanside.

MOTION: Moved by Roberts and seconded by Nichols to approve with modifications. **Motion carried 4/0/1** (Absent: Campbell)

Councilmember Roberts stated that the Council had spent tax payer funds to review the 10,000 page EIR document, that the process of requiring the region and public to review an incomplete document was unfair, questioned whether the Transnet re-authorization would affect the project, that the executive summary

letter should also be sent to executive directors of the Boards, and that the City's comments should be shared with neighboring cities to demonstrate collaboration.

Councilmember Nichols stated that other transit alternatives should be reviewed, and that the word "negative" should be added in front of the word "impacts" on the resolution.

Deputy Mayor Heebner stated that SANDAG was recommending that Caltrans maintain the current freeway design.

C.3. 22nd District Agricultural Association Community Relations Committee Update on Discussions with the City of Del Mar Regarding AB 181 and the Sale of the Del Mar Fairgrounds. (File 0150-85)

1. Discuss the item and provide direction to Community Relations subcommittee as necessary.

This item was adjourned from the November 17, 2010 Council meeting.

This item was not heard.

ADJOURN:

Deputy Mayor Heebner adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.



Leticia Fallon, Deputy City Clerk

Approved: March 10, 2011