



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, September 22, 2005
6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

William C. Boyd
Mark Bradley
Michael Cooper
Isabelle Greene
Keith Coffman-Grey
Barry Siegel
David Tabor

Attendance

Present
Present
Excused
Present
Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner
Anne Van Belkom, Senior Office Specialist

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gregg Hart, Government Relations and Public Information Officer
Roger Horton, Councilmember
Dr. Secord, Councilmember
John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS S

Charmaine Curtis
John C. Jostes
Stella Larson
Jonathan Maguire
William T. Mahan
George C. Myers
Harwood A. White

Attendance

Present
Present
Present
Excused
Present
Present
Present

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Ralph Fertig, Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition, informed the TCC that the percentage of bike riders on buses in Santa Barbara has doubled since 2002. Mr. Fertig would like to see buses carry more than two bicycles at a time. He informed the TCC that Fertig related that there are buses equipped to carry three bikes in front and three bikes in the rear. However, additional technology such as TV cameras would need to be added in order for the driver to have a clear view of the bike rack at the rear of the bus.

REPORTS:

2. 101 In Motion – Rob Dayton

Mr. Dayton informed the TCC/PC that the 101 In Motion presentation to Council would occur on October 4, 2005. Staff was looking for the TCC/PC to recommend that Council approve the staff recommendation on the elements that should be included in the final package selected by the 101 In Motion.

Mr. Gregg Hart gave a presentation regarding the final four packages selected through the 101 In Motion process. For each package, Mr. Hart described its elements, reviewed overall costs, estimated the Levels of Service provided by each package, discusses phaseability issues, and determined environmental impacts. Mr. Hart asked the TCC/PC for their input and direction.

Mr. Dayton gave a quick overview of the staff recommendation which was actually a hybrid of Package B (Train and a Lane). Ms. Larson asked whether the figures that were discussed were in today's dollars. She was told that this was correct. Mr. Dayton added that the anticipated funds were also in today's dollars. Staff clarified for Mr. Myers that the estimated costs would include expenses for extra items such as sound walls and additional plantings.

Questions and comments were then taken from the PC/TCC members.

Ms. Larson was very concerned about improvements that could be done today. She would like to be able to see available funding applied to get real time traffic information as soon as possible.

Ms. Curtis Jacobs would like to see the train started as soon as possible. Feels that the Lane and a Train option would be the most effective option. Is concerned about local intersections that may be affected. She is particularly concerned about the entire Las Positas intersection including the Calle Real section that intersects with Las Positas Road. She asked if a toll road could be a future option, and was told that while this may be a possibility, toll roads have never been popular.

Mr. White asked about sound walls and the concerns about sound bouncing around. He would like more information about sound walls. He also expressed his concern about the fact that this entire planned improvement is severely under funded. On top of this, the anticipated costs discussed do not include any plans to improve or maintain current roads that are in poor shape. Even with the passage of Measure D, there may only be about \$300 Million available to do \$900 Million worth of projects. He would like to see more concentration on determining funding opportunities. Perhaps, drivers could be charged extra if they want to bring a car into the City, or drivers could be charged for using Highway 101. Mr. Hart added that there are plans to try to determine funding opportunities, and that a section on differential parking fees will be included in the final report.

Mr. Mahan stated that there will be environmental impacts (there are already environmental impacts at this time). He will support Package B but feels strongly that a group or committee needs to be formed to start figuring how to pay for the \$600 Million shortage.

Mr. Jostes stated that a decision needs to be made soon. To the south of Milpas Street, a lane and a train will be very effective. However, any improvements to the west of Milpas will need support of the North County and Ventura County. This will take political finessing to accomplish.

He feels the survey poll should be used as an argument as to why Measure D needs to be reauthorized. Furthermore, Santa Barbara needs to take responsibility for limiting growth.

Mr. Myers agrees that a paradigm shift is needed and suggested making Highway 101 a complete toll road.

Mr. Bradley asked about the possibility of obtaining used equipment to start up a commuter train service which could halve the cost. Mr. Hart informed the TCC/PC that there were very few used locomotives and that any new commuter rail service in this area would need to be a premium service in order to attract riders. Mr. Bradley stated that City impacts would not be unsubstantial. While the improvements in Package C would help the commuter from Ventura and Carpinteria, it would not help local traffic. Also, no cost estimates have been done for City impacts resulting from any of these packages. Mr. Bradley also stated the importance of phasing. He felt it was vital that commuter rail was started as soon as possible so it would be in place during the construction. Mr. Hart replied that the earliest that rail could be in place would not be until the end of the operational improvements construction.

Mr. Tabor reiterated that the staff analysis is correct in that the next generation simply cannot afford to live here which will increase the number of commuters. He agreed that Package B (the hybrid approach) was the best option but it should be done as soon as possible.

Ms. Greene asked if any studies had been done beyond 2030 and was told that this was not the case. She felt that the Lane and Train option has potential for being successful beyond 2030, since trains, buses, and carpools may increase in the future. She does not see car commute being a viable alternative in the future.

Mr. Siegel commented that the analysis for 2030 was based on land use assumptions done in 2002. He disagreed with the results from the analysis. Mr. Siegel is primarily concerned with current congestion not that is 2030. Therefore, he wants to have the construction concentrate on the TDM projects and the 101 Operational Improvements. The other option that will not generate more traffic and will help reduce traffic is the train which is why he is willing to consider that element. Mr. Siegel cannot support the staff recommendation.

Mr. Boyd noted that it seems that Santa Barbara does not want to deal with the transportation issues that fall within their own City limits. Mr. Hart agreed that the public is not willing to support those issues and does not want to include an extra lane to the freeway between Turnpike and Castillo Street. There is also the problem of an additional \$350 - \$400 Million in costs for which there is no funding available. Mr. Boyd suggested therefore that other strategies (besides widening this particular freeway segment) are needed to minimize the number of people getting off at Santa Barbara streets.

Ms. Greene considered making changes to some of the structures in Santa Barbara that would make it more expensive and less attractive to drive a car into the City and park instead of using alternative transportation.

Mr. White hopes to see different behavior in the future although he will support the lane and a train proposal. He would like to see intelligent traffic management not just on the freeway but also on City streets.

Mr. Coffman-Grey was pleased to receive the public input. He is very much in favor of the commuter rail and would like to see it available before actual construction begins on the

freeway. He understands that commuter rail alone is not enough by itself. Without traffic mitigation, it will not only be the commuter who will suffer but also the hotels and businesses that are supported by weekend visitors. He will support the City recommendation.

Mr. Bradley wanted to add that increased funding to MTD may be more cost effective than to widen the interchanges. He asked about funding for this and was told that this would not come out of the local portion of Measure D since no city could afford that but that these funds would come out of the other portion.

Ms. Larson, who often drives to San Diego, added that it was important that aesthetics are not forgotten in the improvements made to Highway 101, and that landscaping and plantings in the center divider are included as part of any improvements in order to make this area the special place it is known for.

Mr. Mahan felt that excellent pro and con comments were made at this meeting. He would like to recommend the proposed package.

Prior to making the following motion, Ms. Curtis Jacob expressed her concern about the timing of the rail portion of the project, and felt that every effort should be made to have commuter rail in service before construction begins.

Mr. Myers also requested clarification that the package being recommended was not exactly Package B that came out of the 101 In Motion process, but a hybrid of Package B. Unlike Package B, the staff recommended hybrid package would not include a new north and southbound freeway lane between Patterson and Carrillo Street, but only a new lane in each direction, south of Milpas Street to the County line. This hybrid package also includes the designation of the new freeway lanes south of Milpas Street as carpool lanes. Mr. Hart explained that voters would not accept package B or its hybrid if it included toll lanes.

MOTION : Made by Mahan and seconded by Larson

The **Planning Commission** agrees with the staff recommendation and recommends that the 101 In Motion's final package of projects:

- **Adds a Lane and a Train** by adding one High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane (carpool lane) in each direction for the section of Highway 101, south of Milpas Street to the County line, and adding a commuter rail service between Oxnard/ Camarillo and Goleta.
- **Facilitates Transit and Carpool Use** by designating the new lanes on Highway 101 as carpool lanes, and increasing commuter express bus service to the North County.
- **Manages Demand** by providing financial and other forms of incentives for vanpooling, carpooling, and trip reductions, and by encouraging telecommuting and flexible work schedules.
- **Improves Operations and Communications** by installing freeway on-ramp meters, using Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology to provide motorists with real-time traffic information through 511 call-in, internet traffic reports, and variable message signs along the highway, and by removing stranded vehicles from the corridor with a freeway service patrol.

- **Minimizes Impacts to City Interchanges** by enhancing freeway access and improving frontage roads between Castillo and Las Positas.

Ayes: 6 (Larson, Curtis-Jacobs, Harwood, Mahan, Jostes, Myers)
Noes: 0
Abstains: 0
Absent: 1 (Maguire)

Before the motion made by the Transportation & Circulation Committee, Mr. Siegel related that he did not want to support the staff recommendation. He felt that the general public is by and large uninformed about the technical aspects of these projects, yet their votes are driving the technical decisions on the final package, and this was a problem for him.

MOTION : Made by Coffman-Grey and seconded by Tabor.

The **Transportation & Circulation Committee** agrees with the staff recommendation and recommends that the 101 In Motion's final package of projects:

- **Adds a Lane and a Train** by adding one High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane (carpool lane) in each direction for the section of Highway 101, south of Milpas Street to the County line, and adding a commuter rail service between Oxnard/ Camarillo and Goleta.
- **Facilitates Transit and Carpool Use** by designating the new lanes on Highway 101 as carpool lanes, and increasing commuter express bus service to the North County.
- **Manages Demand** by providing financial and other forms of incentives for vanpooling, carpooling, and trip reductions, and by encouraging telecommuting and flexible work schedules.
- **Improves Operations and Communications** by installing freeway on-ramp meters, using Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology to provide motorists with real-time traffic information through 511 call-in, internet traffic reports, and variable message signs along the highway, and by removing stranded vehicles from the corridor with a freeway service patrol.
- **Minimizes Impacts to City Interchanges** by enhancing freeway access and improving frontage roads between Castillo and Las Positas.

Ayes: 4 (Boyd, Tabor, Bradley, Coffman-Grey)
Noes: 1 (Siegel)
Abstains: 1 (Greene)
Absent: 1 (Cooper)

ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 PM