



# MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

Metropolitan Transit District Auditorium  
550 Olive Street, Santa Barbara, CA  
Thursday, February 23, 2006

---

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting to order at 6:18 PM.

### ROLL CALL:

#### TCC MEMBERS

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

#### Attendance

Present  
Present  
Present  
Present  
Excused  
Absent

#### CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Anthony J. Nisich, Public Works Director  
Browning Allen, Transportation Manager  
John Ewasiuk, Principal Engineer  
Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer  
Robert J. Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner  
Anne Van Belkom, Senior Office Specialist

#### OTHERS PRESENT:

Sherrie Fisher, General Manager, SBMTD.  
Steve Maas, Manager of Strategic Planning and Compliance, SBMTD  
Gregg Hart, SBCAG

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:** None

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

1. Glen Minnich - (2215 Chapala Street) – is in support of re-striping Chapala Street to a single lane and said this was a good time to consider doing this since resurfacing is currently happening.

Brent Kimball – (2219 Chapala Street) – is also in support of re-striping Chapala Street to one lane and a bike lane. He feels two lanes are too dangerous for bikers.

June Pujo – (2425 Chapala Street) – asked to have the re-striping of Chapala Street made into an agenda item at the March 23<sup>rd</sup> TCC meeting.

Alex Pujo – (2425 Chapala Street) – gave copies of petitions signed by Chapala Street residents who want a single lane on Chapala Street. He also had copies of a 1996 petition to Mayor Miller that had asked for the same thing ten years ago.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes were approved following the appearance of Mr. Boyd at 6:25 PM.

A motion was made by Boyd and seconded by Cooper to approve the TCC Minutes from January 12, 2006, as revised.

Ayes: 4 (Boyd, Bradley, Coffman-Grey, Cooper)  
Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Greene, Tabor)

A motion was made by Boyd and seconded by Cooper to approve the TCC Minutes from January 26, 2006, as written.

Ayes: 4 (Boyd, Bradley, Cooper, Coffman-Grey)  
Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: (Greene, Tabor)

3. Streetlight Advisory Group Report – John Ewasiuk, Principal Engineer

Mr. Ewasiuk informed the TCC that Council had directed staff to establish an “ad hoc” City Streetlight Advisory Group in March 2005 in order to make recommendations regarding City streetlight planning and design guidelines. This group would consist of two Public Works Department managers, a Councilmember, and one representative each from the Architectural Board of Review, Historic Landmark Commission, Planning Commission, and the TCC. Tonight’s meeting was to elicit TCC comments only.

The City Streetlight Advisory Group will make several presentations on their progress to date to various Boards and Commissions and will gather all input in order to draft final guideline recommendations. This advisory group will return to the TCC and to the other Boards and Commissions with an update list of recommended guidelines for final comments. The final list of recommendations will then be presented to Council for approval.

TCC members asked numerous questions that were answered by staff (in parenthesis):

- a) Maintenance costs of metal versus concrete poles?  
*Metal Pole: \$17,000 new installation, \$3,500 to paint,  
\$ 5,000 for light (Chapala Street light is \$10,000 each)*  
*Concrete Pole: \$15,000 new installation, maintenance free (except for graffiti)  
\$400 for light.*  
*Lightpole maintenance part of streets and sidewalks budget.*
- b) Rental costs and electric fees to Edison with regards to wood light poles?  
*There is a rental fee and an electric fee for Edison for all wood light poles.*  
*Wood poles cost \$10 per month per pole, while concrete poles cost \$4 per month per pole.*
- c) Process required for a neighborhood to get new light poles installed?  
*It requires 50% plus one of neighbors living on the block to get a light installed by Edison.*

*Edison would install the light on an existing wood pole and it would cost \$65 to add the light to the pole.*

- d) Possibility of using solar energy?

*Current technology is good but installations not aesthetically pleasing due to bulkiness of battery source. Future plans may include having the battery sources put on top of city owned buildings.*

- e) What are plans for Route 225?

*If and when the City takes it over, which will take several years, there maybe plans for future undergrounding.*

- f) What about streetlights to increase pedestrian activity in the City?

*City is looking at pedestrian lighting. There are projects in the design process involving pedestrian streetlights on Milpas Street Corridor. Also, there are future projects planned to include pedestrian street lights on Montecito Street (from Milpas Street to the Eastside Library) and there is the West Downtown Improvement Project in the works which will include the Ortega and Anapamu corridors.*

Chair Coffman-Grey, a member of the City Streetlight Committee, mentioned that the plan is for the established corridors be kept with the current types of light fixtures "as is", but that new corridors follow the established guidelines.

Mr. Boyd asked if the Streetlight Map could be put on the website so it would be available to the public. Browning Allen will look into it.

4. St. Francis Neighborhood Mobility Plan Implementation Process – Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer.

Mr. Clifford gave a progress report to date of the seven traffic calming installations that have been in place in either a temporary or semi-permanent in the St. Francis Neighborhood area. He is also asking the TCC to recommend that Council approve the designing and construction of the seven traffic calming installations in the final configuration as part of the St. Francis NTMP.

Public Comment:

Jennifer Miller (706 East Victoria Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. Traffic is being slowed down at Alta Vista, and it is easier to cross the street at the corner of Alta Vista and Victoria with the traffic circle. Having more police is not workable since the police force is already down 12% and they need to deal with more serious issues. She was also concerned that people who do not actually live in the neighborhood may try to stop this plan. However, she said that the people living in this neighborhood want this plan to go forward.

Michael Self (2636 Tallant Road) - spoke against the traffic calming installations. She said that the 2<sup>nd</sup> ballot on Oak Park NTMP clearly states that people do not want the traffic calming installations. She feels that lowering speeds actually increases accidents since the traffic calming devices create additional congestion in those areas. Mrs. Self gave TCC members two handouts: 1) The EPA withdraws Inaccurate Smart Growth – Traffic Congestion Report (July 28, 2004), and 2) Effects of Raising and Lowering speed Limits (October 1992).

Nancy Tunnell (116 West Canon Perdido Street #D) – spoke against the traffic calming

installations. She wants the grant money (the people's money) spent in other ways.

George Glerum (1721 Garden Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic installations. He attended many of the meetings and learned a great deal. He discovered that stop signs did not slow down traffic. However, with the mini roundabouts, he has noticed that the traffic in the last couple of months has slowed down to ten miles per hour and it is now easier to get out of his driveway. More police is not the answer. Traffic should flow and not stop (as with a four way stop sign). He asked that people get the facts first before they give an opinion.

Susan Gerstein (620 East Valerio Street) – spoke against the traffic calming installations. She gave examples of problems she has seen in trucks and fire engines trying to maneuver through the mini circles and in people not knowing how to drive through the mini circles. She will be sending another letter to the editor of the Santa Barbara News-Press. Ms. Gerstein handed out a list of the problems she has noted.

Larry Gerstein (620 East Valerio Street) –spoke against the traffic calming installations. He feels that people understand stop signs and know what to do at the intersections with stop signs. He feels more stop signs are needed. Traffic circles are only appropriate at a location like Milpas Street where you can see all the traffic coming into the circle. This is not the case with some of these seven traffic circles.

John Self (2636 Tallant Road) – spoke against the traffic calming installations. He wants additional ballots going out about the traffic circles that also include pro and con comments about them. He wants to know what the people who have not gone to the meetings feel about the traffic installations.

June Pujio (2425 Chapala Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. She gave her extensive background as a professional planner and stated that the technology showed that these devices were based on solid proven road design. These types of installations have been successful in many areas of the country. However, one way to ease their introduction into Santa Barbara is to make sure that there is a balance between safety and attractiveness. She urged the TCC to move forward with the seven traffic calming installations but suggested that another community meeting be held for public input regarding the design and amenities of each traffic circle, once this plan has been adopted.

Ralph Fertig (1569 Sycamore Canyon Road) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. Mr. Fertig had driven his car and has ridden his bike through the mini-circles numerous times. While there initially was a learning curve, he has had no problems in maneuvering through them. He feels that it may take up to a year for residents to get fully comfortable with the traffic mini-circles. He has noted that traffic is slowed down and that statistically any accidents that do occur are much less severe. He does feel there is an issue regarding aesthetics but urges the TCC to approve the permanent installations of the traffic calming devices.

Dee Duncan (632 East Sola Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. He is concerned about all of the negativity which he feels is unfair to those who actually attended all the meetings and worked out the plan. He noticed that traffic is much slower since the installation of the mini traffic circles and he feels they definitely work. He wonders if the people who are so angry about the mini traffic circles are outsiders who no longer can drive fast through his neighborhood.

Andy Young (1805 Laguna Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. He states he was involved for three years in the process and was a member of the technical committee. He is in support of the permanent installations and his only concern was why it has taken so long.

John Jameson (1708 Garden Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. He states that the traffic mini circles are very popular in Britain since they reduce pollution and eliminate the sideswipe crash. He does however have problems with the bump outs at Garden and Arrellaga Streets.

Deborah Lynch (1628 Garden Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. She said she also wrote a letter to the editor of the Santa Barbara News-Press but it did not get printed. She has driven through all of seven traffic calming installations and has had no problems. However, she does want the final installations to be very attractive with beautiful landscaping.

David Woodford (1707 Garden Street) - spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. He is disappointed that it has taken so long to get them installed and feels that the temporary installations should be skipped in order to have them immediately installed in their final form. He feels that a lot of support has been lost due to the slow process. He also wants a mini traffic circle installation added at the intersection of Garden and Valerio Streets.

Raymond Appleton (1716 Olive Avenue) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. He stated that traffic routinely would run right through the stop signs, and he is amazed at the way traffic now has slowed down with the installation of the mini circles. He feels people need to realize there will be a learning curve. He also wants to have a traffic mini circle added to the intersection of Olive and Laguna Streets, where there are problems with the stop signs. Mr. Appleton discussed the pollution aspect of traffic having to stop at stop signs. He also added that cars that are hit by other cars running a stop sign end up being directly hit instead of a lesser side swipe which would happen in a mini-circle if someone does not yield in a proper manner.

Scott Wenz (3463 State Street) –spoke against the traffic calming installations. He feels people do not get used to driving in traffic mini circles, and that there has been an increase in accidents since the installation of the Milpas Street Roundabout. He stated that the roundabout at Alameda Padre Serra/Salinas Street also did not help the accident rate and that the traffic circles in the St. Francis neighborhood are not negotiable by fire equipments and would hurt emergency response. He feels that people have been given false and misleading information.

Alex Pujo (2425 Chapala Street) – spoke in favor of the traffic calming installations. He suggested that the City include a competent landscape architect to develop an aesthetically pleasing traffic circle. He pointed out that the traffic calming devices at Roosevelt School and the bulbout at Ralph's on Carrillo/Chapala Streets were very well done and looked very nice. However, he felt that the chicanes on Stanley Drive were not aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Pujo stated that he had attended the St. Francis NTMP charrette with Dan Burden, and suggested that Mr. Burden be brought back for a public meeting to help inform the public about the positive effects of the traffic circles. Mr. Pujo informed the TCC that he was also a biker and has had no problems in negotiating traffic circles, roundabouts, or streets with bulbouts.

TCC Comments:

Mark Bradley - reminded TCC members and the audience that the Circulation Element encourages a mix of transportation modes. He has no problems with the mini traffic circles and has seen them used with no complaints in Portland. In The Netherlands, houses near traffic circles actually have gone up in value. He recommends moving forward with the permanent installations.

Bill Boyd – asked whether people complaining were actually living in the neighborhood or not. With eight people who actually live in the neighborhood in support, while one husband/wife couple not living in the neighborhood is not in support, Mr. Boyd wondered if perhaps people living outside the affected neighborhood were unhappy because they could not longer speed through that neighborhood. Mr. Boyd is in support of the permanent installations. He feels that a learning curve is to be expected. Mr. Boyd would like staff to check the Olive/Valerio Streets intersection where there may be some sight problems relating to the traffic mini circle.

Michael Cooper – was informed (in response to his question) that the City will maintain the mini traffic circles. Dr. Cooper would like staff to find out how much the maintenance will cost each year. He especially has a problem with the mini traffic circle at Olive/Valerio intersection which he feels is dangerous. He has noticed fire trucks having difficulty maneuvering through this mini circle and he feels that too many drivers are inept and do not know how to maneuver through this mini-circle. Dr. Cooper suggested rounding the square street corners to help cars maneuver through the mini circle.

Keith Coffman-Grey - feels the City has dropped the ball on the process since this plan was approved by Council back in December 2003. The original timeline was not met and Mr. Coffman-Grey asked why it has taken so long. He agreed with the neighbors that the temporary traffic calming installations are not aesthetically pleasing, and he would like to see the permanent mini traffic circles installed as soon as possible with nice landscaping.

**MOTION 1:** Made by Boyd and seconded by Bradley

The TCC recommends that Council approve the following items for design and construction in their final configurations as part of the St. Francis Neighborhood Traffic Management Program:

1. Olive Street/Valerio Street – mini traffic circle
2. Olive Street/Sola Street – mini traffic circle
3. Alta Vista Street/Anapamu Street – bulb-outs
4. Alta Vista Street/Victoria Street – mini traffic circle
5. Alta Vista Street/Sola Street – mini traffic circle
6. Garden Street/Islay Street – median island and bulb-outs
7. Garden Street/Arrellaga Street – bulb-out

Ayes: 3 (Bradley, Boyd, Coffman-Grey) Noes: 1 (Cooper) Abstains: 0  
Absent: 2 (Greene, Tabor)

The TCC took a ten minute break from 8:15 PM – 8:30 PM.

5. Measure D Expenditure Plan – Gregg Hart, SBCAG.

Gregg Hart gave a brief history of the original Measure D and reminded the TCC and audience that this measure would sunset in 2010 unless it was reauthorized. With almost each community having a different emphasis on where and how the money should be spent, the focus of this reauthorization plan will need to be on how to get voter support. With the new rules in place requiring 2/3 of all votes instead of just 50%, a coalition of voters is needed to achieve the 2/3 approval vote. Through the recommendation from the Measure D reauthorization consultant, Mr. Larry Tramutola, a new draft sales tax expenditure plan has been developed that replaces the old Measure D plan. The new plan has been split into Measure A (a replacement ½-cent sales tax) and Measure B (an additional ¼-cent sales tax). In addition, there have been some revisions made since the original City Manager's Plan from December 2005, and the revised plan is now called the Balanced Plan. The concept of the two, thirty-year measures (with the new revisions) was found to be necessary to fund a broader range of the County's transportation needs and so elicit the voter support needed for approval. The goal is for the draft A and B measures under the Balanced Plan to go before Council in late March 2006. If Council approves the Balanced Plan, it will be returned to the SBCAG board with feedback and potential changes in early April in order to be adopted by the SBCAG Board at its regular meeting on April 20, 2006. Once the two measures are approved by the SBCAG Board, they would need to be adopted by the various city councils, and if successful, would then go back to the Board of Supervisors to be placed on the November ballot. Mr. Hart showed various charts outlining the projects and their assigned percentages that are included in Measures A and B under the new Balanced Plan. He also clarified that Measure B could only be approved if Measure A was also approved. By having a good distribution of all projects in both Measures A and B, the consultant feels that the chance of having both Measures approved would be enhanced.

Public Comment:

Eva Inbar (Coalition for Fair Measure D) – spoke against the Balanced plan. She feels it is one step better than the old December Plan but there are still problems. She feels that the new Balanced Plan is not balanced and wants to see the same balance between Measure A and B. She also noted that pedestrians are left out and wants to see them included. She also feels that the plan as presented has significant structural deficiencies.

Ralph Fertig (1569 Sycamore Canyon Road) – stated that he is pleased to see that the following items are included: the Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S), the Regional Bike Program, and Roadway Maintenance. He would like to see a category included that requires all new major road projects to include the provision that access will need to be made available to all members of the community including pedestrians, bikers, cars, handicapped etc.). Mr. Fertig hopes to have high schools and UCSB, Hancock and City Colleges included in the SR2S program, and would like to include infrastructure, education, coordination, and outreach included as part of this program. Finally, Mr. Fertig asked that large buses and rail cars make provisions for bikes.

Dennis Story (Goleta) – supports what was said by Eva Inbar in that there is no balance between Measure A and B. He stated it will take \$79 M to get Rail operating, and that the current funds allowed will only provide for a pilot program for commuter rail which is not enough.

He supports a fully funded commuter rail service for \$79 M.

Sherrie Fisher (SBMTD) – is concerned about the funding for transit going to local agencies and not directly to the transit companies for strategic long-range planning purposes. While she maintained that Santa Barbara has been a good partner, she is concerned that this may not be the case with the other communities.

Alex Pujó (2425 Chapala Street) – is also concerned about the lack of balance between Measure A and B, and feels it is necessary to create a balanced A and B Measure. In addition, he asked that the plan include a stipulation that streets are to be considered from a “right of way” to a “right of way” standpoint instead of the current street curb to street curb standpoint. Looking at streets from “right of way” to “right of way” would automatically include such amenities as sidewalks and lighting, which are also important components of street design.

TCC Comments:

Mark Bradley – was informed (in response to his questions) that the \$206 M for local transit would be earmarked for transit agencies, and that voters would not be able to only vote for plan B. Mr. Bradley feels that the deck is stacked toward Plan A.

Bill Boyd – has a problem with the different set of percentages in Plans A and B. He feels that this pits one plan against the other. He acknowledges that Santa Barbara has used much of its local share to fund alternative modes, but wonders if other agencies will follow suit. He said that TDA funds should be used for transit needs, not road maintenance.

Michael Cooper – feels that the entire plan needs to be restructured.

Mr. Hart responded that there will be no money at all after 2010 unless there is a plan that will be approved by the voters, and the polls have indicated that this version of the plan would pass. In response to Dr. Cooper, Hart stated that the poll had consisted of a large sample and was statistically valid to the sub region. Mr. Hart responded that he had full trust in the pollster and feels that with the A and B plan as presented there is a good chance that the Measures will pass. The only way to win is for the community to come together and for people to realize the benefit of the plan.

Keith Coffman-Grey – is also concerned about the skewed balance between plans A and B, and feels that both plans are very confusing. He would like to see them combined and then marketed as one plan with a  $\frac{3}{4}$  cent sales tax. He also stated that a very good marketing campaign will be crucial.

Bill Boyd – stated he could also support a  $\frac{3}{4}$  cent sales tax.

**MOTION 2:** Made by Coffman-Grey and seconded by Boyd.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee moves to send the comments made at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> TCC meeting regarding Measures A and B to Council for their information. The TCC also feels that there is a need for a balanced plan across the board, and that the balanced A and B plan that was presented does not meet that requirement.

Ayes: 4 (Bradley, Boyd, Coffman-Grey, Cooper)

Noes: 0 Abstains: 0 Absent: 0 (Greene, Tabor)

6. Selection of Chair and Vice-Chair.

**MOTION 3:** Made by Cooper and seconded by Boyd.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee has elected Keith Coffman-Grey for Chair for a second term.

Ayes: 4 (Bradley, Boyd, Coffman-Grey, Cooper)  
Noes: 0 Abstains: 0 Absent: 0 (Greene, Tabor)

**MOTION 4:** Made by Coffman-Grey and seconded by Boyd.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee has elected Michael Cooper for Vice-Chair

Ayes: 4 (Bradley, Boyd, Coffman-Grey, Cooper)  
Noes: 0 Abstains: 0 Absent: 0 (Greene, Tabor)

7. Staff Briefing on Current Topics.

None.

8. Review of Upcoming Agenda Items.

For March 23, 2006 meeting:

- 1). Oak Park NTMP Balloting Results – Dru van Hengel - Action Item
- 2) Status Report on Bike Station – Victor Garza
- 3) West Beach /Cabrillo Boulevard – Lou Lazarine,
- 4) Lane Change on Chapala Street – requested by June Pujo.

Upcoming Items:

Queuing lane for Granada Garage – John Schoof is working on this option which should come before the TCC in a few months.

Chair Coffman-Grey asked if any of these items could be done earlier. Staff will check.

9. Committee Member/Subcommittee Comments.

Chair Coffman-Grey asked to have a subcommittee formed to go over what the TCC would like to accomplish in 2006. Cooper, Bradley, and Coffman-Grey volunteered to be on this subcommittee. Chair Coffman-Grey asked to have all ideas submitted to him.

Mr. Boyd stated he would be absent from the TCC meeting on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT: 9:49 PM**