



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC)

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA
Thursday, January 22, 2009 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Pritchett called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM

ROLL CALL:

TCC MEMBERS

Mark Bradley
Keith Coffman-Grey
Edward France
Steve Maas
David Pritchett
David Tabor

Attendance

Present
Present
Present
Present
Present
Excused

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Robert J. Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
John Ewasiuk, Principal Engineer
Teresa Martinez, Acting Administrative Specialist

LIAISONS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2. **Approval of Minutes from August 28, 2008 joint meeting with the Planning Commission; approval of Action Minutes of the September 25, 2008 and November 13, 2008 meetings; approval of Minutes of the December 11, 2008 meeting.**

Motion 1: To approve the Minutes from the August 28, 2008 joint meeting with the Planning Commission.

Motion made by Keith Coffman-Grey and was seconded by Steve Maas.

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

Motion 2: To approve the Action Minutes of the September 25, 2008 meeting.

Motion made by Steve Maas and was seconded by Keith Coffman-Grey.

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

Motion 3: To approve the Action Minutes of the November 13, 2008 meeting.

Motion made by Keith Coffman-Grey and was seconded by Steve Maas.

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

Motion 4: To approve the Minutes of the December 11, 2008 meeting.

Motion made by Keith Coffman-Grey and was seconded by Edward France.

Ayes: 3 Noes: 0 Abstain: 2 Absent: 1

Mr. Maas commented that even though he was absent from the December meeting, he would like the record to show that he supported the Staff recommendation for Item 4: The State and De La Vina Reconfiguration Project – removal of the free-right turn.

Mr. Bradley asked if his comments were read into the discussion at the December 2008 meeting regarding Item 4: The State and De la Vina Reconfiguration Project. He would also like the record to reflect his support of Staff's recommendation on Item 4.

Mr. Pritchett commented that the spelling of the names of public speakers and Committee Member Maas should be corrected.

Mr. Pritchett and Mr. Coffman-Grey commended the Minutes for being thorough.

REPORTS

3. **Fiscal Year 2010 Streets Capital Improvement Program Budget.**

John Ewasiuk, Principal Civil Engineer, presented the Fiscal Year 2010 (FY10) Streets Capital Improvement Program Budget. Due to the current unstable economic situation, the State budget crisis and related State grant funding issues, the City is preparing a one-year FY10 Capital Improvement Budget which is comprised of projects proposed to be funded. Projects that have a high priority include those that have significant consequences if they are not constructed, those that maintain existing infrastructure, and projects that are City policies, such as Sidewalk Infill and School Zone Safety. The next steps in the process are to gather comments from the Planning Commission, the TCC, and the Public; present a Draft Budget to the City Administrator; and then present it to Council. On January 22, 2009, the Planning Commission agreed with the prioritization criteria, but would like to see the moda added if it was approved as a priority. Overall, the Commission had positive comments on the project list.

Committee Member Comments:

Mr. Maas asked if the plan for the Sycamore Creek was to expand the creek bed because currently the bed isn't able to handle the run-off at the bridge under crossing. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that there have been drainage challenges in the past with flow through Sycamore Creek. One of the obstacles is the railroad bridge. Another obstacle is highway capacity being less than what was proposed. By widening the bridge at Highway 101, one measure to deliver the water to the bridge is to provide improvements that will help get the water through the conveyance system faster. Staff is working with the State and railroad to more fully look at solutions. Mr. Maas also asked if there was a list of potential projects in case money became

available through the Economic Stimulus Package. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the Economic Stimulus list was different from this list. The criterion for that list is projects that are shovel-to-ground ready so that they can make an impact on the economy by getting people to work. Such projects include pavement maintenance, sidewalk repair, street lighting, and a drainage project that was designed and bid previously. Projects that will be considered are those that can be delivered in a short amount of time, from 90 to 180 days up to almost a year and possibly up to 2 years.

Mr. France asked if Route 225 was Cliff Drive. Mr. Ewasiuk replied yes: Cliff Drive between Castillo and Las Positas and Las Positas between Cliff and Highway 101. Mr. France then asked if the cost for the Route 225 Relinquishment was Staff time to negotiate with Caltrans. Mr. Ewasiuk replied yes. The budget is for the resources necessary for negotiations once negotiations continue, such as Staff time and consultant time. He also asked if relinquishment would help to do local improvements at that dangerous and accident-prone area. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the City will get the ability to implement improvements, but then it will have to maintain it and further improve upon it. Mr. France also asked if the issue with Sycamore Creek is with upstream flow. Mr. Ewasiuk answered yes the issue is with upstream flow and Engineering is coordinating with the Creeks Division in the initial phases of design.

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked how the figure for Measure D funding was calculated with the expected reduction in sales tax Countywide by 2010. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the Streets Capital Improvement Program is a component of the Streets Fund. When Staff looks at the available funding through UUT and Measure A and D sources, they look at operational costs, like Engineering staff time and Public Works Maintenance staff time; and at transit assistance. The funds that are still available after those costs are taken out, is what is available for the Streets Capital Program. Mr. Allen added that Measure A goes into affect on April 1, 2010. With the new Measure A, there will be a different formula for how the money is going to be distributed. For example, MTD will be a direct recipient of Measure A funds based on the current use of Measure D funds on the South Coast. Beginning April 1, 2010, there will be a difference in the amount of money received in Measure A funds from what was received in Measure D funds, but there will not be an overall impact on MTD because they will be receiving the same amount of money. There will be less revenue coming in, but there will also be a reduction in expenses because the contract with MTD for regular service will end.

Mr. Coffman-Grey also asked if staff saw a reduction in raw materials for pavement maintenance with the fluctuation of raw material costs over the past summer, and if so, if that reduction would allow Staff to do more. Mr. Ewasiuk stated that he anticipates receiving excellent prices in raw materials on anything that is bid due to the competitive market and the drop in oil prices.

Mr. Coffman-Grey also asked why the budget for the intersection improvement at De La Vina and Figueroa was reduced from \$682,000 for FY09-10 to \$375,100 for FY10-11, shown on Exhibit 2, page 3 of the Staff Report. Mr. Allen replied that the grant money received is for three intersections: State at De La Vina, De La Vina at Figueroa, and De La Vina at Canon Perdido. The reduction of the amount is a mislabeling of the funds. The grant was for close to \$1,000,000. The budget reflects how the money will be spent over the current and the next fiscal year, not how much will be allocated to each project over the years.

Mr. Bradley asked if the any of the grant money was in danger of disappearing. Mr. Allen answered that a lot of the Transportation money is safe. It is unknown if the monies from Propositions 1B and 42 are safe. A lot of the grants are federal dollars being filtered through the

State so it may be a few years before it flows to the City because the State could use it to balance its General Fund. In regards to grant projects, Mr. Bradley asked if there was City money for the planning and design work if the grants were delayed and how long the projects could be delayed until there is no money to keep City workers working. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the City needs to be ready for the money. With the one-year budget, staff is doing their best to anticipate what is going to come this year.

Mr. Bradley also asked if the schedule for the Route 225 relinquishment was going to be affected by the budget situation. Mr. Ewasiuk replied that it could be a very big factor due to the nature of the conversation, but when looking at projects in construction having the possibility of closing down, those have a higher priority for discussions with the State.

Mr. Pritchett asked if there was a guideline from the State on what constitutes shovel ready. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that an official criteria has not been provided; Staff has provided lists of projects that are ready to go forward. Mr. Allen added that shovel ready means the project is either ready to go out to bid or projects that can be under construction within 180 days of receiving the money. Mr. Pritchett asked if there was a certain type of Capital project being specified for the Stimulus Plan. Mr. Allen replied that Congress is still talking about it, but the money will flow to the cities via a formula rather than specifying certain projects. Mr. Pritchett also asked if the reason the State and De La Vina Street reconfiguration project was not on the "Grant Fund Leveraging Project List" was because it was in the 2009 budget. Mr. Allen replied that the money was granted in 2000; the money being appropriated for design was money that was approved by Council a few years ago. Construction money won't be appropriated until the California Transportation Commission has informed Staff that the money is available. Only money that is guaranteed by the State goes into the budget. Mr. Ewasiuk also replied that for projects to be on the FY10 list, they have to be projects that are being budgeted in fiscal year 2010 so it wouldn't include projects from a previous year that have funding. Mr. Pritchett asked why this was a 6-year plan and not a 10-year plan. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that every 2 years there is a 6-year report that includes projects that show what projects would be spent on if they had the funding to start spending within the next 6 years. It is a wish list that indicates the needs in the City.

Mr. Pritchett asked if the Measure D and UUT funds shown on page 6 were the only sources of revenues to fund Capital projects. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the three sources of revenues for Streets Capital program are the Measure D funds, UUT funds, and grant funds, but because it is unknown if the grant funds will be available, they are not included in the budget. Mr. Allen added that what is budgeted in terms of grant funds are City matching funds. Mr. Pritchett asked about the difference between precise numbers for some projects and estimations for others. For example, the Pavement Maintenance Program budget versus the 101 Operational Improvements. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the 101 Operational Improvements project budget consists of staff time and consultants as needed. The supplies and materials come out of the operational budget and are not in Streets Capital. The \$100,000s figures are estimates of what has typically been the minimum for a Capital project. The "precise" budget for pavement is really what is left over. Mr. Allen added that the operations budget is paid for first including staff time and supplies.

Mr. Pritchett asked if the request for funds from Engineering staff for the Sycamore Creek Channel Improvements came out of the \$447,000 budget shown in the attachments. Mr. Ewasiuk answered the money requested by Engineering staff was for consultant services to initiate the design. The figure in the report is the construction amount. The money to fund the consultant came out of the drainage account. Mr. Pritchett asked why that wasn't a County flood control

project. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the City and the County discuss and collaborate with one another on projects, but this is a project the City is heading up.

Mr. Pritchett asked what infrastructure improvements were in the school zone safety improvement program. Mr. Allen responded that was money the Traffic Engineer and Operations Supervisor has available to make improvements around school zones such as enhanced pavement markings, striping, radar signs, and signage improvements.

Mr. Pritchett asked if Cliff Drive at Las Positas intersection was related to the studies regarding Las Positas and the freeway and Mission Street and the freeway. Mr. Ewasiuk answered that the Cliff Drive at Las Positas Intersection Project is a stand alone project. The \$100,000 is for design time. Grant money is for construction only. Mr. Pritchett asked for further clarification that the hospital access project is separate. Mr. Allen added there is no relationship between the two.

Mr. Pritchett asked about sidewalk infill and how locations are decided. Mr. Allen answered that was an item for Dru van Hengel, Transportation Operations Supervisor, to address, but there is a rating system used to identify necessary links which was previously presented to the Committee. Mr. Pritchett commented that it is prudent to invest now before problems occur in the future. He also asked if the Planning Commission took a vote. Mr. Ewasiuk answered no. Mr. Pritchett asked what the schedule was for the Route 225 relinquishment. Mr. Ewasiuk answered there would be a meeting in the upcoming weeks to discuss the next steps. Updates can be given at future meetings. There is a \$100,000 budgeted for staff and consultant time as necessary. Mr. Allen stated as it is now, Engineering will continue to work with the State on the relinquishment, however if the State says there is no money for that project then talks will be suspended until money does become available. Mr. Pritchett informed staff that the Mesa Village Group has already done work for public input and design concepts so the City doesn't have to start from scratch.

Mr. Maas asked if it this budget was going to go as a separate item or as part of the City budget. Mr. Ewasiuk responded that the list will be part of the City budget process and is subject to change at any time during that process. The budget will go to the City Administrator for his input, the Finance Committee, and Council.

Mr. Pritchett asked if the revenue sources are considered the General Fund. Mr. Allen answered no. Measure D funds can only be used for transportation projects. The State Gas Tax can be used only for Public Works projects. UUT funds are restricted to improvements in the public right of way.

4. Review of the TCC Calendar.

Browning Allen reviewed the TCC calendar for 2009. The second Thursday of the month is reserved for special meetings and the fourth Thursday of the month is reserved for regular meetings with the exception of November and December when the regular meetings are scheduled for the second Thursdays due to the holidays. Mr. Allen asked for the Committee's input on not having meetings when there were not substantive items to be discussed.

Committee Member Comments

Mr. Maas stated that he would prefer to not have a meeting just for the sake of having a meeting.

Mr. Coffman-Grey stated if there were no substantive items that time could be used for

informational or educational workshops like the Sidewalk Infill Project.

Mr. Bradley stated that he prefers to have important things to discuss. He asked about the subcommittee for speed limits and suggested that as being an item when the subcommittee meets. He also asked about updates on Plan Santa Barbara. Mr. Allen responded that Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, would give an update at the next meeting.

Mr. France commented that he would like to see more items that require public input as opposed to the Committee receiving the projects at the final stage of approval.

Mr. Pritchett stated that he welcomes any Member to bring up an item for the agenda. Mr. Allen responded that should a member have an item for discussion for that member to email him, as well as the Secretary and the Chair, but to be mindful to not send it to the entire Committee in order to stay in compliance with the Brown Act. He also commented that this was a good forum for public education, but he doesn't just want to have a meeting to have a meeting. An hour and a half to two hours worth of material would warrant a meeting. He asked about having other joint meetings with the Planning Commission or Plan Santa Barbara. Mr. Allen responded that a yearly joint meeting with the Downtown Parking Committee can be held, but probably not until Fall of this year. As staff is ready, it will be scheduled.

Mr. Pritchett stated that State and De La Vina is going before Council on February 10, 2009.

Mr. Allen stated that on March 12, 2009 there will be a joint meeting with the Planning Commission regarding Las Positas at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Mr. Bradley asked if there were any other meetings regarding State and De La Vina before the February 10, 2009, City Council meeting. Mr. Allen replied no.

Mr. Coffman-Grey asked for the updated Committee email list.

Mr. Pritchett commented that there was a public meeting regarding improving access to Cottage Hospital on February 24, 2009, at the Burtness Auditorium. Mr. Allen responded that while that is a public meeting, not a TCC meeting, Committee members are encouraged to attend.

5. Confirmation of Mark Bradley's Appointment to Vice Chair.

Mr. Bradley's appointment to Vice Chair was contingent upon his reappointment to the Committee in December 2008.

Motion 5: To confirm the appointment of Mark Bradley as the 2009 Vice Chair of the Transportation and Circulation Committee.

Motion made by Steve Maas and was seconded by Keith Coffman-Grey.

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 Absent: 1

ADJOURNMENT: 7:41 PM

Committee Members: Mark Bradley (Vice Chair), Keith Coffman-Grey, Edward France, Steve Maas, David Pritchett (Chair), and David Tabor

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