



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, May 24, 2007 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

William C. Boyd
Mark Bradley
Keith Coffman-Grey
Michael Cooper
Steve Mass
David Pritchett
David Tabor

Attendance

Excused
Present
Present
Present
Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Teresa Martinez, Administrative Specialist
John Ledbetter, Principal Planner, Community Development

LIAISONS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. **Approval of TCC Minutes for April 24, 2007**

Mr. Tabor moved and Mr. Maas seconded approving the Minutes from the April 24, 2007 meeting as amended.

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

REPORTS

3. **Circulation Element Priorities for Plan Santa Barbara**

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, addressed the TCC regarding forwarding to the Community Development Division the recommended Circulation Element Policies to be

considered in Plan Santa Barbara. Staff first came to the Committee with the Circulation list which constituted the workload of the Committee. On the list there were five implementation strategies recommended because they dealt with land-use issues. The Committee requested that they be able to also make recommendations from the Circulation Element to be provided to Community Development. A draft memo to Paul Casey, Community Development Director, was developed by staff which includes staff's recommendations and the TCC's recommendations. Not included in the draft memo were priorities that are already in process, those that are already implemented, and those that are considered "just-do-it." A point of conflict is the Parking Master Plan because some parking issues are General Plan issues as they affect the land-use discussion. The policies that were included in the draft memo are those that staff felt were closely related to the land use issues including 5.7.5, 7.2.7, 8.1.1, and 8.2.9. The other implementation strategies that would fall under the Parking Master Plan were too detailed to include in the recommendation. It is possible to draft a Parking Master Plan in the background of Plan Santa Barbara based on community discussion and support, and the policy decisions and implementations, to bring it forward when the time is right. John Ledbetter added that the next steps in Plan Santa Barbara are the kick-off the last week of May, 2007, a mailing to all households, and a media campaign for the four workshops, the first of which is on June 14, 2007. Next fall, the information from the workshops and the grassroots outreach will be combined and summarized into a series of "Making the Connections" forums in order to help link the ideas that the community and Council have identified as important, but that are not covered typically in urban planning issues like global warming, sustainability, and public health. The next step will be looking at policy options, growth, and development. The third set of community workshops is to look at different alternatives concluding next winter. Interestingly, two weeks ago at the City Council meeting regarding the building heights issue, there was a realization that it's difficult to look at building heights without looking at other development standards comprehensively so for the TCC to prioritize the Circulation Element is appropriate and critical to be included in the process. Council has asked for a meeting to be put together, scheduled for the second week of July, 2007, from representatives of various Boards, Commissions, and Council to talk about development standards as they relate to building heights. It is anticipated that other issues will be brought up such as variable density, unit size, parking issues, and circulation elements.

Committee Member Comments

Mr. Maas commented that the list of priorities that staff recommended is fine. He would also like 9.2.1 (c) added to the draft memo. He made corrections to policy numbers and typographical errors in the memo.

Mr. Tabor asked Mr. Ledbetter if the process already had a direction and an idea of issues that should be addressed. Ledbetter responded that there are no preconceived notions as to what is going to come out of Plan SB. Tabor asked if land use was first and then everything else will be integrated after the land use element. Ledbetter answered that all issues will be considered together in a comprehensive way—land use, circulation, public safety, and sustainability—without presupposing anything. Tabor asked if rather than being specific at this stage, if it's more appropriate to make more general comments instead of suggesting specific direction. Ledbetter responded that the first set of workshops is not set up as policy conversations. It's more about vision and what the community hopes for in the future. Things are continuing through other venues that will funnel into Plan Santa Barbara in the fall and he doesn't advise holding them back because it's critical to get the issues out there. Tabor asked in regards to the Parking Master Plan if staff, priorities, and the budget are aligned to push forward with it. He also stated it seems that what is in the Circulation Element begs to the question of a Parking Bill of Rights of "do I have a General Plan right to park my car wherever I want to?" Those elemental questions

need to be addressed before looking at specific policies of reducing parking, or where to park or where to take the bus. Tabor asked where those philosophical questions are being addressed. Ledbetter answered that Plan SB is a great venue to discuss those questions to gage the community. The staff suggestion of taking that input and fashioning it into the beginnings of a Parking Master Plan as parallel and complementary process is a great idea.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commended staff on the matrix of recommendations. He stated that 13.2.2(b) is very important to get into the memo. He likes the idea of the Parking Master Plan being done parallel after the public gives their input because it is very important to create one. He is also pleased with staff including in the memo the recommendations in regards to parking.

Mr. Bradley stated that he also supported staff's recommendations in addition to his own. He recalled a conversation he had with someone from the Bicycle Coalition in regards to giving transit vehicles higher priorities since there are new technologies that have come about since the last Circulation Element was changed. He asked where the budget comes in, in implementing the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans since there are also new technologies to enhance their priorities. Rob Dayton responded that conflict with other policies come into play regarding the level of service and pedestrians. In Chapters 9 and 10, regarding the threshold for cars, the work of the Circulation Element is to prevent congestion. Bradley asked where does the relative priority between maintaining circulation, traffic level of service, and providing for other users of the road come up for discussion? Dayton responded that compromising the level of service at intersections in favor of other modes is a big conversation. For example, when the Circulation Element was proposed, there was a part of the community that wanted to change the threshold at the intersections of the freeway from C to D, but the community came out in force against any change in the threshold. Staff has been accused of creating congestion to try to make it easier to walk. Bradley commented that community workshops tend to be emotional and some people's statements are meant to scare people. He asked if staff has a strategy to bring people back to the facts. Ledbetter responded that the purpose of the workshops is to hear from the public so if people are emotional or feel strongly then it's okay. Come the fall with the discussion of policy options and talking about impacts, then the facts need to be addressed clearly in terms of how those are assessed and what the impacts of the facts are.

Mr. Pritchett asked when the General Plan Update would be done. Ledbetter responded that they expect to be done with the process in mid 2008. Pritchett asked if the expiration of Measure E in 2009 was the reason why the City needs a General Plan Update because the provision for commercial growth expansion expires in 2009. Ledbetter answered that was a big part of it and the other part of it was that the housing element states that when we get close to 39,000 units then we have to go back to reassess what the resources are and what the capacity for more housing and commercial development are. There are about 37,500 units now. Pritchett stated that he heard at a presentation to a community group that the City plans to include a ballot measure for the voters to ratify the final General Plan. Pritchett asked if that was an objective of the process. Ledbetter responded that he wouldn't call it an objective at this point, but they are open to it if that is what the community wants. Pritchett asked if a level of service for pedestrians exists. Dayton answered that there have been communities that have looked at that, but a standard has not been developed. The quality of drawing pedestrians out is the measure; it is not only a function of timing, but also, a function of how someone feels in a place. An example of where one would get a high level of service for pedestrians is State Street downtown. The sidewalks have been made extremely wide; there is mid-block crossing with greens for pedestrians when the button is pressed. The challenge is when one looks at travel corridors where the street functions to move cars. Pritchett then asked about the previous public sentiment that the freeway entrances be downgraded to level D and what the rational and exchange for that

was. Dayton answered that the rationale for recommending the freeway be changed was that in the Charter Section one of the tenets is that you can't have traffic impacts with a commercial development because if there is an impact it can't get approved. Most of the impacts happened at freeway interchanges so one of the thoughts was that in lowering the standards at the freeway more small business could get approved. Pritchett asked if Maas was correct in stating that the policy numbers were incorrect in the draft memo. Dayton answered that the policy numbers in the Circulation Element were the ones that would be used. Pritchett asked for clarification of what policies would be included in the memo and which would be left off. Dayton responded that all the recommendations from the Committee would be included except for those that were in play already or a part of another Master Plan. The items in regards to parking have been left off to be included in the Parking Master Plan except for those that directly influence land-use decisions like parking requirements. The parking strategies that refer to operation changes were left out. Pritchett asked if a policy that was suggested by at least one member got into the memo. Dayton responded yes unless it was eliminated for the reasons that were previously mentioned. Pritchett asked if a Parking Master Plan existed. Dayton answered no. Pritchett then asked what it means to "draft the Parking Master Plan in parallel with Plan Santa Barbara" as is stated in the Staff Report. Dayton answered that staff believes that we have a good handle on the issues and the resources to start drafting the framework of the Plan based upon the discussions that are happening in the General Plan arena. Pritchett asked if the Parking Master Plan will be finished when Plan Santa Barbara is finished. Dayton responded that a deadline shouldn't be committed to at this time. Pritchett asked what a Parking Master Plan would empower the City to do. Dayton responded that it would clarify questions that are unclear in the Circulation Element, and staff would move forward to implement what is clear; and staff would move forward with parking requirements. The next layer would be to change certain zoning ordinances to be in compliance with the Parking Master Plan. There are various ways the Parking Master Plan can be implemented after it's done. It will affect the culture of the way things are done especially in the land development process. Pritchett stated that he was taken aback that the detailed policies that were recommended by the Committee were not being included in the memo because they are things that should go in the Parking Master Plan. He would like a few sentences added to the draft memo about the scheduling of the Parking Master Plan that it be finished at the same time or earlier than the General Plan Update. Mr. Allen responded that it is important to have a timeframe for when it should be done, but the biggest concern is that the Parking Master Plan and the General Plan Update not be in conflict with each other. The General Plan Update should be finalized before the Parking Master Plan. Pritchett commented that he feels that the roles of the committees are to put a preference on the record so that other departments and the Council know.

Dr. Cooper concurred with Pritchett. He stated that Barry Siegel is adamant that land-use, circulation, and transportation are all related. Parking is critical to land use and circulation and he asked why a Parking Master Plan hasn't been done. If a Parking Master Plan is developed and a residence has three cars without a driveway or garage and they are allowed three on-street parking permits, what happens to the three cars after the creation of the Parking Master Plan? How do you force compliance with a Parking Master Plan? Those questions should be addressed before the Parking Master Plan is drafted. There has to be an absolute connection to land-use, parking, and transportation. Cooper believes that the TCC has been taking a backseat because when the Circulation Element was formed, the Downtown Parking Committee was supposed to be rolled into the TCC and the TCC was supposed to be the equivalent of the Planning Commission, but due to agendas that has not happened. As a result of transportation not being considered, nightmares now have to be faced. He would like a motion to fast-track a Parking Master Plan. Ledbetter replied that he agreed that the discussions need to occur regarding parking, land-use, and circulation. You need the community's input on parking issues in order to incorporate those

desires into the Master Plan. Dayton also responded that the design shouldn't be done until the vision is in place. The Parking Master Plan will be committed to when it makes sense within the Plan Santa Barbara process. Cooper commented that he appreciated the exceptional sincerity of staff as public employees, but a ballot measure is needed on this to inform the public of what the government knows. Cooper asked what the difference was between the Pedestrian Master Plan being already created and not a Parking Master Plan. Dayton responded that parking is more controversial than pedestrians and bicycles and that is why the Parking Master Plan is more appropriate for a visionary process.

Mr. Bradley commented that he can see how parking can't be done like a Pedestrian Master Plan. It makes sense to do it parallel to Plan Santa Barbara. He asked if it could be done in stages with some amount of detail included and other details added after the General Plan Update.

Mr. Coffman-Grey agreed with the need for a Parking Master Plan in order to look at priorities with the Committee's input. He agrees with creating a Parking Master Plan parallel to Plan Santa Barbara, but the community needs to input without direction from staff. Those recommendations from the community will form a discussion for a Parking Master Plan. The City needs to budget for a Parking Master Plan as well. Parallel planning is fine, but having a time-line of having the Parking Master Plan finished by a certain date is not realistic and he doesn't support it.

Mr. Maas stated that he would like to see a statement that the Committee agrees that the City should create a Parking Master Plan in parallel with Plan Santa Barbara included in the draft memo.

Mr. Tabor stated that he felt the draft memo to Paul Casey speaking to parking policy may be misdirected. He recommended having a joint motion sending to Mr. Casey what is Mr. Casey's and sending to Mr. Dayton direction for staff to follow a time-line for the Parking Master Plan to parallel to the General Plan Update and to come back in Fall (2007) with a product.

Mr. Bradley stated that it would be more useful to make a finding to Council for a budget for a Parking Master Plan.

Mr. Pritchett agreed that the way to address the completion of the Parking Master Plan is with a joint memo to Paul Casey, Community Development Director; and Council. He would like the Committee to express something with timing as a goal. He asked Mr. Coffman-Grey what he would support. Coffman-Grey responded that it would depend on a budget and that he liked the "parallel" wording, but to have a set time was unreasonable without knowing a budget or workload. He would like to get it done as soon as possible. Pritchett would like specificity so that it is not open-ended. He would like the Committee to be specific in their memo to Council to communicate what the Committee feels are important issues. More detail is better in this instance in something as important as the Circulation Element policies. Otherwise these issues will be dropped off if they are not in the memo and the way to include them is to say they will be in the Parking Master Plan. Mr. Dayton responded that it's important for Paul Casey to hear about the Parking Master Plan. The memo to Paul Casey will be redone with a CC to Planning Commission and Council and will include a paragraph about the Committee's desire to complete the Parking Master Plan as soon as possible without having a set date of completion. It will depend on what the community discussions communicate. If a vision articulates itself early on in the process then maybe the Plan can be done at the end of the Plan Santa Barbara process, but if a vision doesn't express itself soon due to controversy then there will be nothing to write.

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked to receive an update in the fall. Ledbetter concurred with Mr. Dayton

that clear consensus points are needed to move forward. Plan Santa Barbara will be brought back in fall for formal input then they can focus on parking. He asked for the Committee to come to a workshop to participate and let their positions on parking be known.

Dr. Cooper agreed with Rob that parking will be controversial because of the whole community getting involved. The Downtown Parking Committee should be a part of the memo as well. Mr. Allen responded that they will be involved with the Parking Master Plan discussion. The process of how the Parking Master Plan is going to be put together has not even been discussed yet. It is still in the very early in the process. Cooper agreed with Coffman-Grey that putting a time-line on something so immense is almost impossible.

Mr. Maas stated that he would like 9.2.1 (c) "Consider zoning ordinance amendments that would reduce parking requirements for non-residential uses that share parking facilities" in the memo. Dayton responded that it would be included. Cooper complemented Maas on his thoroughness.

Mr. Pritchett stated that he felt like he had support from four out of seven Committee Members to put a six month window on the Parking Master Plan, but due to its importance, he would not propose that unless he had unanimous support.

Motion 1: To add to the Draft Memo "To: City Council, Planning Commission, and the Downtown Parking Committee" in addition to the Community Development Director; and also to add additional text to the first paragraph "...TCC believes should be addressed with a special focus and emphasis during the Plan Santa Barbara process;" and to the end of the first paragraph: "We deliberately left off this list many Circulation Element policies that should be addressed separately in the Parking Master Plan that TCC requests be prepared in parallel with the General Plan Update."

Motion 2: To add policies 9.2.1 (c) and 13.2.2 (b) to the memo, as well as, to correct the aforementioned policy numbers.

Motion made by David Pritchett and seconded by Dr. Michael Cooper. Tabor further amended the first paragraph by striking "change the direction of the Circulation Element: and adding instead "to provide and look beyond the current Circulation Element."

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

Mr. Ledbetter informed the Committee that the website for Plan Santa Barbara is youplansb.org. Dr. Cooper congratulated staff for their support, understanding, advice, and guidance and the Committee for their productivity, comments, research, and knowledge.

4. Staff Briefing on Current Topics.

Mr. Allen stated that the Bike Station at the Granada Garage is up and running as of May 1, 2007. The Bike Station Coalition is running the Bike Station for the City and memberships are available on-line at the Bike Station Coalition's website. The opening of the Bike Station signifies another milestone of the Granada Garage Project.

Mr. Allen also reminded the Committee that the TCC calendar for June is incorrect. The meeting is to be held on the fourth, not third, Thursday of the month which will be June 28th, not June 21st. Also the September meeting will be held on September 27th, not September 20th. Mr.

Bradley commented that one of the Plan Santa Barbara workshops is on June 28th. Mr. Pritchett asked why the TCC meeting could not be held on June 21st instead of June 28th since the Plan Santa Barbara workshop is on June 28th. Mr. Allen responded that he would not be in town on June 21st. Dr. Cooper gave the Committee the options of either moving the meeting to June 21st, even though neither he nor Mr. Allen would be present, or canceling the TCC meeting in order to attend the Plan Santa Barbara workshop as a way to hear what the community is saying. Mr. Pritchett asked if there were agenda items that had to be covered in the June meeting or if the TCC could make the workshop their meeting so as to not have an excuse to attend at least one of the workshops. Mr. Allen responded that there were no time-sensitive items for the June 28th meeting. Dr. Cooper asked where and at what time the Workshop was being held. Mr. Pritchett answered that it would be held at the Westside Community Center at 6:00 p.m. Dr. Cooper suggested having the Committee take a fieldtrip to attend the Plan Santa Barbara workshop because he felt that attending the workshop would be more beneficial to the Committee to hear the community's input. The Committee agreed to attend the Plan Santa Barbara workshop at the Westside Community Center on June 28, 2007, at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Allen said that staff would send out a reminder email to the committee members. Mr. Tabor asked if this would be an official meeting of the TCC. Mr. Pritchett responded yes and told staff to notice it as an official meeting since there would be a quorum. Mr. Allen responded that he would verify with the City Attorney to see what is legally required since it is a public workshop and he assured the Committee that what is legally required would be complied with. Dr. Cooper and Mr. Pritchett felt that it should be posted in compliance with the Brown Act. Mr. Bradley requested that City TV televise the workshop. Mr. Allen responded that the workshop would be recorded, but that City TV didn't have the capabilities to televise the meeting at a remote location. Mr. Pritchett agreed that City TV should record that workshop since the Committee was going to be there.

Mr. Dayton informed the Committee that Upper State Street went to Council and the document was approved on May 8, 2007. Committee member Keith Coffman-Grey represented the TCC. There is also a newly formed coalition called Coalition on Wellness born out of the health concerns regarding things that shorten the lives of Americans like diabetes and a sedentary lifestyle and how this is affecting health. They met on May 10, 2007, to formalize the Coalition and to discuss how they would be involved in the General Plan process and the built environment. Pritchett cited a news article at Newsroom.com on May 11, 2007, regarding the events surrounding this.

Mr. Pritchett commented that Mr. Coffman-Grey gave a fantastic interview regarding the Upper State Street Study to the Daily Sound.

5. Review of Upcoming Agenda Items.

Dr. Cooper requested that the forthcoming agendas be focused on the Parking Master Plan until 2008. He would like a standing report or discussion to be included on each agenda similar to the MTD reports. Mr. Allen responded that updates on the General Plan would be given either monthly or bi-monthly and the Parking Master Plan will be included in that update. Mr. Allen also introduced Sarah Grant, Planning Technician II, as the lead to putting together the Parking Master Plan. Mr. Allen informed the Committee that once Staff has mapped out a course for the Plan it will be discussed with the Committee.

Mr. Pritchett asked if the appeal of the traffic calming devices that was heard at City Council would ever have a reason to come to the TCC. Dr. Cooper answered that this was the last appeal for the traffic calming devices. Mr. Allen responded that a formal presentation on that

project will not be made to the Committee, but that the Committee will be presented with the finalization of the program document after the devices are installed. Mr. Pritchett asked if that document was what Council had asked for in order to monitor the devices' effect. Mr. Allen answered that the program document is the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Manual which outlines what the neighborhood process of developing a neighborhood mobility plan consists of. Dr. Cooper stated that he would like to have an idea of what the past and on-going costs of this project are or might be. Mr. Bradley commented that he would like to see what the cost would have been without all of the delays or controversy. Mr. Cooper also stated that the Parking Master Plan conversation will be controversial possibly even more so than traffic calming devices.

6. Committee Member/Sub Committee Comments.

There were no other Committee Member/Sub Committee comments.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:52 PM

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

Liaisons: Roger Horton (Council Liaison), Addison Thompson (Planning Commission Liaison)