



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, April 26, 2007 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:12 PM

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

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

Attendance

Excused
Excused
Present
Present
Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Teresa Martinez, Administrative Specialist

LIAISONS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sherrri Fisher, **General Manager, SBMTD**
Cynthia Boche, **Assistant Planning Manager, SBMTD**

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Dale Francisco, Secretary of Santa Barbara SAFE Streets, commented on the Commuter Rail Subcommittee who met with officials from Union Pacific (UP) on April 11, 2007. UP said it will not work with the existing infrastructure and that a double track from Oxnard to Goleta is needed in order to make commuter rail work. He thinks that these findings reflect on Transportation Planning in Santa Barbara. There is a lot of speculating of what might work and not enough research on what is happening on the ground. He commented that now we know short of a roughly \$2.5 billion investment of double tracking the rail, that we are not going to have a commuter rail system any time soon. Chair Cooper asked for more information on the Rail Subcommittee meeting to which Mr. Francisco was referring. Mr. Pritchett responded that the meeting was covered by the media. It was an open meeting with three council members who met with UP officials. UP says that can't do it because they need the capacity of freight lines. Pritchett commented that it is not as defeatist as the speaker made it out to be, but it definitely is a challenging issue. Dr. Cooper commented that he had a great experience in Spain on a high speed train and if the type of service that was had on that train could be gotten anywhere in this country, we would be looking at a different mode of transportation altogether.

Dr. Cooper asked why so many years were spent discussing this topic. Mr. Maas commented that UP has been looking at commuter rail for some time and there have been previous contacts regarding this. UP is interested in capital investments in their corridor before they would be in favor of commuter rail and it is not a dead issue. Mr. Dayton commented that the City has been in contact with UP in the past and this is not a new message. UP is concerned with the success of commuter rail because California has the highest growth of commuter rail anywhere in the nation. The capital success of commuter rail has been so extreme that commuter service has dominated the maintenance of the corridor between Sacramento and San Francisco. UP wants to protect their corridor for freight. The conversation is about how freight and commuter rail can exist together. We do need to have more capacity. UP representatives also indicated that they are more than willing to come to the table.

Mr. Bradley made a clarification to the comment regarding the said \$2.5 billion investment needed to double track the rail. From the three separate consulting studies looking at the cost of implementing commuter rail, it was never stated that double tracking was needed along the whole corridor. The consultants did say that between two to four sidings were needed.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. **Approval of TCC Minutes for March 22, 2007 and the DPC/TCC Joint meeting from March 8, 2007.**

Mr. Tabor moved and Mr. Coffman-Grey seconded approving the Minutes from the March 22, 2007 meeting.

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 Absent: 2

Mr. Coffman-Grey moved and Mr. Pritchett seconded approving the Minutes from the March 8, 2007 DPC/TCC joint meeting.

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2

REPORTS

3. **MTD's February and March 2007 Monthly Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle and Commuter Lot Shuttle Reports.**

Browning Allen introduced Sherrie Fisher, **General Manager** of MTD to discuss ridership issues on the Shuttles. Sherri Fisher informed the committee that Cynthia Boche, **Assistant Planning Manager**, MTD, put together a report based on the relationship between ridership on the shuttle and the use of hotels/motels by visitors in the community. How the information is distributed to the community will also be addressed. Feedback from the Committee is also welcomed. Ms. Boche stated that ridership correlates with other issues in the community, such as occupancy in hotels/motels and congestion. Fluctuations in tourism are reflected in the ridership of both the Crosstown and State Street shuttles while congestion issues affect the Downtown Shuttle, not the Crosstown Shuttle. Congestion is causing the State Street Shuttle to make a round-trip in 45 minutes, not 30 minutes as in the past. Marketing efforts include the "First Thursday" brochure. The State Street Shuttle is promoted in all "First Thursday" promotional brochures. Santa Barbara "Car-free" cards are also distributed on the Surfliner trains for tourists. Downtown Waterfront Shuttle information cards are distributed at 36 locations including most

lodging establishments and the Visitor's Center. MTD Shuttles and routes are also advertised in the Explorer Map and Seasons Magazine.

Committee Member Comments

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked if the differential in ridership between February and March was due to ~~weather since there was~~ on-going construction during both these months. Ms. Boche responded that, that would be her guess because March was five degrees warmer than February. Mr. Coffman-Grey then asked why this was only seen on the State Street Shuttle and not the Crosstown Shuttle. Ms. Fisher responded that it could also be because of the detour routes from State Street. Ms. Fisher also added that MTD personnel physically go to hotels/motels in order to brief hotel staff on the shuttles. She also mentioned the there are "over loads" on the shuttle which shows that there were times when passengers couldn't board the shuttle due to the shuttle being at capacity. This shows that more service is needed especially with the delays due to congestion.

Dr. Cooper asked that a report to be brought to a future meeting regarding the dollars being spent on marketing over time. He suggested using the money for more buses and drivers instead of on marketing if it is not effective. Ms. Fisher responded a report would be brought to a future meeting. Ms. Fisher also stated that on March 5, 2007, enhanced transit was started, with 10-minute headway on lines 6 & 11. In the three weeks since the inception of the enhanced transit service, ridership has increased 8%. Also, on May 1, 2007, MTD is going bio-diesel. There will also be eight hybrid vehicles operational on May 1, 2007 as well.

Mr. Pritchett asked how many hybrids there are on Lines 1 & 2. Ms. Fisher answered seven of the eight hybrids will operate on Lines 1 & 2. Pritchett then asked how many buses are on Lines 1 & 2. Fisher answered that there are seven, sometimes more, buses on Lines 1 & 2. Pritchett then asked for the number of shuttles that are at or beyond capacity out of the total number of trips throughout the year. Ms. Boche answered that out of the 363 days of the year that the shuttles run, 194 or a little more than half the days, there are trips that reach capacity or are "over loaded." Pritchett then asked if the spikes on the graphs indicate that more people are trying to get on the shuttles at those times. Ms. Boche answered that it probably has something to do with the times the driver changes their trip number. Pritchett commented that there seems to be a need for more shuttles to meet the demand of riders and to get the cars off of State Street. Dr. Cooper responded that no one is riding the bus at 9:00 a.m. and no one is riding the bus when they get off of work so this is not a means to get people out of their cars. He attributed the 3:00 p.m. ridership to school children. Ms. Boche responded that tourists mostly use the shuttle especially in the afternoons and on weekends.

Mr. Maas commented that there was one additional weekend day in March 2007 then there was in March 2006. He also brought to the attention of the Committee that on the chart comparing ridership to hotel/motel occupancy rates, the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) doesn't accurately reflect increases in tourism because as hotel rates increase so does the TOT.

4. **Carrillo Sidewalk Project**

Browning Allen introduced David Stubchaer, Supervising Engineer, Public Works, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Carrillo Sidewalk Project. The sidewalk link of Carrillo and Loma Alta Streets was identified as a high importance sidewalk link in the late 1990s. Due to the high cost of the project, grant funds were sought after so as to not deplete the funds for the Sidewalk Infill Project. Grant funds were received for both projects. Construction on the Carrillo Sidewalk Project is planned to begin before the end of this year. This project will construct new

curb, gutter, and sidewalk between Miramonte to the east of Kenwood by connecting the existing sidewalk. Parkways will also be constructed where feasible between Kenwood and Mountain View Roads. The sidewalk will be constructed on the north side of the road. Extensive landscaping will be done in the parkways. ABR has had their initial review of the project and it will now go to Caltrans for funding allocation by their deadline in late May, 2007. Mr. Stubchaer then opened up the discussion to questions and asked that the Committee find the project to be consistent with the Circulation Element. Mr. Dayton added that this project and the Loma Alta project would normally be a part of the Sidewalk Infill Program, but because they were such long sidewalk segments, these projects would have taken years of the budget. He also thanked Mr. Stubchaer and his staff for getting the project almost to construction.

Committee Member Comments

Mr. Maas asked if the sidewalk would be on the north side only and if there was plan to do the south side as well. Stubchaer replied that the places being looked at are completing the sidewalk on the north side down to the west downtown, and the south side down towards the Mesa. Mr. Maas then asked if many trees will need to be removed. Mr. Stubchaer answered that one live tree and several dead trees would be removed, but many bushes and other trees will also be planted. ABR is still looking at that issue, but where parkway cannot go, the pedestrian experience will be enhanced with other landscaping.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that he had witnessed the current problem for pedestrians and stated that it is too bad there is not enough money to do the whole thing. He hopes the Sidewalk Infill Program will be able to complete the missing sidewalk towards the shopping center. Stubchaer commented that Engineering and Transportation Planning are addressing this problem. Grant funds are expected to be received come July 2007.

Mr. Tabor commented that this was a long awaited project and filling the other links that Mr. Coffman-Grey referred to should be addressed in the next step. The undeveloped park across the street from Kenwood brings more people to the area which also makes this project very important. He was also thankful for keeping the trees.

Mr. Pritchett asked if there was no sidewalk at all. Mr. Stubchaer responded that on the map, the existing sidewalk was in red. Mr. Pritchett then asked what pedestrians currently do without sidewalks. Mr. Stubchaer answered that they walk along the shoulder. Mr. Pritchett then asked if the City is planning on having sidewalk go downhill east of Miramonte. Mr. Stubchaer answered that Transportation Planning and Engineering are discussing options based on State grants. Mr. Pritchett asked why the decision was made for this reach of sidewalk and not down the hill. Mr. Dayton responded that every part of the street was looked at and it was fully intended to fill all of the missing sidewalk links, but due to environmentally sensitive areas that were found it was decided to wait on the sections that would push the project back beyond the deadline to use the grant money. Mr. Pritchett asked what the environmental issue was. Mr. Dayton responded it was the archaeological issue of a shell scatter, possibly Chumash. Mr. Pritchett suggested installing a stoplight for pedestrians coming south of Miramonte who are trying to get to the newly constructed sidewalk. Mr. Dayton responded that Carrillo is a top priority for need of sidewalks. Mr. Pritchett clarified that it was a future funding priority, but because it is a dicey area, having it not so hazardous might increase pedestrians and bicyclists ***going downtown from the area along Miramonte Drive.***

Dr. Cooper asked what the budget for the project is, if the grant was only for just this project, and what is the timeframe for construction. Mr. Stubchaer answered the grant funds were

based on 2000 cost estimates and since prices have increased since 2000, general use grants are also being used to supplement the connection from Kenwood to the existing sidewalk to the west. The grants are per project in the amount of approximately \$800,000. The schedule for construction includes turning the project into Caltrans to get onto the California Transportation Commission agenda in order to get an allocation for funding, then getting an E76, Authorization to Proceed, then to bid, then to Council to award the project and then to construction before the end of the 2007 calendar year.

Mr. Tabor asked about the grey sections on the map around the roadway, near the intersections. Mr. Stubchaer responded that is where the access ramps will go.

Mr. Pritchett asked if it was routine that a pedestrian improvement or other project need to be found to be consistent with the Circulation Element; and, if so, why was this project coming to the Committee after it was already designed and ready for construction. Mr. Dayton replied that the Committee gets two opportunities to review projects. During the prioritization of the Capital Program and then again once the projects are developed and go through the planning stream. The Committee also sees the project before the budget starts to be spent. Since this project came from the Sidewalk Infill Program, the Committee was involved in establishing the criteria that went into establishing the priority of sidewalks. This project has also been before the Committee when the grant was proposed.

Motion 1

Coffman-Grey moved and Tabor seconded making the finding that the Carrillo Pedestrian Project is consistent with the goals of the Circulation Element.

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2

5. Circulation Element Priorities for Plan Santa Barbara

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, stated that this item was brought before the Committee at their request in January, 2007. It is the workload of the Committee to implement the Circulation Element (CE) at the policy level, such as implementing the Pedestrian Master Plan. Plan Santa Barbara, originally known as SB 2030, is a strategy for dealing with certain policy questions in the Circulation Element Prioritization. If there are policy issues that the Committee would like to see incorporated into Plan Santa Barbara, those suggestions can be collated and sent to the Community Development Director. Community Development is receptive to the Committee's suggestions of what should be included in the general plan process which will fully commence the Summer 2007.

Public Comment

Dale Francisco, Secretary of Santa Barbara SAFE Streets, commented on Priority 13.2.2 (b) to consider amending the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that he did not think that changing the parking requirements will be controversial because 9 out of 10 public comments at recently past Planning Commission meetings were in favor of having adequate parking for shopping and residences. He feels that unfortunately Transportation Planning thinks that by not having parking will force people through annoyance to not drive anymore. He does not think that this tactic will prove affective since those who purchase \$1,000,000 condos will not ride the bus to grocery shop at Gelsons. He would like the Committee to consider the real needs of those who

currently live in Santa Barbara rather than a utopian ideal of those who might live here in the future.

Committee Member Comments

Mr. Dayton stated that the organization, Cars Are Basic, faxed a letter that was distributed to the Committee, guiding the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Pritchett observed that the recommendations could be concluded during the May meeting of the TCC. He suggested using the present meeting to ask for clarifications on some of the priorities. He also proposed switching or confirming the priorities due to their original prioritization being quite a few years old and compiled by people who aren't even on the Committee anymore.

Mr. Maas observed that some of the elements in the priorities list are policies, as shown in bold. Policies tend to be more general statements; and the majority are implementation strategies for the various policies that can be taken. He thinks it seems odds to mix policies and strategies together and treat them as if they are at the same level. Dr. Cooper agreed.

Mr. Tabor asked for a definition of Plan Santa Barbara. Is it the catch-all, do-all, end-all as some say, or is it just a look at land-use policies? He commented that it is striking how many priorities incorporate land use and that it is hard to not push for full implementation of the CE. He also asked for clarification of what exactly is being asked of the Committee.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that as a member of the Committee when the final CE was presented, he would hate to start to reprioritize it due to the amount of work that was put into it by the previous Committee, and because it is not that out of date. He also commented that he would like to hear from the Community Development Director regarding what he would like changed in the CE for the upcoming process.

Mr. Pritchett asked what the priority groups mean and if the groups that certain priorities are in can be changed. Mr. Dayton responded that the A, B, C scale was the easiest way to prioritize. Mr. Dayton also reminded the Committee that the implementation of the priorities does not have to go in order, and that a lower priority could be addressed in Plan Santa Barbara because the land-use issue affiliated with that priority is being addressed. The priorities that have been recommended by Staff for Plan Santa Barbara are land-use issues even if they are a lower priority in the grading scale.

Mr. Pritchett commented that the process of demoting and promoting priorities is a way to build a consensus of the Committee. Mr. Dayton replied that the task at hand is to indicate which priorities are appropriate to include in Plan Santa Barbara in order to be able to include them in the process. Mr. Tabor agreed with Mr. Dayton.

Mr. Maas asked for clarification of those policies that have been completed and what happens to them in Plan Santa Barbara. Mr. Dayton responded that if they are not on the list, it is because they are already being implemented. Some of the elements on the list are not policy questions, but are Capital Improvement Projects and through them the policies are being implemented through practice. Mr. Maas asked if they would still be inundated in the CE. Mr. Dayton responded that the Community Development Director said that some elements of the Circulation Element would be reconsidered in the General Plan Update. Dr. Cooper stated that

it was his recollection that the Community Development Director's desire to include the Circulation Element due to opposition to the roundabout issue.

Dr. Cooper asked who has the final say in what the priorities really are. Mr. Dayton responded that the reason the General Plan is being looked at is in response to initiative Measure E. It is not in response to traffic calming because traffic calming is not a General Plan issue. The circulation issues in the General Plan Process are more questions of the right strategy with the types of land use and transit, for example, or looking at traffic analysis and traffic thresholds. Dr. Cooper responded that he remembered Measure E being a result of the concern of congestion at intersections and in response, the City allowed only residential growth which in turn resulted in more congestion at intersections. He then asked for clarity of what priorities need to be included in Plan Santa Barbara. Mr. Dayton replied that staff had indicated what they believed should be included and it was at the will of the Committee to include additional policies in Plan Santa Barbara and that is why this item is in front of them currently.

Mr. Tabor asked why the Parking Master Plan is not being recommended for Plan Santa Barbara. Mr. Dayton answered because the Parking Master Plan is so specific and does not lend well to the quantity of land-use issues. Following land-use decisions, you would point to the ideas in detail with the Parking Master Plan. Mr. Tabor also drew attention to the other side of that as well.

Mr. Pritchett suggested identifying policies regarding the broader issue of where cars would park. He then suggested considering the staff recommendations in order to confirm, nominate, or demote them and then to finalize the list at the May 24th meeting. He agreed that the policies should not be reprioritized after all.

Mr. Maas commented that it would be a lengthy process to vote on each issue. Mr. Pritchett suggested making lists individually in order to come to a quick consensus.

Dr. Cooper commented that it was understood that this would take more than one meeting due to the weight of the task. He suggested setting a date to collate the recommendations. He then asked if it was the Committee's obligation to represent the future of Santa Barbara in the next 20 years or if the obligation was to represent the people now, and if the answer is to represent the people now, who gives the Committee the right, for example, to make disincentives for driving if 75% of the people want to drive alone. Mr. Dayton replied that staff already recommended the policies that they felt were appropriate to be included in the plan. Staff did not ask the Committee to add to the recommendations; the Committee asked to be a part of it.

Mr. Tabor stated that innovative ways to increase capacity without building more roads needs to be thought of in order to create a thriving community in the future.

Mr. Dayton underscored the fact that the Circulation Element policy document is an auto-oriented document that was created for the sole purpose of protecting the public's right to use their car with the least amount of congestion. If the eminent congestion was not present, this document would not exist. Staff fully realizes the majority of people in the future are going to use their cars. This community has demanded a very low level of congestion in comparison to other cities. The goal of the Circulation Element is to keep that congestion at a minimal level. In order to do this, a small percentage of people need to use alternative modes of transportation.

Mr. Maas commented that the future of convenience is market driven and as land becomes more valuable, owners will use land for lucrative purposes other than parking. Additionally, as the cost for building new parking spaces increases so will the cost to utilize those spaces.

Mr. Coffman-Grey recommended coming back at the May 24th meeting to further discuss this item. Mr. Dayton set the deadline for the Committee to submit their lists of recommendations to staff by May 7, 2007.

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

Mr. Dayton informed the Committee that the date for Council to hear the appeal of the ABR decision regarding the aesthetics of traffic calming devices has been set for May 22, 2007. Also Upper State Street will be presented at Council on May 8, 2007 at the evening session.

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

On May 10, 2007, at 8:15 a.m. in the David Gebhard Public Meeting Room, there will be a joint meeting with the TCC and the DPC regarding Transit Village. Dr. Cooper asked what stage in the process for Transit Village will be presented at this meeting. Mr. Dayton replied that it is the middle of the introductory process. The presentation to be seen is in response to Council's feedback on the project.

On May 24, 2007, the discussion regarding the prioritization of the Circulation Element will continue as the only item on the agenda.

"Date Uncertain" items include hearing the update from the Streetlight Advisory Committee. Mr. Pritchett asked if there are items on the agenda after May and if not, does the Committee still meet. Mr. Dayton responded that there are items that staff is working on, such as the Access and Parking Design Guidelines that are used in the land development process.

8. **Committee Member/Subcommittee Member Comments.**

There were no Committee Member/Subcommittee Member Comments.

Please Note: These Minutes were revised on Thursday, May 24, 2007. Items in bold and italics have been added to the Minutes, while items that have been crossed out have been deleted.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:59 PM

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

Liaisons: Roger Horton (Council Liaison), Addison Thompson (Planning Commission Liaison)