

## MEETING SUMMARY

### NORTH COUNTY MEASURE D POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 17, 2007  
9:00 a.m.

Central Coast Water Authority  
255 Industrial Way  
Buellton, CA

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

**Members Present:** Joni Gray, Supervisor, Fourth District; Joe Centeno, Supervisor, Fifth District; Russ Hicks, Councilmember, City of Buellton and committee chairperson; Dick DeWees, Mayor, City of Lompoc; Bob Orach, Councilmember, City of Santa Maria; Jim Richardson, Councilmember, City of Solvang; Aileen Loe, Caltrans, District 5 (ex-officio member)

**Members Absent:** Brooks Firestone, Supervisor, Third District; Lupe Alvarez, Mayor; City of Guadalupe

**Advisory committee members proceeded with self-introductions. Policy Development Committee members in attendance included:** Hamid Bahadori, Auto Club of Southern California; Vibiana Saavedra, PUEBLO; Deborah Brasket, Santa Barbara County Action Network; John Peterson, Buellton Chamber of Commerce; Linda Jackson, Solvang Chamber of Commerce; Norene Nims, 15<sup>th</sup> District Parent Teachers Association of Santa Barbara County; Phillip Greene, Marian Medical Center.

**SBCAG Staff Members Present:** Jim Kemp, Executive Director; Steve VanDenburgh, Deputy Director of Programming & Project Delivery; Gregg Hart, Public Information Officer; Fred Luna, Transportation Engineer; Sarkes Khachek, Transportation Planner

#### 2. REVIEW OF AGENDA AND MEETING OBJECTIVES

Jim Kemp reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting objectives.

#### 3. SEPTEMBER 12 MEETING REVIEW

Jim Kemp presented the meeting summary from the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

Jim Kemp reviewed the meeting overview and presented the responses to questions received from committee members after the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

#### 4. MEASURE D 2008 – NORTH COUNTY INVESTMENT PLAN PROPOSAL

Sarkes Khachek presented the Draft North County Investment Plan Version A.

Following the presentation, the committee discussed the following issues:

- Whether or not a minimum percentage should be included in the Measure D Local Program for alternative transportation expenditures or if a 'maintenance of effort' concept should be used instead.
- Determining how much jurisdictions have expended on alternative transportation within the current Measure D local program and over what period of time, i.e. five or ten-year allocation periods they should have to expend minimum percentages in the new measure.
- With an increased local alternative percentage for Measure D, local jurisdictions may need to expend more Transportation Development Act funding for Streets and Roads.

There was concern raised by some committee members that minimum alternative percentages agreed to by local jurisdictions as part of the 2006 Measure D Expenditure Plan were based upon a three-quarter cent sales tax measure which brought additional revenue compared to maintaining an existing half-cent sales tax measure. Committee members discussed having local jurisdiction's revisit the minimum percentages with their councils and Boards and then report back to the committee.

Sarkes Khachek then presented the Draft North County Investment Plan Version B.

A committee member asked if the Highway 166 Operational and Safety Improvements Program was for the eastern or western portion of 166 and Sarkes Khachek responded that the entire corridor was eligible for funding.

A committee member asked how the amount allocated for Reduced Transit Fares for Elderly and Disabled was determined and Steve VanDenburgh responded that the amount identified matched the amount allocated in the South Coast Draft Investment Plan.

Deborah Braskett then presented the Coalition for a Fair Measure D Proposal. She said she was encouraged by Staff's Version B of the plan which included funding for Safe Routes To School, Specialized Transit for Elderly and Disabled and Traffic Demand Reduction, but the Coalition was in favor of increased allocations for these programs.

The Coalition's proposal also included recommendations for the Measure D Local Program. These recommendations include:

- For local bikeway facilities, local alternative transportation funds should be used for bike facility projects only when the facilities are used exclusively for non-motorized vehicles. Class 2 bikeway maintenance that is part of street maintenance should not count.
- Local Measure D program allocations for alternative transportation should be reviewed on 5 year intervals and require compliance with targets at 10-year intervals, not 30.

Deborah Braskett then suggested that funding from the Highway 101/McCoy Interchange could be reduced by \$4 million to increase the allocations for the Safe Routes to School and Traffic Demand Reduction programs by \$2 million each.

Mr. Marc Chytilo commented that the Highway 101/McCoy Lane Interchange was not included in the adopted 2004 SBCAG Metropolitan Transportation Plan and is not a high priority project for Measure D funding.

Mr. David Whitehead responded that the McCoy Lane Interchange has been included in the City of Santa Maria's General Plan for twenty years and was an important project for the City. He added that most future development would occur in south Santa Maria. Jim Kemp added that the project would be in the revised MTP being drafted by SBCAG staff.

Some committee members expressed concern with reducing funding for highway and interchange projects. A committee member suggested reducing and reallocating the funding identified for Specialized Transit to the Safe Routes to School and Traffic Demand Reduction programs. Committee members expressed the importance of maintaining the Local Program funding amount because of the flexibility local jurisdiction's have with delivering projects in a timely manner.

The committee then discussed what voters would want to see in the expenditure plan. Some committee members expressed that highway projects are a priority in North County, but that alternative modes are also supported in having a balanced plan. The committee suggested that keeping the plan simple and providing flexibility for the local jurisdictions was very important for the investment plan.

The committee recessed for a short break at this time.

Following the break, the committee continued discussion on projects included in the regional project list.

**The committee reached consensus on the Regional Project List as included in Version B.**

Following consensus on the Regional Project List, the committee continued discussion on the minimum alternative percentages as presented in the Version B Local Program.

**Committee members suggested that local jurisdictions review the proposed percentages and provide input back to the committee on appropriate percentages for alternative modes.**

Committee members expressed the importance of having a balanced plan that included alternative modes within the regional program and included percentages within the local program. The committee agreed that Version B should be reviewed and discussed further at the next meeting.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment was provided at this time.

**6. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting will be November 7, 2007 from 9:00am to noon with the meeting location to be determined.

There being no other business, the committee adjourned.