



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday February 22, 2007 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
Keith Coffman-Grey
Michael Cooper
Steve Mass
David Pritchett
David Tabor

Attendance

Present
Present
Present
Present
Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator
Grant House, Councilmember
Helene Schneider, Councilmember
Teresa Martinez, Administrative Specialist

OTHERS PRESENT:

none

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. Approval of TCC Minutes for December 14, 2006 and January 25, 2007.
Mr. Boyd moved and Dr. Cooper seconded approving the Minutes from the December 14, 2006 meeting as amended.

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

Mr. Tabor moved and Mr. Coffman-Grey seconded approving the Minutes from the January 25, 2007 meeting.

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 2 Absent: 0

REPORTS

3. **MTD's December 2006 Monthly Downtown Waterfront Shuttle and Commuter Lot Shuttle Report and the Crosstown Shuttle Quarterly Report. – Browning Allen**

Browning Allen informed the committee that Sherrie Fisher was not able to be present at the meeting as requested by the TCC due to illness. He then introduced Steve Mass as the person to respond to Committee questions. Mr. Maas relayed the message from David Damiano that he expects to come to the next meeting in order to answer questions regarding marketing. Mr. Maas addressed the question of why ridership fell off from 700,000 plus ridership in the mid 1990s to the mid 500,000 range. It was replied that a detailed analysis would have to be done and MTD would work on putting that report together to bring to a future meeting.

Dr. Cooper asked if the marketing expense warrants continuation if the ridership is falling off without signs of improvement. He also commented that the headway on State Street is a primary issue for the Shuttle to navigate because of the congestion. He proposed having a conversation among the Downtown Organization, MTD, and Transportation regarding if the Shuttle needs to continue on State Street and if so, would the downtown merchants be able to facilitate improving the headways since the Shuttle was intended to improve business for those merchants. It was replied that the conversation can be had, but the Downtown Shuttle was a mitigation of the Downtown Redevelopment; and State Street was a street that was designated to move patrons from one end of the street to the other so as to ease traffic on State Street which will limit the conditions of approval from the RDA. Dr. Cooper also responded that it may be with the congestion on State Street there is nothing that can be done, but the Shuttle used to make shorter trips in less time while transporting more people; therefore, the conversation should include if improvements of this service are possible. It was replied that a conversation would be had with David Damiano, Steve Maas, and Sherrie Fisher of MTD regarding this issue.

Mr. Bradley asked why the City does not make State Street a pedestrian only zone. He would like to raise the issue again. He feels that would help the Downtown Shuttle service to run better by getting rid of the congestion while also making State Street more attractive to pedestrians. He also commented on Table 5C in the Monthly Report showing ridership per hour of service. The average per year on the bottom row of the table shows that in 1996-2000 ridership was steady until 2000-2002 when there was a big drop in ridership and since 2002, it has been steady again. He wondered what happened during 2000-2002. It was replied that there was a significant drop in ridership during Fiscal Year 2001-02 due to 9/11. It is unknown why the ridership since then has not fully recovered.

Mr. Boyd also encouraged the City to take a look at other options to improve the pedestrian friendliness in the Downtown area while also maintaining the shuttle service in the area. He suggested maybe diverting auto traffic to the adjacent side streets for portions of time throughout the day.

Mr. Pritchett suggested for a future meeting to look at the General Plan Update and the Circulation Element in order to conclude what parts of the Circulation Element might be a specific recommendation to this issue. Perhaps the concept that part of State Street could be an electric bus and pedestrian/bike way and not just a place for cruising cars is something that could be interjected in the General Plan Update. Rob Dayton replied that the concept of State Street being a paseo is in the General Plan and that issue has been revisited in the early 1990s with the findings that the majority of people were against it at that time. It was discovered by

researching other streets across the nation that unless the life of the street can sustain itself from the early morning to late in the day by pedestrian traffic, the closing-off of the street to through traffic will not be successful. Staff does not believe that the pedestrian activity is habit enough to warrant a closure.

Mr. Bradley asked what the practices of the other cities were when closing off their main streets. It was replied that in the late 1980s or early 1990s, Third Street Promenade in Santa Monica brought the road back in order to bring the vitality back to the area. A short two lane section with rolled curb was opened, farmers market was folded in, and a theater, office and residential spaces were also constructed. The temporary road was closed on the weekends for two years until there was enough presence of people to warrant the street being closed at all times. Mr. Bradley stated that without too much trouble the street could be open for traffic until after the morning rush hour and then closed again for the rest of the shopping day. Browning Allen responded that with the road closure now for the sidewalk project the circulation in the area is an issue and it takes much consideration and planning to think out something like that.

Mr. Tabor commented that the Shuttle is an end to a means of congestion relief in the Downtown by providing another alternative for people to leave their cars in one spot while they are getting to where they are going. He does not feel that closing State Street downtown would relieve congestion although it would speed up the shuttle. But the overall goal should not be lost sight of when looking at this issue. He also commented on the logistics of closing State Street by giving the example that one of the biggest nightmares of the Tuesday Farmers Market is what to do when people come to the end of the farmers market because they are strolling around enjoying the market and when they come to the cross-street there is traffic. If State Street were to be closed you would find yourself with that nightmare of pedestrians possibly wondering out into the cross-traffic.

Mr. Boyd asked if the City has ever done any detailed analysis of why people are driving on State Street during various times of the day. It was replied that it is an attraction for people.

Mr. Pritchett commented that it was an issue suitable for when they address the General Plan Update because the prior attitude of not wanting to close off the street may be different now. In his experience, the big variable for closing off a street to traffic was if the street had car parking and State Street does not.

Mr. Coffman-Grey agreed that this should be one of the topics addressed in the General Plan Update. He also mentioned the Crosstown Shuttle Quarterly Report which showed that ridership has increased. Steve Maas replied that another bus was added in order to stay on schedule during the busier times of the day. MTD covered the cost for the extended service. There were 500 more riders this year than last with one less day of operation.

Mr. Cooper asked what MTD was doing about the declining ridership on the Crosstown Shuttle. Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that he believed that the Crosstown Shuttle was a part of the mitigation for the people who pay for Carrillo Commuter permits. It was answered that the Commuter lot is full in terms of permits issued. It is a mitigation of the RDA like the Downtown Shuttle. It was also responded that weather has an impact on whether people choose to walk or utilize the shuttle service. There has not been a drop-off in usage of the Carrillo Commuter Lot. Dr. Cooper commented that he follows the Crosstown Shuttle in the morning and the speed of the shuttle is an average of 10 miles per hour which may also be a factor in why people are not utilizing it. He feels it is a mobile calming device. Mr. Mass replied that ridership does fluctuate.

In December 2006, ridership was up in comparison to the ridership in December 2005 in spite of there being less operating days in December 2006. Ridership is down for the first part of this fiscal year, but it is hard to say how it is going to end up when the fiscal year is finished. Dr. Cooper then said he would like to see the Crosstown Shuttle run more frequently or have another bus added to the line to help to increase in ridership. It was then replied that if another bus was added, it would double the cost of the service.

4. **City Employee Work TRIP Presentation – Dru van Hengel**

Dru van Hengel gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies that the City is exploring for City Staff. The background of the program is that City Administration recognizes the high cost of commuting both financial and time cost. The purpose of the TDM program is to give incentives to employees to get them out of their cars by saving them time and recovering some their costs. It has been found that employees are dissatisfied with their commutes and the commute from out of town is not going to get better. There is concern that those who move out of town will also seek employment out of town which is a transportation benefit for the regional system, but at the loss of the City who is losing great employees. As a result of this, the City has been exploring ways to allow workers to arrive on the job more invigorated and ready to work while alleviating congestion on local streets and the regional network by encouraging employees to utilize carpools, other transit, and telecommuting. The efforts also provide environmental benefits in the form of fuel consumption and air pollution. Forecasted travel demand in the year 2030 show that the freeway capacity during P.M. peak hour traffic won't be able to meet the demand unless other practices are put into place. Traffic Demand Management are not Capital Improvement Projects; they are projects to enhance the efficiency of the already existing systems by reducing demand of those systems, i.e., local streets and the 101. The goals are to reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and provide low cost trip reduction strategies. The current TDM program consists of offering City employees free MyRide bus passes, commuter choice flexible spending accounts which allows employees who subscribe to long distance bus, train, and van pool services to pay for those costs pre-taxed by deducting those costs from the employees' paychecks, and offering a flexible work schedule program where employees are encouraged to work out of the standard work hours or telecommute one or more days per week. The City has a mutual relationship with Traffic Solutions who provide carpool match list services and other assistance for commuters. The City also offers preferential carpool parking, and has a bike fleet available to employees for trips around town during the day. There is a guaranteed ride home program through Traffic Solutions and through Motorpool and the City provides vehicles for medical appointments and for medical emergencies. Based on the 2006 City Employee Survey, 73% of City employees reported driving alone. The City's goal is to improve TDM to be at least as good as the county average of 68%. The goals of the enhanced TDM Program are to retain and recruit employees, to improve the work-life balance of Staff, to enhance productivity by taking away some of the stress of the commute, and to see a reduction in single occupant vehicle work-trips to the worksite. The schedule consists of revising the vehicle use policy including adding the City fleet carpool program, the committee reviewing the 9/80 plan is planning to present to Council their findings in April, the bus pass subsidy is scheduled to be implemented on July 1, 2007, the Commute Challenge Contest will also be expanded by July 1, 2007, and by October 2007, have all of the enhanced TDM programs available on a web-site for City Staff and for public awareness.

Mr. Maas asked if the 73% who drive alone are City employees or downtown employees. It was responded that the presentation was only talking about City employees.

Mr. Boyd asked what the 4% "Other" mode of transportation referred to. It was answered that the "Other" was skateboard and/or scooter.

Mr. Boyd asked for clarification on the percentage of employees who drive alone to work, but live within one mile of their worksites. It was answered that 50% of those who do live within one mile of their worksites drive alone. It was then suggested that a program be implemented to encourage walking among those who do live within one mile of their worksite. It was responded that, that suggestion falls in line with the idea of individually working with each employees to tailor their work trips. Mr. Boyd felt that the 9/80 schedule would be a benefit even though there are questions about what people do in their off time.

Mr. Bradley asked what percent of employees have work that could be done by telecommuting. It was responded that a new reporting system was implemented in the Financial Management System that will be able track the percentage of those telecommuting along with the number of hours spent telecommuting. The first report has yet to be run, but there is an increase in flex-work participation and telecommuting with the use of GoToMy PC which allows employees to work on their work computer desktops from home. It was also asked if there were institutional barriers to telecommuting; for example, employees feeling that they have to be at the workplace everyday. It was answered that there were some concerns at the start of the program last year that were addressed with management head-on. There are some groups of employees, such as field crews, who it would be inappropriate for them to work from home for a full day unless they are doing reports. The direction from the City Administrator is to consider all of the applications seriously and give them due consideration. Training is also offered to the managers through a telecommuting advantage group. It was also asked how the City would accomplish the Circulation Element Policy 6.4, "The City shall...encourage employees to live closer to the workplace." It was answered that City employees are eligible for the Coastal Housing Partnership Mortgage Assistance Program which is a low interest loan program. Also it is believed that the barrier of Highway 101 (101) will become so great that workers will want to move back into the community, but only time will tell about that. **Bradley mentioned that Santa Barbara's 75% drive alone rate was similar to bigger cities like Sacramento, but after looking at Sacramento's numbers, he realized it was for the whole city, not just the downtown area. When looking at the downtown area, the number of the drive alone rate is about 65% for Sacramento, although San Jose does have about the same percentage as Santa Barbara.**

Mr. Pritchett asked what the figure was for the percentage of commuters for MTD. It was answered that 1% of those who responded to the City survey said that they used MTD as their mode of transportation to work. It was then asked if the MyRide program had already been implemented. It was replied that the MyRide program has already been implemented. It was then asked if all those employees who use MTD had MyRide passes. It was responded that the only passes that City employees are getting are the MyRide passes and in fact, the MyRide passes were first given to City employees before they were given to anyone else. There about 150 City employees who use MTD on a regular basis out of about 1,000 employees. It was then reminded that the survey was self reported with 30% participation or 440 employees. It was then asked if the 150 employees who have the passes ride the bus regularly because 150 employees out of 1,000 is more than 1%. It was responded that there were about 700 to 800 City employees given the passes, but 150 of them ride the bus on a regular basis and since the survey was self-reported there is variability in the numbers. It was then asked what the process was to get a pass and if that was a limiting factor. It was responded that City employees only need to go to the Downtown Parking Office to get their picture taken and the pass is issued.

New employees are told about this at New Employee Orientation.

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked if City employees had to pay for the \$45.00 for the 90 day pass or if they were still receiving them for free. It was answered that City employees are still receiving the passes for free as part of the TDM Work-TRIP program.

Mr. Pritchett commented that City Council agreed, not by vote, that members of City committees, commissions, and boards should also be able to get the free MyRide pass and he asked what the process was for that. It was responded that the process of getting a MyRide is easy to do and Parking Staff will work on outreach.

Mr. Tabor commented that he appreciated these efforts because he would rather see tax dollars going towards getting people off the highways instead of building more highways. He feels that the success of this program coincides with bigger issues such as bringing in a commuter rail service from Ventura County since it has been argued that people will not utilize a commuter rail once they get to Santa Barbara because it is not efficient for them to get around. If something like this can work City employees on a micro level, it will show that this can be expanded for the community at large.

Mr. Maas also commented that this was a great program that will do a lot to mitigate some of the traffic. He also believes that the bus subsidy for employees who live out of the area will be a great incentive to get more riders on those services along with the 9/80 flex work program that encourages employee retention. He also talked about the issue of the 1% number of employee ridership. Based on data from the traffic study during the construction of the Granada Garage, he found that 10% of all downtown employees, not just City employees, were riding MTD buses on a daily basis. The data was based on the Wilbur Smith assessment of the Granada Garage.

Mr. Boyd asked if there has been any tailored marketing done with City employees in order to see if they have good options for bus ridership as a means to make recommendations for alternate bus routes or to highlight the accessibility for some employees who live and work near existing bus routes. It was responded that is a goal of the Division to hold peoples' hands through the process of making choices, but it has not been done yet. The Harbor Department is being worked with to bring access of the Vista and Clean Air Express closer to the worksite by means of providing a shuttle from the bus stops to the workplace. It was then asked what the City was doing to encourage other governmental agencies, like the County and Santa Barbara School District, to implement similar programs. It was answered that the County and the City are involved in similar projects and they have been racing for the last year to get the first flex work program out and to have attractive incentives for alternative transportation. The County and the City are both a part of the Traffic Solutions. Traffic Solutions is the more appropriate body to do outreach for the rest of the community.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that this was a well-rounded approach to reach out to different people with different needs. He was also amazed by the 73% drive alone rate. He hopes that these incentives will help to bring that number down.

5. Rail~Volution Presentation – Rob Dayton

Rob Dayton gave a PowerPoint presentation on the San Diego Field Trip and the Rail~Volution Conference held in Chicago. The Council Rail Sub-Committee was formed in 2005 out of the 101 Consensus Process that had a commute rail component in order to learn more about commuter rail, to understand the relationship with UP, and to facilitate regional coordination.

The difference between light and heavy rail is heavy rail have diesel engines, they have designated tracks generally, they go at faster speeds, and they serve commuter and inter-city travel for longer distances and with less stops. Light rail has either a dedicated corridor or it can go on the street at a wide-range of speeds, it has electric motors or overhead wires, more frequent stops, serves commute and all day trips, and has short or long distance runs. The presentation on the San Diego Field Trip included information on the Sprinter, the Coaster, and the San Diego Trolley. The presentation on the Rail~Volution Conference included information on the elevated "L" light rail trains and the mission of the broader planning concept to develop livable communities with transit. There was a host of various topics that were covered that can be referred to in Council members Schneider and House's notes. One theme of the Conference that is very important is to look at planning from a holistic perspective, not from a reductionist perspective, where specific agencies are only looking at one problem while exacerbating a different problem in another aspect of the community. This conference confirmed that Santa Barbara is already on track to doing a balanced approach with the Circulation Element emphasizing the connection between land use and transportation along with MTD transit service efforts. To summarize the lessons of the Conference in three points: 1. good transportation solutions require communities, 2. holistic transportation solutions will be challenging to take on the paradigm of bridging the gap among agencies, and 3. transit oriented transportation offers a broad range of modest solutions to many of Santa Barbara's current issues.

Dr. Cooper asked about Oceanside being successful because of the rail station being at the transit hub and if that's correct, than the conversation regarding the MTD Transit Center being relocated to the Train Station becomes a different one. It was responded that Oceanside is the end of the line and as such is becoming a hub. It was commented that if light rail is being talked of in any form the bus seems to be an important factor in being there. Clarification was then asked for the concept of if a light rail or commuter line would be used. It was replied that the concept identified in 101 In Motion was for a heavy rail or commuter service to connect cities in northern Ventura County with destinations between Santa Barbara and Goleta. It was then asked if light rail was feasible and if it was being revitalized as a commuter possibility. It was responded that there has never been discussion of light rail in Santa Barbara to date, but that Light Rail was brought up in 101 In Motion and dismissed because it was the wrong tool to solve the problem. Light Rail is used for more frequent stops in a more dense urban fabric, not for long distances between stops at high speeds. It was then asked if a light rail line would run east to west in Santa Barbara being that it is a narrow geographic corridor. It was answered that should be something that is looked at especially with the Upper State Street study showing congestion is at its limit. When the freeway breaks down, Upper State Street suffers so what can be concluded from this, is that in the long-term a designated transit corridor is necessary. It was also asked if the trains talked about in the presentation had bike storage. It was answered that on the Coaster there is room for four bicycles in the downstairs area and on the light rail trains there is room for two bicycles to be on the train in certain positions. There is room for more bicycles on the newer San Diego low floor model cars. Also at rail stops, there are many opportunities to secure bicycles either in lockers or in a semi-secure facility.

Mr. Mass commented on the issue of the connection between a potential rail system and transit. He said that any funding plan of rail will almost certainly include money to allow MTD to serve the train passengers with dedicated buses to pick up passengers and take them to where they need to go. As far as moving the main transit center to the Amtrak station, it would not be useful for many MTD riders who have their final destination in the downtown core near the current transit center. In addition, the roadways in that area are not conducive to a large number of bus trips on a daily basis. The issue mentioned of the Upper State Street Study and

a bus rapid transit system was included in the 101 In Motion Process. This includes a recommendation for bus priority along the Hollister and State Street corridor, such as, being able to extend a green light when a bus is coming, possibly have a Q jumper lane at intersection lanes to allow a bus to get into lanes quicker, and other intersection improvements that doesn't take a full lane for transit, but still speeds up bus travel inexpensively. He also commented on the idea of exploring the use of a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) which is similar to the Sprinter only there is one made that is compliant with the Federal Railroad Administration and can run in a corridor as mixed in with freight trains. It is a U.S. made vehicle produced by the Colorado Rail Car. This option was not considered in 101 In Motion probably due to the additional capital expense in the form of maintenance facilities, but there are also substantial savings in operating costs that were not explored in 101 In Motion.

Mr. Boyd asked how the DMU compares and contrasts with the Sprinter. It was answered that there were similarities and we come to the process of purchasing equipment the question of what is the most appropriate equipment to purchase will be addressed. The Colorado Rail Car is a vehicle that is already being built. It is not something that needs to go through a detailed design process. It was replied that it is more expensive, but it does not hold as many people. The DMU is a car and an engine so when another car needs to be added you have to add a car and an engine versus the traditional engine with the cars. You can add cars as the service grows so the add-on cost is less expensive than the DMU. The issue at hand is the extent of what relieves congestion and what train set is the most appropriate. It was also asked what has been done to understand Union Pacific Railroad (UP). It was answered that Union Pacific's freight routes that go to the east out of the port of Los Angeles are their high demand freight line. Their number one line is the Tahachapee line. It's a bottleneck in the train system because it's a single track line where only one car can use the line at once which is a limitation. This makes the Santa Barbara option the second most popular and needed freight/transport route. Because this is their second most important line, they have discouraged the creation of a commuter service without looking at creating more sections for passing which the 101 In Motion and the Los Angeles-San Diego Rail Corridor Agency (LOSSAN) report looks at what is the needed siding for both freight and passenger train traffic between Santa Barbara and Ventura. Hopefully one of the Union Pacific's representatives will be able to visit the Rail Subcommittee in the next few months. It was then asked about the touchy area of negotiation. It was also asked if there was preliminary work being done to see if there are possibilities to UP coming around. Councilmember House answered that the recent report from LOSSAN showed that additional sidings are needed based on 2015 forecasts. Passenger rail has right of way over freight, but UP does freight. He also referenced Proposition 1B which was recently passed by voters. Proposition 1B provides many millions of dollars in infrastructure improvements. There is real interest in using some of that money to add another lane on the 101 between Mussel Shoals up to Carpinteria which is the narrowest segment of the 101. In a letter supporting the idea of adding a lane to that segment of the freeway, the City also included a comment that comprehensive planning for that stretch should also include looking at the future of rail and the need for additional space for sidings in the area. To the question of understanding UP, it is being looked similar to LOSSAN's approach—by looking ahead. Passenger rail service in the area has been increasing in double digits every year. South of LA is has been going up 25% every year. One lesson learned is that the Measure 1B funding is in different accounts with an account for rail that has not yet been considered for its allocation.

Councilmember House also took this opportunity to voice his joy on being able to attend the Rail~volution Conference and shared how interesting it was to see how a commuter line is utilized by suburbanites. He found it interesting that in suburban areas that are not very dense, life was created around rail stops in the form of coffee shops and other transit services that

connected people from the train station to the rest of the community. He also added that the point is not about what mode is being used, but it was an attitude about way of living.

Mr. Pritchett asked what line was ridden by the group in Chicago. It was answered that the Burlington Northern Line was ridden as far west as Brookfield. It was commented that the towns 25 miles west are denser. Councilmember House responded that there were both good and bad examples of transit oriented developments around the train stations where it was observed that more is needed than just housing to create life around the stations.

Councilmember Schneider commented that although Santa Barbara is not like Chicago or San Diego in terms of size or density, there are lessons that can be learned by looking at their systems. She also commented that a holistic approach needs to be looked at especially with the Upper State Street Study and the General Plan. She also commented on how vital the connectivity of the train station to the rest of the community is to maintain the vibrancy of the rail service.

Mr. Tabor shared with the Committee his experience of traveling in Baltimore without a car. He also commented on his son's excitement of San Diego State University because of the way that the bus station went into the campus and the buzz around the station. He also commented on the regional transportation model and how we need to improve ours for greater sustainability.

Mr. Bradley shared that he went to the Rail~volution Conference when it was in Los Angeles. He feels that DMU's are more fuel efficient and if they can use bio diesel they are better for the environment. He also commented that the perception that a commuter rail will only work on the East Coast is wrong because there are more commuter rail systems in California than any other state in the country and they are all successful. There are three new systems on the drawing board right now: Santa Barbara and Ventura, Sonoma and Marin, and Monterey and Santa Cruz which are all smaller communities. He also mentioned that with every person utilizing commuter rail, there is one less car trip because they are choice riders who would otherwise be driving. He also commented that the Sprinter is one of the most expensive examples and is not representative of how much a similar service would cost. It was also commented that having money from Measure D or whatever replaces Measure D will be very important in getting a commuter service.

Mr. Pritchett had questions regarding the train systems in San Diego County. He asked about the one half cent sales tax and when that expires. It was answered that it was just renewed in the last few years and was extended for another 30 years. It was then asked what the tax was used for. It was answered that one-third goes for maintenance on existing roads, one third for transit and one third for congestion relief or expansion of roads. It was also asked how the Coaster Commuter Train, the freight trains, and Amtrak utilize the same tracks. It was answered that the Coaster and Amtrak use the same line while the light rail, San Diego Trolley, is on a separate corridor altogether. The day Coaster trains from Oceanside are stored in the Trolley Car yard so it's a mixed flow of light and heavy rail. San Diego is the only system that operates both light and heavy rail on the same line in the country. During the day the light rail runs on the blue line and at night heavy freight is run on the same line. This system is not applicable in Santa Barbara because the passenger line and freight are heavy systems that both operate during the day.

Mr. Boyd shared with the Committee his experience of living in Chicago and from that he feels that the availability of options is very important to give to the commuter. Councilmember House

commented that the issue of equity in a transit oriented development becomes more affluent with the presence of transit options and it is important to keep a mixed community. Also where planning failed, it was because there was not enough emphasis on inclusion of the community and public participation upfront.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that he was very pleased to see this presentation on the San Diego Field Trip and the Rail-Volution Conference with the holistic approach as presented in the Conference and the different types of rail as shown in the field trip. He asked when the Coaster went into service in San Diego. It was answered that it was in the 1990s. He then asked how long it took to get the money for the Coaster before it went into service and how long it would take to get the money to get this service in Santa Barbara County if it took 20 years to get the money for the Coaster with a half cent sales tax in a county as large as San Diego's. Councilmember Schneider answered that it is not exactly comparable because Santa Barbara is not going to purchase an entire rail line nor is a completely new line being built. The LOSSAN study is about utilizing an existing corridor instead of starting from scratch which is the case with the Sprinter. Mr. Bradley added that in the 101 In Motion Study, a timeline was set out and he believes that it could be implemented within seven years from the time funding was available.

6. **Date for Election of Chair and Vice Chair.**

Motion 1: Made by Maas and seconded by Cooper

This item was put on the agenda after the January Committee meeting. The history of this committee was started in March and historically the Chair and Vice-Chair have been elected in March. As stated in the By-Laws, the terms of office are to end on December 31. Mr. Pritchett stated that not all of the City Committees elect their Chairs in January. He commented that if the election of Chair was to be moved to February, the newest members on the Committee would be able to learn about the potential candidates. Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that by electing the Chair and Vice-Chair in January, the Committee is able to get a jumpstart on the year by setting priorities instead of waiting till March.

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

7. **Election of Chair and Vice Chair.**

Motion 2: Made by Boyd seconded by Pritchett

Bill Boyd moved to nominate Dr. Cooper for Chair in light of the fact that he has been a longstanding member and has served the past year as Vice-Chair. Mr. Pritchett asked for the pool of candidates. It was replied that everyone is eligible and everyone is free to nominate themselves as well. David Pritchett moved to nominate David Tabor as Chair. A roll call vote was called:

Pritchett: Tabor
Bradley: Tabor
Tabor: Cooper
Coffman-Grey: Cooper
Boyd: Cooper
Cooper: Cooper
Maas: Cooper

The Transportation Circulation Committee has elected Dr. Cooper for Chair.

Motion 3: Made by Coffman-Grey seconded by Cooper.

The Transportation Circulation Committee has elected David Tabor for Vice-Chair.

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

8. **Staff Briefing on Current Topics.**

Browning Allen informed the Committee that on Tuesday February 27, 2007, City Council will hold a joint meeting with the Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors and MTD Board in order to talk about Transit Village located at the Transit Center at City Lot 3. The Committee was reminded of the presentation presented by the RDA to the TCC last Fall, 2006. Also on February 5, the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) gave final approval for the traffic calming devices in the St. Francis area for Safe Routes To School. It was asked what design was approved. They were described as having landscape, ~~feau~~ **faux** sandstone curbing that are consistent with the parkway, and curb extensions with a planter where the radius is large enough. The circles will not have rolling curbs, but they will be mountable for fire apparatuses. Mr. Tabor voiced his disappointment in how long this process took. It was responded that with the approval by ABR, there is now a template for future traffic calming measures. Santa Barbara for Safe Streets appealed ABR's decision, but it is unknown when that will go before Council. Final design is being moved forward and will go out to bid hopefully by the end of March, 2007, with construction beginning before the end of the fiscal year. It was asked why the decision is being appealed. It was responded that Santa Barbara for Safe Streets didn't like them because they felt that the devices didn't fit into the style of the neighborhood and they felt the devices didn't get the appropriate vote. The ABR's action was only on the aesthetics of the devices. It was then asked if the Transportation Division would email the Committee when that appeal goes before Council to which it was replied yes.

9. **Review of Upcoming Agenda Items.**

On March 8, 2007 at 8:00 a.m., a joint meeting will be held with the DPC to discuss the results of the Downtown Employee Survey.

On March 22, 2007, the Planning Commission will come to the regularly scheduled meeting of the TCC to discuss the Upper State Street Study.

The April meeting of the TCC will be dedicated to the consideration of the Prioritization of the Circulation Element to be included in Plan Santa Barbara, formerly known as SB 20/30. It was asked about appointing a sub-committee to address the consideration of the Prioritization of the Circulation Element. It was answered that it would be more beneficial to include all of the members and dedicate one meeting strictly to addressing that topic. ~~It was~~ **Mr. Pritchett** then asked what "information only" meant to the TCC. It was responded that in the matter of the Circulation Element, recommendations by the TCC would be taken to the Planning Commission to advise that certain matters be taken to City Council while undertaking Plan Santa Barbara.

10. **Committee Member/Subcommittee Member Comments.**

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that the Street Light Subcommittee has not yet met so there is no update at this time.

Mr. Tabor commented that Mr. Coffman-Grey ran a great meeting and it was a pleasure to serve under him.

Mr. Coffman-Grey informed the Committee that Sherrie Fisher of MTD had a bad horse riding accident and she is now recuperating. It was asked that the Transportation Division on behalf of the TCC send her a card. It was responded that the Transportation Division would gladly do so.

Mr. Cooper complemented the Minutes from the January 25, 2007 meeting. Mr. Boyd agreed.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:40 PM

Committee Members: Bill Boyd, Mark Bradley, Keith Coffman-Grey, Michael Cooper (Chair), Steve Maas, David Pritchett, and David Tabor (Vice-Chair)

Please Note: These Minutes were revised on Thursday, March 22, 2007. Items in bold have been added to the Minutes, while items that are crossed out have been deleted.