



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, September 27th, 2007 6:00 PM

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

ROLL CALL:

<u>TCC MEMBERS</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>CITY STAFF PRESENT :</u>
William C. Boyd	Present	Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Mark Bradley	Present	John E. Ledbetter, Principal Planner
Keith Coffman-Grey	Excused	Meryl Perutz, Administrative Specialist
Michael Cooper	Present	
Steve Maas	Present	
David Pritchett	Present	<u>LIAISONS PRESENT:</u>
David Tabor	Present	

OTHERS PRESENT:

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. **Approval of TCC Minutes for August 23, 2007**

Mr. Tabor moved and Mr. Boyd seconded approving the August 23, 2007 minutes.

Dr. Cooper questioned the source of the statement in the August 23, 2007 minutes regarding the cost of a bus stop. Staff confirmed that Ms. Fisher made the statement.

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

REPORTS

3. **Plan Santa Barbara - Community Input Summary Report: Preliminary Findings, September 10, 2007 Presented by John Ledbetter Information Only.**

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner, Community Development Department, of the City of Santa Barbara, presented a PowerPoint presentation of the preliminary findings report in order to update the TCC.

Plan Santa Barbara, as a process, was initiated primarily for three reasons. One is that the Measure E Growth Management Program, which regulates non residential growth, sunsets in 2010. It needs to be reassessed within the next year. Second, we are reaching a unit count of about 39,000, which in the housing element stipulates we reassess our resources and how we accommodate future residential growth. Third, Council has asked us to look at our environmental policies particularly living within our resources in relation to the broader issues of global warming and sustainability. This process was initiated by Council in 2005 as an affirmation of the goals set forth the last time the General Plan was updated in 1988, with the exception of environmental issues which are underscored even further. In 2005, we also published our *Conditions, Trends & Issues Report (CTI)* as a baseline for existing resources, public services and facilities. The report discusses trends, constraints and potential policy conflicts as they relate to future growth and development of Santa Barbara.

Outreach

The Outreach Committee was appointed by Council in 2005 to help guide the outreach process. It is comprised of members of the City Council, Planning Commissioners and community leaders. The Committee has served several functions including as a review body for outreach methods, a source of identifying community groups, a sounding board for presentations and as ambassadors to local grassroots meetings. The information that we have received comes from four different venues; public comment forms sent out to homes and business, postings on the web site, a series of workshops and outreach grassroots meetings. Between March and September 2007, over 900 community members from across the City have attended meetings and workshops, and more than 550 comment cards have been returned to the City included comments submitted via email.

The question is how this information is used. The purpose of the information is not to quantify or assign values to each response, but rather to understand the key issues in the community and to understand the range of opinions, so when we begin to develop policy options and envision growth scenarios, we will be able to tailor it to the those issues. The web site has been very helpful in terms of disseminating and collecting information. The website describes *Plan Santa Barbara*. The website, (<http://www.YouPlanSB.org>), offers a variety of ways to get involved in the process

including the workshops. On the website, there is a calendar of events, a library which includes postings of documents including the *CTI* report, and video summaries of the four workshops and over 40 grassroots meetings, including the Bicycle Coalition, Pearl Chase, the Downtown Organization, SBCAN, etc. Information is nearly in real time. People can sign up on the website and receive weekly updates, via email, letting them know to check the website for new postings. Through the website, polls may be taken, asking some of the same questions that were asked in the brochures. Indeed, the website has proved to be a very useful additional tool for the outreach efforts. In trying to connect with the Latino community, booths were set up at laundromats, super markets, swap meets and churches, where we felt we could effectively get the greatest participation. Early on in the process, comment cards were mailed, and over 550 responses were received. In these brochures, general questions were asked about what people loved about Santa Barbara, as well as about their hopes and dreams for the City. As the summer progressed workshops were held where more detailed questions were asked. For example, categories included transportation, community design and the environment. The input was open ended and designed to help determine some main topics that needed to be addressed. In the grassroots meetings the outreach committee was helpful in going out with staff to meet with individual groups. Over 40 different groups and almost 700 participants were involved. Brochures and comment cards were distributed at each. The community responded well to the meetings.

Identifying Key Issues

Without exception, responses from all venues include the things people loved most about Santa Barbara. They include: the small town feel of the City, the diversity of the population, the scenic beauty, access to open space and beaches and, of course, the historic character of the neighborhoods, the architecture, and the vibrant and dynamic culture. The issues presented offered no consensus, but one of the most important issues mentioned was affordable housing, and its impact on the middle class, specifically in reference to the new category of condominiums being constructed, and a concern about maintaining neighborhood character and diversity. This didn't come as much of a surprise.

Community Design

Growth was the most common issue mentioned in reference to community design. There was a wide range of opinion; from those who love Santa Barbara as is, and want to maintain the character and feel, not changing anything at all, to the other extreme, where people want to see Santa Barbara grow and build to its full potential. Some people felt there should be more measured growth to accomplish some of specific goals of the community including more affordable housing. Over crowding in the multi family neighborhoods was identified as a concern, as was building height and large projects (too many luxury condominiums). A new issue that we haven't dealt with in planning was public health concerns, including diabetes, obesity and lung cancer which are

associated with the built up environment in relation to the City's walk ability, accessibility, open spaces and healthy foods. This is seen as an emerging issue.

Environment

People say the atmosphere of Santa Barbara is one of the things they love most. They would like to see the City expand its open spaces particularly in regard to public health. One guiding principle, that of living within our resources, was reaffirmed. Residents suggested that we should look at some of these issues in a more global context, like global warming and sustainability. How can we reduce our waste and look at alternative energy? This was mentioned numerous times. Residents would like Santa Barbara to step up and once again become a leader on environmental issues.

Transportation

Of the most important issues mentioned regarding transportation, was parking and congestion on the 101 freeway. There was a wide spectrum of opinions about parking, from providing more convenient parking in order to help local businesses to the other extreme, suggesting the elimination of parking in order to encourage greater use of mass transit and alternative transportation. Understood, for the most part, was that there should be a balanced transportation policy to accommodate the automobile but supplement single car occupancy with viable alternatives like cycling and pedestrian modes. Public transit improvements were called out and well received. People seem to be happy with the new busses and other improvements but would like to see additional investment in it as well as investment in bicycle and pedestrian transportation, taking into account safety issues and accessibility as related to ADA.

Economics

One of the main issues discussed was work force and affordable housing for the middle class, white collar workers, fire fighters, police officers and teachers. There is awareness of the difficulty attracting and retaining good workers as it relates to the price of housing in Santa Barbara. There was also some discussion about the desire to preserve and encourage local businesses, again in relation to the growing number of national chains. There was a wide spectrum of opinion on this issue.

Tourism

Most people recognize that tourism is an important component of our economy and others felt that we need to pay attention to our residents needs and not just focus on tourist related improvements.

Public Facilities and Services

Given the last year with public safety concerns about gang activity, this is a hot topic. Solutions include recreation, which was mentioned often, especially recreation as

related to youth. On social services, there was a wide range of opinion about how we should deal with the homeless, the aging and child care. Water quality was also mentioned in terms of sewage and drinking water.

Hopes for the Future

Though there are many things that people love about Santa Barbara, there was unanimity about the hopes for the future, realizing we have a lot of serious challenges in the future. The feeling is that we can achieve a viable vision of Santa Barbara by balancing growth with preservation. Additionally, we do need to meet the needs of our residents and workers and do so in the context of sensitivity to environmental policies.

How will this input be used?

Staff is in the process of crunching numbers and developing a growth scenario. The questions are: What are the maximum build out capacities? What are the projections over the next 20 years in relation to our current policies? Which policies need to be changed? How do we change them? Public input is very helpful in targeting which policies are most important and which need to be reexamined.

The *CTI* report highlights issues which will help frame future discussions. We are working on policy options and different growth scenarios now. We will meet with the Outreach Committee and the Planning Commission through the fall and early part of winter, and will begin conducting round two policy option workshops in the spring, followed by the initiation of the environmental review process. We expect to come up with a strategic policy framework toward the end of the summer of 2008.

Committee Member Comments

Mr. Tabor said that over the last several months, the TCC has been looking at its policies to see which ones should be continued forward and included in the next round of policy discussions. The discussions center on parking and the need for cohesion in the Master Parking Plan policy document. The question is, when that analysis will take place and where can we add our input into that process. It looks like we are moving closer to that time. Mr. Tabor said he is looking at the bigger issues as it relates to parking and transportation and also the fine details of how many parking spaces and for what kind of use. As a committee, he said, we are very interested to know the appropriate time for us to chime in. Based on the next steps in the process, it looks as if Community Development will be putting forth some policy suggestions in the spring and that would be the time to decide about moving forward with any particular package from the TCC.

Mr. Ledbetter responded that there would be a discussion of transportation issues with parking at the top of the list, based in part on a letter that was sent by the TCC a number of months ago regarding priority issues that the TCC wants to discuss. It will be discussed before the Planning Commission and feedback will be forthcoming. It will

further inform us as to how to present options in the upcoming workshops. It looks like there will be two opportunities, one with the Planning Commission and another in the workshops.

Mr. Tabor spoke to those in the community who through outreach have identified housing, transportation, and open space as a triangle of issues. The public has been very insightful in shaping his thinking. Where people live and work has a direct relationship on how often and when they are on the roads.

Mr. Boyd noted that in honor of a former fellow TTC member who passed away, Mr. Barry Siegel, he echoes the sentiment of "show me the numbers". Mr. Boyd feels that numbers are something he wants to see very early on so that we have a clear understanding of where we stand relative to our existing population, economic activity, and housing and transportation indices so that we may understand where we are now. As we move into identifying growth scenarios, we need to quantify those and let the public see what we are talking about relative to housing needs, trip demand, where the trips are coming from and going. We need to have a clear picture. Without these answers we can't answer the questions of how much growth is too much growth. The sooner we can get the existing picture identified out there the public and all the committees, the better. In putting together the growth scenarios, I strongly encourage staff to start to quantify those and get that into the discussion. The second point Mr. Boyd made, is his concern about the low level of public input relative to population. The number of responses in relation to the population is about 1%. Mr. Boyd asked *Mr. Ledbetter* if the City was satisfied with this level of response. *Mr. Ledbetter* said the whole process is about input and that since this was the first phase, they were satisfied. The next phase will be additional workshops. Then they will go to the different Boards and Commissions, and will continue to broadcast on the web. We are getting the word out there. So far, we are satisfied with the response we are getting. The Latino community is the most challenging. We are constantly looking for ways to improve the outreach to the Latino community. Another group that is challenging to reach is the youth community. We are continually trying to find ways to reach the group and bring them into the process. This is just the beginning of the outreach process.

Mr. Boyd referred to a comment made by *Mr. Ledbetter* regarding the issue of growth and what is too much. Is too much growth a matter of perception from a staff standpoint? Does the public believe we are growing too fast or not enough? The growth issue is a spectrum of positions, where some people don't want to see any growth; no more houses, no more tall buildings, etc. where others want to see more housing being built, especially more affordable housing, seeing it as adding vibrancy to the City.

Mr. Ledbetter replied that what makes this such a difficult issue is that there is no consensus. It's one of the most challenging issues that we face and we need to make sure that we "bookend" the range of scenarios so that we get all positions reflected when we go out into the community and ask for tradeoffs.

Mr. Bradley asked if there were any issues that came up when they were out in the community that surprised him or were unexpected.

Mr. Ledbetter replied that he was most surprised by the issue of public health. Other than that, we were aware of most of the issues that were raised. How people framed the issues and the vehemence with which they were expressed them was a surprise.

Mr. Bradley asked for number in relation to the trends over the last few years. In terms of the number of scenarios to be used in the next phase, how will that be decided? *Mr. Ledbetter* answered that it was really based on the community and what we hear from them. We haven't heard from the community that they want to build more than four stories or double the amount of square footage that we have, or eliminate Measure E and allow as much commercial growth as possible. What we are hearing is the quite opposite. We are hearing that the community wants to maintain the small town character of Santa Barbara. They want to know how we can do that and still maintain a viable community in terms of socio-economic diversity and environmental sustainability. Many people consider Santa Barbara already built out. In terms of the range of options, we say here is the baseline of what is existing on the ground now, then what is pending and approved, which is about 1,300-1,400 units, then you look at the capacity. If everything that could be built out was, what would Santa Barbara look like? Then you look at what is likely, if all the rules and policies stay the same, what is the likely scenario going to be. We need to start looking at policy decisions. What if we only want to look at affordable housing, or reducing building heights, what impact would that have to preserve views and the historic preservation context? That's how we shape the scenarios.

Mr. Bradley continued by asking if it was certain neighborhoods or corridors, which will be used to illustrate certain scenarios?

Mr. Ledbetter responded yes, and that most of the action right now is in the commercial areas, Downtown and the corridors. Naturally, those are the areas we will most focus on, the ones that are most likely to undergo change.

Mr. Ledbetter also addressed one of Mr. Boyd's points regarding numbers. It is key to understand all the numbers and impacts. Purposefully, we have not done traffic counts, because we want the best and latest data so that when we do develop scenarios it is relevant. Ultimately, it all needs to be quantified so that people can examine it and look at the trade offs to see what the impacts may be.

Mr. Maas asked about accessing the videos on the website. He had been unaware that they were there.

Mr. Ledbetter demonstrated to the committee members how to access the archived videos on the website.

Mr. Maas continued, at the Westside Center workshop which he attended, several

people brought the nature of walk-ability as one of the things they loved about Santa Barbara. Mr. Maas would like to know if this issue was raised at other meetings.

Mr. Ledbetter said that he would have to check how often this was raised as an issue at other workshops and meetings, although he does recall it was brought up, as something people appreciate. Mr. Mass quoted the *CTI* report saying “many people are disturbed by the amount of traffic that exists and potential future increases.” At the heart of this committee are transportation issues. I am sure we’ll be hearing a lot about these as the process continues. The report mentions public transportation options to all areas of the City, what works in some areas of the City won’t work in other areas of the City. The report also mentions integrating multi-modal transit to connect different forms of transportation. Does this mean connecting different forms of transportation? *Mr. Ledbetter* confirmed that it means that different forms of transportation would connect with each other. For example, you can walk to the bus or take a shuttle to the train station, etc.

Mr. Maas feels that the *CTI* report moves towards addressing the issues of looking at current conditions and past trends. So far, the public input seems pretty good.

Mr. Pritchett wanted to clarify some of the numbers referenced in the summary document. It stated that there were four workshop meetings and mentioned that over 900 community members attended. Is that number the total that attended all meetings or the total that attended the four workshops?

Mr. Ledbetter made clear that it was the total number of people that attended all the workshops and meetings, that it was about 200 that attended the workshops. The 900 number refers to the amount of input received.

Mr. Pritchett recommended a summary table to clarify which workshops and meetings the input and attendance came from.

Mr. Pritchett asked for a definition of how the range of major alternatives will be determined. *Mr. Ledbetter* responded that it was still a little early to know. In the report, Mr. Ledbetter outlined the focus of it which will be from what is built and pending all the way up to the full capacity under existing plans and policies. We haven’t seen any respondents say they want to reach beyond our existing capacities, to reach “Manhattanization”.

Mr. Pritchett said that many people expressed a need for big buildings jammed with condos, downtown along the corridors, near the bus routes and the train station. Does this define capacity? It looks as if there are many challenges in defining capacity and living within our resources. There seemed to be no consensus after he attended all four workshops. Mr. Pritchett would like to see a good database in the final report, to account for the variety of comments that have been received. The source of the comment is less relevant than the content. On Page 2 of the preliminary report, “the City did not attempt to produce specific quantitative results”. I would agree with that

analysis. In the same paragraph, you are counting the frequency and range of the opinion. He emphasized his strong feeling that a database is necessary to know what suggestions came in and then staff could synthesize it. He would like to see an easily accessible way to see all the information that has come in. For example, there were a lot of comments about people being able to walk places as a result of Americans becoming more obese. He feels that the preliminary report is a little too qualitative with too much text and not filled with enough color and charts that are easily understandable by the public.

Dr. Cooper agrees that he would like to get percentages of groups, including Hispanics, which as a group is hard to reach. He asked if there was a way to identify people who attend the workshops and meetings so that they fall into certain categories, or specific neighborhoods, for example Eastside, Westside, Latino, etc. He feels that diversity is missing from the information collected. Dr. Cooper asked if the hits from the website were including in the numbers of respondents.

Mr. Ledbetter said they were not including the responses from the website although they are tracked. He also said there is a way to differentiate between multi hits from the same user. *Dr. Cooper* felt that *Mr. Ledbetter* should not have been surprised by the respondents who said "well being" was an issue. It was Cottage Hospital that made that an issue. They had an agenda and they brought it to you. Dr. Cooper asked whether other niche groups could influence the process by organizing themselves, which could skew the results. He feels the process lends itself to abuse by minority/interest groups. Should results from groups be weighted? Dr. Cooper mentioned the mistrust by many regarding Chapala Street and some of the other developments and the frustration with Mayor Blum and the City Council for allowing this kind of development. Is there a bias on the part staff in formulating this information? Dr. Cooper used Measure E as an example. The voters said they didn't want congestion and the citizens didn't even think of mixed use. They felt they were voting against business expansion, and then the City did an "end run" around it by going to mixed use. Are they going to do it again in this process?

Mr. Pritchett added that mixed use commercial and residential is the norm now. The question now is, is that considered residential or commercial? In determining how the ordinances on growth limits apply, how is that counted? If there is one layer of commercial and two residential, which numbers are counted? He feels that the process is going to be very challenging. The General Plan is going to be another political judgment by the City Council. He believes there will be many great suggestions and that the Council will choose something in the middle. It will be the best plan possible, but there will still be a lot of latitude and flexibility. The bigger question and test is how we will comply with the plan 10 years from now.

Dr. Cooper asked if *Mr. Ledbetter* also contacted the hospitality industry as well the Conference and Visitors Bureau. *Mr. Ledbetter* said they had.

Dr. Cooper also asked, in reference to the Latino community and the gang problems we

have been experiencing, if they had gone to the high schools, junior high schools, City College and the Boys and Girls Clubs, etc. for additional input. *Mr. Ledbetter* said they were in the process of doing that now.

Mr. Bradley added that he felt it is more of a socio-economic question in reaching other groups for input than not being able to find them. The high cost of housing, the high cost of transportation, people who are busy with two jobs probably are of the opinion that what they say doesn't matter anyway. He feels that the job of planning should be done for the people who come to the table as well as those who don't for whatever reasons. We need to be educated about what the needs of those people are as well and some how try to incorporate it into the plan, even if they don't sit at the table. We should be able to accommodate everyone, whether they can and do participate. We need to be able to educate ourselves as to the needs of those who do not speak up.

Mr. Maas said that he was at the Westside Center meeting. He said he didn't hear people say that they were adamantly opposed to the big buildings under construction on Chapala. There were some dissenters and there were others that had a little concern, but many people understand that if there is going to be any housing in Santa Barbara built that will be affordable for working class or middle class people, then Downtown is not necessarily a bad place to have such housing. It offers opportunities for less automobile use if you live Downtown.

Dr. Cooper, citing the polls that surveyed the City of its own employees and the Downtown employees, suggested that those people may represent a large portion of the silent majority, those people who are not involved or engaged in the process. He continued, that we have between 72-74% driving their cars alone and whether we agree with it or not, we need to respect that this is what a majority of the population is doing. He believes that even with parking restrictions, etc., it is unlikely that these people will change their habits.

Mr. Boyd asked *Mr. Ledbetter* if he had gotten any comments regarding freight or commercial transportation and its impact on problems within the City. I believe it's an area which is often neglected in the planning process.

Mr. Ledbetter responded that they had received quite a few comments from the Upper State Street process that was done last year, but not much recently, but we do know there is sensitivity to that issue.

Mr. Boyd continued that if we get more commercial we will need more space for trucks and commercial vehicles bringing in supplies and goods. Which routes they take and where they will park, will become issues.

4. Staff Briefings on Current Topics;

There were no briefings on current topics.

5. Review of Upcoming Agenda Items

Mr. Allen stated that at the next meeting we have at least two agenda items. One is the ON-TRAC presentation that the City Council heard back in August, 2007. It has already been taken to Ventura County Transportation Commission as well as the MTD Board. The second item is Plaza de la Guerra. This was presented to the Government Relations Committee of the Downtown Organization. We are bringing it before the Downtown Parking Committee at their meeting in October.

Mr. Bradley requested that the closure of State Street to traffic for pedestrian use be brought up as a future agenda item. It is something that is talked about frequently.

Mr. Allen said that the committee can certainly explore it. *Mr. Allen* will communicate with the Vice Chair, *Mr. Tabor* regarding this issue. *Mr. Boyd* supports the motion.

Mr. Pritchett referred to last month's meeting when *Dr. Cooper* brought up mid-block pedestrian crossings, and the resulting traffic nightmare that occurs at the cross streets. We could possibly use the timing of mid-block and cross street pedestrian crossings to explore the possibility of making lower State Street a pedestrian/electric bus/bike/taxis delivery tracks only. The 3rd Street Promenade in Santa Monica is always cited as an example of success. The TCC is one of the lead bodies that would be able to push this issue along. We are expecting MTD to provide a chart which will show us how slow the State Street Shuttle keeps getting as traffic keeps increasing. He is looking forward to Plaza de la Guerra becoming an agenda item. The Downtown Organization got a briefing on Plaza de la Guerra. We will need to think about how to adjust to the idea of no parking in the Plaza.

Dr. Cooper suggested another agenda item. He would like to see the TCC invite Scott Spaulding of SBCAG to speak about bus stops and customer service.

7. Committee Member/Sub Committee Comments.

Dr. Cooper has an issue with construction, specifically regarding West Anapamu Street. There is now a dumpster sitting in a dedicated bike lane as are several palettes and forklifts. *Dr. Cooper* is concerned about the high school cyclists that now have to move into traffic lanes because of the obstruction.

Mr. Allen responded that bicycles are permitted to go into the travel lane. He has turned over the information to the Public Works inspectors to take a look at it. *Mr. Allen* stated that there must be permits for any dumpster on any City street. It is being investigated.

Dr. Cooper noticed this morning that on the 100 block of West Anapamu Street, in the designated bike lane, were illegally parked cars, including a school bus. What is the Police Department policy on ticketing?

Mr. Boyd asked about progress on the Transit Center.

Mr. Allen responded that the City Council had a joint meeting with MTD Board in September. They are doing Request for Qualification's for potential developers.

Mr. Boyd wanted to know when the TCC would be able to weigh in on questions relating to the Transit Center. *Mr. Allen* responded that he would have to check in with Redevelopment Agency staff. He believes it will be several months, that they are in the very early stages. It was brought before this committee several months ago when Renee Brooke presented the results of their outreach and analysis.

Mr. Boyd asked about Measure D and where it stands in terms of review. Will it be on the ballot?

Mr. Allen answered that Measure D will be on the ballot in November 2008, and the sub-regional committees, North County and South County, are currently working on their expenditure plans. There has been a lot of discussion but not at the point where it can be brought to the committee. At the appropriate time information will be brought to the committee for recommendation for Council.

Mr. Pritchett questioned the timing of information coming to the committee. Ideally, he continued, this committee as the transportation advisors to the City council, should be consulted on the agenda before the City Council says adopts any plan that SBCAG recommends. *Mr. Allen* reminded the committee that the process will be exactly the same as the previous year. The expenditure plan came before the TCC; we requested this committee make a recommendation to the City Council on the expenditure plan before it went to City Council. The City Council took into consideration recommendations from the TCC.

Browning Allen mentioned the passing of Barry Siegel, former TCC member and friend this past week. He was one of the original members of the Transportation Circulation Committee.

Mr. Tabor summed it up by saying, whether you agreed with Mr. Siegel or not, he was an excellent communicator and was able to convey a message in a way that was not in your face and easy to understand. He got his point across very well. I appreciated that very much.

Mr. Boyd said that Mr. Siegel had been involved in transportation planning long before any of us knew what transportation planning was. He was involved in writing one of the earliest versions of transportation plans for Southern California, maybe 30 years ago. He had a real grounded understanding of the transportation planning process. Much of what he brought to all the transportation issues that we address in Santa Barbara was influenced by his understanding of how the transportation process worked. He constantly asked for more information and hard data, which is something we can all learn from as we continue in this process.

Mr. Bradley said that he had the pleasure of working with Mr. Siegel on the committee

for some time. He was also a founding member of COAST and worked with the COAST board. He was instrumental in integrating communities. Two days before he died, he was at the Measure D sub-committee meeting and always argued vigorously for alternative transportation.

Mr. Maas said that you could always count on Mr. Siegel to know what he was talking about, to have researched the topic, to have real numbers to quote and to make a good case for his plan.

Mr. Pritchett did not know him very well. They had been at a few meetings together related to Measure D renewal. He enjoyed his accounts of the meetings, which were long and detailed. He did us all a great service. Let's all carry on his good work on this committee.

Dr. Cooper recollected that Mr. Siegel said over and over gain that transportation dictates planning. I think we need to remember that we can't plan and then figure out transportation. I hope that this committee and this community will embrace that philosophy.

There were no other Committee/Sub Committee Member comments.

Mr. Boyd moved to adjourn in Mr. Siegel's honor.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:27 PM

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

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