



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, April 22, 2010 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Bradley called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

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

Attendance

Present
Present
Present
Present
Present
Absent

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer
Kim Thaler-Strange, Administrative Specialist

LIAISONS PRESENT:

Michael Self, Council Liaison
Deborah Schwartz, PC Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Damiano, MTD
Sherrie Fisher, MTD

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. Approval of Minutes from the February 2010. Committee Member Coffman-Gray noted that Hillary Blackerby was not on the minutes and indicated that she should be added.

Chair Bradley called for a motion.

Motion : Approval of the Minutes from the April 23, 2009 meeting.

Motion made by Ms. Blackerby and was seconded by Mr. Pritchett

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

Committee Member Tabor arrived at 6:15

REPORTS

3. MTD Monthly and quarterly reports for March and the Quarter ending March 31, 2010.

Chair Bradley asked if Steve Maas or Sherrie Fisher of MTD Had any comments on the reports.

Mr. Maas: Rider ship is down. However, the 5-year trend show an upward curve.

Mr. Pritchett indicated that his comment merges with the next agenda item.

4. MTD Presentation of Service Changes

Sherrie Fisher of MTD Gave a report on the changes that were slated to take place in fall 2010.

Ms. Fisher pointed out that MTD has been doing table hours at places including: City College, the Transit Center, UCSB, and La Cumbre and State. There is still opportunity to email MTD or write and give opinions. There is still time to discuss changes for Fall. The goal is to reallocate service hours to maximize efficiency. There will be a 1% (or 2000 revenue hours). There was also a need to correct schedule adherence problems (also known as 'the bus was late').

Line 3 will be reduced to 30 minute headways during non peak weekday hours (9 a.m. – 2 p.m.). Line 6 will have some hours reallocated to improve schedule adherence. Five minutes will be added to this line to keep it on schedule. This line is meant to be coordinated with line 11. There will be five minutes added to Line 17 for better schedule adherence. Two late evening trips from City College will be eliminated (9:16 and 10:16 p.m.). The line 5 will make up for that.

Line 21's Sunday services will be eliminated due to low rider ship. Line 20 will still run on Sunday.

Line 27 will run with 30-minute headways as opposed to 12-minute headways on weekdays when UCSB is not in regular session (This includes breaks). This line has been incredibly successful, with a 300% rider ship increase. This line will coordinate with lines 6, 11, 12 and 24.

Line 2210, which is a school booster from the Mesa to Santa Barbara High School will be eliminated due to low rider ship. Line 5 still services the Mesa and there are other buses that also provide service the Mesa.

Finally, On Veteran's day and New Year's Eve, busses will run on Saturday service schedule.

Sherrie encouraged people to go online and look at specific changes. She also indicated that she had copies at the meeting.

Chair Bradley confirmed the website – www.sbmtg.gov.

Mr. Pritchett asked if the new schedule starts in July. Ms. Fisher replied that it starts in August. He then reaffirmed that the current schedule runs through August, and suggested that MTD staff add a word or phrase to clarify what you mean when you refer to "regular" session at UCSB, since many staff and students consider the summer session a regular session. Mr. Pritchett also inquired if the addition of five minutes for schedule adherence would mean that there would be a longer headway for riders. Ms. Fisher replied that for most trips, lines 6 and 11 would be able to maintain the headway, although there might be an 8 or 12-minute headway on one or two trips to

correct the five minute difference. She also pointed out that the 5 minute difference would be spread over the entire length of the route.

Mr. Pritchett asked if these changes were shaving 1% off the budget. Ms. Fisher replied that they were. Mr. Pritchett went on to ask what other ways the budget was balanced. Ms. Fisher replied that MTD has some budget difficulties but the problem is in the \$400K to \$500K range. We have ARRA funds that we can transfer to Operations if necessary, but they have to last. 2000 hours won't save the budget, but staff is exploring other options. Also, MTD is in contract negotiations with the teamsters.

Mr. Pritchett asked what the public can expect in regards to changes and if this was a commitment that the changes presented are the only scheduled ones. Ms. Fisher replied that these are the only proposals to change for the fall. Anything else is up to the board; however she does not expect that there will be any changes.

Mr. Pritchett pointed out that the State Street Shuttle only costs \$.25, which people think is way too low. Does MTD have anything to do with determining the price of the shuttle? Ms. Fisher answered that: the \$.25 revenue gets turned over to the City; and that they are strongly supporting shuttle. If the price were to go up to \$.50, it would have to be done internally at MTD, with the rider input, but the City would be involved as well. Mr. Pritchett affirmed that MTD doesn't get that money.

Mr. Allen stated that under the City's current contract with MTD, the revenue created by the State Street Shuttle offset the cost. If the price went up to \$.50, the City would either keep the money, or the money that is given to MTD would be reduced. When the Enhanced Transit Subcommittee looked at the expansions, that was part of the discussions. The Subcommittee did not want to mess with the Shuttle. The issue can be revisited in the future with direction from Council. MTD would have to do the analysis. The City is getting \$120,000 in revenue from the Shuttle, which reduces the amount of money we have to pay for the Shuttle. The money currently come out of, Measure D, RDA and DTP funds. The City has a \$1.1 million dollar contract with MTD, which is reduced by the Shuttle revenue, which fluctuates based on rider ship.

Mr. Pritchett then inquired that if there was more revenue from the shuttle, would it go into the streets fund. Mr. Allen replied that staff would have to look into how that is divided. Mr. Pritchett stated that the figure should be nailed down. Ms. Fisher indicated that MTD would be willing to have that discussion.

Mr. Bradley asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Blackerby thanked MTD for reaching out to the rider ship for their input. She commented that it is a good way to let people know what is going on and solicit feedback. It gives MTD cover to say that they have reached out to their rider ship. She expressed an interest in seeing the feedback. Ms. Fisher replied that they have heard very few complaints about changes. MTD is aware that what they do affects the riders and community, so they want to hear about it.

Mr. France thanked Ms. Fisher for the presentation, and stated that he had an overall comment. As a casual rider, his problem is adherence, because it's not known at the time that a bus is running late. On non-workdays there is a lack of ease of reference for schedule changes, especially for weekends and holidays. He suggested that the schedules be simple, and schedule changes include another layer of confusion. Pointed out that in some hubs in other cities, there are led displays that show the times, as well as delays and schedule changes. This is a "quality of use" enhancement. Ms. Fisher indicated that the suggestion is on the long term

Capital Project list. MTD does not have the funds at this time. Ultimately they would like to have a GPS system that could be accessed by phone or display to give notice of delays. They recognize the importance of this.

Mr. France also repeated Mr. Pritchett's comment about UCSB's "regular sessions." He expressed his pleasure that the shuttle is so successful and pointed out that summertime is a well-used time for UCSB and the transit-dependent programs that are run. Maybe the changes in August should be reviewed.

Mr. Coffman-Grey said he was pleasantly surprised at how small the reductions are, indicating that the changes were just small tweaks that needed to be done annually. He also said that it was fortunate that there was only a 1% change.

Ms. Fisher replied that MTD had a contract for fuel costs that helped with their ability to keep changes small. Unfortunately, the fuel contract is ending. Bids are out for a new contract, but they probably won't get the same cost. MTD was fortunate to have had the contract and the stimulus funds.

Mr. Bradley thanked Ms. Fisher for the presentation and asked if there were any fare increases planned for this year. Ms. Fisher replied that there were no fare increases this year, but MTD will be discussing the 10 ride and 30 day passes at some point.

Mr. Bradley also asked if MTD would be gaining Measure A money soon, and if the sales tax drop affected revenue budget. Ms. Fisher replied that Measure A started on April 1, 2010. After a few months MTD will get the first monies. However, as with every agency that is receiving Measure A funds, the expectation is that there will be less money than originally anticipated due to the economy.

Mr. Bradley asked if the schedule adherence on lines 6 and 11 was due to people getting on and off, or other traffic issues. Ms. Fisher answered that it was due to both. These lines are very successful; however, with a line as long as the 6, any road construction or accidents will affect it. Mr. Bradley asked if this adjustment occurred only during peak periods. Ms. Fisher replied that it occurs all day but more so in the peak periods.

Mr. France asked about the Capital Plan. He indicated that there has been a mode share increase in bicycling of about 3-5%. Are there any bicycle facility changes planned for MTD? He pointed out that it would enhance the range of rider ship if there were adequate bicycle facilities. He also stated that there is a lack of secure bike parking around key bus stops. Is that in the Capital Projects. Ms. Fisher replied that there are no plans now, but there could be in the future. It could be less expensive than some other projects, and there may be grant opportunities. MTD would like to have a 3 bike rack on the busses, however it does not meet California standard of how far it can stand out in front of the bus. There is no change there for now.

Mr. France indicated that he understands the challenge. He pointed out that in the next 5 years, security improvements, especially at the transit center could be perks. Ms. Fisher said that they would have to get input from the City. The 2 bike racks are successful; however, people tend to forget their bikes on the rack.

Mr. Bradley inquired about Measure A bike improvement programs starting up. He said that this type of improvement would improve the interface. He also asked if the change to the IV Shuttle will be to the weekend schedule? Ms. Fisher said yes. Mr. Bradley indicated that it would be good to look at the numbers.

Chair Bradley asked for comments and hearing none, moved on to item 5

5. Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer presented an update to the Capital Improvement Program Report from the February meeting.

Mr. Ewasiuk addressed the revised handout correcting a minor error pointed out by Maas, and indicated that he made the same presentation to the Planning Commission earlier that day, and reminded the Committee that he was presenting his report in accordance with the Circulation Element. The focus of his report was on funding priorities, proposed updates, and the Fiscal Year 2011 Streets Capital Improvements budget.

He indicated that there is limited available funding, as revenue projections continue to go down, and competing project priorities. It is important that the City work to maintain the infrastructure before tackling new projects. The six-year CIP is published, and ready for review, addressing both funded and unfunded projects. This is a one-year budget as opposed to the usual two year budget. The Streets CIP will be going to Finance Committee and Council in upcoming weeks.

There are three funding sources for Streets Capital Revenues: Measure A, which replaces Measure D, which expired in March, in the amount of \$680,000 and declining; Utility Users Tax in the amount of \$1.35 million; and grant funds totaling \$4 million, including \$2.2 million for the Ortega Bridge Project, \$1 million for Pavement Maintenance; and \$800,000 for the Safe Routes to School, including the Jake Boysel Bike Path Project.

Projects that would have consequences if not done are the highest priority, including ADA projects, maintaining infrastructure, maximize leveraging of City's funds through grants, and street safety projects. Policy improvement projects are also important.

Mr. Ewasiuk also discussed the number of projects in the CIP, and how eight projects had to be eliminated as staff had to cut an additional \$400,000 from the budget. He expressed the opinion that finance will be giving staff even more reduced numbers. The projects that were removed cost anywhere from \$25,000 to \$100,000 each. Currently staff is trying to keep as many items as possible by spreading out the money and planning to defer or find alternate funding sources for certain projects. Public Works staff is also banking money as much as possible, and utilizing cost savings from under-budget projects to help fund other projects. An example of this is the Ortega Bridge Project, which will utilize cost savings from the Haley/De La Vina Bridge Project. Projects such as the Laguna Pump are being delayed, and sidewalk infill has been removed for right now. Other projects are not due to start for several years. Grant funds are being utilized as much as possible, but in some cases, the City needs to find matching funds. The pedestrian refuge islands and traffic safety education projects are new, and hard to find funding for.

Other project budgets were adjusted. The Mason Street Bridge, and Traffic Signal Operational Upgrades were reduced by \$25,000, while the Bridge and Drainage System Maintenance Projects were increased by \$25,000. Pavement maintenance was increased by \$164,000 because other projects were cut, but will be reduced due to revenue projections. Staff estimates an approximate reduction of \$100,000 - \$200,000. The city has budgeted \$2.2 million in that line item, but is now budgeting \$1 million. \$2.7 million in stimulus money has been received which helps with the shortfall.

Chair Bradley opened the floor for questions

Mr. Maas complemented Mr. Ewasiuk for doing a very good job of prioritization in a tough economic climate. There were two projects that were not addressed during this presentation though they were on the previous list under safety upgrades – the Carrillo/Anacapa and Figueroa/De La Vina intersections. Mr. Ewasiuk replied that the City received \$400,000 in grant funds for the Carrillo/Anacapa intersection thereby allowing the money allocated for that intersection to be used for the Figueroa/De La Vina intersection.

Mr. France asked if the grant funds were for both intersections. Mr. Ewasiuk reiterated that the grant is for Carrillo/Anacapa, which frees up that money for Figueroa/De La Vina.

Mr. France asked if this was money encumbered from previous years. Mr. Allen said that the Committee was given a presentation on this project last year. It does appear on the CIP, and is included as part of the Highway Safety Index Grant. The grant will be used for the Carrillo/Anacapa intersection and the City money will go to the Figueroa/De La Vina intersection, which was originally going to be funded by the Traffic Congestion Relief Program. The problem was that staff didn't know when they would see the money from that program as more awards were granted than available money. These projects are Council priorities so money had to be switched around. Mr. Allen reassured Mr. France that both projects are still on the list.

Mr. Coffman-Grey said he was pleased that De La Vina was mentioned, and is on its way through the process. He pointed out that although the economy is going through tough times, he hates seeing alternative transportation projects being put away. He indicated his understanding that the budget and infrastructure maintenance is important for streets. When he initially saw the maintenance projects going from \$900,000 to \$1 million he thought those funds could be utilized to save other projects. He recognizes that street maintenance is important and will save more money in the long run, and that this would be far worse without Measure A.

Mr. Tabor said that he appreciates the extra effort that has to be put into this. His concerns were addressed when he saw that the bridge projects drop off list, but are not necessarily going off schedule. There's no funds for them right now. He noted that while a couple times a year there is news of sinkholes in other areas, but never here.

Ms. Blackerby said she can only imagine how hard it is to deal with this issue, and asked about the meetings on April 27 and 29. Mr. Allen replied that the Finance Committee meeting on April 27 starts at 11:00 a.m., and the Council meeting on April 29 is from 9:00 a.m. to noon. She also expressed her appreciation for ARRA funds.

Mr. Pritchett pointed out the increase for Drain System Maintenance and asked if this was because of the failed culvert on Modoc? Mr. Ewasiuk explained that the failure was in the corrugated metal pipe under Modoc. This pipe drains the freeway and railroad tracks. It needed to be repaired before the forecasted rain for the following week. Shortly after that repair was made, another larger pipe on Cathedral Oaks needed repair to avoid a potential sinkhole. While these projects were not necessarily significant in cost, they did deplete the Drainage System Maintenance Funds.

He asked Mr. Allen to remind the Committee about the shuffling of funds for Carrillo/Anacapa and Figueroa/De La Vina. What is the mechanism? Mr. Allen said that these were scheduled in the program and there would be discussion on how they will move forward. Mr. Pritchett then reiterated that the meeting on April 27 was the Finance Committee meeting and the April 29 meeting was a Council meeting. Mr. Allen explained that at the Tuesday meeting the

Department heads will discuss where the City is with regard to revenues, and on Thursday, the topic will be the entire City budget.

Mr. Pritchett brought up that the Figueroa/De La Vina intersection was the site of a pedestrian fatality. He asked when the Committee will see some designs for this, if we have the money to move forward. Mr. Allen replied that there is no definitive date to bring before the Committee. MNS is doing the conceptual design; staff is trying to get a status report from them. The goal is to bring this item before the Committee in the next couple of months. Staff will bring three different options so that the Committee can make recommendations. He expressed his hope that staff would see something by the July meeting.

Mr. Pritchett also would like to hear his fellow committee members comments on the BTA, and why this line item is zeroed out, with staff saying that matching funds will be found if needed. He indicated that he is uncomfortable with this approach, and would like to see the line item the way it was. While he acknowledges that staff does not want to chip into the Pavement Maintenance budget, he recommends moving the budget numbers around so the BTA would stay there, and develop a narrative about why the math is needed. It would be a good message to the public that the City is ready to do a policy statement. Mr. Allen replied that he appreciated Mr. Pritchett's concern, and said that staff had the same concern. The City had applied for BTA grants during the current fiscal year. \$29,000 was what we needed for matching funds. He does not know if we will get the grant. We have 3 -4 years to complete projects and can get an extension if necessary. It is better not to plan, giving the workload. If the City gets the grant, staff will ask for the money. Staff had to make the choice and decided to move forward with project that need to be done that are already funded. Mr. Pritchett countered that there is a policy precedent for the bridge projects, and that he is trying to balance from the other side of the table.

Mr. France is not comfortable with the thinking behind the cuts for all Transportation projects. He understands the situation, but would love to see the pavement budget, because it is like the bridge budget. He said that Projects can be put off, however, the ability to think critically becomes important when dealing with other vital projects that are important to a growing number of alternative transportation users. He referenced the 2% increase in the mode share of cyclists, and indicated that the Bicycle Coalition has been conducting a survey that states that the main reason why more people don't become cyclist is due to safety concerns. He expressed a desire to make the argument for more abstract projects that are needed such as traffic safety education. There are more cyclists out on the road and a relative level of unsafe streets. This has been a priority in the past. He does not think that people really understand how important it is. There should also be more scrutiny of the thinking behind these cuts, as this isn't about money, but about the safety of the mode share.

Mr. Bradley pointed out that part of the effect of a weak economy is that more people are using alternative modes, and that should be taken into consideration. He asked if it was possible for matching grants to put it conditionally in the budget, for example if a grant is received before a certain date, could it go to that project? Mr. Ewasiuk replied that the Pavement Maintenance Fund is a slush fund. If there is an emergency and there isn't enough money in other accounts, money is taken out of the Pavement Maintenance Fund. That money is considered liquid, and there is a large amount of it. Mr. Allen added that staff will be holding off on capital projects going out to construction until the second half of the fiscal year because of the economy and the fact that sale tax revenues are down. If we are going to get the BTA grant, there would still be matching money for projects. Holding off on capital projects gives us a bit of flexibility. Also, it insures that we have the money. The amount of money we have available could be reduced if the economy doesn't get better. Tough decisions had to be made, and staff has been asked to look for grant opportunities. Mr. Allen stated that this was the toughest budget he has dealt with

in his 30 years of public service. Staff has to take a hard look at what is available in order to move forward. Maintaining the infrastructure is essential. The first cycle of Measure A money will come to the City in Fiscal Year 2012 for pedestrian, bicycle and Safe Routes to School improvements.

Mr. France replied that this is a difficult situation. He emphasized that robust bicycle user ship and pedestrian rates are long term goals. He pointed out that robust alternative transportation user ship is maintaining the infrastructure.

Mr. Bradley asked if the two large bridge projects at Haley and Cabrillo will require City money in 2011. Mr. Ewasiuk replied that the Haley/De La Vina Bridge Project is fully funded due to the banking of money over several years. The Cabrillo bridge project has been banked, but the right of way phase has taken longer than anticipated. It may be in construction by this fall. No more funding is needed for this project. However, there are new bridge projects: the Ortega Bridge, which is fully funded; Mason, Chapala and Yanonali Streets Bridge, and the Cota Street Bridge. These are grant projects that we are currently banking money for. Staff's careful utilization of funds over the years, coupled with strategic planning allows this opportunity. Mr. Ewasiuk concluded by saying that pavement maintenance is the best surface we can apply for all modes of transportation, not just cars.

Chair Bradley asked for more comments, and hearing none, moved to item 6.

6. Plan Santa Barbara Draft EIR

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner presented the Plan Santa Barbara Draft EIR.

Mr. Dayton said that this is the year of decision and gave a summary of the timeline and steps taken in the report. In general, the DEIR recognizes that additional growth occurring incrementally over the next two decades has the potential for significant impacts cumulatively citywide by 2030. In many instances existing City policies and proposed *Plan Santa Barbara* policy amendments would reduce these environmental effects. The DEIR also identifies mitigation measures as needed to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. Mitigation measures would become additional policies and programs in the General Plan. The DEIR also analyzes comparative environmental effects of alternative policy and growth scenarios ("No Project"/Existing Policies, Lower Growth, and Additional Housing alternatives), and considers regional environmental effects and longer-range effects.

Class 1 impacts would be significant. Increased peak-hour traffic congestion. (Mitigation measures MM T-1 road/signal improvements and MM T-2 to reduce peak-hour vehicle trips and increase use of alternative travel modes through modified parking requirements and pricing and transportation demand management measures.)

Class 4 impacts would be beneficial. Reduction in per capita vehicle commute trips from Plan Santa Barbara transportation policies on parking, transit, mode shift, bus passes, telecommuting/alternative work schedules, car and van pooling, and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

The central transportation issue facing the City is how to accommodate incremental growth while minimizing or avoiding increased congestion at freeway interchanges and major City roads, such as Upper State Street. The DEIR shows that, although better than the No Project Alternative, Plan Santa Barbara as currently proposed will nearly triple the number of significantly impacted intersections in the City.

The traffic model demonstrates that eliminating growth altogether will not eliminate increases in traffic congestion as the trend of less people living and working in the City continues. The analysis shows if people continue to relocate outside the City and drive to work via U.S. Hwy 101, traffic at the freeway interchanges will continue to increase.

The DEIR analysis indicates the most effective measure to combat traffic congestion is to aggressively support Travel Demand Management strategies that include parking pricing management in the Downtown, as well as other strategies described. The analysis shows that the aggressive support of Travel Demand Management strategies analyzed in Alternative 2 (Increased Housing) could be applied to any of the other scenarios described in the DEIR and significantly reduce congestion impacts in each. Additionally, the analysis shows that future development generates the least amount of increased traffic if located within the Downtown core and along major transit corridors north of U.S Hwy 101.

While parking pricing strategies implemented in the Downtown could have the greatest reduction of traffic congestion, implementing such a policy would also have economic ramifications. Therefore, to be successful, parking pricing strategies must be carefully designed to contribute to the economic vitality of the Downtown.

Irrespective of the amount of land use growth, decision makers must determine the appropriate balance between future congestion levels and the aggressiveness of the City's travel demand strategies.

Mr. Allen interjected that before questions, he would speak to the regulation of parking inventory. He indicated that the parking inventory had not been discussed with the Downtown Parking Committee (DPC), and suggested to their Chair that there should be a joint meeting to discuss the parking inventory data. The DPC is meeting on May 13, and are interested in discussions with the TCC.

Mr. Dayton added that the Planning Commission wanted to pursue the parking pricing, but that this is a Downtown stakeholder issue. Staff was invited to the DO retreat and gave a presentation. He indicated that the City owes its transportation success to Downtown businesses. State Street Plaza was created to emulate La Cumbre Plaza. The DO was in agreement and excited about the possibility that Downtown housing could create a living customer base.

Chair Bradley opened the floor to questions and comments.

Mr. Bradley asked about the time of the DPC meeting. Mr. Allen replied that it would be May 13th at 7:30 a.m. Mr. Bradley replied that he had heard that increased housing would generate more trips and needs for more services, even if employees are moving closer to work. His belief is that it is not a strong case for Downtown. He asked Mr. Dayton what the model showed.

Mr. Dayton replied that it depends on where housing is being put. If housing is in Downtown, it would have a neutral impact. A big project, however, might create a stir in area. The City's grid system has the ability to absorb, and there is a very high capacity to move cars, bikes and people. If you put house on the Mesa on the other side of the freeway, there would be more congestion because people would have to cross the freeway. It would be similar with the San Roque area. Housing placed outside of the Downtown core increases congestion, housing within the core has no effect.

Mr. Bradley said that even though parking increases seem to count for most of the traffic demand management, parking pricing would not have much of an effect if there weren't good alternatives to driving such as busses and bike lanes, which we have. He stressed the importance of recognizing that. If there are no options, people will pay to park rather than use

those alternative modes. There is some synergy there that more bike lanes and better services could make traffic demand management more effective. He also noted that there wasn't much quantitative evidence on auto trip reduction due to bike lanes and safe routes. There is new evidence and meta analyses that he will send to the consultants and maybe it can be revisited. It is not clear how many things take some number of automobile trips away. Mr. Dayton replied that the consultants forced us to do that because that couldn't be measured at the time. The study is meant to show changes that can be expected, that are conservative and empirically proven. The measures in this study are empirically proven.

Mr. Bradley asked to see the decision point slide again and asked about phasing because both the Housing Element and the Land Use Element have to be decided on before the Circulation Element. This is where the traffic demand management comes in. He is uncertain as to how balance can be achieved if decisions happen at separate times. Mr. Dayton replied that the land use decision has not been made. Mr. Bradley replied that the traffic demand management would be mitigation for some of the differences between land use plans, but the decision is not being made until after. Mr. Dayton replied that the decisions would have to be made together because it is specifically and legally tied into environmental document.

Mr. Bradley then asked if the document says that this needs to be done as mitigation for adverse effects that it would be all part and parcel. Mr. Dayton replied that is the reason why we asked the consultant what is the parking pricing contribution. He anticipates that will be the discussion, and that staff wants to keep eyes open as to what is real.

Mr. Tabor said that he enjoys seeing things come together. He is glad to hear about the connection and see info on housing Downtown and the relationship between housing and traffic. He thinks that the argument can be made that if we build housing, we can't guarantee that the people who buy the houses will work downtown. More than likely, the kind who would want to live downtown would be the type of person who has a job downtown. Most jobs are retail and maybe those people can't afford expensive condos or only have one car. It may tie into the equation. This brings out all the mode share questions that are in Circulation Elements goals and policies about increasing mode share. This gives staff the ability to go forward and bust through the existing barriers. He indicated that he was glad that information about the importance of parking pricing was shared, and commented that availability is equally important, and maybe pricing is a factor of availability.

He suggested that maybe staff should provide less parking Downtown and force the issue, and that going forward with the traffic demand management has to have incentives to work. There are plenty of incentives that could be provided, and that is a major portion of the discussion. He also said that he never envisioned a Downtown parking kiosk, but something more like the resident sticker program. Mr. Tabor mentioned the evolution of State Street as a La Cumbre Plaza model, and the positives and negatives that came from that, such as the loss of a lot of mom and pop stores. He likes that the Downtown businesses are excited about the idea of a living customer base, which could bring back that mom and pop store culture. He mentioned participating in Ventura's General Plan update and noted certain parallels. Their model spoke to the freeway dividing housing and commercial/residential – a classic Euclidian zoning model. The result was high congestions in the freeway underpasses. They decided to look at housing below the freeway and commercial zones above the freeway.

Mr. France remarked that this is quite a challenge and he looks forward to the joint DPC/TCC meeting. He indicated that this is a good time to assess assumptions going into the game about parking, and that it is critical to strike a balance between congestion and growth. The traffic demand management is about the quality of life. He commented that as a driver he wouldn't mind paying \$1 extra per hour for parking if key spaces were open, and suggested that the big

spenders would probably feel the same. He suggested that would make it more accessible, and there are more quality of life issues to consider, such as congestion. He also suggested that maybe we need to look critically at assumptions that we have going into how we price parking. It would be subsidized, staff needs to be critical as to why and if it is the best thing, all considered.

He echoed Mr. Bradley's comment about the consultant's work, and about what our traffic demand management package would be and what the impacts are. There has to be agreement that rethinking parking is critical and there is good data and studies showing that. The assumption right now is that there are good incentives that may not show up, and as a City, we are going to have to work hard to figure out the right incentives.

Mr. Pritchett said that the analysis is interesting. He noted the date and time of the joint DPC/TCC meeting, and said that it would be better to call out traffic demand management, so people have a better understanding of it. He suggested it be given a more inclusive, less cryptic name so people will appreciate it. He then asked if there as an assumption of the same jobs/housing imbalance in the traffic model, and if it was consistent in all the projections. Mr. Dayton replied that it was. He indicated that increased housing has a lot more houses, but not enough to combat the percentage of people who work here, but live elsewhere. The gap still widens, and all we can do is close the gap. There is no real way to solve the balance.

Mr. Pritchett then asked if the model takes into consideration passenger and commuter rail. Mr. Dayton said that it wasn't assigned empirically. It was described, but is not a hefty enough service to make it empirical. Mr. Pritchett then said to get to the big changes on the freeway interchange congestion, these cool transportation things won't add up to a lot.

Mr. Dayton replied that the model shows that of the empirical data, the carpool lane takes off with pricing in place. The high occupancy vehicle lane facilitates even more. He anticipates an increase to the connection south with SBCAG monies and increased frequency of the Coastal Express.

Mr. Pritchett asked to see histogram of how many intersections are at level D or lower. He added that assuming no one blows holes in the model, if we believe that real way to decrease congestion is by demand management and not housing numbers, then the policy question which is in the last slide is how much congestion can the community tolerate? How many intersections are in model? Mr. Dayton answered that there were 100 intersections.

Mr. Pritchett reiterated that with no project, 21 out of that 100 would get worse? From the traffic perspective, he suggested a split the difference pragmatic traffic based policy, and asked if a goal would be half the difference between the base line for 2008 and no project if we did nothing. That would be a gain of 14 intersections going to level D or lower. He said that is balancing how much in car parking fees people would need to pay through the traffic demand management, predicting that the DPC won't want any and will argue that no one wants to pay. If we assume there is a public goal for no increase it could be said from this analysis that the planning option should be enough demand management car parking fee stuff to only increase the number of intersections to 14. If that is too many, we need more traffic demand management, which puts the onus back on staff determine how to disperse units of the traffic demand management. He suggested that the model can go with the how many bad intersections are tolerable to guide how much of the traffic demand management will be accepted. It could also be noted that the robust traffic demand management goes from 7 to 8, so if the public doesn't like it, they pay. This is a great tools encapsulated to show the traffic demand pricing that gets the difference not downtown housing density.

Mr. Bradley added that this is one kind of yardstick, but if you are only halfway, and the other intersections are at level C, are there other measures in there like total hours of delay? Mr. Dayton said there were not. Mr. Bradley then asked if it was too hard to get out of the model. Mr. Dayton replied that the vehicle miles traveled are in there. There had to be a contribution to the freeway for SBCAG.

Mr. Bradley then stated that the model put up travel time and flows and suggested that those could be put together to get minutes of delay. Mr. Dayton said he would ask the consultant.

Ms. Blackerby asked if, when looking at the robust traffic demand management its not just the on-street parking pricing, but increases in parking structures as well? Mr. Dayton replied that it could eventually mean the elimination of the free period. Staff would have to work in conjunction with what is done on the street. The real thrust of the parking pricing was on-street parking charge. Ms. Blackerby reflected on what Mr. Pritchett said about increments of traffic demand management between robust and moderate and how the difference is measured.

Mr. Dayton explained that it is mainly control of the on-street parking and pricing according to highest valued parking. So there would be more expensive parking in the 00 blocks east and west, and incrementally going down. The consultant came up with some prices. It was \$.66 per hour for the 00 block and \$.33 that going outwards. It would make a real change, and it's interesting because the employees are the ones parking there. The idea is to have the customers to park there - right now it's the employee shuffle. If the employees stop parking in the most valuable spot, and charge a smaller amount for customers, it would be more customer friendly and reducing employee trips. Mr. Dayton said that he saw some tests where they put GPS in cars in certain cities and followed them. The cars were circling. Could reduce congestion.

Ms. Blackerby agreed that the employees are the big issue, and asked if other cities had used the kiosk model, and what would we want to model ours after. Mr. Dayton replied that there are a lot of variations in implementation. Staff and the consultants looked at Santa Cruz, as well as other coastal towns. He mentioned that Santa Monica is doing this, and Ventura just implemented a program. Everyone is doing it differently. There are options that include swiping a credit card and programming a cell phone. Ms. Blackerby indicated that UCSB once had a cell phone programming thing. Mr. Dayton said that they still do.

Ms. Blackerby said that it was good that other cities are using these methods, so if we decide to implement anything, we can see what works best. She looks forward to the joint meeting with DPC to see what their world is like. She asked that in the document staff keep to using units as opposed to houses, and that people would be less confused.

Mr. Coffman-Grey acknowledged that it has been a long process. He is glad to see that the model shows downtown housing on transit corridors decrease traffic. Mr. Dayton reiterated that it was neutral. Mr. Coffman-Grey was impressed that no new traffic was being generated.

He went on to say that having worked downtown and having employees do the shuffle, this traffic demand management strikes strongly. However, he said that staff must exercise caution with the parking dollar vs. how much a customer will be willing to pay and not go elsewhere. We've had sales tax decreases, and when pricing of traffic for customers gets adjusted, they might go elsewhere. He is glad history was mentioned. There was no parking downtown, so people went to La Cumbre. State Street traffic was worse back then, and he give kudos to the merchants for creating the Downtown Parking Program. There is flexibility in increasing parking, but caution is necessary. His preference is for the moderate traffic demand management instead of the robust model. A lot of incentives can be created for employees to utilize alternative transportation. We

had the free 10 ride bus pass for the employees. When enhanced transit came along, that was taken away, and without that incentive, employees are using cars again. Even though bus is still cheaper, the car is easier. Some downtown employees are paying for commuter lots, which are cheaper than doing the shuffle. He would like to see it go this direction but indicated that staff needs to look at ways to subsidize employees, or have business subsidize employees and be careful on parking increase for customers.

Mr. Maas went back to the issue of the large drop in impacted intersections under the increased housing option. The assumption is related to a robust traffic demand management. At the same time, adding 1600 housing units, and if policies were such that they became workforce housing, intuitively could lead to a reduction in the jobs/housing imbalance, and therefore a reduction in impacted intersections. Is staff confident that's not happening? Mr. Dayton replied that housing is not reducing congestion. Mr. Maas asked how would it not be. Mr. Dayton said that in the model realm, the model doesn't distinguish between a high end unit and a one bedroom unit. He also said that the model assumes that the behavior of the residents are similar to the other residents around them, which is sometimes true regardless of the type of unit. In terms of moving the equation of providing new housing that is workforce housing, the model is irrelevant. Staff will be encouraging the PC to look at issues regarding unit size. Mr. Dayton pointed out that Mr. Tabor brought up the limiting parking for residents in Downtown is less a traffic issue and more an issue of affordability, because if the developer puts two parking spots in, the buyer is paying for that.

Mr. Maas indicated that research has been done in unbundled parking. The issue of the traffic demand management was addressed already, but Plan SB assumed a modest increase. The Draft EIR has a couple of mitigation measures for transportation impacts which seem to be the robust traffic demand management program including an increase to MTD services, such as doubling the frequency of transit services on primary corridors at peak hours and increased service on express routes. He thinks there should be policies that Plan SB would require a robust traffic demand management, but understand other concerns related to cost of parking, and a wide variety of traffic demand management that can be implemented. There should be measures that will improve bike and pedestrian transit.

Mr. Bradley indicated that maximum parking requirements said it doesn't make a big difference in terms of trips – that's the way the model is setup. If your housing was like Casa de las Fuentes, where there were no cars, there would be no car trips. He also said this would be affected by policy. Mr. Dayton replied that it might be able to be skewed a bit.

Mr. Bradley also suggested recommendations for presentation. He said that adding housing is neutral for congestions. There are a lot of people who won't believe that. The more detail you can have from model to explain result, including examples would be helpful. It has to be this is why the model says it

Would it be possible to have someone from one of the other cities come and talk to the DPC and the PC about this. Could do some assumptions about how many trips people make and how many people are in Downtown and how close under the robust traffic demand management you are getting.

Mr. France replied that the model is helpful in terms of policy discussion and highly informative. That said, he agrees with the point that no one is looking to of reducing trips and putting traffic and people downtown. He indicated that staff are looking at most efficient ways. He said to address the shuffle because it is a problem for both businesses and employees.

Mr. Pritchett said that the revised agenda says that staff is forwarding Committee initial comments and Draft EIR. What is the mechanism to forward comments? We have the meeting minutes. He said he does not want to make an ABR motion, but where do we go to be constructive on delivering stuff. He wants to discuss policy to double intersections.

Mr. Allen replied that there is access to the minutes and the recording tape. The Committee could email Mr. Dayton individually with comments, or send them directly to the PC. He also suggested considering thoughts to take to the DPC where the Committee can take action if they have ideas for what they want to do. He asked the Committee to take a couple of weeks to formalize an action. The DPC meeting adjourns at 9:00 a.m., and it can be done then. The comment period goes until May 17, 2010.

Mr. Pritchett said that just by watching other committees, in order to be taken more seriously, the Committee needs some kind of statement to help stature and rest of City process. He'd like to see if we can muster something with the DPC in May. Mr. Allen said to email Mr. Dayton or Ms. Strange with comments and they could be put into a document that would create the basis for moving forward.

Chair Bradley asked for any more comments, and announced that Train Day is May 8, 2010, which is Saturday. There will be an event at the Santa Barbara Train Station at 9:00 a.m. and includes a train ride to Carpinteria and back with a magician and press conference. Should be fun and tickets are \$7 for adults, half price for children. Also, Mesa Architects are planning a festival where they will make the parking lot in front of Rose Cafe and have a public plaza for the day.

Mr. France reminded the Committee that May is Bike Month, and showed off his Santa Barbara Cyclemania shirt. There will be 25 free public events. Details can be found at www.Cyclemania.org. He also noted there will be a bicycle ballet at the Mesa event.

Hearing no other comments, Chair Bradley adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

Committee Members: Mark Bradley (Chairman), Hillary Blackerby, Keith Coffman-Grey, Edward France (Vice Chairman), Steve Mass, David Pritchett, David Tabor

Liaisons: Michael Self (Council Liaison), Deborah Schwartz (Planning Commission Liaison)