



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, March 23, 2006
6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM.

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

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

Attendance

Present
Present
Present
Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner
Anne Van Belkom, Senior Office Specialist
Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer
Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator
Lou Lazarine, Redevelopment Specialist

OTHERS PRESENT:

Steve Maas, Manager of Strategic Planning and Compliance, SBMTD
Dan Weber, Conceptual Motion
Steve Yates, Conceptual Motion
Roger Horton, Councilmember
Grant House, Councilmember

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Scott Wentz (Cars Are Basic) stated his opinion that staff misrepresented facts and gave out false information to the community. Mr. Wentz stated that here was a petition with 300 signatures collected in 16 hours that was ignored by staff. Chairman Coffman-Grey replied that the TCC minutes speak for themselves as to what the TCC voted on.

Michael Self (Coalition for Safe Streets in Santa Barbara) said that the public has been lied to as to what the traffic calming devices are all about. She handed out a letter that Alex Pujo had written to the editor of the Independent and contradicted many of the statements that Mr. Pujo made. She also feels that the marketing that was done for this program is very expensive to the community, and that there is too much of a rush to develop traffic calming, which is creating a great deal of community stress and animosity.

Ralph Fertig spoke on the importance of the three handouts (endorsed by the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition) that he passed out to TCC members regarding: 1) Santa Barbara Bicycle

Coalition's view of the Measure D Renewal history and recommendations for the future, 2) Tour of California Survey data, and 3) Hospitality for bicyclists.

Jim Kahan (Allied Neighborhood Association) described the traffic calming installations built over the past ten years as an obstacle course, with the movement of vehicles being hindered. He said that something more user friendly is needed.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Cooper and seconded by Boyd to approve the TCC Minutes from February 23, 2006, as written.

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

3. MTD's Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle and Commuter Lot Shuttle – Browning Allen, Transportation Manager.

TCC members expressed their pleasure at seeing increases in ridership for both January and February 2006 and hoped this would be a future trend. In reply to requests from TCC members, Steve Maas stated he would analyze the data to try to determine exactly what caused the recent growth in ridership. Since ridership overall had been steadily going down, with record lows in January and February of 2005, TCC members asked for specific information as to what may be causing this turnaround. Mr. Maas will return to a future meeting with this information.

4. West Beach/Cabrillo Boulevard Improvements – Lou Lazarine, Redevelopment Specialist.

Mr. Lazarine informed the TCC that the West Beach Pedestrian Improvement Study has been completed and that staff from Conceptual Motion is now before the TCC to present its findings and ask for TCC comments and input. Mr. Steve Yates from Conceptual Motion gave a PowerPoint presentation that began with an explanation of how the Redevelopment Agency Board appropriated \$2 million to improve pedestrian linkage from Stearns Wharf to the Waterfront on April 5, 2005. Conceptual Motion was asked to do a concept study of this area and make recommendations as to what the improvements should be and how the \$2 million should be spent.

In his PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Yates reviewed the goals of the study; listed the historical plans, studies and reports that Conceptual Motion reviewed as part of this study; and named the concurrent projects that are also occurring in that area. Since existing conditions show that pedestrian circulation is very fragmented and disjointed along the Harbor, Sea Landing, and West Beach areas, pedestrian linkage was deemed to be an important component of this study. Recommendations for the \$2 million budget include the following components: 1) Cabrillo Boulevard Pedestrian Crossings/Signals, 2) Repairs to existing sidewalks between Stearns Wharf and Sea Landing, 3) (N) Landscaping between the (E) Beachway and the seawall, 4) Viewing Plazas, 5) Effective Signage, and 6) Sea Landing Improvements. Other potential projects were also looked at and identified (with rough estimates of their costs) for future pursuit with RDA or other funding. Examples included making both Ambassador Park and Sea Landing into more visible destination sites and components of West Beach.

On behalf of other TCC members, Mr. Boyd asked for a hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation. Staff will obtain a copy and mail it to the TCC. TCC members liked the idea of having both Ambassador Park and Sea Landing become more visible and had favorable comments to make about the recommendations made by Conceptual Motion. Mr. Tabor stated that while he liked the pedestrian crossings across Cabrillo Boulevard, he was not sure that the "on demand" pedestrian signals would be the most effective in that location. Another issue that was brought up was the historical aspects of the seawall which would make elimination of it probably impossible and could create issues with regards to accessibility. Chair Coffman-Grey asked about the volleyball courts at West Beach. Mr. Yates stated that even with changes in site locations of vendors etc., there would still be room for the volleyball courts, and the plans are for them to remain on West Beach.

MOTION 1: Made by Greene and seconded by Coffman-Grey.

The TCC confirms that the proposed West Beach Pedestrian Improvements are consistent with the Circulation Element.

Ayes: 6 (Bradley, Boyd, Coffman-Grey, Cooper, Greene, Tabor)
Noes: 0 Abstains: 0 Absent: 0

5. Result of Oak Park NTMP Balloting Process – Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator.

Before discussing the Oak Park NTMP balloting results, Dru van Hengel gave an overview of the entire Neighborhood Traffic Management Program process from its initial inception as a goal in the Circulation Element to the current results of the balloting process in the Oak Park Area Neighborhood.

The Circulation Element of the General Plan included the goal of creating a City-wide Traffic Management Program with separate business and neighborhood emphasis. This led to the development of the NTMP in 2001 by Transportation Planning Staff with the assistance of a NTMP Steering Committee, consisting of three TCC and Planning Commission members, two City Councilmembers, and staff from the Fire, Police, Public Works, and Community Development Departments. Two pilot programs were recommended for the first implementation of the NTMP: the St. Francis Neighborhood Area, and the Oak Park Neighborhood Area. Ms. van Hengel described in detail the process undergone in the Oak Park Neighborhood Area and the overall neighborhood response to the neighborhood meetings, the traffic calming charrette, and the newsletters and other mailers.

At a critical point in the process, when the final ballot/newsletter was about to be distributed, an unforeseen staff change occurred which caused a delay of several months in the distribution process of the ballot/newsletter introducing the traffic calming elements of the area mobility plan. The resulting low response rate was attributed to confusion with the ballot/newsletter as to exactly which traffic calming devices were included as part of the Oak Park NTMP. The Core Group of Oak Park neighbors suggested that a second ballot/ newsletter be mailed out which would clearly distinguish between the traffic calming installations that were part of the Oak Park NTMP, and those traffic calming installations that were actually a part of either the Cottage Hospital Improvements or the City of Santa Barbara Capital Improvement Projects, and thus would proceed regardless of the Oak Park NTMP ballot results. The second newsletter/ballot would also remove a mini traffic circle near The Samarkand Retirement Community due to significant opposition to this single element in the Oak Park NTMP. The cumulative results of

the 2nd ballot did not get an approval rating of 65% which had been identified as a percentage that would constitute general public acceptance of a plan. Staff thus was not able to recommend that the Oak Park Neighborhood Mobility Plan should move forward for adoption by Council, but did recommend that the TCC take into consideration public comments in considering its recommendation to Council.

Public Comment:

Wayne Beckman spoke in favor of the Oak Park NTMP. He was a member of the Oak Park NTMP group and is very disturbed by the incorrect information presented by Michael Self whose campaign helped to create the "no" vote. He does not want the traffic calming in the Oak Park Neighborhood stopped because of a vocal minority.

Eric Alen lives on Stanley Drive and stated that he has noted that the chicanes and traffic circles have made an improvement and have slowed traffic. He stated that these devices only seem to be a problem for drivers who do not slow down. Mr. Allen also does not like the fact that a few people can change the plan that has been agreed to in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Hermann is in support of the Oak Park Mobility Plan and attended the meetings/discussions. She is concerned about the negative campaign that she feels is undoing the work of many neighbors who have spent so much time working on this plan. There are many children in this area and thus many reasons for wanting to slow traffic. Her neighbors also compromised so that the entire plan could be adopted.

Beatrice Beck (426 Stanley Drive) has noticed that there is more traffic but it is much slower with the installation of the traffic devices. She likes the chicanes and finds that they work at they were intended to do. She asked why people who do not even live in the neighborhood are able to cause a neighborhood's vote to change.

Anna Devore (429 Stanley Drive) said she participated and supported the plan that was developed by volunteer residents in 1 ½ years of meetings. She is very disappointed that this plan was voted down by a campaign from individuals who did not participate in this long process. She wants to find a way to install traffic circles and bulbouts on Stanley Drive. She also noted that the chicanes do slow traffic.

John Devore is in support of traffic planning. He regrets that there will not be a mini circle at Stanley Drive. He likes the traffic circles at Olive Street and feels that plants in the circles would be very attractive.

June Pujo (Chapala Street) stated she participated in all of the meetings except for one. She is very concerned that the failure of the ballot will leave her neighborhood without any solution. She asked that the City not abandon her neighborhood. She also mentioned that the Circulation Element sets out policy that moves away from the predominance of cars to a more shared modality. The NTMP was directed by the Circulation Element and the process was to help meet the goals of sharing the road with other modalities. Especially now that the need has been identified and is still here, Ms. Pujo does not want this plan abandoned. She also disagrees with the staff recommendation and feels that the balloting process was not meant to give veto power to a single group. She asked that the funds be reserved to do some individual traffic calming installations on which there is agreement.

Hazel Melvin (2837 Clinton Terrace) did not get involved in the process. She belongs to the Samarkand Improvement Association. She does not like chicanes and people should not be allowed to park on Stanley Drive. She voted against putting a traffic circle on Samarkand/ Clinton since she sees no need for it. She asked to have the Yield signs changed into Stop signs.

Alex Pujo (Chapala Street) attended from four to six meetings as well as the weekend charrette. He supports the traffic calming plan and does not feel that staff can walk away from it. He wants to know if the wrong problems got identified or if one person was able to change the outcome. He does not want one person to be able to stop the will of the community.

Kathy Henry (Stanley Drive) said she was a member of the core group and attended most, if not all, of the meetings. She supported the process and liked some of the items included in the plan although not all. She feels the plan may have failed because it may have been too confusing, it may not have been flexible enough, and perhaps staff and neighbors tried to do too much. However, she does not think it is right to let the entire plan just fail. She does not want to see the neighborhood lose the available money and asked if there was not a more practical way to address concerns such as allowing the neighbors to support some of the traffic calming devices instead of all of them. She asked whether staff could consider pursuing individual traffic calming devices. She also wanted to thank Browning Allen and Dru van Hengel, as well as the rest of the staff that worked so hard in conjunction with the core group.

Geri Barger (Stanley Drive) attended many meetings and feels that the all or nothing vote was hard since many people liked some of the devices but not all. He asked if a line item could be done for each individual installation. He does not want the plan abandoned but asked to have it presented in a way that people can choose which installations they want.

Francis Dauer has lived for 30 years on Alameda Road and has not noticed major problems at Stanley Drive. She feels that a car remains a significant way of moving and feels that two lanes on De La Vina and on Chapala will keep traffic moving.

Michael Self contradicted the negative comments made about her and her organization, Coalition for Safe Streets for Santa Barbara. She said she has dozens of people in her organization and did not mislead people. Mrs. Self felt the ballots presented misleading information and does not agree with the percentages of responses that City staff collated.

TCC members Comments:

Dr. Cooper stated he has previously spoken with Councilmember Horton and Tully Clifford to look at speeding and traffic issues on Mission Ridge and the Riviera since there are no sidewalks. He again brought up the issue of nonconforming streets and wants a Citywide not a neighborhood wide discussion.

Chair Coffman-Grey reminded Dr. Cooper that his comments did not relate to the agenda item under discussion, and asked if TCC members had any other comments related to the agenda item.

Ms. Greene asked the Fire Department staff several questions regarding maneuverability and delays of fire equipment going through roundabouts. Following her questions, Ms. Green was able to conclude that roundabouts actually decrease emergency time for fire equipment since

heavy fire equipment does not have to come to a complete stop. There is more time lost in stopping and having to start again than by slowing down. In trials, emergency vehicles were able to navigate the various traffic installations.

Chair Coffman-Grey asked whether fire trucks actually need to stop for stop signs on their way to an emergency. He was told that fire trucks are still required to make a full stop at all stop signs, which increases the response time.

Mr. Boyd does not understand the staff recommendation which he feels is not acceptable based on the two years of study done by neighbors working through the entire process. He needs more information about what exactly happened during the entire process versus the balloting portion of it, and what the specific concerns were about the recommended improvements. He would like to see an analysis done of the comments made by neighbors, since he has no idea what the positive and negative comments referred to, or whether there was consensus (either pro or con) about specific traffic calming devices. He stated his disappointment with the staff recommendation.

Browning Allen replied that staff will do an analysis but that the reason for the staff recommendation was that by adopting the draft NTMP, Council had agreed that if there was not 65% support for the plan, it would be abandoned.

Mr. Boyd stated that he had read the item written by Michael Self and noted it included flawed information. If the negative ballots were based on the flawed information, and thus the approach was invalid, would this not also invalidate those ballots? Mr. Boyd felt it was unreasonable to count a vote as the end result of an ~~improper~~ **flawed** process.

Mark Bradley asked whether the traffic calming devices would still go through a design phase if the Oak Park Mobility Plan was accepted, and was told that those traffic calming installations would move from a temporary to a permanent installation, as was done in the St. Francis Neighborhood. Mr. Bradley stated that he is not convinced that a majority of residents in the Oak Park Neighborhood are against the plan, and thus will not support the staff recommendation.

David Tabor agreed that there is a great deal of discussion needed on lessons learned during this entire process. It seems to him that those who worked on the Oak Park Mobility Plan did agree on this plan.

Dr. Cooper stated he is confused with the process of trying to eliminate congestion on Highway 101 and creating congestion on City streets. He feels that slowing down traffic only creates congestion. He feels the ballot responses should be considered equally since both groups (for and against the plan) could have gone out and persuaded neighbors to vote in a particular way. He does not condone an override since he is not convinced that the traffic calming recommendations came up with the right solution.

The statement that slowing down traffic creates congestion was refuted by Ms. Greene, who said that slowing traffic did not create congestion. It actually creates less congestion and actually allows more cars to flow through a street, since a slower speed allows cars to travel more closely together.

Chair Coffman-Grey stated it was unfortunate for either side that the process was flawed. He wondered if the Oak Park Neighborhood was too large an area since it enveloped three distinct neighborhoods (Chapala area, Oak Park/Cottage, and Samarkand). The process had asked for the ballots to be mailed back, emailed, or faxed. However, in going door to door, both sides had the opportunity to influence votes. If the Oak Park Mobility Plan cannot move forward, he would love to see individual traffic calming installations move forward. He agrees with the staff recommendation.

TCC members tried to develop two separate motions: 1) separating the Oak Park Neighborhood into three separate neighborhoods, 2) recommending that staff discontinues further work on the Oak Park NTMP. Both of those motions ended up being ended up being withdrawn for lack of a second for the motions, and TCC members ultimately came up with the following motion:

MOTION 2: Made by Boyd and seconded by Greene.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee directs staff to review Attachment 2 to the staff report (position paper prepared by Santa Barbarans for Safe Streets) and do a thorough analysis based on sound transportation planning principles, and then do an assessment of what the impact of that could have been on recipients, and that this information be brought back at the next meeting.

A roll call was taken: Ayes 3 (Bradley, Greene, Boyd)
Nayes 3 (Tabor, Coffman-Grey, Cooper)
Abstain 0
Absent 0

Motion did not pass.

After further discussion, TCC members developed a motion that the vote on the Oak Park Mobility plan be postponed for one month in order to allow staff to continue to explore the process to date and information that has come to light as a result of this public meeting and recommend ways to reach consensus to solve the identified problems in this area. However, since there were varying opinions on what should be incorporated in the motion, including an interest in consulting the City Attorney's Office, Mr. Allen suggested that this agenda item could simply be continued at the next TCC meeting in April with staff preparing the information that has been requested. Mr. Allen stated that a TCC recommendation is needed before a Council date can be set regarding this agenda item. Before considering a final motion, Dr. Cooper asked how much of this area is not conforming to an unidentified State and City Ordinance regarding street width and on-street parking. He also asked how much of this area has sidewalk and what portion is missing.

MOTION 3: Made by Greene and seconded by Bradley.

TCC members agreed to continue this agenda item until the next TCC meeting with input back from City staff regarding the TCC questions during the meeting.

Ayes 6 (Boyd, Bradley, Coffman- Grey, Cooper, Greene, Tabor)
Noes: 0, Abstains: 0, Absent: 0

6. Lane Change on Chapala Street Petition – Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator.

Ms. van Hengel reviewed the background of the neighborhood request to eliminate one traffic lane and install a bike lane on upper Chapala Street, between Mission and Alamar Streets. The original request was made in June 1996. However, since neighbors learned that Chapala Street is about to be resurfaced, they again submitted their request at the TCC meeting on February 23, 2006, with the TCC requesting this item be put on the agenda for March 23, 2006.

The restriping of upper Chapala Street was originally included as a component of the Oak Park Mobility Plan. Since this plan did not receive the requisite 65% neighborhood support, Chapala Street residents asked that the restriping project be considered separately, especially since this street is about to be resurfaced which would create no additional costs for the restriping project.

Staff reviewed the restriping proposal when it was identified in the Oak Park Mobility Plan and agreed that the traffic volumes on Chapala Street can be served with one motor vehicle lane since little to no diversion of traffic onto other streets is expected as a result of the restriping. This request is consistent with Implementation Strategy 4.2.3 of the Circulation Element, and there would be no extra costs associated with this if the restriping was done in conjunction with the ongoing street resurfacing project. Staff also agreed that intersection capacity will not be compromised with the restriping. Bath Street was given as an example of a street that was restriped in the same configuration requested on upper Chapala Street.

Public Comment:

Ralph Fertig (Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition) is in support of the restriping project. He stated it will work as well as it has on Castillo and Bath Streets.

Liza Johnston lives on Chapala Street and is in support of one vehicle lane and a bike lane since there are many neighbors with children.

Michael Self and the Coalition for Safe Streets in Santa Barbara are against the narrowing of Chapala Street since there should not be a street by street strategy. She feels there is too much traffic on Chapala Street especially at certain times of the day. She does not believe that once the street has been restriped to a single lane and a bike path, it will ever go back to being two lanes.

Brent Kimball is in support of the restriping since he would like his children to be able to ride to Peabody School. He stated that the only public opposition is from non-residents.

Glen Minnich (2215 Chapala Street) supports the restriping and was disappointed about the Oak Park NTMP ballot results. He stated that only one of his neighbors was against it and every one of the other neighbors he talked to was for it.

Sarah Shafer (Los Olivos between De La Vina and Chapala) is in support of the restriping. Intersection of Chapala and Los Olivos is very dangerous. She would like to be able to ride with her son to Peabody School.

Carolyn Giannetti (2200 block of Chapala Street) has lived on this street for 17 years. The street is a race track and there have been many accidents. Currently, there is one lane

operating due to work being done by Granite Construction. She has checked traffic at 8 AM, Noon, and 4:30 PM and noted that traffic is flowing more smoothly. She is in favor of restriping.

June Pujo concurs with the previous speaker and noted that speed is the main problem, not the number of cars on the street. Chapala Street neighbors have been asking for the restriping of Chapala Street for 15 years. This restriping project would meet the Circulation Element goal of doing street improvements in conjunction with ongoing projects. It would also be much easier for drivers and passengers to be able to open the cars doors in order to exit their cars.

Alex Pujo informed the TCC that in 1996, Chapala Street had a volume of 5000 cars per day, which is exactly the number of cars Chapala Street has currently. Thus, traffic on Chapala Street has not increased. Numerous projects of this type had it detractors including the narrowing of Shoreline Drive. Mr. Pujo also asked about what would happen with the curb extensions on Los Olivos and Quinto Streets. He feels that those elements should be included along with the restriping of Chapala Street.

Scott Wenz spoke against the restriping of Chapala Street. He feels that staff has lied and that Chapala Street can not handle the traffic if it is narrowed.

Luke Small has seen many accidents in the past three years at Pueblo and Chapala Streets. He is concerned about speed and safety and is in support of the restriping.

Helena Joyce (2311 Chapala Street) stated that many accidents have happened on this street, and elderly people have difficulty in maneuvering through the intersections.

Staff Comments:

David Tabor asked about the results on Shoreline Drive when it was narrowed from two lanes to one lane. Mr. Dayton stated that only anecdotal information was available that suggested that traffic was moving indeed slower. He agrees that further analysis would be beneficial.

Bill Boyd asked if Chapala Street was on the plan for becoming a future Existing Bikeway. Mr. Dayton confirmed that this was correct.

Dr. Cooper asked whether the collision rates on Chapala Street were higher or lower than on other streets. Ms. van Hengel replied that the average collision rate on Chapala Street is comparable to that on other City Streets with the exception of the intersection of Pueblo and Chapala Streets which has a higher collision rate. There is not an increase in traffic volume on Chapala Street.

Chair Coffman-Grey received confirmation from staff that there are from 3,000 to 12,000 **vehicle trips per day** on the various one-lane sections of Bath and Castillo Streets. However, traffic manages to flow smoothly throughout the sections with the single traffic lane. He also noted that one of the goals of the Circulation Element is that streets should carry all modes of transportation, and that bicycle lanes should be included in residential corridors. He feels that the restriping project is a good opportunity to save the City additional costs and to help promote the goals of the Circulation Element.

Mark Bradley is in support of the restriping project since it is consistent with the goals of the Circulation Element, it does not cost additional money, and it has been requested by the neighbors.

MOTION 3: Made by Boyd and seconded by Greene.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee recommends that staff move forward with the restriping of Chapala Street to one vehicle lane and one bicycle lane, between Mission Street and Alamar Avenue.

Ayes: 5 (Bradley, Boyd, Coffman-Grey, Greene, Tabor) Noes: 1 (Cooper), Abstains 0, Absent 0

7. Update on Measure D – Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner

Rob Dayton informed the TCC that this item along with the TCC recommendation is going to City Council on March 28, 2006. This item will also go to the County on March 28. The Coalition for a Fair Measure D is becoming more active and is seeking either more equity balance between Measure A and B, or a single $\frac{3}{4}$ cent sales tax. MTD stated they need more direct control over the funding coming to them, since the five year fluctuation that is currently built in the potential funding is too short a period for them to be able to do adequate route planning. Staff has included this information in its report to Council, and has recommended that Council support the changes that MTD has requested in order to do more effective route planning. There will be a workshop with the SBCAG Board on April 5th to hear the result of the community process and to develop a final Measure D expenditure plan. If the Board officially recommends the final Measure D Expenditure plan, this plan will go back to the cities for their approval. If this plan is approved by the cities, there will be a ballot measure put on the ballot in November 2006.

8. Staff Briefing on Current Topics.

The St. Francis Area NTMP/Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Project will go to Council on April 11, 2006. This will be an evening session.

9. Review of Upcoming Agenda Items.

The Agenda for the next meeting will include a Bike Station Status Report, a continuation of the Oak Park NTMP results, and an Update on Measure D. If TCC members are concerned about another late night meeting, The Bike Station Status Report Agenda item can be moved to May.

Unless the report is not ready, John Davies will be giving a presentation on the results of the Downtown Employee Survey at a joint TCC/Downtown Parking Committee on May 11, 2006.

A Measure D update will be included at each TCC meeting.

Chair Coffman-Grey recalled the traffic problems created last week by the closure of Highway 101 and the resultant grid lock on both the freeway and numerous surface streets, not just in the City but also in the County. He would like to see a presentation on the City's preparedness for this type of emergency since communication did not get out to the public as to what was happening. Mr. Allen will discuss this with the Police and Fire Departments. He suggested this would be an appropriate topic for discussion by the subcommittee

Mr. Boyd asked for further information on the transportation aspects of the Mark Lee development for which the TCC had made a recommendation to support the inclusion of the bridge. Mr. Dayton stated that Council advised the applicant to eliminate the bridge but asked that a Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge would still remain. Mr. Boyd has a major concern with this decision.

Dr. Cooper asked for data about the distribution of age groups in Santa Barbara. Mr. Allen said this information could be pulled from the 2000 Census date.

10. Committee Member/Subcommittee Comments.

The TCC Subcommittee to determine what goals the TCC would like to accomplish this year has not met yet. Chair Coffman-Grey hopes to be able to give a report at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:50 PM

Please Note: These Minutes were revised on Tuesday, May 02, 2006. Items in bold and italics have been added to the Minutes, while items that have been crossed out have been deleted.