



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, April 23, 2009 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Pritchett called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

Mark Bradley
Keith Coffman-Grey
Edward France
Steve Maas
David Pritchett
David Tabor

Attendance

Present
Absent
Absent
Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Kim Thaler-Strange, Administrative Specialist

LIAISONS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Victor Shur, Matt LaBrie of the DPC

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Victor Shur commented on fixing the intersection of De La Vina and Figueroa Streets. Mr. Pritchett replied that this was an agenda item for discussion, and that Mr. Shur can ask questions at that time.

Mr. Allen introduced Kim Thaler-Strange as the permanent Administrative Specialist.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. **Approval of Minutes from October 16, 2008 joint meeting with the Planning Commission; the Minutes of the January 22, 2009 meeting; and the Minutes of the Public Workshop on February 24, 2009, where a TCC quorum was present.**

Motion 1: Approve Minutes from October 16, 2008 joint meeting with the Planning Commission; the Minutes of the January 22, 2009 meeting; and the Minutes of the Public Workshop on February 24, 2009, where a TCC quorum was present.

Motion made by Committee Member Maas and was seconded by Committee Member Tabor

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

Committee Member Tabor commented that on the October 16 minutes, Judy Orias' name was misspelled.

Chairman Pritchett commended the Minutes for being thorough.

REPORTS

3. **MTD Transit Assistance Service Monthly Reports for December 2008, January and February 2009.**

Committee Member Maas stated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Pritchett asked if about the ridership trends based on the state of the economy. Mr. Maas replied that trends are up a bit. In first half of the fiscal year, ridership was way up, mainly due to the high cost of gasoline. Ridership is still up, but not as much as before. In March, there was a small decrease on lines 1 and 2 for unknown reasons.

Committee Member Bradley asked if fares went up in January. Mr. Maas confirmed that they did. However, ridership on lines 6 and 11 was still up. He said that February's numbers were not surprising, due to weather.

Chairman Pritchett asked if MTD staff discussed the possibility of the global economic recession having an impact on ridership. Mr. Maas replied that there is no real data to determine that, but it does impact funding issue. State transit funding has ceased and sales tax revenues are down by 1%.

Committee Member Tabor found an error on the December report: there was a 6.3% drop not a 4.5% drop. He also asked when the next public meeting is. Mr. Mass replied that MTD is having an open houses this week (the week of April 20) for people to come and find out about the proposed service changes. There is one on Saturday, April 25, for those who cannot make it during the week. The service changes will take place in August and coincide with the start of school. The report that discusses the proposed changes can be found on www.sbmtd.gov. The Board will be considering the changes at their May 6 meeting, and will approve the final version in late May.

Mr. Pritchett announced that the MTD Board meeting is on Wednesday, May 6 at 5:30 pm and that the City Public Works Budget Review is that morning.

4. **Review of the TCC Work Plan.**

Chairman Pritchett noted that a very brief staff memo listed projects that Committee is concerned with. These are capital projects and he requested that staff go down the list, and encouraged the two members of the public to comment if interested in any of the projects.

Committee Member Maas noted that the intersection of De La Vina and State Streets is not on list and wondered if this project would be coming back at any point in Fiscal Year 2010? Mr. Allen replied that this project will be back in Fiscal Year 2010; however, as this has already been discussed with the Committee and will not be back before them. Mr. Allen assured Mr. Maas that it would come back, however, if there were significant changes.

Mr. Allen went on to give an overview of the staff memo and reminded the committee that staff comes before them annually, in a workshop setting, to discuss the upcoming year's work plan so that the Committee knows what staff is working on, and can review the projects and ultimately make recommendations to Council. This workshop is a bit late this year due to issues with the budget. Staff wanted to see how the budget would impact the division before meeting with the Committee. There are several projects listed, but the emphasis is on priority projects.

Before getting into the project list, Mr. Allen gave an overview of the budget impacts to the division. He explained to the Committee that the division lost one Assistant Transportation Planner position (held by Dru van Hengel before she was promoted. Sarah Grant was moved into the Mobility Coordinator position). Because of the budget issues affecting Public Works and the substantial drop in Land Development fees, the position was eliminated from the budget. The salary savings were used to fund $\frac{3}{4}$ of a planner position in Land Development. However, because this particular position was slated to work with Rob on Planning projects, such as Plan SB, it will be difficult to do more than we have listed.

In terms of Capital Projects, we have two intersection projects. We will be signaling three intersections. The two highest priorities are the intersections of De La Vina and Figueroa Streets, and De La Vina Street and Canon Perdido. The De La Vina and Figueroa Streets intersection is the priority. These projects will be brought before the Committee in the next few months. At that time, staff will present options that the designer has come up with for addressing needs at the intersections. Staff can do a straight traffic signal or do we need a mast arm and why? Another possibility is to use an alternative similar to the intersection of Santa Barbara and Ortega Streets where we put curb extensions and a pole in, because the Historic Landmarks Commission had concerns about character of neighborhood. Staff has no preconceived ideas of what the project will look like. MNS Engineers will be working on the design for all three intersections. Two or three options will be brought before the Committee for review and recommendation to Council.

Mr. Pritchett reiterated that potential options are a mast arm or a curb extension and pole. Mr. Allen replied that staff does not know what the recommendation will be. The Visibility and Site Analysis is not done yet. Staff will be doing the same thing at De La Vina Street and Canon Perdido. We'd like to bring both intersections at the same time, but the De La Vina and Figueroa Streets intersection is priority.

Mr. Maas inquired about the estimated date that construction would start. Mr. Allen explained that both intersections were funded from the Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). The State of California overextended the award of TCRP funds against the money that was available. The available funds are based on sales tax revenue as well as money from the Federal Government. The State received less money from the Federal Government than they anticipated, and they cannot fund all projects. When the City goes out to bid with these projects, we will notify Caltrans, who will look at what projects have been submitted that are in need of funding. They will make recommendations to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). It is likely that this project will be funded in Fiscal Year 2011. Staff will continue moving forward with the design process so we can submit it to Caltrans when it is ready. The money for the design is committed from TCRP funds. Most of the money will be spent in preliminary design. The balance of the money will come out of matching funds in the Streets Capital Projects fund.

Mr. Shur requested that staff keep in mind the fact that the intersection of De La Vina Street and Canon Perdido is used by blind people learning how to walk. They also use Carrillo Street, but he is uncertain about Figueroa.

Mr. Pritchett asked if there was some kind of school for the blind. Mr. Shur replied that they get off at bus station and use that area a lot for their training, probably because they get off the bus there (at Figueroa) and at De La Vina Street and Mission Street as well.

Mr. Pritchett asked if staff will be doing anything special as far as signal design to accommodate vision impaired people. Mr. Allen replied that the City is required to comply with ADA requirements. There are requirements for design that include accommodation for hearing and vision impaired people.

Mr. Mass asked if the traffic crossings still chirps. Mr. Dayton replied that the sound is more like a ticking than a chirp. It's subtle but you can still hear it.

Mr. Pritchett asked if Mr. Shur is on one of the City Committees. Mr. Shur has been on various committees for 27 years. He was on the DACA committee and now is on the Access Advisory Committee. Kristy Schmidt is the Liaison to that committee. He also noted that Public Works and Building and Safety bring projects before them for review of access ramps and other improvements that support the disabled. The committee works to establish the priority of access ramps, and they have more ramps than money to do the ramps.

Committee Member Bradley commented that the public has been asking about the timing of De La Vina Street and Figueroa Street. Mr. Pritchett replied that 2011 is what we've heard

Mr. Bradley asked if there was any way to make this a priority and to possibly to trade funding with another project. Mr. Allen replied that possibility can be explored. If the City were to get reimbursed, it could be explored with Caltrans. However, there is a chance that the City would not get reimbursed. When the design is ready, it will be at Council's discretion if we want to do this with no reimbursement. It's not a large project, so staff is hopeful that this is the case.

Mr. Bradley asked if the City could time the lights all the way down De La Vina. Mr. Allen replied that this is a question for Dru Van Hengel, Supervising Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Allen talked about the Anacapa and Cabrillo Streets intersection first. This intersection is beachside by Skaters Point, and is heavily traveled by pedestrians because of it's proximity to the Garden Street Visitor's Center. There have been a few pedestrian collisions there, and several close calls. Per discussions, staff feels that it does not meet warrants for installation of a traffic signal. Staff has looked at other improvements similar to the Cabrillo Boulevard and Bath Street intersection and at Chapala the West Beach improvements that include a pedestrian refuge island and curb extension. The Project is partially budgeted, and depending on how other projects are bid, we may be able to free up funding and built it as part of the Cabrillo Bridge Replacement over Mission Creek. Funding for that project, however, is tied up with the state as part of its budget. The federal grant money that the City has is being used by the state for seismic projects. It is a \$20 million project, and needs to be built before staff considers a pedestrian project because a traffic control/detour will be need. It would be more effective to do the improvements as part of bridge replacement or after the bridge replacement. However, when staff moves forward with conceptual design of project, it will be brought before the Committee.

Mr. Pritchett asked if a crosswalk will need to go for review through other commissions as the

West Beach one did. Mr. Allen replied that staff cannot answer that question at this time, as it needs to be discussed with Community Development staff. Staff will know when the application is submitted. Mr. Pritchett confirmed that the design will have a pedestrian refuge island. Mr. Allen commented that the other two have refuge islands.

Mr. Pritchett asked for an update on Anacapa Street and Carrillo Boulevard intersection that was at Council on April 21. He reminded everyone that the intersection has the most collisions. Mr. Allen replied that this was at Council on April 21 for the Award of Professional Services to hire Penfield and Smith to do the final design. Council approved it with a vote of five in favor, one against and one abstention. This is a hot project that Transportation wants the Engineering Division to jump on because this is a high volume street/intersection safety imp.

Mr. Pritchett asked about Loma Alta. Mr. Allen replied that the project was put on hold because the California Transportation Commission (CTC) would not fund it. It will be recommended for funding at the CTC meeting next month. The project is being funded through a Transportation Enhancement Grant, which utilizes federal funds. The State of California is required to provide matching funds for the grant and they don't have the funds available. CTC staff recommended that the project move forward with a smaller amount of money. If the request for allocation is approved in May, the project can be out to bid by June first with construction starting in the summer

Mr. Pritchett then inquired about the sidewalk connection at Carrillo Hill. Mr. Allen stated that it was under construction and just about done.

Mr. Tabor asked about the rent at the intersection and commented that he has seen more people using the intersection of Cliff Drive and Meigs with the new signal phasing in place.

Mr. Pritchett asked if this would have a full sidewalk from Chino Street up the hill to Cliff Drive. Mr. Allen replied that there has been a path there that is being used more than people anticipated.

Mr. Pritchett asked if there were any other questions about street connectors. There were none

Chairman Pritchett moved on to Item B which is the Plan Santa Barbara (Plan SB) Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Travel Demand Model

Mr. Dayton said that the EIR for Plan SB was being reviewed through the summer. The draft document will not be out until after the election. Staff will be spending time with the Planning Commission and the Transportation Circulation Committee on an interim model run. There will be 3 model runs: The original Plan SB model which includes all the policies in framework document; Alternative 1, which is low-build/less than existing, like a down-zoning, and Alternative 2, which is high housing and the sky's the limit with alternative modes.

Committee Member Tabor asked if all the policies are being thrown in or individually. Mr. Dayton replied that we are not isolating anything. Staff explained that we are working with a consultant to find the benefit assigned based on other available empirical data available for specific actions being proposed. Mr. Dayton explained that the consultant wanted to know the specifics, to compare the empirical data with other areas with a similar infrastructure to find the benefit so it could be applied under the model run.

Mr. Tabor asked if there was anything established the model. Mr. Dayton replied that when the "do nothing" scenario was done, the number of intersections impacted went from 13 to 29. If we want to honor community interests with decreasing congestion or making congestion better it's a

tall order.

Committee Member Maas wanted to know if staff is using historical data for the growth rate and travel. Mr. Dayton informed him that it does not assume the growth rate, and the model is based on real land use, not just in the model area, but in Ventura and North Counties as well.

Mr. Maas reaffirmed that it does not assume a change in behavior. Mr. Dayton replied that it would only be with the factors that staff decides to do Plan SB is doing it's model run first to see how much change will be affected, to apply to Alternatives 1 and 2. Staff is trying to be creative with using the model. Mr. Maas asked when this will come back to the Committee. Mr. Dayton replied that it will come back hopefully in mid summer.

Mr. Maas asked when after the election the document would be out. Mr. Dayton replied if the timing was good, possibly January or February. He explained that initially, the trip generation rates account for a need for alternative modes now, and the future traffic model shifts in alternative transportation and land use placement. This is why the MODA was skinny. The General Plan currently allows for 12 units per acre, but this will be changing to be based on square footage, not the number of bedrooms. The package in the MODA allows for 1 parking space maximum and must be sold separately.

Chairman Pritchett asked if the alternatives in the draft EIR have different amounts of residential increases over time. Mr. Dayton replied that Alternative 2 shows increased in rate, and Plan SB displaces where the increases are. It's focused within the MODA.

Committee Member Bradley asked if multi-family structures were outside the MODA. Mr. Dayton replied that they were. The entire grid is multi family R2-R4 and the lower Riviera. R3 and R4 have the same density. R-2's density is six units per acre and R3 and R4 density is 12 units per acre.

Mr. Pritchett asked how many alternatives there were. Mr. Dayton replied that there were 3 alternatives.

Mr. Pritchett asked if 3 alternatives covered more residential density. Mr. Dayton replied that Alternative 2 is more focused on higher density housing with in the moda, and also there would be more of a focus on more conventional housing such as granny flats.

Mr. Bradley asked if the height ordinance would change the EIR. Mr. Dayton replied that Plan SB is using Paseo Chapala as an example of what it would look like with 25% of the square footage going away and more parking goes away.

Mr. Pritchett asked about a Joint PC/TCC meeting mid-summer. Mr. Dayton replied that it depends on how it plays out because there are other issues aside from transportation planning. Mr. Pritchett also asked if there will be a public meeting for Plan SB or if there would be anymore meetings or workshops. Mr. Dayton said to keep an eye on the Plan SB website.

Mr. Pritchett noticed that there was a joint meeting of the PC and TCC in March to discuss the Project Study Report (PSR) for the Mission/Las Positas Cottage Hospital Access.

Staff is looking at a hook off ramp by the Earl Warren Showgrounds. Staff received comments from Caltrans and are trying to make contact with the Earl Warren Showgrounds to get their comments. There is a joint meeting of the PC and TCC on June 11, 2009 at 6:00 pm, hosted by the TCC. The PC and TCC will receive the final report and give a recommendation for staff to go

to Council. If Council approves moving into the PSR, in the next Fiscal Year, the PSR will get us federal money to get the project moving.

Mr. Maas pointed out that it is in the minutes from the earlier meeting. SBCAG thinks it should be done in time for STIP funding. Mr. Allen said that he would remind them of what they said. Mr. Dayton reminded the Committee that it will depend on the Measure A survey.

Mr. Maas said that the City will get that in but Caltrans would be upset about the new northbound hook ramp being too close to La Cumbre off ramp. He wondered if they had commented. Mr. Dayton said they are okay with ramp but are concerned about the bridge abutment.

Mr. Bradley asked about double bike lanes? Was this option studied? Mr. Allen replied that this can be discussed at the June meeting, and could be controversial.

Mr. Pritchett affirmed that the item would be on the agenda. Mr. Allen said that the entire report was on the agenda and that the Committee can make a motion. Mr. Allen also mentioned Bath, Castillo, and De La Vina Streets being changed from 1 way to 2 way from Constance to Pueblo.

Mr. Pritchett asked where this would be written. Mr. Dayton replied that there would be a staff report. Mr. Pritchett asked where will important Circulation Elements fall in the PSR. Can staff identify the best option? Mr. Dayton said that he knows it is in the final report. Staff is using a traffic model.

Mr. Maas asked if this changes the traffic model run. Mr. Dayton replied that yes. The lane changes at Las Positas Road and Calle Real.

Mr. Pritchett reminded all that the June 11, 2009 joint meeting with the PC was at 6:00 pm

Mr. Pritchett and Mr. Tabor both asked where staff was with the reclassification of City Streets. Mr. Allen replied that Dru Van Hengel was working on GIS mapping and trying to find an intern to do the work. She will try to get the work done in the summer. Mr. Pritchett clarified that there are three classes of streets. Mr. Allen replied that they are collector, arterial and local.

Mr. Maas pointed out that collector and arterial streets get federal money by the mile.

Mr. Pritchett pointed out that local streets can be 25 miles per hour. Mr. Allen said that Council can do analysis and look for funding.

Mr. Maas asked if a reclassification needs a Council vote. Mr. Allen replied that we submit a new map to Council.

Mr. Tabor asked if the Circulation Element would be amended.

Mr. Pritchett pointed out that they are looking for objectivity. Mr. Allen replied that Dru was on top of it.

Mr. Maas asked about the timeline and Mr. Allen replied that we are looking at doing this during the summer with a reclassification next spring.

Mr. Dayton started the discussion of the Parking Design Guidelines. He told the Committee that the Guidelines were last revised in 1981. He pointed out that the land use must meet certain

requirements. Revising the guidelines to add alternative modes of access (sidewalk widths, types of bicycle parking, etc) will be coordinated with the Urban Design Guidelines.

Mr. Maas asked about the Master Plan. Mr. Allen replied that Plan SB needs to be completed first. Mr. Dayton added that the loss of one of the division's positions delays our work.

Mr. Maas asked about some linkage. Mr. Dayton replied that it's not the number of spaces but that the shape of the spaces and vehicle size needs to be considered. Compact spaces will be considered.

Committee Member Bradley left at 7:15

Mr. Maas asked about De La Guerra Plaza. Mr. Allen replied that a lot of projects were scaled back due to funding and that the RDA was working on it.

Mr. Tabor stated that RDA lost staff, but the West Beach Pedestrian Improvements are going forward.

Mr. Allen remarked that there was quite a bit to work on. Mr. Tabor replied to hire interns.

5. Meeting Schedule

Mr. Allen asked about a change in the schedule from monthly to quarterly meetings.

Committee Member Maas stated that if we only have the MTD reports to go over, do we need to have a meeting. Mr. Allen pointed out that it will take time to get projects ready to bring to the Committee. There could possibly be a meeting in June and one in July for traffic calming issues that need to go to Council before the end of the Fiscal Year.

Chairman Pritchett indicated that there was a meeting scheduled for June 25. He wanted to know if a Traffic Calming report for St. Francis and Safe Routes to school would be coming.

Mr. Allen pointed out that there is not going to be a meeting in May. He suggested that the fourth Thursday of each month could be reserved, except in November and December when the meetings are on the second Thursday, in case there is something that needs discussion. An email would be sent to the committee members at least two week prior to let them know. We will do cancellations.

Mr. Pritchett reiterated that he does not like not having meetings. Mr. Allen assured him that we are not fading away. Emails will be sent, but he reminded staff to respond only to the sender.

Mr. Pritchett requested that the TCC be notified if there is something on the Council Agenda. Mr. Allen answered that he and Kim Thaler-Strange reviewed all CARs prior to Council, and would notify the Committee if something important is scheduled.

Mr. Tabor indicated that there were a lot of things that staff thinks are important. Pressure for staff can cause setbacks. Mr. Allen said that staff needs to see what is important to Council.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:31 PM

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

April 23, 2009

Page 9 of 9

Committee Members: Mark Bradley (Vice Chair), Keith Coffman-Grey, Edward France, Steve Maas, David Pritchett (Chair), and David Tabor

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