



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
Special Joint Meeting

**TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION
COMMITTEE (TCC)
and
PLANNING COMMISSION**

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, October 16, 2008 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Tabor called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM.
Charmaine Jacobs arrived at 6:08 PM.

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

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

Attendance

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Dru Van Hengel, Traffic Operations Supervisor
Bob Pearson, Finance Director
John Ewasiuk, Principal Engineer
Jessica Grant, Project Planner

PC MEMBERS

Bruce Bartlett	Present
Charmaine Jacobs	Present
John Jostes	Present
Stella Larson	Present
George Myers	Present
Addison S. Thompson	Present

LIAISONS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bill Delo, IBI Group

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None.

REPORTS

2. **Work Session on Streets Capital Improvement Program Fiscal Year 2010-2011 (FY10-11) Budget and 6-Year Streets Capital Improvement Plan**

John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer, gave a presentation on the FY10-11 Streets Capital Budget. Every two years, the City prepares a two-year Capital Improvement Financial Plan which is comprised of projects proposed to be funded. The City also prepares a six-year Capital Improvement Plan Report comprised of unfunded projects that are anticipated to be undertaken if funded. The purpose of the Work Session, in accordance with the Circulation Element, is to develop project priority for funding. Mr. Ewasiuk discussed program funding sources, priority categories, projects in those categories, and current project needs both funded and unfunded that are candidates for the budget. Budgeting for maintenance for existing infrastructure is a top priority. This category includes the Cabrillo Boulevard Bridge. Other priorities include City improvement projects such as sidewalk infill and Safe Routes to School and those that have significant consequences if not constructed, like pavement maintenance. Primary funding sources are the Utility User Tax, Measure D (set to end April 10, 2010), and State and Federal grant funds. Measures A and G will be on the November 2008 ballot. The results of that ballot will help to determine funding sources for the Streets Capital Program. Once that information is received, the FY10-11 budget can be drafted. The draft budget will then come back to the Commission and Committee for comments, then go to the City Administrator and Finance Committee. Before the end of the fiscal year, the budget will go through the City Council approval process.

Commissioner/Committee Member Comments

Commissioner Meyers asked what indications the State has made regarding funding for the Cabrillo Street Bridge. He also asked if there was alternative funding to reconstruct the bridge if State funding falls through and how that would affect the budget. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRR) program funds were diverted to the seismic bridges in the State which pushed out the funding for the HBRR program. Cabrillo is one of the primary bridges to continue moving on its critical path. The Caltrans Local Assistance Group is assisting with keeping the project on schedule. They have been successful in having the state find other funds for the ROW phase of this project. The City would like to be first in line for funds for the construction phase in order to keep the project on schedule. The Haley/De La Vina Bridge is in the same situation. Construction on the Haley/De La Vina Bridge was planned for spring 2009, but because of the delay in funding, the City is now targeting a summer 2009 start if funding can be obtained from what was not used in the Seismic Program.

Committee Member Boyd asked what the definition of when a bridge complies with seismic requirements is versus when it is just for HBRR. Isn't the Cabrillo Bridge on a critical route as an alternative to Highway 101? Mr. Ewasiuk answered that there is criteria for when a bridge qualifies for certain funding. HBRR has a sufficiency rating based on structure, compliance with standards, and a multitude of other criteria to determine if it is qualifies for the HBRR program. Seismic has different criteria in regards to seismic stability for structural integrity. Because the Cabrillo Bridge is already in the HBRR process it is not beneficial to apply for the Seismic Program because that would take more time. Mr. Boyd also asked about the cost of the Cabrillo Bridge project. On Attachment 4, the Cabrillo Bridge is listed at \$800,000 and the Haley/De La Vina Bridge is listed at \$9.4 million. Mr. Ewasiuk replied that the total cost for the Cabrillo Bridge is \$18.5 million; the amount listed is what was budgeted for last fiscal year including the matching funds needed to satisfy the City's 11.5% share. The Haley/De La Vina Bridge amount is the match the City was

anticipating from the State, but those monies have been deferred.

Mr. Boyd stated that previous versions of the Capital Program contained dollar amounts and had priorities identified. He asked about the new items on the list and what those items were anticipated to cost and which ones are prioritized. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that he purposely left the dollar figures off because the funding sources aren't identified yet and he wanted to give a description of projects for further discussion focused at the projects themselves. Mr. Boyd also asked if staff has looked at the plusses and minuses of going to a four-year as opposed to a three year Slurry Seal Program in order to reduce the annual costs. Mr. Ewasiuk responded that idea was brought before Council last year. Previously, the City was on a six-year cycle of slurry-sealing, but at the cost of slurry seal and the funding sources the City has, the six year program would be stretched to as far as eight years. At the same time, the streets that are used more need to be slurry-sealed more frequently, every five to six years, while the residential roads can be done every eight years.

Committee Member Maas asked if the Ledbetter Beach-way Connection Project was a priority for the City. Mr. Allen responded that it was a priority. A study has been done, and staff has cost estimates, but there is not enough money in the budget to do what the City would like to do. Mr. Maas also asked about the Santa Barbara Street bike lane and why there was not a corresponding Anacapa Street bike lane. Mr. Allen answered that a bike lane is needed on Santa Barbara Street because it is an uphill street and bicyclists travel more slowly than vehicular traffic which is not the case on Anacapa Street since Anacapa Street goes down hill. Mr. Maas also asked about what the bicycle facility would look like on Olive Street since it is narrow and there is also parking on that street. Mr. Allen answered that staff would like to do something on Olive Street. Staff would need to come together to put together a vision which would then be brought to the TCC. Mr. Ewasiuk added that the six year list is a needs list that likely goes beyond six years, but is beneficial to have for when funds do become available.

Commissioner Bartlett stated that the Chapala Bridge Seismic Upgrade (#7-12 on the expanded list) is a bridge to essentially nowhere because the youth hostel will lose its parking lot when the creek is widened. He asked why that bridge couldn't be converted into a pedestrian bridge since it is made of wood and doesn't get much other use especially after the parking lot is removed. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that staff is looking at the usage of that bridge. The diverted money was made available to upgrade that bridge even though it wasn't the highest priority on the bridge list. It is on the list so that it has the opportunity to be made seismically stable for future use. Mr. Bartlett also asked why the De La Vina/Calle Laureles Bridge (#7-41 on the expanded list) was on the list since it was just rebuilt with upgrades to sidewalk, curb, and gutter replacements. Mr. Allen commented that it still is a potential project if funding becomes available and the main concern at that location is getting ADA compliant access ramps.

Committee Member Bradley asked about the costs of the projects on the lists even though it is a wish list. Assuming that Measures A and G pass, the costs of all projects together what percentage could be done within the next six years? Mr. Ewasiuk answered that he guesses it would be less than 10% of the need. The focus is on infrastructure maintenance because the City needs to maintain what it already has. Mr. Bradley commented that with all of the non-linear costs it doesn't give other projects a chance to get funded especially with the Circulation Element saying other modes should be a priority and with the new State law, SB 375, pushing land use and transportation planning to reduce greenhouse gases. Mr. Ewasiuk responded that one of the purposes of this meeting and other meetings like this are to gauge where the priorities of the community are even if there is not funding. Mr. Allen commented that the other advantage of

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

October 16, 2008

Page 4 of 8

having a PC/TCC priority list is that when grant opportunities become available a potential project has already been identified. Measure A money has been designated for Safe Routes To School and bicycle and pedestrian projects that come off the top of the South County share that would be available to the City on a competitive basis. Mr. Bradley commented that it would be great if there was federal money available to put into bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Commissioner Thompson asked about the draft priorities for funding. He noted that in the Staff Report it seemed that categories one through five seemed like a hierarchy of priorities, but those priorities were presented in a different order. He asked if categories one through five were a hierarchy of priorities and if there was significance as to why they were presented in a different order. Mr. Ewasiuk commented there was no reason why the order was changed. The priorities on Attachment 1: Policy Project Priorities are more the prioritization categories. The project priorities for funding are being recognized as being significant issues in regards to maintenance and getting City policy improvement projects done. Attachment 1 is the hierarchy for funding priority categories. Mr. Thompson asked if three priorities gave enough ability to delineate all projects listed. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that category C was also added after the mailing went out. Those categories are sufficient to delineate the projects because there is supporting information included on the lists that also help to do so. Mr. Thompson also asked when the list will get prioritized. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the next step is identifying the funding sources after the ballot. Not every project will be prioritized because only a small percentage of it will be funded. Mr. Allen added that there will be opportunity to prioritize certain categories, such as Safe Routes to School or bicycle projects, because of the potential funding source if Measure A passes on the ballot.

Committee Member Coffman-Grey stated that he would like staff to come back after the ballot with numbers so that the Commission and Committee can prioritize projects they feel are important. He also asked about the signal at De La Vina and Figueroa and if it was not on the current list because it was already funded. Mr. Allen responded that there is some money for that project, but more money is needed. Mr. Coffman-Grey asked if that was the next signal in line to be done due to it being on one of MTD's major bus routes. Mr. Allen responded yes.

Commissioner Jacobs stated that with only funding for about 10% of projects, what are most important to her to get funded are bicycles and Safe Routes to School. Alternative transportation needs to be a priority in order to keep within the priorities of Plan Santa Barbara (Plan SB). The whole Plan will fail if bigger buildings are coupled with more people driving into the downtown area. She would like an overlay to go on the Plan SB map with the moda.

Committee Member Pritchett asked if this item would be brought back for the December TCC meeting. Mr. Allen responded that there was a big item on the December meeting already so it would need to be discussed with Mr. Ewasiuk and Planning staff to determine when this item will be brought back to the Commission and Committee. Mr. Pritchett asked if they would be targeting a two-year budget that will start next fiscal year. Mr. Ewasiuk stated that every year a two-year budget is passed along with a six-year report. Mr. Pritchett asked that for next time, Item C be included with the Report. He would like for each project to have a notation with what category (A1, A2, B, or C) it falls into. He would also like rough cost-estimates to be included with the projects. Mr. Pritchett also asked where sidewalk infill gets constructed. Mr. Allen stated that there is a City Council approved process that establishes how sidewalk infill is prioritized. Points are given based on six or seven categories such as sidewalk that leads to a school, park or bus route. Mr. Pritchett asked if property owners contributed to the project in areas where sidewalk infill is needed. Mr. Allen replied no. The only time private residents contribute to public improvements is when

conditions of approval stipulate it.

Committee Member Tabor agreed with Commissioner Jacobs regarding the next phase of planning. He was glad to see the Parking Master Plan on the list. He commented that what are missing are projects on the Redevelopment Plan.

3. **Work Session on the Las Positas/Mission Circulation Options**

Jessica Grant, Project Planner, Transportation Division, presented the Las Positas/Mission Circulation Options Project. In 2005, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital's Seismic Compliance and Modernization Project identified in their Environmental Impact Report that the project would contribute to additional traffic to the Las Positas/Mission interchanges as well as to some surrounding intersections. The Las Positas and Mission interchanges are operating at or near capacity. Both of these interchanges are access points for Cottage Hospital, the major trauma center for the county. A Condition of Approval for the project requires Cottage Hospital to provide \$250,000 towards the funding of a Project Study Report (PSR) that would explore transportation improvements to the Las Positas and Mission interchanges. In order to fulfill this requirement, staff is proposing a two-part process: Phase One will be the development of a Circulation Options Report and the inclusion of a public input process to narrow the project down to the most cost effective improvements. Phase Two will be the drafting of the PSR for Caltran's approval and will only include the option that is developed through the public input process.

Mrs. Grant introduced Bill Delo, the Transportation Planner and Consultant Project Manager for the project with IBI Group, who discussed the study area, the existing conditions analysis, transportation needs and potential improvements, and provided a study timeline and the anticipated community involvement plan.

Public Comment

Judy Arrias, president of Allied Neighborhood Association, commented on how important it was to have adequate access into and out of the Las Positas Valley due to the location of Valle Verde and Vista del Monte. She stated that if the City can't improve the intersections above level D and comply with the City Charter to live within our resources, projects proposed for Las Positas Valley should not be of high density. If you can't give safety in the Valley, the number of projects should be reduced. There is also no sidewalk on Modoc Road for students to walk to La Cumbre Junior High. The Las Positas interchange is a dangerous interchange because it takes so long for the lights to change resulting in people running the red lights.

Committee Member Comments

Committee Member Maas asked if the consultants had been working with MTD regarding this project. He commented that MTD would have useful information regarding the transit element of the study. Mr. Delo responded that they plan on meeting with MTD in the future.

Commissioner Meyers asked about the selection of the Area of Study, in particular the designation of San Pascual Street instead of including San Andres and Micheltorena streets. He also asked about the selection of hot spots and the omissions of hot spots at Bath and Castillo streets. Mr. Belo responded that intersections have been looked at along San Andres, but when looking at where the improvements and the overpasses would be going, San Pascual is the southern limit. In terms of the Mission Street intersections with Bath and Castillo, the existing conditions analysis don't show these intersections as being deficient although there are traffic issues particularly with left turns from Mission Street onto those two streets. In the Cottage

Hospital EIR, they are shown as being deficient in the future so they are being looked at for improvement.

Commissioner Jostes commented that he appreciated the intentions in trying to address the overarching issues that face the community between Mission and Las Positas, but he feels the project is misguided and poorly framed. It misses the point of addressing growth management issues that are confronting the City as the need to reevaluate and update the General Plan is addressed. This study ignores the issue of the need to say "no" to projects that take the City outside of its resources. He would like the Study Area to be expanded to include Earl Warren Show Grounds. He would also like Calle Real to revert back to a two-way street. He also commented on the issue of funding for this project. Given that during the last presentation, it was stated that only about 10% of Capital Improvement Projects would be funded, he asked how much an over crossing of Highway 101 and the needed land acquisition were going to cost to accommodate further growth in this section of town. He would like this project to have a linkage to the General Plan Update process. Mr. Dayton responded that it is very important to frame the issue correctly. This project is incorporated with Plan SB because it is a grand-scale project of tens of millions of dollars if staff is successful in resolving automobile capacity issues for today and the future. The project is not only for cars, but it is an opportunity to improve connections for pedestrians and bicyclists as well. This is the most congested location in the County of Santa Barbara and with Cottage Hospital being a level two trauma center, access is very important. SBCAG has said that if Measure A passes this would be the highest priority for State Transportation Improvement Funding. The City needs to be ready to take the funding once it becomes available. Staff is grateful for advice on how they could better frame this in the context of Plan SB with the right people in the process and including the right Study Area.

Commissioner White asked if the PSR could include analysis that showed how projects in the different areas impact Highway 101. Mr. Dayton responded that when a project is put into the model, it will give the impacts everywhere and it does include highway volumes. Mr. White also asked what effects development in the different areas will have on intersections. He stated that information would be helpful to know during the Plan SB process in order to prioritize what developments and at what locations will have the most impact on these intersections. Mr. Dayton responded that the PSR is a report written specifically to meet the needs of Caltrans in order to propose a project that Caltrans would help fund. It is not a land-use placement document. Plan SB will do that within the EIR.

Committee Member Pritchett asked to have the document sent as an electronic file. He also asked if all of the funding for the PSR was coming from Cottage Hospital. Mr. Allen responded that the Circulation Options Report is fully funded by the hospital. There is money left over from the \$250,000 that has been set aside by Cottage Hospital to do the PSR after the process has been narrowed down to one to two projects. If more money is needed, the TCC and PC will be brought back into the process to make a recommendation to Council. Mr. Pritchett also asked how many over crossings might be done. Mr. Delo responded that it would only be one of the five shown if one was done at all. Mr. Allen pointed out that what IBI presented are ideas. P&S still needs to do analysis, staff needs to meet with Caltrans, and the community needs to give their input before anything is done. Mr. Pritchett asked if the approach of the study was to have the goal of improving the LOS from a D to a C at the Mission Street interchange and then design something that the model would say would do that. Mr. Delo responded that several criteria would be looked at including improving traffic operations in order to get specific intersections back to a LOS-C or better; improving access to the hospital; and improving traffic while minimizing impacts to surrounding properties. Mr. Pritchett agreed with Mr. Jostes that this project needs to

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

October 16, 2008

Page 7 of 8

be looked at from a broader perspective instead of only looking at the demand side. Even if LOS is improved for now, in the future it will decrease unless there is an epiphany of lifestyle change or the City stops approving projects that lead to more traffic because the cumulative effect of that is crippling, as is illustrated by the congestion around the hospital. Mr. Pritchett commented that the community notification list should also include the upper Westside neighborhoods on the other side of the freeway and that email might be more effective than post mail.

Commissioner Bartlett asked how Caltrans plays into this because they are the party responsible for the current situation and now the City has to repair it. The neighborhoods were there before Caltrans came in and segregated the neighborhoods with the freeway and it was also Caltrans who made this section of Calle Real dysfunctional. Mrs. Grant responded that there have been initial discussions with Caltrans. They have also provided data on all improvements projects from Las Positas to Mission and surrounding interchange, but the comments from Caltrans are even if it existed before doesn't mean it would meet their standards today. Mr. Allen added that a Caltrans staff person has been assigned to work with staff throughout process. The City does not have the money to fund some of the proposed projects so State and federal funding will need to be obtained.

Commissioner Jacobs commented that she would like to get focus on the study and the funding from the Cottage EIR mitigation for its traffic impacts to get it to a place where it is ready for community involvement. She would like the Study Area to include Earl Warren Showground and Adams School. She asked if one of the circles was meant to show the non-signalized intersection into Earl Warren Showgrounds. Mr. Delo responded that circle shows the non-signalized intersection of Tallant and Las Positas which operates at an unacceptable LOS. The circles are highlighting the intersections that are operating at an unacceptable LOS. Ms. Jacobs stated that since this is coming from Cottage's EIR, the intersections that were identified in that EIR as having future degradation should be looked at. Ms. Jacobs also asked about who would be invited to the stakeholders meetings aside from Caltrans. Mr. Delo responded that they are working with the hospital to get the input from employees and first responders so their input can be incorporated. Ms. Jacobs also noted the nurses who travel to Cottage Hospital as a group who should be included in the survey.

Committee Member Boyd supported the comments of Commissioner Jostes. He asked if the demand was coming from the Mesa or from further south in the City. Mr. Delo responded that once the model is used, they will have a better idea of where the traffic is coming and to where it is going. With regards to Jostes' comment of living within our resources, Mr. Boyd also asked about what demand management strategies would be utilized by employers like Cottage or what could be used by residents at those major intersections instead of just looking at physical improvements. Mr. Delo responded that they are looking at demand from a multi-modal standpoint especially from across the freeway and they can look at demand management strategies. Mr. Boyd also asked if there was any possibility for roundabouts on Modoc at Las Positas or Las Positas at Calle Real. Mr. Delo stated that is being considered with the improvements.

Committee Member Coffman-Grey commented that the public noticing for the workshop needs to be better with the inclusion of the Westside even though they are not in the Study Area. Media outlets need to be included also. He also stated that he is looking forward to being involved in the workshops and working on the individual items.

Committee Member Maas asked about improving transit services over the freeway. He asked if that meant funding for transit or just physical improvements to make it more feasible to do more

cross freeway traffic. Mr. Delo responded that it could be either more physical improvements or it could be rerouting an MTD line or implementing a new route. Mr. Maas pointed out the difference in cost for doing a one-time physical improvement as opposed to having on-going funding for a bus line. Mr. Maas also asked if SBCAG talked about where the funding would come from. Mr. Allen answered that no specific funds were identified, but SBCAG did identify a need to do something at this location so whatever funds become available, the City can compete for them.

Commissioner Thompson agreed with Commissioner Myers that especially to the south, the Study Area should go down to San Andres, and that public outreach should be expanded as part of the process. Mr. Thompson also commented that the Purpose and Needs statement precludes one of the out-of-the-box solution in regards to the Las Positas interchange. The statement says Improving traffic conditions at the Las Positas road interchange, but one thing that should be on the table is eliminating the Las Positas road interchange and taking the traffic off at Pueblo onto two-way Calle Real.

Committee Member Tabor agreed with the comments regarding the need to represent the Westside on the public outreach list.

Mr. Allen stated that once the dates for public workshops have been set, the Commission and Committee will be noticed.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:38PM

Michael Cooper left the meeting at 6:50 PM.

John Jostes left the meeting at 7:50 PM.

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

PC Committee Members: Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, John Jostes, Stella Larson (Vice Chair), George Myers (Chair), Addison S. Thompson

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