



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, July 26, 2007 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

William C. Boyd
Mark Bradley
Keith Coffman-Grey
Michael Cooper

Attendance

Excused
Present
Present
Present

Steve Mass
David Pritchett
David Tabor

Present
Present
Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Teresa Martinez, Administrative Specialist
Dru van Hengel, Mobility Coordinator/ Acting Supervising Transportation Engineer, Public Works

LIAISONS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. Approval of TCC Minutes for May 24, 2007

Mr. Coffman-Grey moved and Mr. Tabor seconded approving the May 24, 2007 Minutes as amended.

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

REPORTS

3. **MTD's April and May 2007 Monthly Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle and Commuter Lot Shuttle Reports.**

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager, addressed the TCC regarding the April and May MTD Downtown Waterfront and Commuter Lot Shuttle Reports. This was only informational items and no action was required by the committee. Sherri Fisher from MTD will be at the August meeting and is set to present annual reports on the shuttles.

Committee Member Comments

Dr. Cooper mentioned the previous time Sherri Fisher was present at the TCC meeting and whether or not she could provide an advertising budget in order to look at the cost benefit ratio of how much MTD is spending on advertisement and the response to that investment. Mrs. Fisher is supposed to get back to the committee with a report on the advertising dollars and whether it is cost effective based on the monthly reports.

Mr. Coffman-Grey discussed the upward turn around on ridership for the Carrillo Lot the last couple of months. Mr. asked when the free 10-ride bus pass was discontinued and the 3 month for \$45 took effect for downtown workers. *Mr. Allen* replied by saying that the 10-ride bus pass was discontinued over a year ago and was replaced by the annual My Ride bus pass. In the fall of 2006, My Ride bus passes were phased out and 30-day passes were distributed until the 90 day passes were available. Mr. Coffman-Grey asked when the option of the free 30-day bus pass ended for downtown workers. He was curious as to whether bus riders were switching back to their cars and using the downtown shuttle lot due to removal of the free bus pass. Also, he wondered how many people had the free 30-day bus pass before it was discontinued and how many signed up after the 3 months for \$45 took into effect. *Mr. Allen* commented that the free My Ride 30-day pass ended February of this year. However, the number of downtown employees participating in the 90 day pass program currently exceeds previous enrollment in free 30-day My Ride Program. He stated that there were 179 bus riders using the 30-day pass when they were issued in December 2006, and currently there are 215 workers who pay \$45 for 90 days. Mr. Coffman-Grey acknowledged that the new fees did not deter downtown employees from using the bus.

4. **City Employee Work TRIP Program Follow-up**

Dr. Dru Van Hengel, the Mobility Coordinator for Public Works, addressed the TCC regarding the Work Trip Reduction and Incentive Program for staff members. The presentation was intended to give the TCC an idea about the status of this program. Initially, the Transportation staff was asked by Administration and Council to look at the commute of current and perspective employees. In addition, the City was asked to examine longer commutes that are costing more because of excessive fuel consumption and resulting in employees arriving fatigued and dissatisfied with the 101 commute. There is a concern as an agency that employees are looking to move their jobs closer to the areas in which they reside. The program is intended to develop new and preexisting incentives to use alternative transportation and improve employee retention and recruitment. Furthermore, the program can also reduce air pollution and traffic congestion by finding low cost trip reduction strategies. Before the trip incentive program began, 73% of the workers reported driving alone to the work place. The goal of the program was to not only be as low as the average for the county, but to be a model employer for alternative Transportation. Thus far, Transportation staff has made considerable progress in enhancing pre-existing solutions and creating new trip incentive strategies. The pre-existing employee staff benefits include free MTD passes for employees, participant traffic solution benefits, flex work program, preferential carpool parking, a twelve bike fleet, guaranteed free ride home program, and City vehicle use for medical

emergencies. In a 2006 survey, 50% of employees responded yes when asked if they were willing to explore alternative transportation. However, the common deterrent for this is fear of needing their car at a moment's notice during the workday. Also carpools and transit systems often make the trip longer. Transportation staff is exploring comprehensive programs to curtail these negative aspects for greater benefits. The first is to implement changes in City vehicle policies. People who are registered for Work Trip Program and use alternative transportation are supported with use of a City vehicle. Employees can use a car for occasional errands in a work day and to transport family members for medical appointments. Also management with assigned vehicles can use the car to transport children to school and back. Secondly, City vehicles are now eligible for City sponsored employee carpools. The Ride Share Program, which began on July 1st, has 21 new members in seven different carpools. Another incentive has been to provide long distance and vanpool subsidies of 75%. In addition to offering MTD My Ride passes, the City now offers alternative passes such as the Clean Air Express, Coastal Express and Valley Express. Lastly, our staff has expanded its existing commute contests in which 81 employees participate and are eligible for \$20 gift cards a day just for using alternative transportation. The programs intranet site has created a way to access information, link users, and keep track of progress. Employees are able to take advantage of Traffic Solutions and upgrade to a service that provides a carpool match list and calendaring functions. Overall, the program and the employees who participate are pleased with the progress. Eventually, staff would like to create an open Internet sight in which prospective employees can look at the incentives we offer. As of today, 52 employees take advantage of the programs offered. Eventually, we hope to reach 300.

Mr. Pritchett asked how does the survey work and whether the Transportation staff is collecting data continuously and then picking a point in time to define the year of survey results. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded by saying that staff was not collecting data continuously but sets goals of doing bi-annual commute surveys, which was initially done in January 2006 to ensure data before unrolling the Transportation benefits and the 9/80. In addition, there was a second bi-annual commute survey done in June 2007. Mr. Pritchett asked if the result of the June 2007 survey was the pie chart data seen in the presentation. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded by saying that the pie chart was from the 2006 survey and that Transportation staff will come back to the commission with the 2007 results in a more detailed manner at a later date. Mr. Pritchett affirmed the need to see the 2007 data and requested a copy of the presentation to be sent to the Committee through email. He also asked whether the Transportation staff had plans to work with other City employers on using these benefits. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded by stating that Transportation staff is working with Traffic Solutions. She also noted that the City is attempting to be a model employer and provide templates to others. As of now, other employers can not follow the City's progress because the information is in a closed intranet sight. Eventually, all documentation will be given to Traffic Solutions in order to share with these employers

Mr. Maas asked whether the surveys were statistically valid or just self reported data. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded by stating that Transportation staff requests that the entire employee population participate in the survey. However, there is a slight bias toward self-interest. Mr. Maas then questioned whether the drive-alone people were overrepresented due to the high percentage recorded in June. *Dr. Van Hengel* replied that drive-alone workers were not overrepresented and were often not interested in taking the commute survey. Lastly, Mr. Maas asked how long distant bus subsidies such as the Valley Express were handled. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded by stating that the Valley Express offers three types of services; pay as you go, 10-day pass, and 30 ride pass. The 30-ride commuters have 25% of the cost deducted from their payroll. The 10-ride bus pass involves picking up three of the passes and when they bring back four they get another three.

Mr. Coffman-Grey commented that once the City gets more statistics, it should be presented to both the smaller and major employers. He noted that although smaller employers cannot afford providing certain incentives, such as the Valley Express, they might be persuaded to implement other aspects of the plan if it was presented to them in a detailed package. Mr. Coffman-Grey also commented that if smaller employers understand how much it would save overall congestion of the City, they might contribute to things such as bike stations or commuter lots. Also, delivering the plan to larger employers has the possibility of trickling down to smaller companies.

Mr. Tabor commented that it is an employee retention program at this stage. He added that the installment of the program must outweigh the cost of training new staff members and recruiting additional employees. Mr. Tabor added that Cottage Hospital made its decisions on an incentive program because recruiting hospital employees and keeping them is essential for their business. Mr. Tabor also noted that every company will be taking a look at this program and it will be easier to convince employers if it is something they just have to plug in and not have to recreate. In addition, he believes that the internet sight, especially the online carpool program, will be a great place to track overall trends and individuals over time. Mr. Tabor also had questions regarding the 9/80 program and whether most people stayed an hour later or arrived an hour early. This question was brought up to see whether or not the transport systems were broad enough to fit the varying schedules. *Mr. Allen* responded by saying that the employee schedules varies from department to department and each individual. However, he believes that the employees pick the right transit that fits their schedule needs. Lastly, Mr. Tabor commented that it is not just the economic costs that this program needs to consider, but the social costs such as quality of life. As the presentation commented, if an employee has to sit in the car 290 hrs a year, much community and personally rewarding opportunities will be lost.

Mr. Bradley responded by asking how the different possibilities were communicated to people and whether someone sat down with employees and demonstrated the different options available to them. Also, he asked whether there were ideas for making the program more attractive such as a benefit that doesn't continue indefinitely. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded that the City was cautious in rolling out the program because of the staff's resources and the need to use correct guidelines. Currently, the program is being communicated through word of mouth and emails that were delivered at the start of program. However, the program should double in participants when it is put on the front of the City portal. This will be done as soon as the staff is confident that all operations are running smoothly and that the staff is comfortable with the growing rate. Also, *Dr. Van Hengel* commented that new employees and participants are allowed to try out different incentives without long term commitment.

Dr. Cooper asked which county authority would Transportation staff report its information too. *Dr. Van Hengel* responded that the City will be helping Traffic Solutions reach out to employers. Dr. Cooper then commented that it is important to give Traffic Solutions a cost per employee with each segment of the program. If they have some idea of what it is going to cost them, it may open a small employer's eyes to alternatives other than paying monthly parking in private lots. Dr. Cooper also mentioned the idea of dis-incentives, such as charging City employees to park their cars, which could lower the rate of drive-alone employees and motivate them to seek out alternative transportation.

Mr. Pritchett responded by asking if the City staff knew where drive alone employees and carpoolers put their vehicles. He also recommended that Transportation staff follow the chairs lead and have deterrents such as fees for employees who put their car downtown instead of just

incentives for those who use alternative transportation.

5. Plan Santa Barbara Monthly Update

Browning Allen began by stating that Plan Santa Barbara will be an ongoing agenda item at every TCC meeting. Although staff might not have anything to report, it will be on the agenda nevertheless. Mr. Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, defined Plan Santa Barbara as the City's 20 year update to revisit the General Plan. In the past, citizens have been very active at looking at the existing policy structure and direction of Santa Barbara. So far, there has been a first round of workshops which entailed four workshops in four different locations. At these preliminary workshops discussions included; what are the issues, what do we like about Santa Barbara, and what are citizens concerned about. Mr. Dayton commented that those who attended the workshops on the Westside saw the breakout groups and the notes that were taken from their discussions. Plan Santa Barbara staff is planning to come to this meeting in September to tell the committee what we have heard from these workshops and all four meetings. The next stages of the process are in the fall in which staff will take what we have heard from the community and organize forums. These forums will get staff and community around the same table to solve the problems addressed through techniques available to us. In addition to the two forums, the City will also sponsor private group forums such as architectural organizations that wish to discuss their interests. Mr. Dayton told the committee he would give them the dates of these so they can plan to participate. In January and February, staff will hold the second round of workshops. At this point City staff will have heard what is important and the techniques the City has. The goal at this junction is to develop possible scenarios in terms of plan development changes and adjustment of the master plan. Included in these workshops will be the very important topic of Measure E which regulates square footage. Mr. Dayton also pointed out the letter to the Community Development Director Paul Casey from the Committee. Staff met with the Planning Commission to present letter and it was also sent to Downtown Parking and will be going to Council. Due to the committee's interest in the Parking Master Plan, staff has been trying to incorporate parking issues into the Plan Santa Barbara arena. Staff has taken the issue to community development staff where there has been great interest in other circles and committees as well. The parking issue will be presented in the forums and will give citizens an opportunity to discuss the issue. Also there needs to be a second workshop in which the TCC, Downtown Parking Committee and the Planning Commission discuss parking issues under the umbrella of Plan Santa Barbara.

Mr. Pritchett asked for clarification as to whether second round workshops were after the forums which were taking place in a few months. He then asked what the City sponsorship of these private group forums entailed. In addition, was it the private groups' interest to direct the discussion at these forums? *Mr. Dayton* responded that second round workshops were after the forums and that an example of City sponsorship of a forum might include providing a venue. Furthermore, these groups do have special interests and it is their own venue to direct discussion. He feels that it is important that groups should have discussion within their own faction in order to provide input. Plan Santa Barbara should be most advertised and discussed as much as possible and it is important that the City be part of this process. Mr. Pritchett asked if John Ledbetter was a lead on that. *Mr. Dayton* responded that Mr. Ledbetter was a contact, that he was the committees contact, and also Bettie Weiss is a contact.

Mr. Tabor commented that representation at the June 28th workshop was not a good cross-section of the City. Mr. Tabor did not observe any younger people, commuters that use the shuttle or citizens with families. He believes that it is essential for these absent groups to participate in topic that affect them, such as parking strategies and MTD use. It is crucial to find different methods to get these groups involved in the process and to discover what their needs are. *Mr.*

Dayton responded that the committee will hear a good report about the cross-section in September where there will be a pre-empting strategy of how to do an outreach.

Mr. Coffman-Grey agreed with Mr. Tabor and thought that the demographics appeared to be the usual crowd. He was not sure how to get the whole City involved but knew that once decisions were made other people would come out to voice dissent. He feels it's important to get these people to the workshops before decisions are made.

Dr. Cooper asked who is responsible for distilling all the information that has been presented at these first round forums. *Mr. Dayton* responded that it is the staff's responsibility and other consultants which total about twelve. Dr. Cooper then commented that it was very interesting that the committee is in agreement that there needs to be a bigger cross-section at the workshops. He then mentioned that at a recent board of directors meeting of the Rivera Association, he was appointed to contact Paul Casey for the City's attendance at the Board of Directors meeting and general meeting. Betty Weiss responded that the City could not show up at meeting with General Riviera Association Membership. Dr. Cooper discussed the desire to include the City at these meetings but their failure to attend. Another topic Dr. Cooper addressed was Measure E. He commented that when Measure E came up on the ballot the citizens of Santa Barbara voted to maintain existing commercial development in order to limit congestion at intersections. Mr. Cooper felt the City was acting contradictory to the voter's requests for less automobile congestion by substituting commercial development for residential mix and match development. *Mr. Dayton* responded that the residential development was intended to reduce congestion because there would be fewer commuters. However, the unintended consequences have been larger upscale units that have become second homes and not residences for commuters. Mr. Dayton explained that even though the residential development has not had their intended benefits, it has not caused an increase in traffic congestion. Dr. Cooper then made a side note that his own office space was at once residential and that the City had made it commercial with no trouble. He also made a side note regarding the type of development on the Chapala Corridor and whether it was feasible for Milpas because of it's the similarities in density. *Mr. Dayton* responded by saying that was correct because C2 zones for commercial and R4 zones for residential are equivalent. Dr. Cooper commented that it would be great to see a map of Santa Barbara that demonstrated these possibilities and build outs in areas such as Milpas. He believes it is important to see what everything would look like and what the needs are in the development of Milpas Street in four story mix use. Also, what would our responsibility be as a Transportation and Circulation Committee? *Mr. Dayton* responded that every project goes before the Planning Commission and they make decisions on a project-by-project basis. Dr. Cooper responded by saying that we need a much stricter and defined guideline rather than a project-by-project basis.

Mr. Tabor commented that Measure E in the 80's was the second phase of a General Plan change. In the 1970's there was a major residential down zoning that was such a hot issue it got dropped ten or more years later. Mr. Tabor mentioned that there was obviously a huge amount of development potential on the table and as a result, something had to be done. Measure E was the ultimate outcome but focused only on commercial. Mr. Tabor concluded that this is the first time we look at both residential and commercial at the same time and can strike a balance. Therefore, this is a great opportunity and a much bigger effort than Measure E.

6. Staff Briefings on Current Topics;

Mr. Allen stated that currently contractors are working on the Slurry Seal Program. Also Transportation staff is looking at solutions for Milpas Street due to the lack of a bike lane. The City

is exploring alternatives such as share the road markers which needs to be run by the bicycle coalition. Mr. Allen stated the eventual goal of this Committee is to see a bike lane. Lastly, the City is out to bid for the Safe Route to School Program. The bid date is closing in mid August and will be on Council in early September.

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked about the status of the Pershing Park project. *Mr. Allen* responded that we can't make the link over to Montecito Street but we are still moving forward and will be putting a pedestrian signal there. The design is 100% complete and the City is awaiting environmental clearance from the state of California. The City hopes to be out to bid sometime this Fall.

Dr. Cooper commented that he understood from Mr. Dayton that there would be a monthly Plan Santa Barbara update. However, Dr. Cooper remembered from last meeting that the committee was very worried about the Parking Master Plan. He would like to see that update as a monthly item as well. *Mr. Allen* responded by saying they are all linked to Plan Santa Barbara and that the Parking Master Plan will be done with the General Plan Update. Dr. Cooper requested that it be put on the agenda with the Plan Santa Barbara update.

7. Review of Upcoming Agenda Items

For the August meeting of the TCC we have the Plan Santa Barbara update. In addition, Sherri Fisher from MTD will present annual reports on shuttle services and we hope to have a report on the enhanced transit that began in March. The entire September TCC member will be devoted to Plan Santa Barbara. The Planning Department staff will be here to present what they have heard from the workshops.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:52 PM

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

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