



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, April 27, 2006 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting to order at 6:02 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
Victor Garza, Parking/TMP Superintendent
Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator
John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sherrie Fisher, General Manager, SBMTD.
Steve Maas, Manager of Strategic Planning and Compliance, SBMTD
Greg Knudson,

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None. (Dr. Cooper came in at 6:05 P.M.)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Ralph Fertig read his own letter to Editor of the Santa Barbara News-Press that corrected inaccurate statements from a letter entitled "Bike paths rolling over car lanes" that was published in the "Letters" section of the News-Press on April 27, 2006.

Michael Self stated she represented the Coalition for Safe Streets, of which she is the Chair. She commented that since the Circulation Element is not part of the Municipal Code, it is not binding. She also feels that our public transportation is not capable of adequately meeting the needs of a diverse population. The Coalition for Safe Streets wants to ensure that this area retains its beauty, charm, and grace. She noted her disappointment with TCC members who do not want to enter into further discussion regarding these issues and feels strongly that the TCC should declare a moratorium on future traffic projects until everyone is fully informed by both sides.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Boyd and seconded by Tabor to approve the TCC Minutes from March 23, 2006, with the following revisions:

Page 6, Mr. Boyd Comment section, paragraph 3, last sentence: Mr. Boyd felt it was unreasonable to count a vote as the end result of an ~~improper~~ **flawed** process.

Page 9, Chair Coffman-Grey comment, first sentence: 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.

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

3. MTD's Monthly Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle and Commuter Lot Report, and Quarterly Crosstown Shuttle Report.

Mr. Maas discussed the Crosstown Shuttle ridership fluctuation. In response to TCC questions, Mr. Maas explained how a change in the payment mix (full fare price versus discounted price) could indicate an increase in fare revenues while showing a corresponding decrease in passengers. The Carrillo Lot Shuttle had a 15% increase in March over last year.

4. Bike Station Status Report.

Victor Garza, TMP/Parking Superintendent, introduced Andrea White, a consultant for the Bikestation Coalition. Mr. Garza gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Bicycle Station which is to be located in approximately 1,300 square feet of ground area in the office structure attached to the Granada Garage. The Bikestation Coalition was hired to design the bike station and they also performed a Needs Assessment which determined that the most practical operation scenario initially would be an un-staffed facility with close City supervision. There will be room for a bike rack system that can house approximately 80 bikes, individual lockers, a public restroom and shower, and floor space for minor bicycle repairs and maintenance. An agreement with the Bikestation Coalition is being finalized, with Council approval scheduled for May 2006. The Grand Opening for the bike station should occur in July 2006, which will be after the Grand Opening for the Granada Garage which is scheduled for June 2006.

Public Comment:

Dale Francisco asked whether usage statistics could be automatically generated for patrons using the bike station. He was told this would be the case.

Ralph Fertig was informed that this bike station is planned to become an officially trademarked bike station.

TCC Comment:

Mr. Bradley asked for more information about the Green Bike Program. In describing the program, staff discussed how the bikes would be checked out, used, and secured.

5. Results of Oak Park NTMP Balloting Process (Continuation).

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager, informed the TCC that the staff recommendation has not changed. Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator, gave a PowerPoint presentation that outlined in detail how the NTMP program came into being, how it led to the Oak Park Mobility Plan, and how the Circulation Element policies apply to the Oak Park Mobility Plan.

Ms. van Hengel described how neighbors were invited to participate in neighborhood and core group meetings. In between the neighborhood meetings, the core group provided direction to staff, conducted outreach to neighbors to solicit participation, and worked from the results of surveys and neighborhood meetings to develop a Mobility Plan.

Numerous mailers and invitations were sent out not only to invite the neighbors to participate in the meetings but also to inform the neighbors about the results of the meetings and the plans that were being developed. In addition to these meetings, a three-day workshop was held with Dan Burden from Walkable Communities, an expert in developing successful traffic mobility plans throughout the world.

The final product of the neighborhood meetings, the core group meetings, and the three-day traffic calming charrette was the Oak Park Mobility Plan. The traffic calming solutions in this plan were also reviewed to ensure that they were in compliance with the goals and policies of the Circulation Element. Since the Oak Park Mobility Plan was the second pilot program developed from the NTMP, it benefited from what was learned during the development of the St. Francis program.

The first survey ballot for the Oak Park Mobility Plan was mailed in June 2005, with less than 10% of the ballots being returned. In addition, a critical staff change at this time created some unfortunate delays that caused a loss of momentum in the Oak Park NTMP. When staff was able to meet with the core group to discuss the lukewarm response and apparent confusion as to what was being voted on in June 2005, the core group suggested mailing a second survey ballot with a revised Oak Park Mobility Plan that eliminated the Capital Improvement projects, the Cottage Hospital Modernization Project Conditions of Approval projects, and one mini-circle in the Samarkand area due to significant opposition from neighbors living in that area. The revised Oak Park Mobility Plan (3,800 ballots) were mailed in December 2005, with 200 ballots either mailed back, faxed, or emailed by individual respondents, while 300 ballots were hand delivered by Mrs. Michael Self.

An analysis of the 2nd survey ballots indicates that while there was a majority of support of the plan from ballots returned via mail, fax, or email, this majority was reversed when considering all of the returned survey ballots. Staff reviewed some excerpts from the position papers circulation by Mrs. Self. Final results seem to indicate a failure to accurately measure community sentiment. Since the Oak Park Mobility Plan did not receive the 65% approval that would indicate general neighborhood support, the staff recommendation was to discontinue with the Oak Park Neighborhood Mobility Plan.

Per request from the TCC, Ms. van Hengel also consulted with a City Attorney who advised her that these results are not "formally" binding since this process was actually a petition process

and not an official formal ballot process. He suggested in future not using the term "ballot" due to its connotation as an official term.

Finally, in response to an earlier question by Dr. Cooper, Ms. van Hengel briefly discussed California Vehicle Code 22500 (g). In the Oak Park area there are several residential streets that have parking on both sides and the remaining road width is less than 20 feet. However, the entire Oak Park NTMP area has either red curb, "No Parking" signs, and/or pavement markings that are appropriate to accommodate the requirements of the California Vehicle Code Section 22500 (g).

Public Comment:

Josiah Jenkins expressed concern about lane reductions. He does not want traffic restricted any more than it already is. He is concerned about delivery trucks stopping on the street and blocking traffic if there is only one lane.

Wayne Beckman questioned the process that was used to get a consensus vote. He suggested using either a real secret ballot or an opinion poll. He feels that if the Coalition for Safe Streets in effect has veto power, there is no sense in planning any more traffic calming since the same thing that has happened with the Oak Park Mobility Plan will get repeated in other neighborhoods.

Diane Krohn lives in the Samarkand area and attended many of the Oak Park neighborhood meetings and core group meetings. She is disappointed that many of the negative votes seemed to have been based on inaccurate and false information. She feels it is not unreasonable for car drivers to be asked to drive safely through her neighborhood.

Jim Westby lives in the lower Riviera area and supports a motion to stop the NTMP plans. He does not like traffic circles and feels that fire trucks will not be able to adequately maneuver through the traffic mini circles; especially, through the one on Alta Vista.

Sharon Westby lives in the St. Francis area and wants work stopped in Oak Park. She asked that the TCC and staff listen to the people who feel this plan is too dangerous for children and pedestrians. She feels that the areas in Santa Barbara are too small for the traffic circles that have been planned.

Michael Self stated she took a personal look at the ballots and disagrees with staff as to the results. She feels that staff misrepresented the votes on Chapala Street. Mrs. Self informed the TCC that she had brought this to staff's attention who said this would be corrected, but it never was corrected. She also stated that when her paper was first presented to staff at a core meeting in December, Transportation staff had nothing contradictory to say about her statements. Mrs. Self feels that the core group is selected from among Transportation staff, COAST, and the Bicycle Coalition. She also indicated that the Fire Department representatives at the TCC meetings gave false information since she has "off the record" information that shows that the Fire Department is not in favor of this plan. Mrs. Self complained that staff has not given her the data that she has asked for, and finalized her statements by stating that the public only needs to look at what has happened at St. Francis to get an idea of how disruptive the traffic calming solutions can be.

Glen Minnich spoke in favor of the program. He stated he was a member of the core group and was certainly not selected by anyone. He informed the TCC that he and his neighbors together determined what the problems were and what the solutions should be. He is concerned about the role that activists are taking in stirring up the neighbors against this plan. Just because there now does not seem to be consensus, this does not mean that problems don't exist. He strongly encourages staff to go ahead with the traffic calming installations that have no impact on vehicular traffic such as more visible crosswalks and curb extensions. He also would like to see each traffic calming recommendation be considered individually.

June Pujo reviewed her lengthy involvement with the Oak Park core group who came up with a consensus on a draft report only after a lot of discussion and debate. Ms. Pujo strongly supports the traffic calming solutions which experts in this field have said would work. She does not want to see Oak Park abandoned. She encouraged the TCC and staff to revisit the program and to set aside the \$300,000 in order to fix the things needed to make the NTMP work.

Alex Pujo stated that the process needs to be "tuned up". He wondered if perhaps the expert testimony was not convincing enough, and feels that the experts need to be listened to. He also feels that the core group needs to be cohesive and promote a single plan that all need to agree on. If one member of the core group does not agree, the core group needs to go back and modify the plan to get consensus from everyone in the group. Then the entire group needs to try to get public support for the plan. Mr. Pujo also mentioned De La Vina Street as probably one of the most dangerous streets in Santa Barbara for bicyclists because of the overall speed of cars.

TCC Comments:

Mr. Bradley wanted to make a correction regarding the statement Mrs. Self made about the Circulation Element not being part of the Municipal Code and thus not binding. He informed the TCC that every city and county in California is legally required to include a Circulation Element as part of its General Plan. The entire process of getting consensus on the Santa Barbara Circulation Element was lengthy and comprehensive. Mr. Bradley is not sure that the vote reflects an accurate picture of what the neighborhood wants. He suggested that this procedural issue be passed on to Council for them to decide this issue.

Mr. Tabor is concerned about the process that was used. He would like to find a better way to accurately measure the impact of the traffic calming devices on people's lives. He would also like to see some means of incorporating some of the traffic calming suggestions. He feels that the delays of installing the traffic calming devices in the St. Francis neighborhood may have created a negative impact that could have affected the results in the Oak Park Neighborhood.

Ms. Greene wanted to thank Dru van Hengel for her in depth and frank report. She suggests that there may have been something wrong with the voting process. She would like to see staff determine alternatives rather than simply dropping the Oak Park Mobility Plan since the problems clearly exist.

Mr. Boyd also wanted to compliment Dru van Hengel and staff on the thoroughness of the response to questions and comments from TCC members at the last meeting and in getting materials back to TCC members. Mr. Boyd was very pleased that staff was able to solicit information from other communities that had faced similar kinds of problems and are also moving ahead with traffic calming. The information from the other communities suggested that

traffic circles are a very successful way to calm traffic. Mr. Boyd indicated that since the ballots clearly stated that they needed to be returned via email, mail or fax, only those that came in this way should be considered valid ballots. He does not want to see the entire process abandoned.

Dr. Cooper had no comment.

Chair Coffman-Grey feels strongly that the people living in a neighborhood should have the right to determine what will happen in their neighborhood. He reviewed what had happened during the entire process and indicated that this was both a lengthy and comprehensive process, and thus everyone who was interested could have participated. He has been troubled by the ballot process since the ballots did state to return them by mail, email or fax. He would not like to see the process end, especially since there are legitimate questions that could be raised as to how these votes were obtained. He noted the different solutions that communities across the country had come up with regarding which neighbors should be included in a ballot and how votes should be assigned. Keeping those solutions in mind, Chair Coffman-Grey asked TCC members to comment on and consider a written motion he had developed that included a section identifying the neighbor group that should be able to vote on a neighborhood proposal, and a section specifying the voting process. TCC members discussed the motion and added language for clarification purposes (see italics).

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

The Transportation & Circulation Committee disagrees with the staff recommendation to discontinue further work on the Oak Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program and to recommend to Council to direct staff to move forward with the *modified* Oak Park Neighborhood Traffic Management Program.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee recommends an *advisory vote* on each proposed traffic calming device in the Oak Park Neighborhood separately.

The process of voting shall be to give a vote to each property owner and resident (thus, owner-occupants get two votes) if the property has frontage on a street within 600 feet of a proposed device measured on roadway centerlines. If the device affects a property's sole source of access, that property is included in the vote even if it is outside the 600 feet. Voting will be by return ballot by mail or fax only.

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

Staff will make a determination as to whether this process needs to be further defined or if it should be brought directly to Council for their consideration.

6. Mission Street Bike Lane Project Review.

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner, reminded the TCC that this project was previously identified as a high priority project by both the TCC and Planning Commission in 2000 (#4 for TCC and #1 for PC) and again in 2002 (#3 for TCC and #3 for PC). Caltrans approved a \$1,225,000 combination of Federal and State funding for the \$1,357,000 project,

with the City paying the remainder 9.7%, which comes to \$132,000. This project will connect the Class II bicycle lanes that currently connect to each end of Castillo Street and Modoc Road.

The plans for this project would include the replacement of the curbs to widen the roadway by 7 feet between the Northbound 101 ramp and San Pascual Street to accommodate Class II bike lanes. This project will also include wider sidewalk where possible, landscaping, and new street/sidewalk lighting. In addition, an additional curb access ramp will be constructed in the Mission Street Underpass so that there will be curb access ramps at both freeway ramp intersections in the underpass and at the San Pascual intersection.

The project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy 4.2 (relating to the expansion, enhancement, and maintenance of the bikeway system) and Policy 4.4.4 (relating to the use of parking restrictions to create peak commute hour capacity for bicycle traffic).

Mr. Dayton also introduced Mr. Greg Knudson from MNS Engineers, Inc., who is the designer on this project, and Mr. John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer, who is the City staff member managing the project.

MOTION 2: Made by Boyd and seconded by Tabor.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee confirms that the Mission Street Bikeway Project is consistent with the goals of the Circulation Element.

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

Mr. Tabor was informed that the ABR had reviewed this project. Mr. Tabor also requested that when the road is resurfaced, the crew should make sure that along with the street, the full width of the bike path is also made smooth, and not just the part that is left over from resurfacing the street itself.

7. Funding Strategy for the Pedestrian Master Plan.

Mr. Dayton reminded the TCC of the joint TCC/Planning Commission meeting in April 2005 at which the TCC and the PC both approved the Pedestrian Master Plan that was presented. At that time, the financial portion was not included since it was not ready. Staff had informed the TCC and PC that they would return with the financial portion once it was completed. Unfortunately, the loss of two staff members last year delayed the completion of this report, which is why it is just now coming back for TCC comments and review.

The Pedestrian Master Plan final draft will be going to Council on June 6, 2006. Mr. Dayton clarified some of the numbers in Table X-8 were confusing since they were done in 5 year increments using a balanced approach funding. TCC members were concerned about what would happen to the pedestrian improvements if Measure D was not renewed.

Favorable funding has been received for the Safe Routes to School improvements and costs for specific improvements in four pilot schools (Table 10-6) have been determined. Costs for improvements to other neighborhood schools were extrapolated and actual costs may differ.

MOTION 3 : Made by Boyd and seconded by Coffman-Grey.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee recommends that Council approve the funding strategy for the Pedestrian Master Plan.

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

8. Update on Measure D.

The plan was approved 12-0, with Solvang abstaining. There were a number of compromises that needed to be made. The Coalition for a Fair Measure D made a huge compromise. Staff is pleased that the SBCAG Board is behind Measure D, and the fact that there are also private interests ready to campaign for the plan. The plan will now go before the individual cities for ratification and will come before Council on June 6, 2006.

Mr. Bradley informed TCC members that COAST will be trying to educate people and promote public support. Mr. Bradley also felt that MTD should get named as a line item on the South Coast Transit list. Sherrie Fisher, General Manager from MTD, confirmed that MTD would like to be included on the list. She feels there is a need for educational process since it is not clearly understood by all SBCAG members that MTD is a public agency (created by 65% of voters in the late 60's) with a legal responsibility and right to provide the transit service in the community. MTD is concerned that with this plan already going to the cities for ratification, it will make it all the more difficult to have this issue fully looked at and resolved.

Ms. Greene bemoaned the fact that funding for transit is always given in very small increments so it becomes extremely difficult to get to that critical point where transit is so convenient that people will choose it over other modes. Ms. Greene suggested to Sherrie Fisher that she review the integrated transportation plan used in Curitiba, Brazil, where transit services actually pay for themselves.

9. Staff Briefing on Current Topics.

Approved by Council on April 11, 2006: 1) The restriping of Chapala Street between Mission Street and Alamar Avenue from two vehicle lanes to one vehicle lane and one bicycle lane; and 2) The installation of the 11 traffic calming devices as part of the Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Improvements and the St. Francis Mobility Plan. The goal is to have this project under construction this summer.

Granada Garage – All levels of the garage have been opened to the public as of last month. The Parking offices should be completed by June 1, 2006, if the weather cooperates.

Upper State Street – The Planning staff will be introducing this item to the TCC on June 22, 2006.

10. Review of Upcoming Agenda Items.

May 4, 2006

A workshop on Level of Service (LOS). This is the 2nd of three workshops for the Planning Commission and the public. The first workshop held in March 2006 was on Traffic Analysis, and the "as yet to be scheduled" 3rd workshop will be on the subject of Parking.

May 11, 2006

TCC members indicated there will be a quorum

- 1) Temporary parking on Anapamu Street – this was scheduled to be removed after the Granada Garage was constructed but the Downtown Organization has asked for it to remain.
- 2) Queuing Lane on Anacapa Street for the Granada Garage.

June 8, 2006 – 7:30 AM (replaces May 11th meeting)

- 1) Joint Downtown Parking Committee/TCC Meeting – Results of Downtown Employee Survey.
- 2) Request from Redevelopment staff to also include the Urban Village Study at this meeting.

June 22, 2006

General Plan Update

Per request from Chair Coffman-Grey, a yearly calendar showing upcoming TCC dates was distributed to TCC members. This calendar will be updated on a yearly basis.

11. Committee Member/Subcommittee Comments.

Chair Coffman-Grey stated that the Subcommittee did meet last Tuesday morning and created a list of future agenda items for TCC participation. The completed list will be made available at a future TCC meeting. Dr. Cooper requested that the Minutes show that while he was absent from the Subcommittee meeting on April 18, 2006, Mr. Bradley was absent from the Subcommittee meeting at their previous meeting in March.

Mr. Allen reminded the TCC that he will not be at the May 25th TCC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:54 PM