



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday January 25, 2007 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM when Committee Member Cooper arrived for a quorum.

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

William C. Boyd
Mark Bradley
Michael Cooper
Keith Coffman-Grey
David Pritchett
David Tabor
Steve Maas

Attendance

Excused
Absent
Present
Present
Present
Present
Excused

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer
Teresa Martinez, Administrative Specialist

OTHERS PRESENT:

none

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: Item Five (5) was moved in front of Item Four (4).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. The Minutes of the Transportation & Circulation Committee meeting on December 14, 2006 were not approved due to there not being a quorum for approval. Motion to continue the approval of minutes to the February 22, 2007 meeting.

REPORTS

3. MTD's November 2006 Monthly Downtown Waterfront Shuttle and Commuter Lot Shuttle Report. – Browning Allen

Dr. Cooper commented that the ridership tends to be falling off by over 200,000 people since 1996/1997 despite considerable marketing measures. He asked for the exact amount that is

being spent on marketing, but noted that since that is an MTD figure, the Committee would not have that information. He asked when is the return on investment going to be reviewed in order to ensure that money is not being wasted. It was responded that that question would be forwarded to Steve Maas and Sherrie Fisher. It was also responded that there has been a reduction in the revenue hours of the Shuttle along with other changes. Also after 9/11, there was a reduction in ridership, as well as other issues that occurred in 1996 and 1997 that caused a significant drop-off. The City has been providing close to \$1,000,000 in support of MTD for the service. It was also noted that the shuttle is a mitigation of the Downtown Redevelopment. We will continue this service until the RDA expires and then at that point it can be evaluated whether the program is efficient. What we can do is take a closer look at what else can be done to increase ridership whether it is more marketing or something David Damiano can do. Sherrie Fisher will be invited to the next meeting so that she can give a history of the fluctuations in ridership along with David Damiano. Dr. Cooper also commented that based on the Marketing/Public Information bullet points, he felt that everything is being done to increase ridership and he also asked what the \$1,000,000 was being spent on and if it was \$1,000,000 going to marketing. It was responded that the money is used to buy down the fair to 25 cents. It is a popular service with high demand during the summer months. Ridership has been consistent over the last few years in the mid 500,000 range. It is unknown if the 700,000 range will ever be reached again, but Sherri can discuss why there was a drop between 1996 to now when she comes next month, but it is believed that that was the time when the Shuttle started charging a fair.

Mr. Pritchett asked about the City's investment in the MTD's Crosstown Shuttle. He also asked if reports were given for that service as well. It was responded that the City does provide an operational subsidy for that service and under the agreement with MTD, quarterly reports are given for the Crosstown Shuttle Service. The next quarterly report will be given at the next meeting.

4. **Street Capital Budget FY 08-09 – John Ewasiuk**

John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer, Public Works Department, was introduced to talk about the Streets Capital Improvement Program Draft Budget. Overview: every two (2) years the City prepares a new six (6) year City wide Capital Improvement Report to address the City's infrastructure and major equipment needs. The six (6) year Capital Improvement Report has been developed and is soon to be presented to the Finance Committee. As part of the Citywide budget, the two (2) year Capital Improvement Financial Plan is also developed and will ultimately be reviewed by Finance Committee and approved by Council. First two (2) years of the six (6) year report becomes the draft for the two (2) year financial plan. On September 28, 2006, there was joint TCC and Planning Commission meeting for a Streets Capital Budget Work Session. Due to limited funding sources, increased material costs, and increased competition for funding, it became apparent that the funding for maintenance of the existing infrastructure is a top priority. Staff obtained input and comments from the Committee and Commission regarding streets capital improvement budget issues. Subsequently Staff developed funding priority categories and project priorities for funding which were included in the memo from October 18, 2006 to the Committee and the Commission. In association with the Citywide two (2) year Capital Improvement Financial Plan, a two (2) year draft of the Streets Capital Budget was also developed. A separate meeting will be had with Planning Commission on February 8, 2007. A copy of the Master Budget Calendar was distributed to the Committee. Streets Capital Improvement Two (2) Year Budget was developed with the consensus of the Engineering, Transportation, and Facilities Maintenance divisions within the Public Works department. A PowerPoint presentation was given on the Draft Streets Capital Project by Category, FY 08 and

09. The categories include City Obligations which are agreements with County Flood Control and Memorandum of Understanding for Goleta Transportation Improvement Plant which is being worked on in a five (5) year plan in negotiations on that issue, but funds are budgeted in the event that those obligations have to be fulfilled; Leverage Opportunity Projects or bridge projects which have grant funds and matches for the grant funds. Matches vary between 80%-88% of what the funds provide. The bridge projects are multimillion dollar projects with matching funds from Measure D funds, Utility User Taxes, and grant funding making up the remainder of resources. Maintenance of infrastructure and improvements are also included in the categories. These projects have limited funding in the projects and improvements side because of the need for maintaining the infrastructure.

Mr. Pritchett asked what the source of income is for the Electrical Lines Undergrounding Program. It was answered that those funds are received from Southern California Edison as a part of their billing process. A portion of that goes to the Rule 20A Undergrounding fund for the undergrounding of Milpas. There is Council approval for the undergrounding of Cliff Drive starting at Meigs and Flora Vista. There are limited funds, but there was a project area that was defined. It was also asked if it was really grant money or if it is a tax on electric bills. It is a collected tax from the utility bill that Edison sets aside in an escrow account for City projects. It is categorized as a grant because is it restricted funds that can only be used for one specific purpose.

Dr. Cooper asked how the budget interacts with the Circulation Element and the priorities that are being proposed. It was answered that the City Division managers are very aware of the Circulation Element that require prioritization of projects. Division managers meet as a group and discuss the issues and needs of the budget. The Boards and Commissions are also asked as far as what their needs and priorities are and collectively as a group they develop the budget. Dr. Cooper also expressed his appreciation for the undergrounding program. He suggested having the man who spoke with the Riviera Association on this issue be made available to the public as an educational resource to explain the benefits of this program for individuals and for the community. It was responded that Council designated funds for both underground utility districts, Rule 20A Funds and Utility Underground Assessment District Funds. More Information will be on-line for the public on the Engineering website for the Public Works Department. The City has hired on two (2) consultants, a recently retired Southern California Edison planner and a longtime Streets Facilities Maintenance Supervisor to help neighborhoods initiate their assessment districts.

Mr. Tabor asked how the Committee would interject new policies or priorities into the two (2) year or five (5) year process. It was answered that any suggestions in improvements are greatly appreciated and all the Committee need do is voice their concerns or suggestions to Staff. There are also opportunities for Committee members to speak to the Finance Committee or at Council if there is an issue that the Committee feels strongly about. This budget is a difficult budget in regards to the tremendous amount of needs of maintaining the existing infrastructure with little funds left for improvements, but there is still some improvement fund money left aside.

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked for clarification on Traffic Signal Operational Upgrades and Street Light and Traffic System Planned Programs. It was answered that the Street light and Traffic Systems Planned Programs is money that Facilities Department uses to maintain the traffic signals and street lights in the City. The Traffic Signal Operational Upgrades funds are used by the Traffic Engineer to do operational upgrades or enhancements. It was also asked where the

monies would go to add a new signal. It was answered that that would be budgeted for separately.

5. **Review Circulation Element Prioritization – Rob Dayton**

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, was introduced to review the Circulation Element Implementation Policy Prioritization. It was outlined that the Capital Improvement Projects were quite different than the Circulation Element Prioritization. The Capital Projects are funding improvements in infrastructure while the Prioritization is about the policy level in the Circulation Element. The Circulation Element was a controversial issue in the late 1980s and from that controversy, this Circulation Element was born. The way the controversy was handled in this document was to keep that question on the table and not necessarily resolve it. From a policy perspective this document gets implemented by taking the general policy in the document to another level. For example, taking from the Circulation Element and creating a Master Plan, then creating ordinances from that Master Plan and implementing the ordinances until it is Staff common practice. In 2001, the TCC formed a subcommittee to prioritize and identify based on a balanced approach and degree of difficulty or controversy embodied in a certain policy question. They prioritized first by a level ABC and then again numerically within each grade. The SB2030 process includes 5 policies noted under this process that are anticipated to be addressed in that process.

Mr. Pritchett asked how many people were on the original subcommittee. It was answered that three (3) members were on the subcommittee and then it was reviewed by the full committee three (3) or four (4) times before it was approved. It was then asked if any of those subcommittee members are still on the Committee now. The answer was no. It was also asked what the bold font and check marks indicated. The bold font indicates the policy. The implementation strategy has a third number. The check mark means one of two things. Either it's institutionalized or it lends itself to a declaration. A policy level would not have a check mark or a prioritization because that is the policy of the City. There are certain implementation strategies not found on the sheet because they are already common practice or because they are Capital Projects. It was also asked why some items are marked as a part of the General Plan Update 2030 and not others. It was answered that the ones marked as being a part of SB 2030 plan are believed to be the ones addressed within that process. It was suggested that the Committee could concur with or highlight other choices included under the General Plan Update 2030 at a future meeting. It was responded that the ones included under SB2030 are the ones that would *only* fit within that process. Transportation has clearly been identified as an issue for the SB2030 process in a broader level. If the Committee would like to suggest other policies those suggestions would be forwarded to the Planning Division to be incorporated in the work scoping presented to Council.

Mr. Tabor was pleased to hear that the scope of the SB2030 project was open for further discussion. He also recommended some reprioritization regarding creating a parking master plan and moving it from a Priority B level to a Priority A level. Other suggestions for reprioritization include prioritizing based on helping to meet other general plan goals by looking at transportation, housing, and open space issues as they all tie in together. Some of the issues that can tackle more than one issue should have more importance or a higher priority. Also "bang for the buck" could be a way to reprioritize where some issues may not be a high priority, but could be implemented more quickly than other issues and as such should be a higher priority.

Dr. Cooper agreed with Mr. Tabor in regards to the parking priority that a sound general plan on parking needs to be created. He also had questions in regards to the expansion of the upper State Street Project in regards to all the numerous smaller retailers. He asked specifically how we structure an Uptown Parking Committee for the smaller merchants who need to have some type of public parking available. He was concerned with the development of housing downtown and allowing residents to park in City lots because the merchants are taxed for the usage of City lots where the residents would not be taxed. He commented that as the downtown loses its private parking supply, it's going to force those people into the City's lots which are already being abused. There are a lot of issues that he would like to discuss with Downtown Parking Committee. He also asked what a Business Area Mobility Plan is. It was responded that the development came out of neighborhood associations, now the NTMP, wanting to be a part of the Circulation Element. It was also said that if the residents get a plan where the focus is on a neighborhoods, businesses also wanted a plan where the City focused on them. It was a compromise to get the policy approved and it keeps businesses and neighborhoods involved with the improvements or implementations being done that affect them.

Mr. Tabor asked why Priority A6, Creating a Master Plan for Cabrillo Boulevard, was still listed as an A priority since Council gave direction in the late 1990s to not proceed with this item. It was answered that Staff has been directed to not work on this Policy 9.5.1.

Mr. Pritchett asked if the West Beach Sidewalk Improvement program was represented in the Circulation Element as a task to be implemented. It was answered that it was believed to be included, but even so the implementation is not necessarily born out of this particular policy. The implementation comes from the Redevelopment and Council to revitalize a particular section of town that they believe needs help. Some history on why Council made that decision is because it relates to the development of Chase Palm Park on the north side of Cabrillo Boulevard between Garden and Calle Cesar Chavez. When the park was created there was concern that there was a four lane highway between two parks so there was an anticipation of some safety issues. The signal was implemented after the relinquishment of State Route 225. The only way to reduce the speed without enforcement was to reduce the lanes to two (2) on Cabrillo Boulevard. When that idea was floated, community members along with some Council members were taken aback by that idea and Staff was directed to not work on this policy. Aside from that, there are improvements that are listed in the Circulation Element that are being implemented without making specific reference to the policies. Mr. Allen gave the example of Policy 5.5, The City shall create and foster a pedestrian friendly environment through physical and cultural improvements and amenities; the West beach Improvement Project is a Capital Project being funded through the RDA. Although it is not a policy, it is consistent with the fostering of a pedestrian friendly environment due to the improvements such as street furnishings, viewing points, and installation of pedestrian signals on Cabrillo Boulevard. It was also responded that the West Beach Sidewalk Improvement Program also falls under Policy 9.1.1 Improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit in coastal zone. This policy specifically references the area of improvement to be between the Wharf and Harbor and La Playa areas.

Mr. Tabor expanded on his earlier comment on prioritization of parking. In regards to Priority C12, Research the availability and develop the mechanism that allows the general public to use private and governmental agency parking lots. It was asked if it costs over \$100,000 dollars to build a new parking space downtown and if we are able to spend less money on Staff time to gain access to existing spaces and better utilize them it would be a good priority to pursue to get more "bang for the buck."

Dr. Cooper asked about Policy 10.1.1, Create a Mobility Classification and Service System Map: Draft map has been completed, but not officially approved. He asked what the map was and why it was created. It was answered that the map was created based on the four (4) categories listed under the policy: Commercial, Residential, Mixed Purpose, and Gateway and its use is to meet the classification system of the State. The Committee, Planning Commission, and Council decided that classifying streets based on function did not apply to Santa Barbara. The map is based on land use on the side of the street instead of the function.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that after four years since the document was created; it is amazing how much has been done even though there is still a lot more to do. He congratulated the City for accomplishing so much in such a short amount of time.

Dr. Cooper voiced his concerns in regards to what the implementation of some of these policies is going to cost as a means to help prioritize projects.

6. **Staff Briefing on Current Topics.**

Mr. Allen gave a project update on the West Downtown Improvement project which is from the Ortega pedestrian bridge to Chapala Street and the Anapamu pedestrian bridge to Chapala Street. The project is 50 % through design and the design will hopefully be completed by the end of this fiscal year. Improvements include improving the pedestrian corridor on both sides of the street, adding mid-block pedestrian lighting, and enhancing pedestrian crossing with curb extensions at some intersections on both of those streets. It was also reported that Tully Clifford left the City on January 18, 2007. Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator, is the acting Supervising Transportation Engineer. Mr. Pritchett asked if the West Downtown project is the same project that the Redevelopment Agency was scoping a few years ago. It was answered that the project is RDA funded. The scoping was done in early 2001 and it was found that the community wanted safer conditions for pedestrians and more lighting. Mr. Pritchett then asked if the Transportation Division is involved with the Work TRIP Program that was presented at Council. It was responded that the Work TRIP program is a part of the Transportation Demand Management Program. Work TRIP is an enhancement of efforts the Transportation Division has already implemented to reduce trips to work. These enhancements include allowing City employees to use City fleet vehicles to establish a carpool, helping to subsidize the rides of City employees on the Clean Air Express, Coastal Express, or the Valley Express, and expanding the Alternative Transportation Challenge drawing where City employees using alternative transportation are eligible to win a \$20 gift card to various local merchants. The City Administrator's office is also putting together a Citywide committee for implementing a Citywide 9/80 program where administrative offices will be closed every other Friday to start in July 2007. Dru will come to a future meeting to discuss the program in more detail as the policy further develops. Mr. Dayton pointed out that that was Policy 6.2, B10 on the Priority in Process of the Circulation Element. Dr. Cooper asked for the definitive bottom line figures of the Transportation Demand Management program affecting St. Francis. It was responded that those figures are available and will be emailed to Dr. Cooper.

7. **Review of Upcoming Agenda Items.**

Mr. Allen will be bringing the results of the Downtown Employee Survey within the next few months. Parking staff did the door-to-door canvassing of the merchants in the downtown core to get a count. Staff is working on a report that will be hopefully brought in front of the Downtown Parking Committee and the TCC next month. A joint meeting can be held at the Committee's desire in March. Mr. Pritchett asked if this survey was replacing the consultant's report referenced in the December minutes. It was responded that this data Staff feels

confident in reporting to the Committee. Dr. Cooper asked if the forms he fills out every year for his business license were included in the compilation of data for the survey. It was responded that the data comes from a combination of business license information, door-to-door canvassing in 2005 with the MyRide bus pass program and 2006, as well as sending out post cards to businesses that were not there to answer the survey in person. Downtown Organization was not used as a source of information for this report. The report will be comprehensive and will include a methodology of what was used to come up with the numbers. Every business was canvassed. Mr. Coffman-Grey feels that it is important that this meeting be a joint meeting with the Parking Committee since the original meeting was a joint meeting. Mr. Pritchett would like to look at the Circulation Element matrix that was presented tonight in order to make recommendations for the General Plan Update process. There is already a Staff recommendation with the notations for SB 2030. Mr. Coffman-Grey suggested appointing a subcommittee at the next meeting when the new chair is appointed. He would also like to revisit when the chair and vice-chair are elected and move the election to January to be consistent with the rest of the Committees. Dr. Cooper commented that before recommendations could be made, implementation costs need to be evaluated in order to prioritize. Mr. Dayton responded that most of the items are policies without capital projects assigned to them. The process of estimating costs begins with asking what do we want to do with the question and if there is a capital project behind the answer then what will be the breadth be of that project. The aforementioned document is just getting to the question. Dr. Cooper gave an example of traffic calming circles and if anyone knew what the cost of the obstructions were going to cost initially. Mr. Allen clarified the confusion of some documents being referenced. John Ewasiuk presented the Capital Improvement Program for the next two (2) years. This Committee prioritized not only the upcoming two (2) year improvement program, but also the overall Capital Improvement program, the unfunded Capital Improvement program where dollar amounts are included. The Neighborhood Traffic Management Program had a dollar amount to it which the Committee recommended should be funded along with other physical improvements. The Circulation Element was specifically referenced in that document of unfunded Capital Projects. The document had amounts equaling close to \$20,000,000 in projects that were identified and prioritized by this Committee as well as by Planning Commission.

8. Committee Member/Subcommittee Member Comments.

Mr. Tabor thanked the Staff for getting the Measure E Report and referenced Exhibit G as being a good reference summary of development in the City over the last 16 years. He also expressed his enjoyment in seeing the Santa Barbara MTD commercials that are airing on local television. Mr. Coffman-Grey shared with the Committee that Committee Member Boyd requested a five month leave of absence from the Mayor starting March 15 to August 15, 2007. Mr. Dayton announced the Carsharing Seminar to be held on Tuesday February 1, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:16 PM

Committee Members: Bill Boyd, Mark Bradley, Michael Cooper (Vice-Chair), Keith Coffman-Grey (Chair), Steve Maas, David Pritchett, and David Tabor