



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, June 9, 2005
5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Due to having to waiting for a quorum, Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting at 5:55PM.

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

William C. Boyd
Keith Coffman-Grey (Chair)
Michael Cooper
Isabelle Greene
Barry Siegel

Attendance

Present 5:55 PM
Present
Present 6:05 PM
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Supervising Trans. Planner
Anne Van Belkom, Senior Office Specialist
Scott Reidman, Waterfront Business Manager
Paul Casey, Community Development Director
Jim Armstrong, City Administrator

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Damiano, Community Relations Mgr., SBMTD
Roger Horton, Councilmember

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Councilmember Horton informed the TCC about a press conference he attended today to foster support for renewed funding of Proposition 42 (Transportation Funding for California). TCC Chair Coffman-Grey reminded staff about his request at the last TCC meeting to have a letter sent on behalf of the TCC in support of this proposition. Browning Allen responded that he would talk to Don Olson to see if a signed letter from Mayor Blum could be sent to Arnold Schwarzenegger, Pedro Nava, and Tom McClintock. TCC members agreed that they would like to have Mayor Blum send this letter.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. Wharf Woody Shuttle.

David Damiano from MTD summarized his analysis of the ridership on the Wharf Woody and recommended to have it only run on Saturdays and Sundays instead of daily during the months of July and August. Mr. Damiano also strongly recommended using the \$22,576 in savings for additional marketing for the Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle instead of adding service elsewhere.

Mr. Damiano gave the June 29th "10 Millionth Passenger" presentation in front of the Art Museum as an example of a strategic marketing opportunity, which he feels is an effective tool in increasing future ridership.

The meeting was then opened for public comment.

Harley Augustino from PUEBLO is interested in using any available funds for the enhancement of public transportation with emphasis on the needs of the public workforce. He feels that any decision on the Wharf Woody be postponed until the July 20th Joint Meeting to Discuss Transit Issues. He also emphasized that any Measure D funds should be reserved for those routes that assist the workforce in getting to work or to help getting people out of cars. He recommends that no action be taken tonight and he hopes that the July 20th Joint meeting will be a real action meeting.

Scott Riedman, Waterfront Business Manager, spoke on behalf of the Wharf merchants and asked that the Wharf Woody remain on Saturdays and Sundays, especially now that there is a condition of approval for the merchants to contribute to the Wharf Woody (Waterfront 57% and merchants 43%).

TCC members were informed that if the Wharf Woody was to cut back to weekend service, it would need to be decided at this meeting. After discussion among TCC members as to whether it would be better to spend the \$22,576 on marketing or on additional services, Mr. Damiano advised the TCC that given the rather small amount of savings available, it would be best spent on a highly targeted marketing campaign designed to boost ridership, since this amount would only be able to add 1.3 hours of service during weekends or 4.3 hours on weekdays.

Mr. Augustino (Pueblo) again reiterated that with ridership tailing off at the end of the day, it would not be worthwhile to add additional service later in the day. He still feels that any decision regarding the Wharf Woody be postponed until the July 20th Joint Meeting.

Chair Coffman-Grey felt it was vital to continue to have the Wharf Woody run on the weekends since there seemed to be a real need during that time.

In response to a question regarding what the staff recommendation was regarding the Wharf Woody, Mr. Allen said that the staff recommendation was to delete the weekday service of the Wharf Woody and to use the \$22,576 to enhance the marketing of the Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle.

Chair Coffman-Grey felt that no changes should be made to the Wharf Woody before the merchants are fully informed about the changes and have a chance to respond.

Paul Casey stated his concern about the MTD deadline and the fact that no outreach has been done to Harbor Merchants. While he feels that reducing the weekday service is a great idea, he suggested this decision be postponed.

Roger Horton also mentioned that the merchants of the Harbor and Stearn's Wharf may combine, which could alter the decision regarding the Wharf Woody.

Mr. Allen suggested that TCC allow him and his staff to work with MTD and the Harbor and Stearn's Wharf merchants this summer to see what their consensus would be regarding the Wharf Woody.

MOTION 1: Made by Siegel and seconded by Boyd.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee recommends that the Wharf Woody service be reduced to weekend service.

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstains: 1 (Greene) Absent: 0

Chair Coffman-Grey was concerned about the monies currently being contributed by the merchants for the Wharf Woody service. He wants to make sure that this would be reviewed when the time came for the Wharf Woody service to be reduced.

3. Work Session for TCC Members on the role of the TCC. (6:40 PM)

As an historical item, Browning Allen gave TCC members a handout that showed items that were previously discussed. Mr. Allen explained that tonight's focus was to discuss the bullet points in the document in their TCC packets and hear the committee's thoughts.

Councilmember Horton stated that he would need to leave at 6:43 PM and thus had only time for a final comment before he left. Given that there now is a Circulation Element and large projects such as the 101 In Motion and St. Francis, he feels that there needs to be a specific committee that will play an important role for the City by hearing public comment and making sure that the goals of the Circulation Element are made part of new projects being reviewed.

This brought about a question on the new applicants for the vacant spots on the TCC Committee. Browning Allen informed the TCC that there were five candidates and that midyear appointments would be made at the June 28, 2005 Council Meeting.

Mr. Allen continued his presentation by reviewing each of the bullets listed in the handout.

Bullet 1- Pre-Design visioning on pedestrian and capital projects.

Bullet 2 -Public outreach on transportation capital projects prior to the commencement of design.

Bullet 1 items are already happening with the TCC reviewing such projects as the Pershing Park Multi-Purpose Pathway, the Mason Street Bridge, and the Milpas Beautification project. The FY05-06 Sidewalk Infill Project will come before the TCC in July. Jim Armstrong, City Administrator stated that Bullet 2 is a fairly significant change since the TCC and Transportation staff will be looking at pre-design contact work and in essence become a buffer between the public and Council. Mr. Armstrong also corrected the TCC by saying that Bullets 1 and 2 are more than just mediation since the TCC is the keeper of the Circulation Element, the Pedestrian Master Plan, and the Bicycle Master Plan. After discussion regarding the need for better outreach to affected neighborhoods, Mr. Allen informed the TCC that public noticing has changed significantly and neighborhood contact for specific traffic calming projects will now include five contacts with property owners before any construction is done. Current notification that has gone out informed the St. Francis neighborhood about the installation of the recent interim traffic calming devices on Garden at Islay, Sola at Olive, Alta Vista and Sola, and Alta Vista at Victoria. Mr. Allen invited the TCC members to go look at and drive through these interim installations. The TCC will be brought up to date later this summer as to the effectiveness of the devices.

Bullet 3 –Recommend changes to land use policies and standard conditions of approval of development projects.

TCC need to consider how the Circulation Element may differ from City code and make appropriate recommendations to resolve any such issues on a policy level. An example will be the Sidewalk Infill Program and whether to require missing sidewalk to be installed whenever a new residential project is approved, or whether the project owner should be required to pay an "in lieu" fee instead. This recommendation will depend on the type of neighborhood and what the expectations are for how that neighborhood should look in the future. Currently, there is a staff person working on the Downtown Parking Plan and Parking Design Guidelines (a plan to develop standards for parking in the downtown core), which will come before the TCC in draft form and then in final form for TCC recommendation. Jim Armstrong informed the TCC that their role should be to try to get more consistent parking standards. Thus, the TCC's role would be to recommend standard parking conditions for various projects from a policy standpoint, not to recommend a case by case parking requirement for individual projects. Staff confirmed that the Planning Commission would also play a part in this. Mr. Boyd suggested that the PC and TCC form a subcommittee to look at these types of issues first before presenting them to both committees.

Bullet 4 -Provide recommendation to the Transportation Planning staff and/or the Planning Commission on major land development projects in which there are substantial transportation and circulation issues.

Mr. Siegel stated that the Community Development Director should give the criteria regarding what he considered major land development projects needing TCC input, so the TCC has a clear understanding of what projects should come to them, and which ones are not subject to TCC review. Mr. Casey replied that the TCC should not be involved in doing the Environmental Review and that to some extent the determination as to whether a project should be looked at by the TCC is somewhat of a discretionary call.

Mr. Boyd used the example of Cottage Hospital where he felt the TCC should have been able to review additional transportation related items such as the parking facilities. Chair Coffman-Grey suggested that if the Planning Commission had a recommendation from the TCC regarding public comments received on transportation related issues, this could help them shorten their meetings. Mr. Casey reminded the TCC that it is the Planning Commission's role to implement CEQA (Californian Environmental Quality Act) requirements, and he does not want the PC to relinquish that responsibility. Mr. Allen explained that just because a project is large, it does not mean it needs to go before the TCC since it may not have significant transportation issues. Mr. Dayton mentioned the potential Circuit City Plaza redevelopment project with Whole Foods as an example of a major project that may not be reviewed by the TCC. Due to the nature of the prior uses at this location, as compared with the future uses given the installation of Whole Foods, there could actually be a paper reduction in traffic impact, with no legal recourse to make changes in order to add additional transportation related requirements. Mr. Casey and staff confirmed for the TCC that if Councilmembers or Planning Commissioners have specific items on which they want to know the TCC's recommendation, they can ask to have this reviewed by the TCC. However, Mr. Armstrong cautioned the TCC to be careful and remember that they cannot get involved in areas that are not under the purview of the TCC.

Bullet 5 -Provide recommendations on regional transportation efforts such as the 101 Operational Improvements, 101 In Motion, Measure D renewal strategies, commuter rail efforts, public transit policies.

In response to an inquiry regarding notification currently being sent to the Milpas Businesses (of which the TCC was not informed), staff informed the TCC that this noticing did not involve the TCC as it informed the neighborhood about upcoming traffic detours during the temporary closures of the Highway 101 ramps in order to speed up the 101 construction. With regards to the larger projects, such as the 101 In Motion and Measure D, Mr. Siegel asked what the City's position was regarding the 101 In Motion and if there would be interim solution that would be looked at. Mr. Allen stated that the 101 In Motion would be returned to the TCC later this summer. Another major item discussed was Measure D funding and the difficulty in getting this reauthorized. Mr. Allen informed the TCC that SBCAG has hired a consultant to determine how monies should best be spent to ensure that Measure D gets the required votes to pass. Mr. Casey reminded everyone that if the proposed County split gets approved, this would postpone the Measure D vote. Mr. Allen also added that with the 2/3 vote requirement, the TCC needs to realize that compromises may need to be made on what would constitute the best transportation plan since without the 2/3 vote, there would be not be a transportation plan. Mr. Armstrong also added that part of the difficulty in making promises regarding the 101 in Motion package, is what to do if there are no funds available to do the promised projects. Staff assured the TCC that they would be very involved with 101 In Motion project, and the Measure D campaign.

Bullet 6- Provide recommendations on parking rates and policies as they relate to promoting the goals of the Circulation Element.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that parking rate policies will encourage people not to park but to use alternative transportation. He stated that Council needs to hear both perspectives regarding the parking issue. The Downtown Parking Committee has one perspective and is designed to reflect the needs of the merchants who want to provide parking for their customers. The TCC has another perspective which is to try to get people out of their cars and using alternative transportation modes.

Following the review of the bullets, Chair Coffman Grey asked if there would be a new neighborhood chosen for the next NTMP within the next two years. Mr. Allen confirmed that due to the current funding crisis, there would not be another neighborhood chosen but that efforts would be made to finish the current two neighborhoods.

After additional discussion, a consensus was reached to formalize the items that were discussed by revising the original resolution that set up the TCC, and to take this to Council for final approval.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 PM