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Executive Summary

Where people live, work, and play, and how they travel between the locations of those activities, now and in the future, are at the heart of a Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The location and diversity of land uses, their disposition, and the density of development are determining factors for how people choose to travel. Fundamentally, this plan explores the region’s land use and travel patterns, accounts for the demographic growth that will force new demands on both, and presents a vision for how they can work together to satisfy the goals important to the region while also meeting the State’s greenhouse gas reduction targets. Neither land use changes nor transportation investments in isolation can address the issues facing the region; a balanced approach is necessary to ensure the region is able to address its long-term needs.

Fast Forward 2040 Vision

Fast Forward 2040 continues the vision laid out in the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy adopted in 2013. It relies on the same core strategies and planning assumptions and strives to achieve the same, broad goals as the prior plan. In particular, Fast Forward 2040 is based on the same Regional Growth Forecast and Regional Housing Needs Allocation as well as essentially the same land use assumptions and growth allocation as the prior plan. Transportation projects and programs have been updated to reflect funding source changes and projects completed and new projects added in the interim.

Goals

Fast Forward 2040’s planning goals and objectives guided the development of the plan, applying a performance-based approach. Land use and transportation scenarios, including both land use and growth assumptions and regional projects and programs, were developed and evaluated based on these guiding principles. The five plan goals remain unchanged from the prior plan:

- **Environment**: Foster patterns of growth, development and transportation that protect natural resources and lead to a healthy environment.

- **Mobility & System Reliability**: Optimize the transportation system to improve accessibility jobs, schools, and services, allow the unimpeded movement of people and goods, and ensure the reliability of travel by all modes.

- **Equity**: Ensure that the transportation and housing needs of all socio-economic groups are adequately served.

- **Health & Safety**: Improve public health and ensure the safety of the regional transportation system.

- **A Prosperous Economy**: Achieve economically efficient transportation patterns and promote regional prosperity and economic growth.

The plan’s goals, as well as the objectives, policies, and performance measures are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.
Transportation Investments

At its core, a regional transportation plan identifies regional transportation needs, prioritizes those needs, and presents an implementation plan for maintaining and improving the regional transportation network. Transportation investments are projects or programs, most with benefits quantified by travel demand modeling, and are consistent with the planning goals and objectives. Since the incorporation of the sustainable communities strategy component in the previous update cycle, transportation investments are also assessed to determine whether, in combination with land use assumptions and growth allocation, they are supportive of the region’s greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Fast Forward 2040 contains a multi-modal transportation investment package that, when implemented, will advance the region’s goals, satisfy the planning objectives and, as a result, meet the needs of the traveling public into the future. The plan can only include projects that the region can reasonably expect to afford, and there are many projects beyond those listed in this plan that the region’s agencies have identified. Those projects, the desired yet unfunded, are listed as illustrative projects and may be implemented if revenues beyond those forecast are realized. The programs and projects contained in this plan have resulted from other planning studies, congestion management planning, 101 in Motion, the Measure A Strategic Plan, or at the recommendation of member agencies.

Transportation investments are discussed in Chapter 3 and listed in Appendix 2.

Financial Element

The financial element analyzes the cost of implementing the projects identified in the action element. It also provides a realistic forecast of available revenues, showing that the projects can be implemented using “committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources.”¹ The financial element demonstrates that Fast Forward 2040 is fiscally constrained.

- The total amount of revenue anticipated from federal, State, regional, and local sources over the life of Fast Forward 2040 is approximately $6.1 billion. Measure A, the local sales tax measure, accounts for 23 percent of anticipated revenues.
- The total cost of the projects in Fast Forward 2040 is approximately $6.1 billion: $1.7 billion for highway projects, $2.0 billion for streets and roads projects, $273 million for bicycle and pedestrian projects, $2.0 billion for transit projects, $3.5 million for intelligent transportation system (ITS)

projects, $15.9 million for transportation demand management (TDM) projects, and $31 million for rail projects.

- Fast Forward 2040 revenue forecasts are largely conservative and are based on historical data. With the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB1, Beall, 2017), SBCAG does not consider any speculative funding sources.

The following figure demonstrates how the forecasted revenues are allocated by mode. Of the auto-oriented funding, 79 percent is allocated to maintenance and operations.

**Figure 1: Funding by Mode**

The financial element is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

**Sustainable Communities Strategy**

Development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) involved the study of eight, separate land use and transportation scenarios, each analyzing different combinations of land use and transportation variables. The preferred scenario was selected from these scenario options on the basis of scenario performance as quantified by the adopted performance measures tied to the overall Fast Forward 2040 goals. All scenarios applied the same region-wide population, employment and housing projections from the 2012 SBCAG Regional Growth Forecast. Sub-regional distribution of forecast population growth varies by scenario consistent with allowable land uses, residential land use capacity and policy assumptions.

Central to the SCS is a set of land use assumptions identifying the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region. While there is no requirement of consistency between Fast Forward 2040 and local land use plans and while local jurisdictions explicitly retain land use authority under SB 375, Fast Forward 2040 is required to make land use assumptions and allocate forecast future growth consistent with those assumptions and the allocation of regional housing needs. Starting with land uses allowed by existing, adopted local General Plans, the land use assumptions, developed in close coordination with the planning staff of SBCAG’s member jurisdictions, selectively provide for intensification of residential and commercial land uses in urban areas proximate to existing transit. The intent of these changes is ultimately to shorten trip distances and reduce vehicle miles traveled by (1) directly addressing regional jobs/housing imbalance by providing more housing on the jobs-rich South Coast and more jobs in bedroom communities in the North County, and (2) promoting more trips, both local and inter-city, by alternative transportation modes, especially public transit.

Allowable land uses in the preferred scenario are adequate to accommodate forecast population, household and employment growth and to meet identified housing need. For the preferred scenario, forecast population

---

growth is distributed consistent with this pattern of allowable land uses. The development needed to satisfy future growth is focused within existing urbanized areas and avoids resource areas identified in the Regional Greenprint.

The transportation component of the SCS includes all new programmed and planned projects, including limited new bus transit service. Additionally, continuing the approach of the 2013 plan, the SCS includes an **Enhanced Transit Strategy**. The strategy that creates a framework for future transit service expansion at such time as new revenue sources may become available. The enhanced transit strategy is described in greater detail in Chapter 3. Recognizing the uncertain nature of future, new revenue sources, it takes a targeted, balanced and flexible approach to expanding transit service as needed in the future. Specifically, the enhanced transit strategy included in the preferred scenario commits to transit service expansion as new revenue sources become available (1) when and where transit enhancements are actually needed (defining quantitative triggers to determine when such need exists), and (2) while protecting existing funding for competing local demands, such as street and road maintenance. Because it is a general strategy, it does not change the list of fiscally constrained, programmed and planned transportation projects.

*Nothing in a sustainable communities strategy shall be interpreted as superseding the exercise of land use authority of cities and counties within the region….Nothing in this section shall require a city’s or county’s land use policies and regulations, including its general plan, to be consistent with the regional transportation plan or an alternative planning strategy.*


The Sustainable Communities Strategy is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

**Senate Bill 375**

California Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), requires each MPO to demonstrate, through the development of an SCS, or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) how its region will or could integrate transportation, housing, and land use planning to meet the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets set by the State, while accommodating forecast growth.
Regional Growth
A central focus of the regional transportation plan is accommodating forecast growth. The sustainable communities strategy requires that forecast growth is accommodated in a manner that considers the environmental impact – namely, greenhouse gas emissions targets. In 2012, SBCAG developed the current Regional Growth Forecast which covers the period 2010 through 2040. Over the course of the 2010-2040 forecast period, the county-wide population is forecast to increase by 96,100 persons from 423,895 to 520,000 or 23 percent. The following figure highlights the forecasted growth consistent with the sustainable communities strategy.

Figure 2: 2010-2040 Preferred Scenario Population Growth

Demographic characteristics and forecasted growth are presented in greater detail in Chapter 4.

Performance Measures
Since MAP-21 became law in 2012, SBCAG has been following a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals.

SBCAG has organized its transportation planning policies to fit the RTP-SCS goal framework and crafted explicit, quantifiable performance measures that are also keyed to the plan goals. The goal framework and the performance measures follow the mandated performance-based approach.

SBCAG applied the performance measures in Fast Forward 2040 scenario development and analysis and in the selection of the preferred land use and transportation scenario. These performance measures are explicitly keyed to the five RTP-SCS goals, listed above, as well as to the plan objectives.

Ultimately, the preferred scenario balances competing considerations in a way that maximizes region-wide benefits and minimizes detrimental effects. Compared to the future baseline scenario in 2040, the preferred scenario:

- Reduces overall vehicle miles traveled by 19 percent, vehicle hours traveled by 16 percent, and average daily traffic (ADT) volumes by eight percent.
- Reduces overall congestion (as measured by congested vehicle miles traveled) by 35 percent compared to the future baseline scenario.
• Reduces average vehicle trip time by 11 percent and average vehicle commute time for workers by five percent.
• Saves residents and workers almost $500,000 annually in auto operating costs (a 19 percent reduction).
• Achieves an overall increase in transit accessibility (the percentage of population within a high quality transit corridor) of 24 percent, and nine percent overall from 2010.
• Achieves an increase in transit accessibility for low income populations (the percentage of low income population within a high quality transit corridor) of 81 percent, and 17 percent from 2010.
• Increases transit ridership by 10 percent (52,240 daily trips for the preferred scenario versus 47,450 for the future baseline), a 52 percent increase from 2010 numbers, and results in a seven percent increase in alternative trip (biking, walking, and transit) mode share.
• Apportions 73 percent of new housing growth to infill areas (compared to 23 percent in the future baseline scenario).
• Develops 4,165 fewer acres to accommodate growth (3,727 total acres for the preferred scenario versus 7,892 acres total for the future baseline scenario).

Fast Forward 2040 performance measures are presented in Chapter 2 and their application is discussed in Chapter 4.

Public Participation
To ensure opportunity for meaningful input and involvement in the development of the RTP-SCS and to meet the requirements of state law, SBCAG adopted a Public Participation Plan specific to the RTP-SCS process in September 2015. The SBCAG public participation process for development of Fast Forward 2040 consists of three outreach phases: (1) RTP-SCS Scoping and Goal-Setting, (2) Alternative Transportation / Land Use Scenarios, and (3) Draft RTP-SCS and Preferred Transportation / Land Use Scenario Adoption. The outreach begins with a wide scope and narrows throughout the development of the RTP-SCS until plan adoption.

The first phase focuses on direct stakeholder outreach to seek input on the scope of alternative scenarios to be considered in the planning process. SBCAG staff met with numerous groups, both public sector and private sector organizations, as part of the key stakeholder meetings during this first phase of the public participation process.

3 Defined as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes per peak commute hour.
During the second phase of the public participation process, SBCAG held two public workshops (one each in North and South County) to report the preliminary results of the alternative land use and transportation scenario modeling and obtain stakeholder feedback.

The third phase of the public participation process is to allow public comment meeting on the draft RTP-SCS and draft environmental document through two, noticed public meetings before the SBCAG Board of Directors. As provide by the Public Participation Plan and state law, there was a 45-day public comment period for the draft RTP-SCS and supplemental EIR in addition to the 55-day comment period on the draft SCS.

Public participation is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 1:
Introduction

Fast Forward 2040 is the 16th iteration of SBCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan and the first update to the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy. Fast Forward 2040 covers the years 2016 through 2040.

Purpose and Need

Fast Forward 2040 updates the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP-SCS) adopted by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) in August 2013 and continues the planning vision for the Santa Barbara County region laid out by the 2013 plan. As have past Regional Transportation Plans, Fast Forward 2040 plans how the region will invest limited transportation funds to maintain, operate and improve an integrated, multi-modal transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods. The updated plan identifies specific strategies, policies and actions, including a list of programmed and planned transportation projects affordable within the region’s anticipated reasonably available transportation funding, to achieve regional goals and priorities and meet the current and future needs of the region. The planning horizon year remains 2040, the same as the prior adopted plan.

As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill 375), Fast Forward 2040 contains a Sustainable Communities Strategy that considers both land use and transportation together in a single, integrated planning process that accommodates regional housing needs and projected growth. This Sustainable Communities Strategy continues the strategy and vision of the adopted 2013 plan, updating it to reflect changes to land use and transportation projects in the interim. Whereas the 2013 plan incorporated a new Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Plan and Regional Growth Forecast, Fast Forward 2040 utilizes the same planning assumptions with regard to housing needs and growth as the prior adopted plan. While SBCAG must update the RTP-SCS every four years, the RHNA planning process occurs every eight years, every other RTP-SCS cycle.

The Sustainable Communities Strategy recognizes the fundamental relationship between land use and transportation choices: the two components influence each other and neither component can be understood without reference to the other. Fast Forward 2040 meets the requirements of SB 375 and, in particular, demonstrates how the integrated land use and transportation plan achieves the region’s mandated greenhouse gas emission targets for passenger vehicles.

At the same time that it meets the requirements of SB 375, Fast Forward 2040 builds on past efforts to move the region forward toward achievement of a broader range of goals related to the environment, mobility, social equity, health and safety, and economic vitality. The plan was shaped using a performance-based approach as required by federal transportation law that measures progress toward these plan goals. From the range of integrated land use and transportation planning options studied, Fast Forward 2040 designates a preferred future land use and transportation scenario that, applying quantifiable performance measures, best achieves the plan goals and meets the region’s transportation needs. The preferred scenario represents the updated version of the scenario embraced by the adopted 2013 RTP-SCS.
In updating the plan, SBCAG actively sought input from local decision-makers and communities, interested stakeholder groups, and other government agencies through an extensive public process. Fast Forward 2040 builds on and incorporates careful planning work at both the regional and local level. Past planning efforts by SBCAG and local member agencies are on track toward regional sustainability and strive to address the region's core planning challenges. Land use changes modeled as part of the preferred scenario were developed in close coordination with SBCAG member agency planning staff and build on local plan updates currently in process, just as transportation projects were developed in close coordination with Caltrans, local public works departments, and transit providers.

In planning for projected growth in the region, Fast Forward 2040 represents a voluntary strategy that retains local government land use autonomy. Neither SB 375 nor any other law requires local member agency General Plans or land use regulation to be consistent with Fast Forward 2040. Implementation of the Fast Forward 2040 therefore depends on local government policy decisions and voluntary local government action.

Fast Forward 2040 is also dependent on the availability of adequate funding. The plan allocates funding considered reasonably available to transportation investments over a long period. It includes only those projects that can be afforded within the real, expected fiscal constraints. Indeed, inclusion of projects in Fast Forward 2040 is a prerequisite to the use of federal funding for these projects.

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a supplement to the programmatic environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the RTP-SCS adopted in 2013 evaluates the environmental effects of Fast Forward 2040. Because Fast Forward relies on the same housing and growth assumptions and embraces the same Sustainable Communities Strategy vision, changes from the 2013 plan are relatively modest. The EIR and supplemental EIR also lay the groundwork for the environmental review of listed transportation projects and allow for the streamlined review of qualifying development projects within Transit Priority Areas as provided by SB 375.

The legal requirements that guided the development of this plan are described in Appendix 7.

**Our Region**

The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) region is located along California’s Central Coast about 300 miles south of San Francisco and 100 miles north of Los Angeles, with boundaries identical to those of Santa Barbara County. Santa Barbara County occupies 2,745 square miles of land bordered on the north by San Luis Obispo County, on the east by Ventura and Kern Counties, and on the south and west by the Pacific Ocean. US 101 is the major transportation route through the region.
Geography

North County
The northern portion of the County is characterized by its rural, natural setting, with the Los Padres National Forest, San Rafael and Dick Smith Wilderness Areas, and Lake Cachuma Recreation Area. The North County is known for its agribusiness, including vineyards and wine-making, and rocket launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB). It has four population centers: Cuyama Valley, Lompoc Valley, Santa Maria Valley, and Santa Ynez Valley (see Figure 3).

Cuyama Valley: The Cuyama Valley, located in northeastern Santa Barbara County, includes the unincorporated communities of Cuyama and New Cuyama. With a population of about 1,245, the economy of the Cuyama Valley is agriculturally based.

The Cuyama Valley is accessible by SR 166, the Friendship Airport, and Cuyama Transit. Cuyama is a relatively isolated area, which is approximately 60 miles east of Santa Maria and 60 miles southwest of Bakersfield via SR 166.

Lompoc Valley: The Lompoc Valley lies at the base of the Purisima, Santa Rita, and White Hills. The Pacific Ocean is at the western edge of the Lompoc Valley. VAFB, to the north of the Valley, encompasses more than 98,000 acres. It lies near the Santa Ynez Mountains to the east and is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the south and west, and farmland to the north. VAFB is home to the 30th Space Wing of the Air Force Space Command, which is responsible for the Department of Defense Space and Missile launch activities on the West Coast of the United States. The Valley includes the incorporated City of Lompoc, as well as Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks, and Vandenberg Village in unincorporated Santa Barbara County.

The Lompoc Valley is accessible by State Routes 1 and 246, the Surf passenger rail station, the Lompoc Airport, the Breeze Bus and the Wine Country Express. VAFB is accessible by SR 1. Two Union Pacific branch lines connect Lompoc and VAFB to the Union Pacific main line.

Santa Maria Valley: The Santa Maria Valley is bounded by the Santa Maria River to the north, the Casmalia Hills to the west, and the Solomon Hills to the south. The Santa Maria Valley includes the cities of Santa Maria (the largest city in Santa Barbara County) and Guadalupe, and the unincorporated areas of Orcutt and Sisquoc. This is the fastest growing area of the County.
The Santa Maria Valley is accessible by US 101, State Routes 135 and 166, Amtrak passenger and Union Pacific freight service, the Santa Maria Public Airport, the Breeze Bus, and Greyhound Bus service. The Santa Maria Valley Railroad also serves the Santa Maria Valley, interchanging with Union Pacific at Guadalupe.

Santa Ynez Valley: The Santa Ynez Valley lies at the base of several converging mountain ranges including the San Rafael and Santa Ynez Mountains and the Purisima and Santa Rita Hills. The Valley includes the incorporated cities of Buellton and Solvang, the small unincorporated communities of Ballard, Los Olivos, and Santa Ynez, and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians Reservation.

The Santa Ynez Valley is accessible by US 101, State Routes 154 and 246, Amtrak bus connector service, the Wine Country Express, Breeze Route 200 and the Santa Ynez Airport.

South Coast
The southern portion of the County is bounded by the Santa Ynez Mountains to the north, the Pacific Ocean to the south, the Ventura County line to the east, and Gaviota to the west. It is a narrow strip of coastal land known as the South Coast. It includes the incorporated cities of Carpinteria, Santa Barbara—with the region’s only marine harbor facilities—and Goleta, as well as unincorporated Summerland, Montecito, and Isla Vista—home to UCSB.

The South Coast is accessible by US 101, State Routes 150 and 154, Amtrak, the Santa Barbara Airport, the VISTA (Ventura Intercity Service Transit Authority) Coastal Express, Coastal Express Limited, the Clean Air Express, and Greyhound Bus service.

SBCAG serves Santa Barbara County and its eight incorporated cities. Several subregions comprise Santa Barbara County, the South Coast, and the North County.

- South Coast, including the cities of Carpinteria, Goleta, and Santa Barbara
- Cuyama, including the unincorporated communities of Cuyama and New Cuyama
- Lompoc, including the city of Lompoc
- Santa Maria, including the cities of Guadalupe and Santa Maria
- Santa Ynez, including the cities of Buellton and Solvang
Figure 3: Santa Barbara County


Demographics

As of January 1, 2016, Santa Barbara County has a total population of 446,717 increasing by approximately 3,700 persons or 0.8 percent from the previous year and similar to historical annual averages. During this one-year period there was a net increase in births over deaths of approximately 2,900 and a net in-migration of 800 persons. The City of Santa Maria continues to have the largest incorporated proportion of the population with 23 percent followed by the City of Santa Barbara with 21 percent. Over the 2015 to 2016 period, the City of Goleta has experienced the most significant percentage growth, increasing by 551 persons or 1.8 percent, and the City of Santa Maria the most significant numerical growth, increasing by 1,456 persons or 1.4 percent. Figure 4 through Figure 7 provide graphical representations of the region’s demographics.
The most recent Census indicates that the countywide median age is 33.6 years. An estimated 23 percent of the population is under 18 years and 13 percent is 65 years and older. More growth in the older age groups 65+ has occurred. This growth is due in part to the normal aging process of the baby-boomers.
**Figure 6**: Age Distribution of Santa Barbara County Population, 2014

Source: American Community Survey 2010-2014

**Figure 7**: Change in Age Distribution, 2000 and 2010

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2010 Census

An estimated 47 percent of the County population identifies themselves as Non-Hispanic White, followed by 44 percent identifying themselves as Hispanic or Latino (see Figure 8). In this comparison, these two groups are mutually exclusive. The other category represents the combined African, American Indian, Pacific Islander and two or more race groups with four percent of the total.
One of the primary influences on travel demand is population growth. Santa Barbara County’s population grew by 24,548 persons, or six percent, between 2000 and 2010 (see Table 1). This increase is down from an eight percent increase between 1990 and 2000. The Cities of Santa Maria, Buellton, and Guadalupe experienced the greatest percentage growth in the County: 29, 26, and 25 percent, respectively. The Cities of Carpinteria, Solvang, and Santa Barbara experienced a decline in population, due in part to the recession, loss of jobs, and high housing costs. Over this time period, the City of Santa Maria overtook the City of Santa Barbara as the largest city in the County.

Based on updated January 2016 population estimates from the Department of Finance, Santa Barbara County’s population grew five percent in the 5-year period between 2010 and 2015, compared to the prior 10-year period that experienced an increase of 6 percent. Both the Cities of Santa Maria and Santa Barbara experienced a 5 percent increase and the City of Carpinteria increased by nearly 7 percent—the largest percentage increase of all county jurisdictions.

Table 1: Population Growth 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>4,957</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>14,194</td>
<td>13,040</td>
<td>13,928</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta*</td>
<td>28,788</td>
<td>29,888</td>
<td>31,325</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>41,103</td>
<td>42,434</td>
<td>44,116</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>89,600</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>93,190</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>77,423</td>
<td>99,553</td>
<td>104,404</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>5,332</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>5,451</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Total</td>
<td>133,420</td>
<td>133,417</td>
<td>142,088</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>399,347</td>
<td>423,895</td>
<td>446,717</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The City of Goleta provided the 2000 population estimate since the City was not yet incorporated in 2000.
Housing Affordability Drives Location Decisions

According to the National Association of Homebuilders, Santa Barbara County is the one of the least affordable small metropolitan area housing markets in the nation. Only 46 percent of households in the county are able to afford the median-priced home, compared to 56 percent statewide and 71 percent nationwide. As shown in Figure 9, housing on the South Coast is significantly more expensive than in neighboring areas to the north and south. Due principally to the high cost of local housing on the South Coast, significant numbers of workers commute daily from lower-cost areas into the higher-cost South Coast to work. This commuting pattern underlines the need for additional workforce housing on the South Coast. Workforce housing generally refers to housing affordable to gainfully employed households whose income is too high to qualify for traditional affordable housing programs, but is insufficient to secure higher cost housing within a reasonable proximity to the workplace. Workforce housing is generally used to describe the housing needs of workers that provide essential community services, such as teachers, police officers, firemen, and medical personnel, as well as service and retail workers.

Figure 9: Median Home Prices 2014, Santa Barbara, Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties


Another consideration in the Santa Barbara County housing market equation is a large farm-worker population, with disproportionate numbers living in poor housing conditions due to low wages, high migration rates, and high local housing costs. The City of Santa Maria, which houses 55 percent of the county’s farm-worker population or 20,000 workers at peak season, estimates a need for up to 4,600 units of farm-worker housing.4

Some communities have higher proportions of lower wage-earning residents that either cannot afford to buy or rent and/or have higher numbers of wage earners living in housing units (high household size) in order to afford the rent or mortgage. These areas have a greater need for more affordable housing. As shown in Figure 10, the Cities of Santa Maria and Guadalupe have the highest household sizes as a significant portion of their residents work in lower wage jobs in the agricultural sector and require more wage earners to afford housing costs. Also of note are the large numbers of lower-paying service sector jobs catering to the South Coast tourism industry.

4 Santa Maria Housing Element, 2009, III-22.
Figure 10: 2010 Household Size Estimates

Similar to the North County-South County jobs imbalance, the housing imbalance is continuing. Per the SBCAG Congestion Management Program, a total of 7,557 residential dwelling units in Santa Barbara County were approved or permitted and not occupied as of December 2015. The City of Santa Maria in North County approved or issued building permits for 1,861 units or 25 percent of the count-wide total and 836 units have been approved or permitted in the City of Guadalupe. North County cities account for 58 percent of the approved and permitted units.

As for the rental market, the market-wide vacancy rate on the South Coast is the lowest on record and less than one percent in April 2014, down from 1.8 percent in April 2011. Overall average rent was $1,596 in April 2014, up from $1,501 in April 2011. The overall average rent in Ventura County was $1,623 in April 2014. Figure 11 shows median gross rents for the cities in Santa Barbara County according to the 2007-2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

These cost statistics help to explain the large number of people who chose to reside far from their workplaces on the South Coast, affecting the region’s travel patterns and increasing work trip lengths. Realtors in the region, seizing on the opportunity presented by the housing situation, have capitalized with advertisements—“Drive a little; save a lot”—appealing to workers who believe the cost of the housing stock on the South Coast is out of their reach. Workers may fail to appreciate the cost of the commute itself—in time, money, pollution, and stress.

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 Report May 2016

---

5 California Economic Forecast. 2015 Santa Barbara County Real Estate & Economic Outlook.
6 California Economic Forecast. 2015 Ventura County Real Estate & Economic Outlook.
Aging Population Retiring in Place

The increasing number of retirees also impacts housing opportunities. The population of older people is growing and many of them plan to “age in place.” By 2030, 20 percent of the U.S. population is forecast to be comprised of older adults. According to a study by the AARP, 89 percent of homeowners prefer to remain in their homes through retirement.

In Santa Barbara County, a comparison of the age distribution over a 50-year forecast period from 2010 to 2060 shows a dramatic increase in the population over 65 years compared to the population 60 years and under. As many of these people retire and age in place rather than downsizing, jobs will open up to younger workers, but housing will not. This phenomenon will limit housing supply, especially on the South Coast. In many cases, baby boomers are not selling and moving, even when they retire. If they did, they could face higher property taxes and capital gains taxes, with nothing comparable to their current home to buy. So they stay put and remodel if necessary. In addition, the size of the households declines with age. As a result, each housing unit has fewer occupants, further limiting housing availability (see Figure 12 and Figure 13).

---


**Figure 12: Countywide Percent Change in Age Groups, 2010-2060**

Source: California Department of Finance, P-1 Population Projections by Age, December 2014

**Figure 13: Average Number of People per Household by Age of Householder, US**


**Impacts on the Transportation System**

Workers choose the private automobile for many reasons, such as multiple-stop commutes (to run errands, transport children, etc.), flexible job schedules, unpredictable daily routines, shifting work hours, and the perceived need to conserve time. These factors and others contribute significantly to mode choice.
In addition, land use patterns, which influence the distance between home and work, affect the convenience of alternative modes. From 1990 to 2010, the mean travel time to work increased by 8.3 percent.

When gas prices spiked in 2008, people drove less. Americans drove 11 billion fewer miles in March 2008 than they did in March 2007, the first time since 1979 that traffic decreased from one March to the next. The 2008 fuel cost increase affected rural areas—with little or no public transit, scarce jobs and long commutes, low incomes, and older vehicles—the hardest. In more recent times with lower gas prices, California gasoline consumption is on an upward trend along with a growing population that began in 2013 (see Figure 14 and Figure 15).

Although Santa Barbara County residents, particularly workers, are still overwhelmingly dependent on automobiles, the trend is slowing. In Santa Barbara County, daily VMT increased by only 9.5 percent from 1990 to 2010 (see Figure 16). Daily VMT per household remained steady and daily VMT per capita decreased by 8.6 percent.

---


---

Figure 14: California Gasoline Sales: Annual Net Taxable Gasoline Gallons

![Figure 14](http://www.boe.ca.gov/sptaxprog/spfrpnts.htm)


Figure 15: California Annual Population

![Figure 15](http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-7/view.php)

The number of workers age 16 and older increased by 6.7 percent between 1990 and 2010. Although 65.5 percent of workers still drive alone to work, that percentage has decreased each decade since 1990. The percentage of workers using transit, on the other hand, has increased dramatically—91.4 percent from 1990 to 2010. The percentage of workers carpooling has also increased.

![Figure 16: Travel Characteristics Change, 1990–2010](image)

Sources: ACS 2010-2014, SBCAG travel model

A primary influence on travel demand is the relationship between where people live and where they work. This relationship has become an increasingly important issue nationwide as the spatial mismatch between jobs and affordable housing is causing growing numbers of workers to reside farther from their workplaces than they would otherwise choose, increasing commuting distances. Regionally, this trend is evident with large numbers of commuters traveling daily from housing in Ventura, Santa Maria, Lompoc, and the Santa Ynez Valley to jobs on the South Coast, and between San Luis Obispo County and the Santa Maria Valley. The average commute distance in the tri-county region (Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties) is 16 miles (SBCAG, 2007 Commute Profile Report).

According to the SBCAG 2014 State of the Commute Report, approximately 10 percent of South Coast employees commute from residences in northern Santa Barbara County. A smaller number of workers, "reverse commuters," travel in the opposite direction. See Figure 17 below.
The one-way commute distance for workers who live in Santa Maria, for example, and work on the South Coast is, according to Google Maps, approximately 65 miles, a distance that takes approximately one hour and 15 minutes to drive. A 75-minute daily commute between Santa Maria and Santa Barbara equates to approximately 625 hours of time spent in travel over a year's time, which is approximately 30 percent of a normal work year, and equivalent to more than 15.5 weeks of vacation.

The North County-South County jobs imbalance is projected to improve, but will not be eliminated. According to SBCAG’s 2012 Regional Growth Forecast (2012 RGF), the percentage of region-wide jobs on the South Coast will decrease from 61 percent in 2010 to 52 percent in 2040. However, while jobs on the South Coast will increase by 10 percent from 2010 to 2040, jobs in North County will increase by 59 percent over the same time period.

This intra-County imbalance leads to increased transportation demands on US 101 and State Route 154, with the consequence of increased congestion and vehicle miles traveled per capita.

There is also an inter-county commuter imbalance. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, one percent of Ventura County residents (approximately 12,200 people) and three percent of San Luis Obispo County residents (approximately 8,630 people) commute to work in Santa Barbara County. In Santa Barbara County, less than one percent of residents (approximately 2,400 people) commute to work in Ventura County and two percent of residents (approximately 7,400 people) commute to work in San Luis Obispo County. These figures are shown on Figure 18 below.

Source: American Community Survey 2006-2010 Five-year estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

---

10 SBCAG. 2012 RGF, 21.
This inter-county imbalance leads to increased transportation demands on US 101, with related increases in congestion and vehicle miles per capita. US 101 on the South Coast in particular already experiences congestion.

Figure 19 below shows how inter-county commuting figures have changed over time.

Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013 Five-year estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Social Equity and Economic Segregation

In accordance with State and federal legal requirements discussed earlier, the Fast Forward 2040 policy recognizes the importance of ensuring that disadvantaged populations receive their fair share of the benefits of transportation services and investments and that no single group is disproportionately impacted by the plan. The first step to avoiding such impacts is to identify potentially disadvantaged populations. Disadvantaged populations may include minority and low-income populations, as well as seniors and people with disabilities. The tables below identify the locations of these populations in the SBCAG region.

Approximately 17 percent of Santa Barbara County’s population lives in poverty.11 The cities with the highest rates of poverty are Lompoc, Santa Maria, and Guadalupe. In addition, 27 percent of people in the unincorporated Guadalupe area live in poverty. People age 65 and over make up 13 percent of the County’s population. The City of Solvang has the highest rate of seniors, at 21 percent.

Ten percent of the County’s (civilian, non-institutionalized, age 5+) population has a disability. The Cities of Solvang, Lompoc and Carpinteria, and the unincorporated North County areas—have higher rates of persons with disabilities than the countywide average.

In Santa Barbara County, 70 percent of the population identifies themselves as in the White race category (not Hispanic exclusive). The largest single minority race is Asian, at five percent of the County’s population.

Nearly half of the County’s population identifies as Hispanic or Latino (can be of any race). In many areas of the County, Hispanic or Latino is not the minority. In Guadalupe, for example, 86 percent of the population is Hispanic or Latino.

11 The Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. If a family’s total income is less than the family’s threshold, then that family and every individual in it is considered in poverty. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated for inflation using Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains or noncash benefits.
### Table 2: Potentially Disadvantaged Populations—Poverty, Age, Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Age 65 &amp; Over</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>21,298</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total North County Cities</td>
<td>32,780</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Cuyama Area</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Guadalupe Area</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Lompoc Valley</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Santa Maria Valley</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uninc. North County</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>13,434</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South County Cities</td>
<td>16,887</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uninc. South County</td>
<td>14,489</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>68,953</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*of the population for whom poverty status is determined

**of the civilian non-institutionalized population, age 5+

Poverty Source: Table B17025, U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey

Age Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, (100% sample)

Disability Source: Table S1810, U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey
### Table 3: Potentially Disadvantaged Populations—Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White*</th>
<th>Black or African American*</th>
<th>American Indian and Alaska Native*</th>
<th>Asian*</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander*</th>
<th>Some other race*</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>37 1%</td>
<td>137 3%</td>
<td>5 0%</td>
<td>424 9%</td>
<td>237 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>74 1%</td>
<td>103 1%</td>
<td>279 4%</td>
<td>5 0%</td>
<td>2,783 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>25,950</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2,432 6%</td>
<td>750 2%</td>
<td>1,615 4%</td>
<td>186 0%</td>
<td>9,020 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>55,983</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,656 2%</td>
<td>1,818 2%</td>
<td>5,054 5%</td>
<td>161 0%</td>
<td>29,841 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>38 1%</td>
<td>59 1%</td>
<td>72 1%</td>
<td>1 0%</td>
<td>611 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total North County Cities</td>
<td>93,566</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4,237 3%</td>
<td>2,806 2%</td>
<td>7,157 4%</td>
<td>358 0%</td>
<td>42,679 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Cuyama Area</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>19 2%</td>
<td>13 1%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>135 11%</td>
<td>38 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Guadalupe Area</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3 1%</td>
<td>7 3%</td>
<td>1 0%</td>
<td>88 33%</td>
<td>20 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Lompoc Valley</td>
<td>11,597</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>698 5%</td>
<td>181 1%</td>
<td>686 4%</td>
<td>94 1%</td>
<td>1,133 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Santa Maria Valley</td>
<td>26,547</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>460 1%</td>
<td>452 1%</td>
<td>1,190 4%</td>
<td>61 0%</td>
<td>2,969 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td>10,948</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>67 1%</td>
<td>289 2%</td>
<td>194 2%</td>
<td>18 0%</td>
<td>737 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uninc. North County</td>
<td>50,266</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,237 2%</td>
<td>944 2%</td>
<td>2,090 3%</td>
<td>174 0%</td>
<td>5,062 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>9,348</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>144 1%</td>
<td>296 2%</td>
<td>15 0%</td>
<td>2,599 20%</td>
<td>529 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>20,833</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>469 2%</td>
<td>283 1%</td>
<td>2,728 9%</td>
<td>26 0%</td>
<td>4,182 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>66,411</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1,420 2%</td>
<td>892 1%</td>
<td>3,062 3%</td>
<td>116 0%</td>
<td>13,032 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South County Cities</td>
<td>96,592</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,998 2%</td>
<td>1,319 1%</td>
<td>6,086 5%</td>
<td>157 0%</td>
<td>19,813 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. South County</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1,041 1%</td>
<td>416 1%</td>
<td>5,332 8%</td>
<td>117 0%</td>
<td>6,306 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>295,124</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8,513 2%</td>
<td>5,485 1%</td>
<td>20,665 5%</td>
<td>806 0%</td>
<td>73,860 17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only those who identify with only one race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, (100% sample)
Table 4: Potentially Disadvantaged Populations—Hispanic or Latino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>6,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>21,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>70,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total North County Cities</td>
<td>100,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Cuyama Area</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Guadalupe Area</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Lompoc Valley</td>
<td>3,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Santa Maria Valley</td>
<td>9,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unincorporated North County</td>
<td>16,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>6,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>9,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>33,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South County Cities</td>
<td>49,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated South County</td>
<td>14,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>181,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, (100% sample)

Air Quality

As mentioned above, the federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) to set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for pollutants that are considered harmful to public health and the environment. The EPA has set NAAQS for six pollutants: ozone, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead.

Ozone

Ozone (O₃) is a strong irritant that adversely affects the human respiratory system, potentially leading to lung damage. Ozone exposure aggravates asthma, bronchitis, and other respiratory ailments, as well as cardiovascular disease, with children and the elderly at the highest risk. Ozone also damages crops and forests and contributes to the degradation of anthropogenic materials such as plastics, paint, and textiles.

Ozone is not produced directly by any pollution source, but is instead formed through a series of chemical reactions involving oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and reactive organic gases (ROG) in the presence of sunlight over a period of several hours. The major sources of NOx in the County include the combustion of fossil fuels in automobiles and other mobile sources, the petroleum industry, and channel shipping. ROG sources include natural seeps of oil and gas; use of solvents in paints, consumer products and industry; automobiles;
natural vegetation; and the petroleum industry. Reducing ozone levels is dependent upon reducing the emissions of these ozone precursors.

The major pollution sources in the County are grouped into the following categories:

- Stationary or point sources (e.g., large industrial sites)
- Area-wide sources (e.g., home heating devices, small business combustion processes, home/yard appliances)
- On-road mobile sources (e.g., cars, trucks)
- Other mobile sources (e.g., marine shipping, off-road vehicles, motor boats, trains, aircraft)
- Natural sources (e.g., vegetation, gas seeps)

The planning emission inventory developed for APCD’s 2016 Ozone Plan (formerly known as the Clean Air Plan) describes the relative contribution of each of these sources in Santa Barbara County.\textsuperscript{12} On-road mobile sources (cars and trucks) contribute approximately 13% of the total ROG\textsuperscript{13} emissions and 14% of the total NOx emissions in the region. Other mobile sources (trains, boats, diesel agricultural equipment, etc.), stationary sources (solvents, oil and gas production, etc.), and area-wide sources (pesticides, forest management, residential fuel combustion, etc.) combine to make up the remainder.

Both ozone contributors, however, are forecast to decline. On-road mobile source emissions of ROG and NOx are forecast to decline by 67\% and 78\% respectively through the 2035 horizon planning year of the 2016 Ozone Plan. These emission reductions primarily result from State and federal controls on light duty vehicle and heavy-duty diesel emissions and the natural attrition of older vehicles being replaced by newer vehicles (i.e., fleet turnover).

As explained above, the County is currently in attainment of the federal ozone standard, but is designated as non-attainment for the stricter State standard.

\textit{Particulate Matter}

Particulate matter (PM) is a respiratory irritant. The respiratory tract effectively filters large particles; however, small particles of 10 microns in diameter or less (PM10) and even finer particulates of 2.5 microns in diameter of less (PM2.5) can cause serious health effects. The chemical makeup of the particles is an important factor in determining the seriousness of the health effect. Anthropogenic (resulting from human activity) sources of particulate matter include re-entrained road dust (materials found on the roadway) from vehicles, construction and demolition, tilling dust (agriculture), re-entrained road dust from unpaved roads, and fuel combustion. Natural sources of particulate matter include wild fires, sea salt, and windblown dust. Particulate matter is also formed secondarily in the atmosphere from chemical reactions involving sunlight with NOx and sulfur dioxide gases.

\textit{PM10}

The County is currently in attainment of the federal PM10 standard, but is designated as non-attainment for the stricter State standard.\textsuperscript{14} A specialized sampling and analysis study completed by APCD in 1989 (the Santa Barbara County Particulate Matter Emission Reduction Study) found that motor vehicle exhaust and locally generated geological dust are the most significant sources of directly emitted PM10 in the County. The study determined that potential control measures should concentrate on these primary sources of PM10.

\textsuperscript{12} APCD. 2016 Ozone Plan, August 2016.
\textsuperscript{13} APCD’s annual emission inventory and planning emission inventory include Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC), the definition of which is essentially equivalent to ARB’s definition of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG). (APCD, 2010 Clean Air Plan, 3-2.)
\textsuperscript{14} APCD. Santa Barbara County Attainment/Nonattainment Summary 2015. https://www.ourair.org/air-quality-standards/.
although non-traditional controls (e.g., controls for fugitive dust) should also be evaluated. Thus, attainment of the State PM10 standard may depend on the development of innovative control technologies and the effectiveness of these controls upon implementation. PM10 air quality benefits will also result from implementation of ozone control measures adopted in the Clean Air Plans/Ozone Plans that address ozone precursors (ROG and NOx), by effectively reducing the chemical reactions involving NOx in the atmosphere that result in secondary PM10.

**PM2.5**
The County is currently in attainment of the federal PM$_{2.5}$ standard, but is unclassified for the stricter State standard.$^{15}$

Statewide, PM$_{2.5}$ emissions have fluctuated since 1975, and are now predicted to continue increasing. Emissions have declined dramatically between 2000 and 2010, but are now forecast to continue increase out to 2035 due to increased VMT, resulting in re-entrained road dust.$^{16}$ Re-entrained road dust created by on-road vehicles accounts for 5 percent of PM$_{2.5}$ in the County.$^{17}$ Statewide, the primary contributors to PM$_{2.5}$ emissions are area-wide sources.$^{18}$

**Diesel PM**
California identified diesel PM as a toxic air contaminant in 1998 because of its potential to cause cancer and other adverse health effects.$^{19}$ The primary sources of diesel PM are trucks, buses, large off-road equipment such as bulldozers and tractors, portable equipment such as cranes, refrigerating units on trucks, and stationary engines used to generate power or pump water.

**Carbon Monoxide**
The County is currently in attainment of all federal and State carbon monoxide standards.$^{20}$

**Climate Change**
According to the U.S. EPA, “[c]limate change refers to any significant change in the measures of climate lasting for an extended period of time. In other words, climate change includes major changes in temperature, precipitation, or wind patterns, among other effects, that occur over several decades or longer.” “Global warming refers to the recent and ongoing rise in global average temperature near Earth’s surface. It is caused mostly by increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Global warming is causing climate patterns to change. However, global warming itself represents only one aspect of climate change.”$^{21}$

Human activities, such as fossil fuel combustion, have been emitting significant amounts of carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) into the Earth’s atmosphere since the Industrial Revolution, changing the composition of the atmosphere. This composition change has intensified the greenhouse effect, a natural process in which GHGs trap in heat from the sun to warm the Earth.

$^{15}$ APCD. Santa Barbara County Attainment/Nonattainment Summary 2015.
$^{17}$ APCD, SB 656 Report, 2006.
Carbon dioxide is the primary greenhouse gas (GHG) emitted by human activities, making up 81 percent of all U.S. GHG emissions in 2014.\textsuperscript{22}

*Climate Change and Transportation*

Transportation is the second largest source of CO\textsubscript{2} emissions after electricity generation, contributing 26 percent of total U.S. CO\textsubscript{2} emissions in 2014.\textsuperscript{23} In the State of California, transportation accounts for more than 36 percent of GHG emissions.\textsuperscript{24}

Santa Barbara County’s CO\textsubscript{2} emissions (tons per day) from on-road mobiles sources are shown in Figure 20. In the absence of State and federal controls, CO\textsubscript{2} emissions are forecast to increase through 2035 (approximately 25 percent over 2005 levels) with the majority of emissions generated by light-duty autos and trucks.

*Figure 20: On-Road Mobile Source Emissions of CO2 in Santa Barbara County*  

Looking at the trends, it can be said that CO\textsubscript{2} emissions closely mirror fuel consumption and VMT. For example, from 2020 to 2035, passenger vehicle CO\textsubscript{2} emissions are forecast to increase approximately 15.4 percent. During the same period, fuel consumption and vehicle miles traveled are forecast to increase approximately 16.7 percent and 15.4 percent, respectively. Vehicle miles traveled and fuel consumption trends for the years 2005 through 2035 are summarized in Figure 21 and Figure 22.


There are three primary methods for reducing emissions from the transportation sector:

- Reduce the carbon intensity of fuels
- Reduce emissions from vehicles (i.e., enhance vehicle efficiency)
- Reduce vehicle miles traveled and the usage of carbon-intensive modes of transportation by improving land use patterns and transportation systems

**Federal Response to Climate Change**

The U.S. EPA is responsible for developing and implementing regulations to ensure that transportation fuel sold in the U.S. contains a minimum volume of renewable fuel. The EPA developed the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) in collaboration with refiners, renewable fuel producers, importers, and other stakeholders. The RFS program was created under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct), and established the first renewable fuel volume mandate in the United States. For a fuel to qualify as a renewable fuel under the RFS program, EPA must determine that the fuel qualifies under the statute and regulations. Among other requirements, fuels must achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as compared to a 2005 petroleum baseline. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) expanded the RFS program to include diesel and increase the volume of renewable fuel required to be blended into transportation fuel to 36 billion gallons by 2022.

---

The U.S. EPA, along with the U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), has also worked to develop a national program to improve fuel economy and reduce GHG emissions from new vehicles. The two agencies began collaborating in response to President Obama’s May 2009 announcement of “a new national policy aimed at both increasing fuel economy and reducing greenhouse gas pollution for all new cars and trucks sold in the United States.”

The first phase of the Light-Duty National Program has been implemented and established GHG emissions standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards for new passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles, covering model years 2012 through 2016. The final rulemaking for the first phase was published in May 2010.

The second phase of the Light-Duty National Program extended the first phase standards to model years 2017 through 2025. The final rulemaking for the second phase was published on October 15, 2012. Over the lifetime of the vehicles built for model years 2012-2025 (Phases 1 and 2), this national program is projected to reduce GHG emissions by 6 billion metric tons, save families more than $1.7 trillion in fuel costs, and reduce the nation’s dependence on oil by more than 2 million barrels per day in 2025.

As another component of the effort, the EPA and NHTSA worked together to establish the Heavy-Duty National Program for medium- and heavy-duty engines and vehicles. The final rulemaking for the heavy-duty program was published in September 2011. Over the lifetime of the heavy-duty vehicles built for model years 2014-2018, this national program is projected to reduce GHG emissions by 270 million metric tons and save approximately 530 million barrels of oil. In August 2016, EPA and NHTSA finalized the Phase 2 standards for model years 2018-2027 medium- and heavy-duty trucks. The final Phase 2 standards are expected to lower CO2 emission standards by approximately 1.1 billion metric tons, save vehicle owner fuel costs of about $170 billion, and reduce oil consumption by up to two billion barrels over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program.

State Response to Climate Change

The State of California enacted Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to adopt a statewide GHG emissions limit equivalent to reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. It also requires the ARB to prepare and approve a scoping plan for achieving the emissions reductions once every five years. The Climate Change Scoping Plan, which the ARB adopted in 2008 and updated on May 22, 2014, recommends reduction measures for a variety of sectors, including transportation. On April 29, 2015, Governor Jerry Brown issued Executive Order B-30-15 which established a greenhouse gas reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. ARB is

---

currently preparing another update to the Scoping Plan to address the requirements laid out in the Governor’s Executive Order B-30-15. In August 2016, the California legislature passed SB 32, which requires the state to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. SB 32 was signed into law by the Governor in September 2016.

There have also been several transportation-focused responses to climate change. The Governor’s Executive Order #S-01-07 set a statewide goal to reduce the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020, and directed that a Low Carbon Fuel Standard for transportation fuels be established for the State.

Assembly Bill 1493 (2002), the “Pavley” bill, authorized and instructed the ARB to implement a program for the reduction of GHG emissions from passenger cars and light trucks. It required vehicles manufactured after the year 2009 to adhere to CO₂ emission standards. On September 24, 2009, the ARB adopted amendments to the Pavley regulations that reduced GHG emissions in passenger vehicles manufactured between 2009 and 2016. In January 2012, ARB approved a package of new emissions rules for cars and light trucks (referred to as the Advanced Clean Cars Program). One component of the package included CO₂ emission standards for light-duty cars and trucks that are identical to the federal Phase 2 light-duty standards (described above). Other components of the Advanced Clean Cars Program include continuing to reduce smog-forming emissions in vehicles built after model year 2015, promoting zero-emission vehicles (ZEV) by requiring manufacturers to offer specific numbers of the very cleanest cars for sale, and ensuring that the cleanest fuels (such as electricity and hydrogen) are provided for as clean vehicles come to market.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, which is described above, requires the ARB to develop regional GHG emission reduction targets for passenger vehicles for 2020 and 2035. SB 375 then requires each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to demonstrate, through the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), how its region will integrate transportation, housing, and land use planning to meet these targets. This 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the first RTP for SBCAG that must comply with SB 375.

According to ARB staff, the RTP-SCS may not count the effects of LCFS, State/Federal GHG emission standards (Pavley, Phase 2 Light-Duty standards), or other components of the State’s Advanced Clean Cars Program (such as the ZEV requirements and promotion of clean fuels) toward the SB 375 targets. The following figures show the relationship between the expected effects of state and federal regulations (such as LCFS, Pavley/Advanced Clean Cars Program) and the RTP-SCS on greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles.

---

Local Response to Climate Change

The County of Santa Barbara adopted a Climate Action Study in September 2011. It is the first phase of a Climate Action Strategy, the second phase of which is a Climate Action Plan. The Study includes a countywide GHG emissions inventory and forecast, and an evaluation of potential emission reduction measures. An Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP) was adopted by the County in May 2015 that “seeks to reduce the County’s GHG emissions through implementation of selected ERM’s with the goal of achieving a GHG reduction target of 15 percent below baseline emissions by the year 2020.” The ECAP also assists the County with reducing GHG emissions consistent with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and includes a forecast to 2035.

---

The City of Santa Barbara adopted a Climate Action Plan in September 2012. The Climate Plan includes an inventory and forecast of GHG emissions generated by the Santa Barbara community; strategies to reduce emissions in the areas of energy, travel and land use, vegetation, waste reduction, and water conservation; and strategies to begin planning for adaptation to climate change effects. In 2013, the City began preparing Climate Action Plan Implementation Status Reports as part of their General Plan implementation monitoring and implementation reporting. 37

The City of Goleta adopted an Energy Efficiency Action Plan (EEAP) in September 2012 that addresses the energy consumption of the City’s municipal building energy efficiency. The EEAP is one component of the City’s community-wide Climate Action Plan, which was adopted in July 2014. The Climate Action Plan “establishes a 2007 baseline inventory; a planning horizon of 2007 through 2030 and quantifies GHG emissions from the community-at-large and City operations; establishes reduction targets for 2020 and 2030; identifies measures to reduce GHG levels, focusing on those that the City has authority to implement; and provides guidance for monitoring progress on an annual basis.”38

Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation

There is still a scientific debate about the exact nature and extent of climate change and its effects (such as sea level rise and increase in global temperatures) are not completely understood. However, impacts from climate change may include heat waves, floods, fire, sea level rise, storm surges, and more. Sea levels along the California coast have already risen by as much as seven inches over the last century.39

Climate change impacts may affect transportation infrastructure. Extreme heat increases the risk of buckling of roadways and railroad tracks. Increased precipitation may flood tunnels. The combination of a drier climate and more intense rain storms increases the risk of mudslides. Sea level rise may damage ports and other coastal infrastructure.

The 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy (CAS) suggests the following adaptation strategies for transportation:

- Develop a detailed climate vulnerability assessment and adaptation plan for California’s transportation infrastructure
- Incorporate climate change vulnerability assessment planning tools, policies, and strategies into existing transportation and investment decisions
- Develop transportation design and engineering standards to minimize climate change risks to vulnerable transportation infrastructure
- Incorporate climate change impact considerations into disaster preparedness planning for all transportation modes

An important component of the CAS was the development of Cal-Adapt, an on-line, interactive mapping and visualization tool that offers a view of how climate change impacts (such as sea level rise, wildfires, precipitation/snowpack, and temperature change) might affect local communities in California. The data available on Cal-Adapt has “been gathered from California’s scientific community, and represent the most current data available wherever possible.”

Cal-Adapt denotes some “threatened areas” within Santa Barbara County that are “vulnerable to a 100-year flood event according to the passive inundation (Bathtub) model”.

The California Natural Resources Agency updated the Adaptation Strategy in 2013 into “sector-specific” action recommendations for local, regional, state, and federal governments.

State and local jurisdictions are taking steps to mitigate the effects of climate change impacts and implement adaptation strategies. Examples include:

- The California Natural Resource Agency’s Safeguarding California report, which shows how state government is acting to implement the state’s CAS, notes that Caltrans is “currently conducting a vulnerability assessment of the State Highway System infrastructure to impacts due to climate change and extreme weather events. The assessments will be conducted in each of the 12 Caltrans Districts, and is scheduled to be complete during calendar year 2017.”

- The Goleta Slough Management Committee was formed in 1991 to serve in an advisory capacity to local governments, state and federal agencies to ensure that the Goleta Slough Ecosystem Management Plan Area, comprised of 2,250 acres of habitat and adjoining lands, are addressed in a comprehensive manner, irrespective of jurisdictional boundaries. This plan area is almost entirely within the Coastal Zone and encompasses the entirety of the Slough, open space areas and creeks that feed into it, as well as the Santa Barbara Airport and developed areas within the City of Goleta, Santa Barbara County and UC Santa Barbara. Portions of the Goleta Slough are designated as an Ecological Reserve and a Marine Conservation Area, both managed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. In 2015, a consultant prepared a Goleta Slough Area Sea Level Rise and Management Plan to assess the vulnerability of the area to the effects of sea level rise and to provide information for future projects, plans, research and studies in the area.
Implementing agencies should consider the impacts of sea level rise implementing this plan’s projects. Coastal Act Section 30253 requires that new development minimize risks to life and property from hazards and to assure stability and structural integrity without the use of shoreline protective devices. Agencies should consider modeling sea level rise conditions and refer to the best available science on climate change and sea level rise (e.g. the 2012 National Research Council Report, *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington*).

**System Security**

Although the transportation system has always been susceptible to the consequences of natural disasters, such as fires, floods, mudslides, and earthquakes, the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001 and other international events have increased awareness of the system’s susceptibility to human-induced disasters.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s Transportation Systems Sector-Specific Plan: An Annex to the National Infrastructure Protection Plan describes strategies to reduce risks to critical transportation infrastructure. The plan defines the transportation sector as including six interconnected modes—highway, mass transit and passenger rail, freight rail, aviation, maritime, and pipelines—that are vital to the movement of both people and goods.

In Santa Barbara County, the transportation network includes roadways, public transit, passenger and freight rail, public airports, and a harbor facility. There are also active oil rigs with connecting pipelines off the coast of the County. Several of the County’s facilities are critical to the transportation infrastructure, for example:

- **US 101** is the most direct route between the San Francisco and Los Angeles. It is an important thoroughfare for the movement of people and goods and is a connector for the high-tech, university, and agricultural corridor between Los Angeles, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties. It also serves as a secondary, parallel north-south travel corridor alternative to Interstate 5, particularly when the Grapevine area is subject to extended closures due to extreme weather events. Six transportation agencies on the Central Coast of California formed the Central Coast Coalition to raise awareness of the US 101 corridor.

- **Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB)** is the Air Force Space Command organization responsible for all Department of Defense space and missile launch activities on the West Coast and all U.S. satellites destined for near polar orbit.

Security of the many transit services in the County is also important. In November 2006, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security’s Transportation Security Administration and Office of Grants and Training, developed a document titled Transit Agency Security and Emergency Management Protective Measures. It suggests protective measures to enhance transit security and emergency management, understanding that transit agencies have finite resources.

**Public Health and Safety**

The connections between public health and transportation are becoming increasingly apparent. Transportation has long been linked to safety and air quality concerns, but there is growing interest in the areas of active transportation and mental health.

Creating Healthy Regional Transportation Plans, a report prepared by TransForm in collaboration with the California Department of Public Health, identifies the following direct health effects of transportation projects and policies:

---


• **Physical Activity and Active Transportation.** Active transportation (walking, biking, and wheeling to destinations) has a direct health benefit, and can reduce the risk of heart disease, improve mental health, lower blood pressure, and reduce the risk of overweight and obesity-related chronic disease such as Type 2 Diabetes. Public transit is considered active transportation because it generally involves an active mode on one or both ends of the trip.

• **Collision Injuries and Fatalities.** Motor vehicle collisions are a major cause of death and injury, and are the leading cause of death among those ages 5-34. In 2009, traffic injuries caused 3,063 deaths, 25,328 hospitalizations, and 221,454 emergency department treatments in California. 18 percent of deaths, 19 percent of the hospitalizations, and nine percent of the emergency department treatments were pedestrians and bicyclists. Road design, “Complete Streets,” speed reduction, and other strategies can all reduce the toll of motor vehicle collisions.

• **Air Pollution.** Auto emissions impact air quality and contribute to impaired lung development, lung cancer, asthma and other chronic respiratory problems, and heart disease. Cleaner fuels and more efficient vehicles can reduce emissions, but strategies that reduce driving are also important for air quality because some pollutants, like particulate matter from re-entrained road dust, are directly related to how much people drive.

• **Climate Change.** The transportation sector causes 35 percent of California’s total gross greenhouse gas emissions. Minimizing transportation’s contribution to climate change will limit the health effects of climate change, such as heat illness, effects of higher ozone levels, impacts of extreme weather events, and changes in vector-borne diseases.

• **Stress and Mental Health.** Commuting during rush-hour traffic can be highly stressful for drivers. Unreliable and infrequent transit service can also cause stress, especially for low-income employees who depend solely on transit to get to their jobs on time.

**Goods Movement**
The economy and quality of life in the SBCAG region are dependent on the ability of shippers to move goods in a safe, efficient, and cost-effective manner. The three key freight-dependent industries in Santa Barbara County include retail, agriculture, and manufacturing (including food products), which combined account for 22 percent of the county’s $3,955 million Gross Regional Product (GRP). Additionally, certain segments of the economy produce goods that are dependent on freight transportation more than others. These industries are referred to as goods movement-dependent industries and include agriculture/farming, forestry and fishing, construction, utilities, manufacturing, retail, wholesale, and transportation/warehousing, amongst others. In 2013, Santa Barbara County employed 80,194 goods movement-dependent industry employees (18.4 percent). The goods, as well as the modes and routes used to move them through the region, are described below.

The figure below shows the top commodities in Santa Barbara County by weight for 2012 and 2040. Gravel, sands, petroleum, and waste/scrap are the top commodities, with some significant shipments in agricultural goods. Tons of mixed freight, other agricultural products, and waste/scrap are all projected to double or more by 2040.

---

48 GRP is a direct measure of the value of all final goods and services produced in an economy.
Figure 25: Santa Barbara County Freight Flows by Top Commodities by Weight

Source: Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) 3.

Figure 26 below shows the top commodities by value in 2012 and 2040 for Santa Barbara County. Shipments of electronics, machinery, motorized vehicles, mixed freight, and miscellaneous manufactured products all topped $2 billion in 2012. All five categories are projected to increase through 2040, with the fastest growth occurring for miscellaneous manufactured products. Agricultural products are projected to comprise 9.5 percent of shipments by value in 2040.

Figure 26: Santa Barbara County Freight Flows by Top Commodities by Value

Source: Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) 3.

Modes

Figure 27 and Figure 28 below show the modal split for goods moving into, out of, and within Santa Barbara County in 2012 by weight and by value. Truck shipments accounted for 81.4 percent of shipments by weight and 76.4 percent of shipments by value in 2012. Trucking is projected to increase to 83.7 percent of the modal split by weight in 2040 but fall to 71.5 percent by value. Pipelines will decrease slightly and rail gain slightly for shipments by weight, with a large increase in multiple modes and mail to 20.3 percent and a smaller increase to 3.4 percent by air for shipments measured by value.
**Figure 27: Santa Barbara County Freight Flows by Mode (weight)**

Source: Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) 3.

**Figure 28: Santa Barbara County Freight Flows by Mode (value)**

Source: Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) 3.

**Goods Movement by Air**

In the Central Coast region, less than one percent of the total tonnage of freight and approximately two percent of the total value of freight is transported by air. Goods moved by air are generally time-sensitive or high-value, such as specialized fruits or machinery. In 2010 the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport carried the most metric tons of cargo—1,964—of any airport within Caltrans District 5. More information about airports is provided in Chapter 3.

**Goods Movement by Rail**

Two rail companies transport goods in the SBCAG region. Union Pacific (UP) has a Class I rail line that runs north-south along the coast through Santa Barbara County. Santa Maria Valley Railroad (SMVRR) has 14 miles of private rail line between Santa Maria and Guadalupe; SMVRR connects to the Union Pacific (UP) line in Guadalupe. More information about rail is provided in Chapter 3.
Goods Movement by Truck

Like the rest of California where, in 2010, trucks transported 88 percent of the total manufactured tonnage in the State, the dominant mode of freight transport in Santa Barbara County is trucking. The next section includes a discussion of truck routes.

Routes

Figure 29 shows the major freight routes in Santa Barbara County. Trucks are not allowed to travel on all roadways. Figure 30 shows the truck networks on California State Highways in Caltrans District 5. The federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA) required states to allow longer trucks on the National Network. STAA trucks, which are trucks that conform to the requirements of the STAA, are limited to the STAA Network, which includes the National Network (NN), Terminal Access (TA) routes, and Service Access routes. NN routes include federal highways and are shown in green. TA routes are portions of State routes or local roads that can accommodate STAA trucks; State highway TA routes are shown in blue. Service Access routes are roads that allow STAA truck access for fuel, food, lodging, and repair within a mile of a signed exit from the National Network. Service Access routes are primarily local roads and are not shown. California legal trucks may travel on the STAA network as well as on all State highways in California, except those with special restrictions. California legal routes are shown in black and yellow; the yellow routes with “30” text are advisory routes on which trucks with certain KPRA (kingpin-to-real-axle) lengths are encouraged not to travel.

Figure 29: Major Freight Routes

Figure 30: State Truck Network, Caltrans District 5, SBCAG Region

Source: Caltrans Truck Network Map.

The primary freight artery in the SBCAG region is US 101. It is the primary north-south artery for the entire Central Coast. It connects Santa Barbara County with Los Angeles to the south and San Francisco to the north. In addition to forming the backbone of the local transportation network, US 101 is a vitally important corridor for state-wide goods movement. It is one of only two routes connecting the most populous areas in the state, Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area, and is the only alternative north-south highway corridor available at those times Interstate 5 is closed, which happens frequently due to weather conditions and traffic accidents.

The highest commercial truck volumes in the region are on US 101, particularly between downtown Santa Barbara and the Ventura-Santa Barbara County line. Figure 31 shows truck volumes and percentages throughout the county.
The major routes used for transport of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes include US 101 and State Routes 135, 166, 246, and 1. From the north, trucks take State Route 246 to Purisima Road, to Lompoc Casmalia Road, then State Route 1 to Vandenberg Air Force Base. State Route 166 to US 101 was certified to transport rocket propellants and radioactive materials.

Hazardous waste transport is now prohibited on State Route 154, the only State route in the County with this restriction. The prohibition was established by legislative action based on the proximity of the highway to Lake Cachuma and the high crash rate on State Route 154.

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) maintains records of all hazardous materials incidents (accidental spills or releases of hazardous materials or wastes from a transporter) in Santa Barbara County. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department’s Hazardous Materials Response Team works in conjunction with the city fire departments to control incidents in the County.

Intermodal Connectivity
Good intermodal connectivity is critical to the overall effectiveness of the transportation network. It is particularly important for encouraging a shift to modes other than the single-occupant vehicle. A transit trip, for example, generally involves at least two modes: transit and walking, bicycling, or driving. It is important that the necessary connections between modes are, and are perceived to be, convenient and time-effective. Examples of connectivity enhancements include bicycle lockers at transit centers, bicycle racks on buses, park-and-ride and/or joint-use parking facilities at transit centers, and transit service to train stations and airports. Table 5 below shows the different modes available throughout Santa Barbara County.
Table 5: Multi-Modality in Santa Barbara County Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Hwys</th>
<th>Park &amp; Ride/Joint Use</th>
<th>Bikeways</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Airports</th>
<th>Marine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incorporated Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>101, 246</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>101, 150, 192</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>101, 217</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>1, 166</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>1, 246</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>[Surf] X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>101, 144, 154, 192, 225</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>101, 135, 166</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated County Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyama</td>
<td>33, 166</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla Vista</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hills/V. Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt</td>
<td>1, 101, 135</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez</td>
<td>154, 246</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Constrains, Growing Needs, and Infrastructure Maintenance

Funding for transportation projects in Santa Barbara County comes from a variety of federal, State, and local sources. The region does benefit from Measure A, the half-cent county-wide sales tax initiative, but still does not have sufficient funding to meet the growing needs of transportation system improvement and maintenance. In February 2016, the Los Angeles Times reported that statewide, Caltrans has a maintenance backlog of $59 billion and local jurisdictions have a backlog of $78 billion\(^{49}\). The Santa Barbara County region is not unlike the remainder of the state with backlogs at all levels.

Federal transportation funding assistance has leveled off over roughly the last decade. MAP-21 and then the FAST Act represent the long-term departure of consistently increasing federal transportation funding support, instead keeping growth largely in-line with inflation. Recent federal transportation bills have altered funding programs to refocus on evolving priorities.

During the Great Recession, the California Legislature passed a variety of bills to alter the way fuel taxes are collected with the purpose of enabling the use of fuel taxes to make debt service payments on statewide transportation bonds. These bonds were previously paid for with general fund revenues. Rolling bond payments into fuel tax revenues was the first hit to the State’s transportation funding picture. The second blow resulted in the collapse of fuel prices. Roughly half of fuel tax is priced-based, or a dynamic excise tax responding to fuel price, and this has decreased significantly over the last several years. Over the last five years, the average retail price of regular gasoline in California ranged from a high of $4.67 a gallon to a low of $2.29 a gallon.\(^{50}\) This difference represents a more than a 50 percent drop in price and correlates with a roughly 25 percent loss in fuel taxes collected. Subtract the debt service and the source of the recent California transportation funding crisis is clear. Fortunately, midway through the development of Fast Forward 2040, the California State Senate passed SB 1 (Beall, 2017), which was subsequently approved by the House


\(^{50}\) [http://www.californiagasprices.com/retail_price_chart.aspx](http://www.californiagasprices.com/retail_price_chart.aspx)
and signed by the Governor. SB 1 provides a significant boost to transportation funding and more than restores funding to pre-recession levels. State gas tax revenue is allocated 44 percent to cities and counties, 44 percent to the STIP program (MPO discretionary projects), and 12 percent to the SHOPP program (State highway maintenance).

The region does benefit from its status as a self-help county through the 2008 passage of Measure A. Though Measure A does include numerous named projects to which portions of the total funding are dedicated, a sizable 58 percent, or $613.7 million estimated at time of passage, is returned to the region’s jurisdictions through the Local Street and Transportation Improvements (LSTI) program over the life of Measure A (2010–2040). LSTI program funding is allocated largely at the discretion of local governments with a focus on maintenance, safety, and operational improvements.

The region’s needs continue to grow. As road maintenance is deferred, backlogs grow and repairs can become more costly. The federal FAST Act will be in place through the next regional transportation plan update, so no new federal funding is expected. Measure A continues to grow in-line with sales tax revenue growth and also in importance. State funding assistance will soon increase due to the passage of SB 1 and will allow for restoring the region’s roads.
CHAPTER 2: Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures

One of the important initial steps in developing Fast Forward 2040 was the identification of planning goals and objectives to guide the development of the plan, as well as identification of performance measures that could be used in evaluating alternative planning scenarios and in monitoring the performance of the adopted plan over time. The goals establish the guiding principles for Fast Forward 2040 and a framework for decision-making. Regional projects and programs are developed, funded, and implemented based on these guiding principles.

Background

The goals and objectives of this plan continue the goal and objective framework embraced by the adopted 2013 RTP-SCS. They are based on and consistent with both the planning factors articulated in MAP-21 and continued in the FAST Act, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Smart Mobility 2010 framework, tailored to the Santa Barbara County region. The policy approach embraces MAP-21 and the FAST Act’s emphasis on performance measurement.

Federal Guidance: FAST Act Planning Factors

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) adds two new planning factors to the factors first articulated in the 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and continued with the 2012 Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) federal surface transportation programs. These planning factors call on SBCAG to establish a policy framework that will:

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight;
- Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- Promote efficient system management and operation;
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
- Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and
- Enhance travel and tourism.

Since MAP-21 became law in 2012, SBCAG has been following a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals. SBCAG must establish performance measures and targets to use in tracking progress towards attaining its planning goals. The establishment of performance measures and targets must happen in coordination with both State transportation plans and providers of public transportation to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable.
Consistent with this mandate, SBCAG has organized its transportation planning policies to fit the RTP-SCS goal framework and crafted explicit, quantifiable performance measures that are also keyed to the plan goals. The goal framework and the performance measures are based on and in synchrony with the emerging performance-based approach.

The federal rulemaking process to implement the performance measures required by MAP-21 was ongoing as this plan was being developed. As the rulemaking process for each performance measure was completed, a period of State review and threshold-setting commenced. To the extent possible, this plan began to incorporate the MAP-21 performance measures.

**State Guidance**

In parallel with the adoption of the [2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (RTP Guidelines)](http://www.dot.ca.gov/rtp/2010guidelines.html), Caltrans produced a report entitled Smart Mobility 2010. This report, which was prepared by Caltrans in collaboration with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Housing and Community Development and the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, lays out a proposed “planning framework” for an integrated set of transportation planning principles, goals, performance measures, and implementing strategies that can be used in the formulation of State, regional, and local transportation plans. As did the adopted 2013 RTP-SCS, Fast Forward 2040 goals and objectives follow the Caltrans Smart Mobility 2010 framework. Caltrans’ recently adopted [California Transportation Plan 2040](http://www.dot.ca.gov/rtp/2040plan.html) (Caltrans, 2016), plan goals largely follow the Smart Mobility framework and are consistent with the goals of Fast Forward 2040.

Both the RTP Guidelines and Smart Mobility 2010 recognize the significant influence of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) on the requirements for preparing RTPs in California. Recognizing the increased focus on transportation and land use coordination and other sustainability principles resulting from SB 375, Smart Mobility 2010 sets forth a proposed framework for integrated goals, objectives, and performance measures based on the following planning principles:

**Location Efficiency**

- Integrate transportation and land use in order to achieve high levels of non-motorized travel and transit use, reduced vehicle trip-making, and shorter average trip length while providing a high level of accessibility.

**Reliable Mobility**

- Manage, reduce, and avoid congestion by emphasizing multi-modal options and network management through operational improvements and other strategies.
- Provide predictability and capacity increases focused on travel that supports economic productivity.

**Health and Safety**

- Design, operate, and manage the transportation system to prevent serious injuries and fatalities, promote active living, and lessen exposure to pollution.

**Environmental Stewardship**

- Protect and enhance the State’s transportation system and its built and natural environment.
- Act to reduce the transportation system’s emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that contribute to global climate change.

**Social Equity**

- Provide mobility for people who are economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged in order to support their full participation in society.
- Design and manage the transportation system in order to equitably distribute its benefits and burdens.

**Robust Economy**

- Invest in transportation improvements – including operational improvements – that support the economic health of the State and local governments, the competitiveness of California’s businesses, and the welfare of California residents.

These six categories were used to organize SBCAG’s planning goals and objectives in Fast Forward 2040, and to identify and organize specific performance measures used in the planning and evaluation process. Smart Mobility 2010 also organizes performance measures and recommended metrics according to the six principles outlined above, identifying the primary methods, tools, and data sources needed by a transportation planning agency to utilize these measures. Fast Forward 2040 organizes its goals, objectives and performance measures following this approach.

**Plan Goals and Objectives**

Five goals guided the development of Fast Forward 2040 and will continue to be the goals of the plan’s implementation.

1. **Environment:** Foster patterns of growth, development and transportation that protect natural resources and lead to a healthy environment.

2. **Mobility & System Reliability:** Optimize the transportation system to improve accessibility jobs, schools, and services, allow the unimpeded movement of people and goods, and ensure the reliability of travel by all modes.

3. **Equity:** Ensure that the transportation and housing needs of all socio-economic groups are adequately served.

4. **Health & Safety:** Improve public health and ensure the safety of the regional transportation system.

5. **A Prosperous Economy:** Achieve economically efficient transportation patterns and promote regional prosperity and economic growth.

For each of the five goals, a subset of objectives were also developed. The objectives are clear statements of what needs to be accomplished to reach the goals. Performance measures for each goal area are used to assess progress toward accomplishment of the goals and objectives. Fast Forward 2040 goals and objectives are presented in Table 6.
### Table 6: Fast Forward 2040 Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Environment** | -Reduce GHG emissions in compliance with CARB Regional Targets\(^{51}\)  
-Reduce criteria pollutant emissions  
-Encourage affordable and workforce housing and mixed-use development within urban boundaries  
-Promote transit use and alternative transportation  
-Reduce vehicle miles traveled  
-Preserve open space and agricultural land, and sensitive biological resources |
| **Mobility & System Reliability** | -Reduce travel times for all modes  
-Reduce congestion  
-Increase bike, walk, and transit mode share  
-Employ best available transportation system management (TSM) technologies to make travel reliable and convenient  
-Work cooperatively with schools and school districts to reduce congestion surrounding schools |
| **Equity** | -Comply with HCD/Regional Housing Needs Assessment  
-Support the development of affordable and workforce housing near jobs and educational institutions |
| **Health & Safety** | -Reduce the frequency and severity of collisions on the transportation network  
-Increase public outreach and education |
| **A Prosperous Economy** | -Reduce congestion  
-Optimize network performance to reduce time lost to commuting  
-Encourage measures that bring worker housing closer to job sites  
-Promote a mix of land uses responsive to the needs of businesses, including agriculture and tourism |

Fast Forward 2040 goals and objectives, as well as the performance measures discussed later in this chapter, were developed with guidance from the Joint Technical Advisory Committee (JTAC) and with public input received during meetings with key stakeholder groups from across the region. Chapter 4 discusses the public process in more detail.

**Policies**

In Fast Forward 2040, planning policies have been organized around the five plan goals. The emphasis of these policies is on a programmatic and performance-oriented goal and policy framework.

**Goal 1, Environment:** Foster patterns of growth, development and transportation that protect natural resources and lead to a healthy environment.

**Policy 1.1 Land Use**

The planning, construction, and operation of transportation facilities shall be coordinated with local land use planning and should encourage local agencies to:

- Make land use decisions that adequately address regional transportation issues and are consistent with the RTP-SCS.
- Promote better balance of jobs and housing to reduce long-distance commuting by means of traditional land use zoning, infill development, and other, unconventional land use tools, such as employer-sponsored housing programs, economic development programs, commercial growth management ordinances, average unit size ordinances and parking pricing policies.
- Plan for transit-oriented development consistent with the RTP-SCS by:

\(^{51}\) SBCAG’s current GHG reductions targets are zero percent per capita increase over 2005 levels for target years 2020 and 2035.
• concentrating residences and commercial centers in urban areas near rail stations, transit centers and along transit development corridors.
• designing and building “complete streets” serving all transportation modes that connect high-usage origins and destinations.
• Preserve open space, agricultural land and sensitive biological areas.
• Identify, minimize and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and, in particular, require mitigation of traffic impacts of new land development through on-site and related off-site improvements for all modes of transportation, including incentives to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.

Policy 1.2 Air Quality

Transportation planning and projects shall be designed to:
• Lead to reductions in greenhouse gas and criteria pollutant emissions, consistent with the air quality goals of the region, including targets for greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles in 2020 and 2035 as required by Senate Bill 375 (SB 375).
• Be in conformity with the Air Pollution Control District Clean Air Plan and the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as required by the federal Clean Air Act.

Policy 1.3 Alternative Fuels and Energy

Transportation planning and projects shall:
• Encourage the use of alternative fuels, and the application of advanced transportation and energy technologies to reduce vehicular emission production and energy consumption.
• Promote renewable energy and energy conservation, consistent with applicable federal, State, and local energy programs, goals, and objectives.

Policy 1.4 Aesthetics and Community Character

Transportation planning and projects shall:
• Consider aesthetics and preserve and enhance historic and local community character.
• Preserve and maintain the historic character of existing highway structures and mature plant material unless demonstrated to be infeasible.

Policy 1.5 Regional Greenprint

SBCAG shall pursue development of a coordinated regional approach to mitigate impacts from transportation projects on sensitive biological areas, in collaboration with local governments and federal and State agencies. This approach may include designation of priority conservation areas within the region where mitigation should be targeted.52

Goal 2, Mobility and System Reliability: Optimize the transportation system to improve accessibility to jobs, schools, and services, allow the unimpeded movement of people and goods, and ensure the reliability of travel by all modes.

Policy 2.1 Access, Circulation and Congestion

The planning, construction, and operation of transportation facilities shall strive to:

52 See the Protected Lands section in Chapter 4 for a description of the Regional Greenprint components.
• Enhance access, circulation, and mobility throughout the Santa Barbara region and between neighboring regions.
• Reduce congestion, especially on highways and arterials and in neighborhoods surrounding schools in cooperation with schools and school districts.
• Reduce travel times to be consistent with the adopted Congestion Management Plan for all transportation modes, with equal or better travel times for transit and rail in key corridors.

Policy 2.2 System Maintenance, Expansion and Efficiency

Transportation planning and projects shall:
• Promote the maintenance and enhancement of the existing highway and roadway system as a high priority.
• Strive to increase the operational efficiency of vehicle usage through appropriate operational improvements (e.g., signal timing, left turn lane channelization, and ramp metering).
• Preserve existing investments in the system by emphasizing life cycle cost principles in investment decisions (i.e., account for capital and annual maintenance costs) in order to reduce overall costs of transportation facilities.
• Promote transportation demand management (TDM), e.g., through appropriate commute incentive programs, to reduce demand and improve efficiency.
• Increase the capacity of the existing highway and roadway system through the provision of additional traffic lanes only when (1) an existing facility is projected in the near term to no longer provide an acceptable level of service as determined by the standards established in the Congestion Management Plan (CMP), and (2) alternative means of capacity enhancement and measures to increase efficiency of usage have been explored.

Policy 2.3 Alternative Transportation Modes

Transportation planning and projects shall:
• Encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips and the use alternative transportation modes to reduce vehicle miles traveled and increase bike, walk and transit mode share.
• Provide for a variety of transportation modes and ensure connectivity within and between transportation modes both within and outside the Santa Barbara region. Alternative mode planning and projects shall be compatible with neighboring regions’ transportation systems.
• Plan and provide for ancillary support facilities for alternative transportation, such as bicycle parking.
• Promote inter-regional commuter transit and rail service.
• Promote local and inter-city transit.
• Work to complete the California Coastal Trail through provision and implementation of trail segments and connections in coordination with the California State Coastal Conservancy, California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Coastal Commission, Caltrans, and other agencies.

Policy 2.4 Freight and Goods Movement

Transportation planning and projects shall facilitate secure and efficient movement of goods and freight in a manner consistent with the general mobility needs of the region by:
• Making efficient use of existing transportation system.
• Identifying and constructing projects to improve freight movement, including rail and highway projects and projects to improve ground access to airports and rail terminals in the region.
• Regularly collecting and updating information on freight and goods movement and facility needs.
• Addressing freight and goods movement facility improvement needs as a high priority, including needs identified in the Central Coast Coalition Commercial Flows Study, with special focus on the critical US 101 corridor.
• Considering freight and goods movement in the design and planning of all projects.
• Planning for intermodal connectivity (airport, rail, and highway) in freight and goods movement.

**Policy 2.5 Transportation System Management Technologies**

Transportation planning and projects shall:

- In concert with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the California Highway Patrol, and local public transit and public works agencies, encourage the deployment and use of the best available transportation system management (TSM) and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies to make travel reliable and convenient, increase transportation system efficiency, and reduce travel demand through the implementation of system and demand management strategies.
- Promote a jointly maintained and enhanced regional ITS architecture consistent with the Central Coast ITS Strategic Deployment Plan.

**Policy 2.6 Consistency with Other Plans**

The planning, construction, and operation of transportation facilities shall be consistent with relevant plans, including, but not limited to: (1) the California Transportation Plan, (2) SBCAG’s Transportation Connections: The Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan for Santa Barbara County, (3) adopted local General Plans, (4) short-range transit plans, and (5) other regional policies.

**Goal 3, EQUITY:** Assure that the transportation and housing needs of all socio-economic groups are adequately served.

**Policy 3.1 Access**

The planning, construction, and operation of transportation facilities and of the system as a whole shall:

- Encourage safe and convenient travel for all transportation system users, including the disabled, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and other vehicles.
- Ensure that the transportation needs of all groups, in particular disadvantaged, low-income, and minority groups, are adequately served and that all groups have equal access to transportation facilities and services.
- Give special attention to the needs of elderly and disabled individuals for improved transportation accessibility and removal of physical barriers, including provisions required under the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
Policy 3.2 Affordable Housing

SBCAG shall encourage local agencies to:

- Address and plan for forecast regional housing needs for all economic segments of the population.
- Plan for adequate affordable and workforce housing within existing urbanized areas near jobs and public transit.
- Consider transit availability and accessibility as an integral element of land use planning and project permitting, with special emphasis on serving the disabled, elderly, and other transit-dependent communities.
- Recognize that housing provided by colleges and universities is an important component in addressing the region’s overall housing needs, which should be taken into account in local agencies’ own housing planning.

Policy 3.3 Environmental Justice

The planning process shall be consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, SBCAG’s 2015 Public Participation Plan, and SBCAG’s SB 375 Public Participation Plan (2015).

Goal 4, HEALTH AND SAFETY: Improve public health and ensure the safety of the regional transportation system.

Policy 4.1 Safe Roads and Highways

The planning, construction, and operation of transportation facilities and of the system as a whole shall:

- Enhance safety of all facilities.
- Ensure design of highways and roads safe and convenient for travel by all users including the disabled, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit buses, and vehicles.
- Incorporate night sky-friendly lighting, where appropriate, to enhance safety of transportation facilities.
- Encourage the completion of emergency preparedness plans, which include agency coordination, system security, and safe and efficient mobility—particularly for the elderly and disabled—in times of natural or man-made disasters.
- Maintain consistency with the State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).
- Address the resiliency of new projects to possible future impacts resulting from climate change (e.g., sea level rise and inundation of low-lying areas).

Policy 4.2 Public Health

The RTP-SCS shall promote integrated transportation and land use planning that encourages:

- Active transportation (transit, biking and walking).
- Development of “complete streets” serving all transportation modes, including active transportation.

Goal 5, PROSPEROUS ECONOMY: Achieve economically efficient transportation patterns and promote regional prosperity and economic growth.

Policy 5.1 Commuter Savings

The RTP-SCS shall strive to reduce average commute time and cost by encouraging measures that bring worker housing closer to job sites.

Policy 5.2 Support Business and Local Investment
The RTP-SCS shall:

• Promote a mix of land uses responsive to the needs of businesses, including agriculture and tourism.
• Support investment by businesses in local communities.
• Encourage the creation of high-paying jobs, especially in areas with an imbalance of housing relative to jobs.

Policy 5.3 Public-Private Partnerships

Promote inter-jurisdictional and public/private partnerships that:

• Encourage the provision of transportation services and transportation infrastructure where common goals are served.
• Help public transit agencies to secure private funding for transportation improvements in exchange for advertising on transit vehicles, bus shelters, benches, and other transportation-related public use items.

Policy 5.4 Transportation Funding

SBCAG and its member agencies should:

• Aggressively seek funding necessary to implement the Plan.
• Support protection of State and federal transportation funding and efforts to increase these revenues for the region.
• Require that new development contribute its fair share of the costs of new transportation infrastructure and system improvements for all modes necessary for such new development, as allowed for by law.
• Make efficient use of funding by maintaining, preserving, or enhancing existing infrastructure for all modes, using low-cost operational improvements, and using performance-based outcomes as the basis for prioritizing and funding projects, where feasible.

Performance Measures

In concert with the adoption of goals and objectives, SBCAG identified and adopted measures to assess performance of land use and transportation scenario alternatives in Fast Forward 2040 and to assess progress toward the plan goals. SBCAG’s planning process fully embraces and incorporates the performance-based approach required by MAP-21 and the FAST Act as well as the performance-based approach recommended by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The adopted performance measures are intended to be objectively quantifiable standards. Most utilize data readily available from the SBCAG land use and travel demand models. The performance-based approach required by MAP-21 and the FAST Act, and currently being implemented by the FHWA and Caltrans, includes the assessment of several performance measures not quantified by models, but rather based on other data sources.

SBCAG applied the performance measures in Fast Forward 2040 scenario development and analysis and in the selection of the preferred land use and transportation scenario. These performance measures are explicitly keyed to the five RTP-SCS goals, as well as to the plan objectives. Though the performance measures seek to quantify outcomes against plan goals and objectives, for many objectives there is not a one-to-one relationship with the performance measures. Some objectives require an assessment of several, related performance measures to quantify outcomes. Plan goals and performance measures are presented in Table 7 and performance results are presented in Chapter 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Environment** | -GHG emissions per capita (lbs./day)  
- Passenger vehicle CO2 emissions per capita (tons/day)  
- Vehicle miles traveled per capita  
- On-road reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions (tons/day)  
- On-road oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions (tons/day)  
- Criteria pollutant emissions per capita (lbs./day)  
- Acres of new development on agricultural land or open space (total and %)  
- Transit mode share (%)  
- Active transportation mode share (%)  
- New housing capacity within high-quality transit corridors (acres)  
- Percent of new housing unit capacity accommodated by infill development (% of total)  
- Total (remaining) acreage available for new development  
- Average density (du/acre)  
- Percent Change in Tailpipe CO2 Emissions on the NHS Compared to the Calendar Year 2017 Level |
| **Mobility & System Reliability** | - Vehicle miles traveled  
- Vehicle hours of delay  
- Vehicle hours traveled  
- Average daily traffic  
- Congested vehicle miles traveled  
- Congested lane miles  
- Average vehicle trip time (all trips) [minutes]  
- Average vehicle commute time (workers) [minutes]  
- Transit ridership  
- Transit accessibility (% of jobs within a high-quality transit corridor)  
- Transit accessibility (% of population within a high-quality transit corridor)  
- Percent drive-alone mode share (all)  
- Percent drive-alone mode share (workers)  
- Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good and Poor condition  
- Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good and Poor condition  
- Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable |
| **Equity** | - New affordable and workforce housing (indicated by density) [units within 20 du/acre zones]  
- Transit accessibility for low incomes (% of population within a high-quality transit corridor)  
- Average trip time for low income communities (minutes) |
| **Health & Safety** | - Serious injuries (number and rate per 100 million VMT)  
- Fatalities (number and rate per 100 million VMT)  
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries  
- Active transportation mode share (all and worker trips) [%]  
- Rolling stock: % of revenue vehicles exceeding Useful life benchmark (ULB)  
- Equipment: % of nonrevenue service vehicles exceeding Useful life benchmark (ULB)  
- Facilities: % of facilities rated under 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale  
- Infrastructure: % of track segments under performance restriction |
| **Prosperous Economy** | - Net commute savings (time) [minutes]  
- Net travel savings (time) [minutes]  
- Net cost avoided (money)  
- Average vehicle trip distance (all trips and work trips) [miles]  
- Freight (vehicle hours of delay on the National Highway System) |
CHAPTER 3:
Transportation System

This chapter provides an in-depth description of the region’s multi-modal transportation network, its performance, issues and challenges, and presents the implementation strategy, which will position the region’s transportation network to safely meet tomorrow’s demands.

Overview

The Santa Barbara County region’s transportation network consists of approximately 2,054 miles of maintained public roadways (see Table 8), 338 miles of Class I, II, and III bikeways, 13 public transit services (see Table 10) and dozens of private transportation services, three railroad operators, five public-use airports, and one harbor facility. Together they provide for the transport of people and goods in the region. The following section provides an overview of the components of the transportation network.

Existing Condition

Highways and Roadways

As mentioned above, there are approximately 2,054 miles of maintained public roads in Santa Barbara County (see Table 8). The mileage is split nearly evenly between rural and urban roadways. The County of Santa Barbara and the eight incorporated cities together maintain the majority of the roadway system—approximately 1,720 miles of public roadways. The State maintains approximately 330 miles and other jurisdictions (such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the University of California) maintain approximately 1.9 miles (see Figure 32 and Figure 33).

In the discussion of performance measures, four scenarios are referenced: Existing Conditions, Future Baseline Scenario, Preferred Scenario, and No Build Scenario.

Existing Conditions represents existing conditions as of 2010 – that is, the region as it was in 2010: the transportation system, land use patterns, and socio-economic characteristics (e.g. households and employment). The year 2010 was selected as the Base Year for this analysis because it is the same base year in the previous RTP/SCS and allows for direct comparison of the updated plan. Additionally, the regional travel demand model is calibrated and validated to these same 2010 conditions, including HPMS VMT estimates, traffic counts, and demographic conditions.

Future Baseline: The Future Baseline scenario shows forecast population and employment growth distributed in accordance with land uses allowed by existing local General Plans, assuming current sub-regional growth trends continue (which show population growth occurring predominantly in the North County and City of Santa Maria). It includes all programmed and planned Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) transportation projects.

Preferred Scenario: The Preferred Scenario selectively increases residential and commercial land use capacity within existing transit corridors, shifting a greater share of future growth to them. It also changes the jobs/housing balance and unlike the Baseline/Business as Usual Scenario it does not continue existing growth trends. In consultation with affected local planning departments, the preferred scenario selectively varies land uses to increase densities in certain locations along existing transit corridors and insofar is not consistent with underlying, existing local General Plans. It also includes all programmed and planned Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) transportation projects.

No Build Scenario: Forecast population and employment growth is identical to the Future Baseline scenario; however, all transportation projects are assumed to remain static based on Existing Conditions.
Table 8: Estimated Mileage* of Maintained Public Roads and VMT by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maintained Mileage (Centerline)</th>
<th>Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>181.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>98.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>237.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>236.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>847.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>552.11</td>
<td>321.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Highway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highways</td>
<td>169.42</td>
<td>130.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other State Agencies</strong></td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>31.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of California</strong></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>762.77</td>
<td>1,291.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mileage refers to centerline miles.

Source: California State Transportation Agency, Department of Transportation System, Division of Research, Innovation, and System Information. 2014 California Public Road Data.

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/datalibrary.php
There are no interstate highways in Santa Barbara County, but there is one U.S. highway (US 101) and several State routes (all or parts of 1, 33, 135, 144, 150, 154, 166, 192, 217, and 246). Transportation Concept Reports / Fact Sheets are available for each of these routes in Santa Barbara County on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 5 website at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/corridor-mobility/d5-page.html.

US 101 is the main transportation link between the urban areas in the County. It connects the South Coast to the Santa Ynez Valley and the Santa Maria Valley. State Route (SR) 154 provides an additional connection between the South Coast and the Santa Ynez Valley. Lompoc access to US 101 is via State Routes 1 and 246. The Cuyama Valley is only accessible from Ventura and Ojai via SR 33, or from Santa Maria and Bakersfield via SR 166. All of these roadways are shown on Figure 37.

**National Highways**

Santa Barbara County’s regional roadway network includes several roadways that are part of the National Highway System (NHS). The NHS includes roadways important to the nation’s economy, defense, and mobility. It includes the following subsystems: (1) Interstate, (2) Other Principal Arterials, (3) Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET), (4) Major STRAHNET Connectors, and (5) Intermodal Connectors. The STRAHNET consists of highways that are important to U.S. defense policy. The National Highway System was updated and expanded to include additional rural and urban principal arterials, as required under Section 1104 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). Figure 34 through Figure 36 depict the NHS and STRAHNET within the urbanized areas of the County (Santa Barbara, Lompoc, and Santa Maria).

---
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Figure 34: National Highway System, Santa Maria
Figure 35: National Highway System, Lompoc

Figure 36: National Highway System, South Coast
State Routes

“The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the owner and operator of the State Highway System (SHS), which consist[s] of the 15,000 miles (50,500 lane miles) of Interstate Freeways and State Routes and carries over half of the travel in the state. Caltrans is responsible for planning, designing, building, operating and maintaining the SHS.”

Santa Barbara County has 300 highway centerline miles (Table 8, above). Figure 37 shows the State highways in Santa Barbara County.

**Figure 37: State Highways, Santa Barbara County**

Several of Santa Barbara County’s roadways are part of the California Interregional Road System (IRRS). The IRRS was identified by statute in 1989 and includes State routes or portions of State routes that serve interregional people and goods movement. In Santa Barbara County, US 101 and SRs 1, 154, and 246 are part of the IRRS. The IRRS includes a subset of routes identified as High Emphasis Routes; Focus Routes are a further subset of the High Emphasis Routes. US 101 is termed both a High Emphasis Route and a Focus Route. Caltrans defines high emphasis routes as “the most critical Interregional Road System (IRRS) routes. More importantly, these routes are critical to interregional travel and the State as a whole.”

---

56 Caltrans. *Transportation Funding in California.* 2011, p. i.
routes are the “corridors that should be the highest priority for completion to minimum facility standards in order to serve higher volume interregional trip movements.” Figure 38 includes a map of the IRRS in Santa Barbara County.

**Figure 38: Interregional Road System (IRRS), Santa Barbara County**

In addition, three roadways in Santa Barbara County are Official Designated State Scenic Highways: State Route 1, State Route 154, and US 101 along the Gaviota Coast. These routes are shown on Figure 39.

**Figure 39: Scenic Highway System, Santa Barbara County**

Truck networks and truck restrictions are shown on Figure 40.

---

61 Caltrans District 5 Planning and Local Assistance. Maps. Ibid.
62 Caltrans District 5 Planning and Local Assistance. Maps. Ibid.
Local Streets & Roads
The County of Santa Barbara and the eight incorporated cities in the County maintain approximately 1,710 miles of public roadways (see Table 8). That accounts for approximately 70 percent of the maintained public roadways in Santa Barbara County. Approximately 38 percent of the daily vehicle miles traveled occur on city and County roadways.64

Roadway System Issues & Needs
This section describes the existing travel conditions (the 2010 Current Baseline) on major roadway systems in Santa Barbara County, as well as the future travel forecast under the 2040 No Build condition. The 2040 No Build forecast refers to the forecast based on the 2040 demographic and socioeconomic conditions based on the 2012 Regional Growth Forecast without implementation of any programmed or planned transportation projects. The peak periods are defined as 7-9 AM & 4-6 PM, respectively, with an average freeway lane capacity of 1,900 vehicles per hour or 3,800 vehicles per peak period. ADT capacity is calculated using the vehicle per hour per lane capacity multiplied by 24 hours. The table below explains the V/C ratio used throughout this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Scheme</th>
<th>V/C Ratios</th>
<th>Roadway Travel Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>&gt; 0.25</td>
<td>Traffic unimpeded, free flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Green</td>
<td>0.25 – 0.50</td>
<td>Free flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Yellow</td>
<td>0.50 – 0.75</td>
<td>Moderate, some restrictions on maneuverability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Yellow</td>
<td>0.75 – 1.00</td>
<td>Serious, traffic approaching capacity, slow speed, some delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1.00 – 1.25</td>
<td>Severe, forced or break-down flow, frequent delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>&gt; 1.25</td>
<td>Severe, stop-n-go, significant delay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Traffic
The existing (2010) travel condition on US 101 at the San Luis Obispo (SLO) County line is at free-flow (63,930 average daily traffic (ADT) or volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) of 0.40). During the PM peak period, traffic at this location is moderately congested (10,180 vehicles or V/C of 0.67). Under the 2040 No Build scenario, traffic at this location is projected at 84,850 ADT or V/C of 0.53, representing a 33 percent increase.

63 Caltrans District 5 Planning and Local Assistance. Maps. Ibid.
and a rise to moderate congestion. During PM peak periods, traffic would be seriously congested (14,260 vehicles or V/C of 0.94).

The existing (2010) travel condition on US 101 at the Ventura County line in the south is at free-flow (65,570 ADT or V/C of 0.41). During the PM peak period, traffic at this location is moderately congested (10,530 vehicles or V/C of 0.69) with the southbound direction exhibiting serious congestion of V/C of 0.82. Under the 2040 No Build scenario, traffic at this location is projected at 96,600 ADT or V/C of 0.61, representing a 47 percent increase and a rise to moderate congestion. During PM peak periods, traffic would be seriously congested (13,640 vehicles or V/C of 0.90) with the southbound direction exhibiting severe congestion of V/C of 1.16 indicating frequent forced or break-down flow and delay.

Figure 41 summarizes ADT growth on all State routes between 2010 and 2040 under the No Build condition. Traffic on SR 1 at the SLO County line is forecast to increase 51 percent, reaching 3,690 ADT. Such increase is primarily due to congestion on north US 101. Traffic on SR 246 west of US 101 is forecast at 21,290 ADT. Traffic on SR 246 between Buellton and Lompoc is expected to increase by 21 percent. Traffic on SR 154 is forecast to increase 29 percent, reaching 14,210 ADT.

**Figure 41: Traffic Growth on State Routes**

South Coast
The South Coast includes the Cities of Carpinteria, Goleta, and Santa Barbara, and the unincorporated communities of Montecito and Summerland. The population of the South Coast is forecast to grow from 202,154 in 2010 to 231,638 in 2040, an increase of 15 percent over the 30-year period. Employment is projected to grow from 117,153 in 2010 to 128,906 in 2040, a 10 percent increase. Major transportation issues in this region include:

- High volumes of interregional commuting by Ventura County residents to jobs on the South Coast, for example at the Fairview and Storke/Glen Annie interchanges;

65 SBCAG. 2012 RGF.
• High volumes of commuters, interregional through traffic, truck traffic, and weekend recreational travel on US 101, all contributing to existing traffic congestion and low levels of service from Turnpike Avenue south through Santa Barbara, the Montecito/Summerland unincorporated area, and the City of Carpinteria;
• The inadequacy of some US 101 interchanges to accommodate current vehicular traffic;
• Substandard ramps and two-lane overcrossings in this portion of the corridor presenting capacity problems; and
• The need to provide additional capacity on the US 101 corridor that is multi-modal in its approach and includes highway, transit and rail strategies.

The existing freeway between Santa Barbara and southern Carpinteria is a four-lane section. Congestion occurs during peak traffic periods. The dominant vehicle traffic flow on US 101 during weekday peak periods is bi-directional. 57 percent of the total traffic between the Ventura County line and Olive Mill Road is traveling northbound in the morning peak with an almost identical 57.3 percent occurring in the southbound direction for the evening peak. The lack of continuous alternative frontage roads along the freeway has exacerbated the freeway congestion problem. When accidents occur, long vehicle queues and additional delays result.

The next section discusses traffic on South Coast US 101 in more detail.

The existing circulation system in the Goleta area is incomplete and/or underdeveloped along a number of links. The arterials have limited continuity and capacity and do not provide a viable alternative route for most trips made on US 101. Gaps in the regional roadway network cause overall traffic congestion as drivers divert to other routes to complete their trips. Calle Real, a freeway frontage road, continues to be discontinuous in two locations. Lack of a through-route between Turnpike and Patterson and between Storke Road and Los Carneros Road causes local trip diversions onto the freeway, Hollister Avenue, and Cathedral Oaks Road. Moreover, many two-lane facilities are experiencing increasing levels of congestion, including Hollister Avenue.66 Regardless, gap closure may cause neighborhood incompatibility, which must be considered in the analysis of a given transportation project, for example, when completing the missing segment will transect a neighborhood. Existing gaps in the community's arterial system, gaps in certain residential secondary streets, congested intersections, and a lack of bus stops and bus pockets in some areas also adversely affect the efficiency of service provided by a number of Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) bus lines.

Future land use development projects will add to the existing vehicle traffic on these regional facilities and lower the motorist's level of service at many intersections and interchanges in the Goleta area. Currently proposed land use projects include redevelopment of the City of Goleta Old Town area, development of lands within the City's airport area, development of the Cabrillo Business Park, development of the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan, and continued construction at UCSB.67

South Coast US 101

Daily traffic on US 101 through the South Coast is expected to increase by between 12 percent and 94 percent, depending on the location along the corridor. Under the 2040 No Build forecast, daily traffic for the entire South Coast US 101 corridor is expected to grow by an average of 22.5 percent. Figure 42 presents the 2010 Current Baseline and 2040 No Build daily traffic forecast on South Coast US 101.

66 Measure G (2012) disallows agricultural land use designation changes. Bishop Ranch, including three vacant parcels with agriculture land use designations, parallels the north side of US 101. Calle Real runs to the east and west of Bishop Ranch, bisecting Calle Real into two segments.
67 Goleta’s complete streets project for Hollister Avenue in Old Town may divert more trips to US 101.
Figure 42: 2010 and 2040 No Build ADT on South Coast US 101

Figure 43 through Figure 45 present the South Coast US 101 corridor modeled under original (2010 Current Baseline) PM peak period travel conditions. Current traffic on US 101 southbound already exceeds capacity from Padaro Lane to Olive Mill and Mission to Turnpike. Other northbound and southbound segments of 101 are currently approaching capacity and remain slow during peak periods.

Figure 43: South Coast US 101 2010 Current Baseline PM Peak Period Traffic
Figure 44: Existing (2010) PM Peak Period Traffic – Milpas to Ventura County
Figure 45: Existing (2010) PM Peak Period Traffic – Santa Barbara & Goleta Areas
Figure 46 through Figure 48 present the South Coast US 101 corridor under the 2040 No Build PM peak period travel conditions.

**Figure 46: South Coast US 101 2040 No Build PM Peak Period Traffic**

Under the 2040 No Build condition during the PM peak period, the entire southbound stretch of US 101 from Olive Mill to southern Carpinteria would be at severely congested conditions due to the insufficient capacity on the freeway. Additionally, the southbound stretch from Turnpike to Mission would exceed capacity. Traffic on this southbound stretch during the PM peak period is predominantly commuters.

Between the Carrillo and Turnpike as well as the Fairview and Hollister Avenue interchanges, northbound traffic would intermittently reach capacity as commuters are destined home from work toward North County households, but travel would be limited to the existing four-lane facility.

**North County**

**North County US 101**

By 2040, daily traffic on the north US 101 (SR 1 to SLO County line) is expected to increase 58 percent. Figure 49 presents the 2010 Current Baseline and 2040 No Build daily traffic forecast on North County US 101 between SR 1 and the SLO County line.

Figure 50 presents the North County US 101 corridor modeled under original (2010 Current Baseline) PM peak period travel conditions.

Figure 51 presents the North County US 101 corridor under the 2040 No Build PM peak period travel conditions.
Figure 47: 2040 No Build PM Peak Period Traffic – Milpas to Ventura County
Figure 48: 2040 No Build PM Peak Period Traffic – Santa Barbara & Goleta Areas
Figure 49: 2010 and 2040 No Build ADT on North County US 101

Figure 50: North County US 101 2010 Current Baseline PM Peak Period Traffic
Travel conditions under 2010 conditions are below available capacity. Under the 2040 No Build conditions, some segments, notably north of Betteravia and south of Route 1, experience at or near capacity conditions. Additionally, traffic between Route 1 and Highway 246 will also reach capacity due to similar constraints.

**Santa Maria Region**
The Santa Maria region includes the Cities of Santa Maria and Guadalupe and the unincorporated community of Orcutt. The population of the Santa Maria region is forecast to grow from 141,312 in 2010 to 192,913 in 2040, an increase of 37 percent over the 30-year period. Employment is projected to grow from 42,013 in 2010 to 75,646 in 2040, an 80 percent increase. Major transportation issues in this region include:

- The inadequacy of some US 101 interchanges—Betteravia, McCoy, and SR 135—to handle anticipated traffic;
- Truck transport of hazardous materials and agricultural products through central urban areas;
- Inadequate freeway access in developing areas;
- Slow agricultural traffic on SR 166 near Guadalupe;
- Intersection improvements on SR 166 at SR 1, Black Road, and US 101 to improve operations to and from SR 166; and
- The need for continued highway maintenance on SR 1 through the City of Guadalupe.

As the fastest growing area in Santa Barbara County, the Santa Maria region, particularly the City of Santa Maria, will be the focus of new job growth in the North County if past growth trends continue, given its large labor market and the availability of relatively affordable housing.

Under 2010 Current Baseline peak period conditions (Figure 50), traffic on US 101 between Betteravia Road and Stowell Road is moderately congested. Similarly, moderate congestion is also experienced intermittently...
on SR 135 between Union Valley Parkway and Donovan Road because many motorists use this section to bypass US 101. V/C calculations rate US 101 through Santa Maria at level of service (LOS) B-C.

Under the 2040 No Build conditions more sections of US 101 would continue the trend toward moderate congestion. Traffic in both directions on US 101 between Donovan Road and Betteravia Road would have the highest traffic volumes, but would be well below capacity. Congestion is also forecast in San Luis Obispo County north of the Santa Maria River Bridge where the freeway capacity reduces from six lanes to four lanes.

**Lompoc Region**

The Lompoc region includes the City of Lompoc and the unincorporated communities of Mission Hills and Vandenberg Village. The population of the Lompoc region is forecast to grow from 57,744 in 2010 to 66,672 in 2040, an increase of 15 percent over the 30-year period. Employment is projected to grow from 20,135 in 2010 to 24,021 in 2040, a 19 percent increase. Major transportation issues in this region include:

- Increasing number of Lompoc Valley residents commuting to jobs on the South Coast and in the Santa Ynez Valley;
- The need for improved access to Lompoc across the Santa Ynez River by providing a bridge raised above flood level with wider shoulders to improve vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access;
- The need for improved traffic safety and operations on SR 246 between Buellton and Lompoc by adding passing lanes and turning lanes between Purisima and Domingos Roads;
- The need for a connection to Rucker Road to better serve the Mesa Oaks and Mission Hills areas since McLaughlin is not a “thru” traffic roadway;
- Flooding on SR 246 west of Purisima Road;
- Ongoing maintenance on SR 1;
- Slow agricultural traffic on SR 246; and
- Lack of direct freeway access to a growing urbanized area.

The major employment concentration lies in the retail/commercial strip development along H Street and Ocean Avenue. Much of the existing traffic in the Lompoc area is oriented toward Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB), the South Coast employment centers along State Route 1, and along the concentration of commercial development bordering H Street and Ocean Avenue.

Under 2010 Current Baseline peak period conditions, traffic in the Lompoc Region is primarily free-flow to moderate congestion, with the exception of SR 1 north of Central Ave and south of SR 246, where traffic is slow due to commuters returning to residential neighborhoods south and north of the City.

---
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Figure 52: Existing (2010) PM Peak Period Traffic – Santa Maria Area
Figure 53: 2040 No Build PM Peak Period Traffic – Santa Maria Area
Figure 54: Existing (2010) PM Peak Period Traffic – Lompoc Area
Under the 2040 No Build conditions, traffic volumes are expected to increase on all major roadways (Figure 55). This includes North SR 1 from Central Avenue to Vandenberg Village, SR 246 east of Purisima Road, Ocean Ave and Downtown H Street. Traffic on SR 1 south of Santa Rosa road, is forecast at 14,700 ADT. Traffic on SR 246 east of Purisima would reach 18,430 ADT. Slow speeds on these roadways during peak periods are expected. Traffic on SR 1 south of SR-246 is forecast to increase 12 percent, reaching 39,770 ADT. This location would remain as the heaviest traffic location within the Lompoc area. Congestion is expected at the intersection of SR 1 and Purisima during peak periods. Traffic on Downtown H Street is forecast to increase between 1 to 8 percent reaching 29,520 ADT, and Ocean Avenue between 11 to 55 percent reaching 21,450 ADT at its highest single location. Slow speeds are expected on all these roadways during PM peak hours.

Santa Ynez Valley Region

The Santa Ynez Valley includes the Cities of Buellton and Solvang, and the unincorporated community of Santa Ynez. The population of the Santa Ynez Valley is forecast to grow from 22,674 in 2010 to 28,787 in 2040, an increase of 27 percent over the 30-year period. Employment is projected to grow from 12,806 in 2010 to 19,185 in 2040, a 50 percent increase. Major transportation issues in this region include:

- The reliance on SR 246 as “Main Street” in Solvang and Buellton;
- The need for operational improvements at the Highway 246/Alamo Pintado intersection;
- Heavy volumes of recreational traffic on weekends; and
- Travel speed along SR 246, which is significantly affected by local circulation, through interregional traffic, and signalization in the City of Solvang, as well as the lack of an alternate east/west route.

State Route 246 is the principal arterial in the region and the major access route into and out of the City of Solvang and the nearby communities. The concentration of traffic, often tourist traffic, on SR 246 through Solvang has led to worsening congestion at signalized intersections, particularly at 5th Street, Alisal Road, Atterdag Road, and Alamo Pintado Road, the key north/south streets in the City. Traffic on Alisal Road at Copenhagen Drive is often congested due to heavy pedestrian crossings on Alisal Road and tour buses seeking parking. Local traffic traveling to or from the southern portions of the city is diverted onto Alisal Road, the only through roadway to the south, which adds to its congestion during peak traffic hours.

The Chumash Casino Resort, located between the City of Solvang and the unincorporated community of Santa Ynez, is a significant visitor destination. With its gaming and entertainment venues and 1,677 employees, the Chumash Casino generates traffic that affects SR 246 and SR 154 in both directions. The Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians provides shuttle service from Goleta, Lompoc, and Santa Maria to provide an alternative means of travel for its patrons. The Chumash also provide shuttle service for employees; the majority of Casino employees are required to take shuttles to and from work, which helps to reduce traffic congestion.

The traffic due to the Casino and other visitor activities in the Santa Ynez Valley has added to the traffic generated by nearby Santa Ynez Valley Union High School (SYVUHS). According to the California

---

70 SBCAG. 2012 RGF.
71 2015 Santa Barbara Real Estate and Economic Outlook, p 52.
Figure 55: 2040 No Build PM Peak Period Traffic – Lompoc Area
Department of Education, SYVUHS had an enrollment of 1,025 for 2014/15. As the district serves a large area, many students travel long distances to reach the school. Many of these students also drive their own cars. Traffic is congested on SR 246 during the weekdays when students arrive in the morning around 8:30 and are released around 3:00 PM.

State Route 246 also sees long-distance commuter traffic. SR 246 serves as an alternative (to US 101 and SR 1) route between the Lompoc region and the South Coast.

While existing traffic conditions within the Santa Ynez Valley are generally at free-flow throughout the day, conditions will get worse by 2040. Under the 2040 No Build scenario, traffic on SR 246 is forecast to increase 26 percent over the 2010 Current Baseline condition. Average speed on SR 154 would decline slightly as traffic is expected to increase to 14,420 ADT, a 29 percent increase over the existing volumes. Figure 56 and Figure 57 summarize the 2010 and 2040 No Build PM peak period traffic conditions.
Figure 56: Existing (2010) PM Peak Period Traffic – Santa Ynez Area
Figure 57: 2040 No Build PM Peak Period Traffic – Santa Ynez Area
Congestion Management Program (CMP)
SBCAG was the designated as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Barbara County in 1991, after the passage of Proposition 111, which increased the state gasoline tax. During its tenure as the CMA, SBCAG has been working with the State, local agencies, and transit agencies on implementing congestion relief projects throughout the County.

Purpose
The CMP addresses the problem of increasing congestion on regional highways and principal arterials through a coordinated approach involving the State, County, Cities, and transit providers. Bringing these stakeholders together to address regional and multi-jurisdictional issues related to congestion, land development, and air quality, the CMP ensures that limited transportation funds are more efficiently utilized and that investment is allocated in a balanced way to improve the transportation system for all modes. The purpose of the CMP is to: 1) Establish a regional link between new development and its impacts on the transportation system, 2) Promote inter-jurisdictional coordination in identifying and mitigating these impacts, 3) Systematically monitor and evaluate the performance of the transportation system, and, 4) Identify improvements to resolve identified impacts.

Consistency with the RTP-SCS
State law requires the CMP to be consistent with the programs and projects contained in the Regional Transportation Plan (California Government Code §65089.2(a)). The CMP strives for consistency with the RTP-SCS in two areas:

1. **Conformance with RTP-SCS goals:** Congestion management objectives for the Santa Barbara County region are a requirement under the federal regulations (23 CFR 450.320(c)(2)) and were developed in the latest approved Congestion Management Program document (SBCAG, October 2016). The regional congestion management objectives were developed based on the regional vision and goals outlined in the RTP-SCS. Performance measures were developed within each objective category to monitor progress. The regional congestion management objectives include:

   - **Livability:** Work to foster livable communities – areas where coordinated transportation, housing, and commercial development give people access to affordable and environmentally sustainable transportation.
   - **Multi-modal Access & Reliability:** Implement congestion relief strategies to reduce travel times, encourage increased coordination amongst service providers, provide a healthy, safe, and reliable multi-modal network, and increase opportunities for all users of the regional network.
   - **Economic Vitality:** Support growth in economic activity and maintain quality of life in the region by promoting the efficient movement of people and goods.

2. **Consistency of CMP Capital Improvement Projects with RTP-SCS projects:** State law requires the CMP to be consistent with the programs and projects contained in the County’s Regional Transportation Plan (California Government Code §65089.2(a)). The CMP Capital Improvement Program is a seven-year program project list that includes projects that improve traffic operations, transportation demand management programs, and or expanded transit services that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Improvement Program. In addition, the regional congestion management objectives serve as a guide for planning and funding improvements in the RTP-SCS. By adopting these objectives in the CMP, the CMP serves as a supporting mechanism to assist in implementing the goals and policies set in SBCAG’s RTP-SCS.CMP Performance Monitoring and Deficiency Plan Requirement.
The Congestion Management Program utilizes level of service (LOS) measurements to determine congestion levels. These standards form the basis for determining when improvement plans need to be implemented. State law requires that SBCAG, as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Barbara County, establish LOS standards for measuring performance of the CMP network highways and local arterials. Gov. Code § 65089(b)(1). Additional descriptions of LOS for different roadway facility types are provided in the updated 2016 CMP document.

The requirements for deficiency plans arise during SBCAG’s biennial conformance assessment. For the biennial assessment, SBCAG requires that each of the local agencies submit P.M. peak hour intersection count or level of service data for select intersections on an annual basis. Caltrans provides its published estimates of annual average daily traffic (AADT) and count station data to estimate traffic flow on state facilities. The data provided by the local agencies and Caltrans is crucial in determining level of service and measuring performance for CMP facilities. Level of service on CMP facilities are shown on Figure 58 through Figure 63.72

Figure 58: Existing A.M. Peak Hour Level of Service on the South Coast US 101 (2014)

---

Figure 59: Existing P.M. Peak Hour Level of Service – Goleta and Santa Barbara Area

Figure 60: Existing P.M. Peak Hour Level of Service – Montecito and Carpinteria Area
Figure 61: Existing P.M. Peak Hour Level of Service – Santa Maria Valley

Figure 62: Existing P.M. Peak Hour Level of Service – Lompoc Valley
Once the relevant data is obtained, staff conducts an analysis to determine whether there are any facilities operating at LOS E or worse. If a facility exceeds the CMP LOS standard, staff may recommend that a deficiency plan be required. Where a facility exceeds the LOS standard, the law requires local agencies to prepare deficiency plans or risk being found in "non-conformance" with the CMP requirements. The legislation requires that deficiency plans either mitigate the deficiency at its location through capital improvements or alternatively, implement systemwide improvements which benefit circulation and air quality. These improvements are at the discretion of the project sponsor and can include operational improvements (such as coordinated signal timing upgrades, ramp metering or left-turn channelization at intersections). See Appendix E of the 2016 CMP for additional information. If a local agency is found to be in "non-conformance" with the CMP requirements, it is at risk of losing gas tax funds that are normally apportioned to it under Section 2105 of the Streets and Highways Code.

The 2016 CMP update addressed changes in state law to align the CMP with the provisions of SB 743. SB 743 redefines an “infill opportunity zone,” which may be designated by local jurisdictions and within which the requirements of the CMP do not apply, to correspond to transit priority areas identified in a Sustainable Communities Strategy. Infill opportunity zones are an optional measure, which a jurisdiction may consider using. This RTP-SCS includes updated Transit Priority Areas shown in Chapter 4. As shown on the maps in Chapter 4, there are potential areas that can be designated as infill opportunity zones. However, to date, no jurisdictions in Santa Barbara County have designated these areas as infill opportunity zones.

**CMP Impact Thresholds and Local Agency Review**

SBCAG’s CMP land use analysis program was designed to address transportation impacts associated with land use development decisions and to promote regional information-sharing, while at the same time acknowledging that land use decisions are the purview of local jurisdictions. The CMP land use program focuses on proposed development rather than existing land uses. The passage of Senate Bill 743 in September 2013 and the pending CEQA Guidelines update affected the land use analysis program of Santa Barbara County’s CMP. One of the intentions of the bill was to “more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through...
active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions." The proposed CEQA Guidelines remove the requirement for a project to demonstrate consistency as part of the CEQA review process with the policies and programs contained in the Congestion Management Program.\textsuperscript{73}

Taking into account the statutory requirement to implement “a program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on regional transportation systems” and Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines, the 2016 CMP approved by the SBCAG Board revised the Land Use Element to ensure consistency with the pending CEQA Guidelines update. Specifically, each local jurisdiction in Santa Barbara County currently has project-specific impact thresholds for analyzing impacts of land use projects under CEQA. SB 743 and the new OPR Guidance require each jurisdiction, acting as a lead agency under CEQA, to update these thresholds to utilize a vehicle miles traveled (VMT)-based threshold to measure the potential impacts to regional transportation systems from individual land use projects. The current draft proposal from OPR requires that lead agencies develop these thresholds within two years of finalization of the new regulations. Therefore, each member agency currently has and will be updating programs to analyze impacts of land use decisions on regional transportation systems, consistent with state requirements. Previously, the CMP land use analysis, where required for projects large enough to meet screening criteria, was accomplished as part of the local agency’s environmental review of projects under CEQA. As noted, the proposed CEQA Guidelines remove the requirement for a project to demonstrate consistency as part of the CEQA review process with the policies and programs contained in the Congestion Management Program. Therefore, it is no longer necessary or appropriate to include specific CEQA impact thresholds as part of the CMP.

However, Government Code Section 65089(b) (4) still requires inclusion of a “program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions . . .” using the performance measures from the CMP. Furthermore, the CMP statute still endorses an approach based on traditional level of service measures. Thus, the CMP retains the existing, LOS-based land use analysis program, but severs the connection to the environmental review of projects under CEQA. In particular, the CMP land use analysis program retains project size screening criteria and LOS-based review criteria.

State Implementation Plan and Transportation Control Measures

In non-attainment and maintenance areas, Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) must demonstrate transportation conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must "discuss ways in which activities in the plan will conform to the SIP, including TCM [transportation control measure] implementation."\textsuperscript{74} Since Santa Barbara County is an attainment/unclassifiable area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, SBCAG’s RTP is not subject to this conformity requirement.

SBCAG does, however, develop transportation control measures (TCMs) for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District’s (APCD’s) Ozone Plan (formerly known as the Clean Air Plan), which is the region’s contribution to the SIP. SBCAG and the District have used the guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation under Section 108(f)(1)(a) of the Clean Air Act when determining the appropriateness and criteria pollutant emission reduction potential of TCMs. Examples of potential TCMs listed in the Clean Air Act under Section 108(f)(1)(a) include: public transit programs, restriction of roads to bus-only or high-occupancy vehicles, transportation demand management programs, trip-reduction ordinances, traffic flow improvement programs/projects, park-and-ride facilities, programs to limit or restrict vehicle use in downtown areas (e.g., congestion pricing), programs for the provision of shared-ride services, programs for the provision of areas for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and bicycle storage, programs to control extended vehicle idling, programs...

\textsuperscript{73} Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, Office of Planning and Research, January 20, 2016.

\textsuperscript{74} 2010 RTP Guidelines, 89.
and ordinances to facilitate non-automobile travel and provision of mass transit for special events and activity centers, and programs that facilitate the voluntary removal of older light-duty autos and trucks. TCMs reduce emissions from on-road motor vehicles and trucks by: improving the existing transportation system to allow motor vehicles to operate more efficiently, inducing people to change their travel behavior to less polluting modes, or ensuring emission control technology improvements in the motor vehicle fleet are fully and expeditiously realized. TCMs address the need for the traveling public to carefully consider the implications of continued reliance on the single-occupant vehicle as the major choice of commute trips, the need to provide and promote alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel, and the need to consider regulating those factors that promote single-occupant-vehicle travel.

Despite our region’s current federal ozone attainment designation status, SBCAG continues to evaluate the feasibility of TCMs and their implementation within each CAP update. See Table 5-3 in the 2016 Ozone Plan, available at https://www.ourair.org/planning-clean-air/, for a list of existing SIP TCM commitments.

SBCAG’s Sustainable Community Strategy was adopted as a Transportation Control Measure in the APCD 2013 Clean Air Plan under the Activity Centers (T-14) measure. Consistent with the region’s SCS, TCM T-14 (Activity Centers) emphasizes transit-oriented development, smart growth, and complementary investments in a multi-modal transportation network, which will result in reductions of ozone precursor emissions.

Transit

Transit is a critical element in the overall transportation system. Total transit ridership (shown in Figure 64, below) in the County grew by approximately 14 percent from FY 2000/01 to FY 2014/15. Ridership spiked in FY 2008/09, likely due to increases in fuel prices but has declined in recent years, most likely due to lower fuel prices.

SBCAG annually conducts an analysis of unmet transit needs in the region in accordance with the Transportation Development Act. The process allows the public to request new or improved transit services that are currently not being provided. In the 2017 Transit Needs Assessment, there were no identified unmet transit needs that were reasonable to meet.

Figure 64: Transit Ridership in Santa Barbara County, FY 2001/01-FY 2014/15

Does not include CTSAs. Source: Transit Providers

The following section describes the transit services provided within the SBCAG region.
Public Transit Services

Local & Regional
In fiscal year (FY) 2014/15, local and regional public transit providers provided 9,165,134 fixed-route and demand-response rides. The Santa Barbara MTD provided more than 7.4 million of those rides.

Northern Santa Barbara County
Santa Maria Area Transit (SMAT) & Breeze
SMAT provides both fixed-route and demand-response service in the Santa Maria area, including Orcutt and Tanglewood, utilizing a fleet of 48 active vehicles (11 for ADA/demand response, 16 for commuter service, two for trolley service, and the remaining for fixed route service). SMAT provides service Monday through Friday between the hours of 5:30 AM and 10:30 PM, and Saturday and Sunday between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM. The City of Santa Maria manages the transit system and contracts with a private operator for operation of the service.

As a public entity that provides non-commuter, fixed-route transit service, SMAT is required by the ADA to provide complementary paratransit service for persons who are unable to use the fixed-route service. SMAT provides its own complementary paratransit service.

SMAT also currently administers the Breeze Bus, which provides service between Santa Maria, Orcutt, Lompoc, Vandenberg Village, and Vandenberg Air Force Base from 5:45 AM to 6:30 PM Monday through Friday and on Saturday. The Breeze also began providing service between Santa Maria, Los Alamos, Buellton, and Solvang in January 2013, as a pilot project.

In FY 2014/15, SMAT had 889,456 boardings system-wide and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 22 percent.

City of Lompoc Transit (COLT) & Wine Country Express
COLT provides both fixed-route and demand-response service in the Lompoc area, including the unincorporated areas of Mission Hills and Vandenberg Village, utilizing a fleet of 13 vehicles. COLT provides service Monday through Friday between the hours of 6:30 AM and 7:00 PM, and on Saturdays between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM. The City of Lompoc manages the transit system and contracts with a private operator for operation of the service.

As a public entity that provides non-commuter, fixed-route transit service, COLT is required by the ADA to provide complementary paratransit service for persons who are unable to use the fixed-route service. COLT provides its own complementary paratransit service.

The City of Lompoc also provides the Santa Barbara Shuttle and the Wine Country Express. The Santa Barbara Shuttle operates on Tuesdays and Thursdays, departing at 8:30 AM from the Mission Plaza Transit Center and going to the Santa Barbara MTD Transit Center. The Wine Country Express provides service

75 SBCAG, 2016 Transit Needs Assessment.
76 Farebox recovery ratio is the proportion of operating expenses covered by passenger fares. Source: Triennial Performance Audit, Santa Maria Area Transit (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
between Lompoc, Buellton, and Solvang. Three round trips leave Lompoc each weekday at 7:15 AM, 1:00 PM, and 4:45 PM. Saturday service was recently added.

In FY 2014/15, COLT had 113,713 boardings system-wide and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 12 percent.77

**Santa Ynez Valley Transit (SYVT)**

SYVT provides both fixed-route and demand-response service in the Santa Ynez Valley, including the Cities of Buellton and Solvang and the unincorporated communities of Ballard, Los Olivos, and Santa Ynez, utilizing a fleet of five vehicles. SYVT provides service seven days a week between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. Service frequencies on Sundays are longer (approximately 80 minutes). The City of Solvang is the service administrator for the joint powers authority (JPA) and contracts with a private operator for operation of the service. Santa Ynez Valley Transit provides service. In FY 2014/15, SYVT had 44,325 boardings and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 17 percent.78

**Guadalupe Transit – Guadalupe Shuttle and Guadalupe Flyer**

The City of Guadalupe provides both fixed-route and demand-response service in Guadalupe and to Santa Maria. The Guadalupe Shuttle is a deviated fixed-route service that operates in the City of Guadalupe, Monday through Friday, from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM, utilizing one bus. The Guadalupe Flyer is a fixed-route service that operates between Guadalupe and Santa Maria, 6:15 AM - 7:50 PM Monday through Friday, 8:15 AM - 5:15 PM on Saturday, and 8:45 AM – 6:35 PM on Sunday. The City also owns one ADA van. The City of Guadalupe manages the transit system and contracts with SMOOTH (Santa Maria Organization of Transportation Helpers) for operation of the service. In FY 2014/15, Guadalupe Transit had 105,572 boardings system-wide and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 24 percent.79

**Santa Barbara County Transit – Cuyama Transit**

Santa Barbara County provides deviated fixed-route service within the Cuyama Valley and to the Orcutt/Santa Maria region on Cuyama Transit. Cuyama Transit operates on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 8:30 AM and 4:30 PM, utilizing one bus. In FY 2014/15, County Transit had 651 boardings system-wide and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 11 percent.80

**Southern Santa Barbara County**

**Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD)**

MTD is an independent special district empowered under the California Public Utilities Code to provide public transit service on the South Coast of Santa Barbara County. MTD provides fixed-route service in the Cities of Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, and Goleta and the unincorporated areas of Isla Vista, Montecito, and Summerland, utilizing a fleet of 106 vehicles (74 diesel vehicles, 14 electric vehicles, and 18 hybrid vehicles). MTD provides service Monday through Sunday, beginning as early as 5:30 AM and running as late as midnight.

As a public entity that provides non-commuter, fixed-route transit service, MTD is required by the ADA to provide complementary paratransit service for persons who are unable to use the fixed-route service. MTD

---

77 Triennial Performance Audit, City of Lompoc Transit (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
78 Triennial Performance Audit, Santa Ynez Valley Transit (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
79 Triennial Performance Audit, City of Guadalupe Transit (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
80 Triennial Performance Audit, County of Santa Barbara (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
contracts with Easy Lift to provide complementary paratransit service. In FY 2014/15, MTD had 7,487,113 boardings and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 36 percent.81

**Inter-regional & Regional Commuter Transit**

Interregional and regional commuter transit operators provide commuter service between Santa Barbara County and the Counties of San Luis Obispo and Ventura, while regional transit operators provide commuter service between north and south Santa Barbara County. In fiscal year (FY) 2014/15, the interregional & intra-county public transit providers Clean Air Express and VISTA (Ventura Intercity Service Transit Authority) Coastal Express together provided 484,760 fixed-route rides.82

**Clean Air Express**

The Clean Air Express provides fixed-route commuter service from Lompoc, Santa Maria, Buellton, and Solvang to the South Coast. The Clean Air Express operates Monday through Friday with thirteen southbound trips in the morning and thirteen northbound trips in the late afternoon. Bi-directional Saturday service was recently implemented between Buellton, Solvang, and the South Coast.

The Clean Air Express has been administered by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, SBCAG, the City of Lompoc, and the City of Santa Maria. In November 2012, administration of the service was transferred from the City of Santa Maria back to the City of Lompoc. The Clean Air Express is funded solely by Measure A and SBCAG is the Clean Air Express policy board. In FY 2014/15, the Clean Air Express had 227,770 boardings and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 79 percent.83

**San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (SLORTA) Route 10**

SLORTA Route 10 is operated by the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority. It provides bi-directional, fixed-route, inter-county service between San Luis Obispo County and the City of Santa Maria. Route 10 operates Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM to 9:45 PM, Saturday from 8:00 AM to 7:45 PM, and Sunday from 8:00 AM to 6:45 PM. In Santa Maria, it serves the SMAT Transit Center, the Amtrak station, the Greyhound station, Allan Hancock College, and Marian Medical Center. It also serves Cal Poly (California Polytechnic State University) in San Luis Obispo.

**VISTA Coastal Express**

VISTA service to Santa Barbara provides bi-directional, fixed-route, inter-county service between Ventura County and southern Santa Barbara County. This VISTA service operates seven days a week, from 4:20 AM to 7:45 PM on weekdays and from 6:45 AM to 7:00 PM on weekends. Primary areas of service include UCSB, the Hollister corridor in Goleta, both Cottage Hospital locations, downtown Santa Barbara, the hotel area along East Beach, and the corporate park and downtown areas in Carpinteria. VISTA service to Santa Barbara is managed and funded jointly by the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) and SBCAG, with VCTC acting as the lead agency. In FY 2014/15, the VISTA Coastal Express had 256,990 boardings and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 48 percent.84

---

81 Triennial Performance Audit, Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
82 SBCAG, 2016 Transit Needs Assessment.
83 ibid.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Service</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Funding Agency(ies)</th>
<th>Policy Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMAT</td>
<td>Santa Maria urbanized area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Maria &amp; County (County contributes funding for service in unincorporated areas)</td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze 100</td>
<td>Santa Maria, Lompoc, VAFB</td>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>Santa Maria, Lompoc, &amp; County (costs shared equally)</td>
<td>Breeze Policy Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze 200 (pilot)</td>
<td>Santa Maria, Los Alamos, Buellton, Solvang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Maria, Buellton, Solvang, &amp; County (costs shared equally)</td>
<td>Breeze Pilot Project Policy Committee**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Air Express</td>
<td>Santa Maria/ Lompoc/ Buellton/ Solvang to South Coast</td>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>SBCAG</td>
<td>NC Subregional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLT, incl. Santa</td>
<td>Lompoc urbanized area (and to SB)</td>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>Lompoc &amp; County (County contributes funding for service in unincorporated areas)</td>
<td>Lompoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lompoc, Buellton, Solvang, &amp; County (costs shared equally)</td>
<td>Buellton, Lompoc, &amp; Solvang, &amp; County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Country Express</td>
<td>Lompoc, Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Shuttle</td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Flyer</td>
<td>Guadalupe, Santa Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYVT</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley</td>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>Buellton, Solvang, &amp; County</td>
<td>Solvang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyama Transit</td>
<td>Cuyama Valley to Santa Maria</td>
<td>County of Santa</td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLORTA Route 10</td>
<td>Santa Maria, SLO County</td>
<td>SLORTA</td>
<td>SLORTA, Santa Maria</td>
<td>SLORTA Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTD (Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Santa Barbara, Goleta, Carpinteria, unincorporated</td>
<td>MTD (special district)</td>
<td>MTD, South Coast cities, County, UCSB, SBCC, etc.</td>
<td>MTD Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISTA (Coastal Express)</td>
<td>Oxnard, Ventura, Carpinteria, Santa Barbara, Goleta</td>
<td>Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC)</td>
<td>SBCAG, VCTC</td>
<td>VCTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation**

SBCAG designated Easy Lift Transportation as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for the South Coast region in 1980, and SMOOTH (Santa Maria Organization of Transportation Helpers) as the CTSA for the Santa Maria/Guadalupe/Orcutt area in 1998.

**Easy Lift Transportation**

Easy Lift, a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, serves as the CTSA for the South Coast region. As a CTSA, Easy Lift provides Dial-A-Ride, Greatest Generation Accessible Transportation, Children’s Accessible Transportation, and other services. Easy Lift also contracts with Santa Barbara MTD to provide ADA complementary paratransit service\(^85\) to the South Coast. Easy Lift operates a fleet of 27 vehicles. In FY 2014/15, Easy Lift had a ridership of 58,356 and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 58 percent.\(^86\)

**Santa Maria Organization of Transportation Helpers (SMOOTH)**

SMOOTH, a non-profit organization, serves as the CTSA for the Santa Maria region. As a CTSA, SMOOTH provides Senior Dial-a-Ride, Non-Emergency Medical Transportation, and other specialized transportation services. SMOOTH is also the contract operator for Guadalupe Transit and the Santa Barbara County Health Clinic Shuttle. SMOOTH operates a fleet of 29 vehicles. In FY 2014/15, SMOOTH’s CTSA division had a ridership of 74,511 and achieved a farebox recovery ratio of 80 percent.

**Active Modes**

With its favorable landscape and climate, the SBCAG region is ideal for active transportation. Improvements to the active transportation environment yield benefits to the economy, environment, and public health, among other aspects of life. The active modes serve an integral role in the overall transportation system. Individuals commuting by bicycle or foot reduce the demand on the region’s road network and parking facilities. Additionally, the presence of active transportation users contribute to vibrant and desirable communities.

In 2015, SBCAG completed the Regional Active Transportation Plan. The plan coalesced the region’s bicycle and pedestrian planning and presented an action plan for improving the network into the future.

**Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Network**

The region’s pedestrian network is expansive and an inventory of the network at the regional scale has not been completed or is it feasible. A complete sidewalk network is present in most of the region’s urbanized areas. Where deficiencies exist, local agencies continuously work to fill gaps and improve the network. The region, through Measure A, provides funding for pedestrian network improvements which connect residential areas to schools.

The region’s bicycle network is comprised of four types of accommodation.

- **Class I (bike path):** Provides a completely separated right of way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow by motorists minimized.
- **Class II (bike lane):** Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.
- **Class III (bike route):** Provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic.
- **Mixed flow streets:** Bicyclists are permitted ride on nearly all roads, with the exception of certain limited access freeways.

---

\(^85\) The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires public entities that operate non-commuter, fixed-route transportation systems to provide complementary (in the same area, during the same hours) paratransit service for persons who are unable to use the fixed-route service due to disabilities, etc.

\(^86\) Triennial Performance Audit, Easy Lift Transportation (Final Draft), Michael Baker International, December 2016.
In 2012, SBCAG’s Traffic Solutions division prepared a map of the region’s bicycle network. Their effort found the region has 34.3 miles of Class I bike paths, 136.2 miles of Class II bike lanes, and 167.8 miles of Class III bike routes.

Maps of the region’s bicycle network are available as part of the Traffic Solutions bike map and in the Regional Active Transportation Plan.

The Obern Trail is an example of a Class I Bikeway

In addition to the bicycle and pedestrian networks serving the local populace, portions of each are parts of the California Pacific Coast Bike Route and the California Coastal Trail.

California Pacific Coast Bike Route
The California Pacific Coast Bike Route (CPCBR) runs through Santa Barbara County. All of State Route 1 in Santa Barbara County is part of the CPCBR. The CPCBR follows US 101 and local streets and roadways through the remainder of the County. The Traffic Solutions bike map includes the CPCBR.

Caltrans, along with the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission of California, developed the Pacific Coast Bicentennial Bike Route in 1976 in honor of the United States Bicentennial. The California State Legislature re-designated it as the Pacific Coast Bike Route in the 1990s. It runs the entire length of California from the Oregon border to the Mexican border.

---

88 http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist1/d1transplan/bikeped/bikeguide/pacific_coast_bike_route.pdf
The California Coastal Trail (CCT) also runs through Santa Barbara County. Figure 65 and Figure 66 show the status of the CCT in the County. The figures show that where the CCT travels through urbanized areas adequate conditions are in place. The remainder of the CCT, traveling through undeveloped and rural areas, is in need of substantial improvement.

The seeds of the CCT were first planted in 1972 when California voters passed Proposition 20, which recommended that a trails system be established along or near the coast. When completed, the CCT will be a 1,200-mile, continuous, interconnected public trail system along the California coastline from Oregon to Mexico. Today approximately half of the CCT is completed.

The CCT is “designed to foster appreciation and stewardship of the scenic and natural resources of the coast and serves to implement aspects of Coastal Act policies promoting non-motorized transportation.” The goals of the CCT are as follows:

- Provide a continuous walking and hiking trail as close to the ocean as possible;
- Provide maximum access for a variety of non-motorized uses by utilizing parallel trail segments where feasible;
- Maximize connections to existing and proposed local trail systems;
- Ensure that the trail has connections to trailheads, parking areas, transit stops, inland trail segments, etc. at reasonable intervals;
- Maximize ocean views and scenic coastal vistas; and,
- Provide an educational experience where feasible through interpretive programs, kiosks, and other facilities.

Figure 65: California Coastal Trail Status, Southern Santa Barbara County

---

Completing the Coastal Trail is a funding priority and opportunities for mutual benefit when implementing other transportation projects should always be considered. Several of the bicycle and pedestrian projects highlighted in Appendix 2 will provide improvements for both the Pacific Coast Bike Route and the California Coastal Trail. Additionally, SBCAG and the region’s jurisdictions attempt to coordinate efforts with the California Coastal Conservancy when advancing projects on the Pacific Coast Bike Route or the California Coastal Trail.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Policies**

Chapter 2 of this plan presents, among other things, the policies used to guide the implementation of Fast Forward 2040. While several of the policies touch on bicycle and pedestrian issues, Policy 2.3, Alternative Transportation Modes, highlights the primary focus of Fast Forward 2040’s policy intent in regards to these modes.

**Policy 2.3 Alternative Transportation Modes**

Transportation planning and projects shall:

- Encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips and the use alternative transportation modes to reduce vehicle miles traveled and increase bike, walk and transit mode share.
- Provide for a variety of transportation modes and ensure connectivity within and between transportation modes both within and outside the Santa Barbara region. Alternative mode planning and projects shall be compatible with neighboring regions’ transportation systems.
- Plan and provide for ancillary support facilities for alternative transportation, such as bicycle parking.

---

_92 California Coastal Conservancy. Completing the California Coastal Trail. January 2003._
• Promote inter-regional commuter transit and rail service.
• Promote local and inter-city transit.
• Work to complete the California Coastal Trail through provision and implementation of trail segments and connections in coordination with the California State Coastal Conservancy, California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Coastal Commission, Caltrans, and other agencies.

SBCAG, Caltrans, and each of the region’s jurisdictions recognize the value of active transportation and seek to improve upon existing conditions.

Supportive Programs
Financing the programs and infrastructure that enables and promotes active transportation comes from a variety of sources and in a variety of means. The Active Transportation Program, managed by Caltrans, provides funding for planning and capital projects through annual statewide competitive grant processes. Measure A, the region’s half-cent sales tax measure provides funding for capital projects, infrastructure maintenance, as well as Safe Routes to School and other educational programs. The Coalition for Sustainable Transportation (COAST) and the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition (SBBIKE) provide these educational outreach activities in the Santa Barbara County region.

Connectivity with Transit
Bicycle and pedestrian connections with transit hubs are an important aspect of overall bicycle and pedestrian planning. The ability to walk or bicycle on one or both ends of a transit trip is an integral part to the success of the region’s transit services. With few exceptions, the region’s transit network is sufficiently connected to the bicycle and pedestrian networks. Additionally, the ability to transport bicycles on public transit vehicles is important to provide needed connectivity that is not possible by either bicycle or bus alone. In the SBCAG region, there are seven fixed-route transit providers, with most accommodating bicycles:

• MTD – South Coast – all buses, except electric trolleys accommodate bicycles
• COLT – Lompoc Valley – most buses accommodate bicycles
• SYVT – Santa Ynez Valley – all buses accommodate bicycles
• SMAT – Santa Maria – all buses accommodate bicycles
• CAE – North County to South Coast – all buses accommodate bicycles
• Guadalupe Transit – Guadalupe and Santa Maria – all buses accommodate bicycles
• Cuyama Transit – New Cuyama to Santa Maria – no bicycle accommodation

AB 2707 (2014) amended the California Vehicle Code to increase the allowable length of certain types of vehicles. The law was aimed at enabling transit providers to increase the transit vehicle bicycle rack capacity from two to three bicycles.

In fiscal year 2013-14, MTD reported transporting in excess of 120,000 bicycles. It is currently investigating options for increasing bicycle storage capacity on its buses and this plan includes a project to upgrade the bicycle racks on its buses.

Private transit services, such as AMTRAK and Greyhound, also accommodate bicycles, though each has its own policies related to transporting bicycles.

Most of the region’s multi-modal transportation hubs, particularly those in urbanized areas, are largely equipped with bicycle storage infrastructure, such as bike racks or lockers. Five of the region’s 13 park-and-ride lots have bicycle storage amenities and seven of the 13 are integrated with the pedestrian network. Most of those not connected or with amenities are not in locations conducive to bicycle and/or pedestrian travel.
**Bicycle Network Gaps**

Several gaps in the bicycle network exist in the region and work is ongoing to fill these gaps. Some of the region’s more significant gaps are discussed below.

- **Hollister Avenue through Old Town Goleta** – A gap in the Class II network exists. The City of Goleta is currently updating its bicycle and pedestrian plan and developing a complete streets corridor plan for this area.

- **Rincon Beach Park** – Class II bike lanes on Carpinteria Avenue and the Class I bikeway along US 101 are separated by a gap in the network. SBCAG was recently successful with an Active Transportation Program grant application to construct a Class I connection to fill the gap.

- **Ledbetter Beach Bikeway** – A Class I bikeway along the City of Santa Barbara’s waterfront is interrupted by a parking lot at Ledbetter Beach. The City of Santa Barbara has a project listed in this plan to fill the gap.

Each of the region’s jurisdictions, as well as SBCAG, recognize the importance of providing safe and convenient access and amenities for pedestrians and bicyclists, and are all working to improve on the existing networks.

**Aviation**

There are five public-use airports in the Santa Barbara County region, two of which provide commercial air service (Santa Barbara Airport and Santa Maria Airport). Lompoc, Santa Ynez, and New Cuyama Airports are General Aviation use. The Vandenberg Air Force Base, located in the Lompoc Valley, is a military installation owned and operated by the U.S. Air Force. It is the third-largest Air Force base in the United States.

Funding for improvements at airports is generally coordinated by staff at the airports. Santa Barbara Airport and Santa Maria Airport are included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems, which allows for eligibility for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program grant funding for capital projects. All airports (with the exception of VAFB) can coordinate state funding through the California Aviation System Plan (CASP) Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is prepared by the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics. The following table provides a statistical summary of the region’s airports. Each is then described separately.

---

Table 11: Regional Airport Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport</th>
<th>Transit Access</th>
<th>Based Aircraft (a)</th>
<th>Enplaned Passengers (annual)</th>
<th>Operations (annual) (a)</th>
<th>Cargo (tons/yr)</th>
<th>Operators</th>
<th>Destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>365,769 (b)</td>
<td>108,285</td>
<td>2,058 (b)</td>
<td>Alaska, American, United (c)</td>
<td>Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, Phoenix, New York (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>43,236 (d)</td>
<td>38,995</td>
<td>1,586 (d)</td>
<td>Allegiant, Mokulele (e)</td>
<td>Las Vegas, Washington D.C., Denver (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a – General Aviation airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a – General Aviation airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cuyama</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a – General Aviation airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
(a) NFDC Facilities Report, Federal Aviation Administration
(b) Draft Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan, June 2014
(c) Santa Barbara Airport webpage: http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/gov/depts/flysba/airline/airlineinfo.asp
(d) Draft Santa Maria Airport Master Plan, September 2016
(e) Santa Maria Airport webpage: http://www.santamariaairport.com/flight-schedule.php

Santa Barbara Municipal Airport

Photo source: Santa Barbara Airport Website http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/gov/depts/flysba/default.asp

The Santa Barbara Airport is owned and operated by the City of Santa Barbara. It is located on 952 acres, approximately 400 of which are dedicated to aviation uses owned by the City of Santa Barbara. The airport is bounded by the City of Goleta to the west, north, and east and Pacific Ocean to the south. The University of California Santa Barbara and the community of Isla Vista are located southwest of the airport. A sizeable amount of the property (approximately 450 acres) is located within the Goleta Slough Ecological Reserve.

Santa Maria Airport

Photo source: Santa Maria Public Airport District
The Santa Maria Airport is owned and operated by the Santa Maria Public Airport District. The Airport District occupies 2,516 acres, with approximately 1,500 acres devoted exclusively to aviation use. The airport is located in the City of Santa Maria. The community of Orcutt is located immediately south and east of the airport.

**Santa Ynez Airport**
The Santa Ynez Airport is owned by the County of Santa Barbara and operated by the Santa Ynez Airport Authority. The airport is located in the Santa Ynez Valley, approximately four miles northeast of the City of Solvang and approximately 0.3 miles west of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians reservation.

*Photo source: Santa Ynez Airport*

**Lompoc Airport**
The Lompoc Airport is owned and operated by the City of Lompoc. This general aviation airport is located in the northern area of the City of Lompoc, bounded by the Santa Ynez River to the north and H Street-Route 1 to the east.

**New Cuyama Airport**
New Cuyama Airport is a privately owned, public use general aviation airport located in the Cuyama Valley area of Santa Barbara County, bounded by Perkins Road to the east and the town of New Cuyama to the north.

**Vandenberg Air Force Base**
The Vandenberg Air Force Base is owned and operated by the U.S. Air Force and is located approximately seven miles northwest of the City of Lompoc. Vandenberg Air Force Base primarily serves as a space and missile test facility for the USAF.

**Intermodal Connectivity**
Intermodal connectivity is important for facilitating a shift from the single-occupant vehicle to other modes. Fast Forward 2040 RTP-SCS includes several projects that will help improve intermodal connectivity in the region. The following are some examples:

- The Commuter and Passenger Rail Planning and Service Improvements project (SBCAG-700) will help improve passenger rail service between Ventura and the City of Goleta and includes connecting transit service, station facilities, etc.
- The Hollister Class I Bikeway (Go-205) and the Bikeway Infill Project (Go-307) will complete new and missing segments of bikeway in the City of Goleta.
- The North Avenue of Flags Park & Ride project (B-PL-400) will provide a second park-and-ride facility in the City of Buellton to accommodate demand.
- The South Alisal Road Bikeway Improvements project (Sol-PL-300) will provide bicycle facilities in a popular tourist area and the Alisal Road Bridge Replacement & Widening Project (Sol-PL-200) will provide for replacement of structurally deficient existing bridge and provide for the extension of regional bikeway and improved bicycle access across the Santa Ynez River.
• The Highway 246 Santa Ynez River Bridge project (L-MA-100) will provide improved access to the City of Lompoc to improve bicycle and pedestrian access.
• The Rincon Trail (C-PL-304) will construct a multiuse trail from Rincon Park to Carpinteria Avenue (part of the Carpinteria Coastal Vista Trail) to provide regional connectivity for bicycles and pedestrians.

See the full list of Fast Forward 2040 RTP-SCS projects with project descriptions in Appendix A2.

Goods Movement
Freight is transported within Santa Barbara County by truck, rail, and air, with the majority of freight transported by truck. Many of the highway, rail, and aviation projects included in the Fast Forward 2040 RTP-SCS will facilitate the movement of goods. Infrastructure improvements, operational improvements, and construction of additional infrastructure all provide for greater transportation efficiency.

Roadway capacity increasing projects, such as the following, will improve the facilities’ level of service and, in some cases, reduce conflicts between agricultural vehicles and other traffic, allowing for greater efficiency in goods movement:
• US 101 HOV Widening
• State Route 246 passing lanes between Buellton and Lompoc
• The Goleta US 101 Overpass
• San Ysidro Lane and US Highway 101 interchange (US 101 HOV Widening related project)

Rail and air projects such as infrastructure improvements, operational improvements for greater efficiency, construction of additional infrastructure, and miscellaneous equipment and facility purchases will not only improve passenger travel, but also goods movement. Rail siding projects on the Union Pacific track along the Pacific Surfliner route will reduce conflicting train movements.

See the full list of Fast Forward 2040 RTP-SCS projects with project descriptions in Appendix A2. The Central Coast California Commercial Flows Study (AMBAG, 2012) provides additional depth on the region’s goods movements issues and needs.

Transportation Safety
Overview
Many of the projects listed in Fast Forward 2040 seek to improve safety, and safety is a focus of the goals and policies of this plan. Goal 4 calls for safety improvements on the transportation network and related policies state consistency with the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan. The safety of all users—motorists, transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians—is equally prioritized in this plan.

The implementation of safety-related programs and projects occurs at all levels and with a variety of funding sources. The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) provides funding for safety-related improvements, $65 million forecasted over the life of this plan. Measure A also provides a portion of its funding for safety improvements. Whether a project is specifically intended to improve safety conditions or relieve congestion, all projects are designed to contemporary safety standards and most offer improvements over the existing condition.

Strategic Highway Safety Plan
The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) prepared by Caltrans, with the most recent version covering years 2015-2019, provides updates on recent accomplishments and defines the course for future safety improvements. One recent accomplishment is the creation of the Transportation Injury Mapping System
(TIMS), used to assemble much of the data presented below, enabling safety analyses by a broad range of interested parties. The SHSP contains a measurable objective of reducing the fatality rate by three percent annually and the rate of severe injuries by 1.5 percent annually. Fifteen challenges areas are identified and discussed, along with series of strategies that can be implemented to improve safety for each challenge area.

**Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the New Decade**

Caltrans released the Smart Mobility Framework in February 2010 to serve as a guiding document for decision making in the current decade. Smart Mobility 2010 presents a five-goal structure, including a safety related goal.

---

**Health and Safety:** Design, operate, and manage the transportation system to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, promote active living, and lessen exposure to pollution.

---

Fast Forward 2040’s goals align with the Smart Mobility framework.

**Federal Transportation Safety Performance Measurement**

MAP-21 required the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to develop a safety performance measure, resulting in a final rule published in March 2016 (81 FR 13881). The rule requires MPOs track five categories of safety-related data. State DOTs are required to set safety targets and then MPOs may either follow the State targets or set their own. The five categories include:

- Number of fatalities;
- Rate of fatalities per VMT;
- Number of serious injuries;
- Rate of serious injuries per VMT; and
- Number of combined non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

Fast Forward 2040 presents the first iteration of the safety data for the Santa Barbara County region in response to the federal rule. This data will become the baseline for future analyses determining if yet to be set safety targets are achieved.

The rule requires fatality data be obtained via the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) and all other data to be obtained from a State source. For the non-fatality data, SBCAG obtained the data via the UC Berkeley Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) which organizes Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) data into a user-friendly database and also geo-codes all collisions. Two of the five performance measure categories are rates; i.e., X per 100 million miles traveled. California’s Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS), prepared annually, provided the average daily vehicle miles traveled at the SBCAG region scale. To develop an annual vehicle miles traveled figure necessary for the rate calculations, the daily figures were simply multiplied by 365.

The following table presents the transportation safety performance measures as required by the federal rule.
### Table 12: Transportation Safety Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate 5-year Rolling Average</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate 5-year Rolling Average</td>
<td>5.957</td>
<td>5.967</td>
<td>5.743</td>
<td>5.761</td>
<td>5.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual VMT (millions)</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>3,511</td>
<td>3,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trends

Fatalities and serious injuries are discussed in the previous section, missing, however, is the long-term trend in the number of collisions on the region’s roads. Figure 67 provides a 10-year trend for collisions by mode in the SBCAG region. As is shown, a long-term downward trend in the total collisions is evident.

### Figure 67: SBCAG Region Collisions (2006-2015)

Many local governments are considering safety standards, and at least one, the City of Santa Barbara, has adopted a Vision Zero Policy. The Regional Active Transportation Plan (SBCAG, 2015) provides additional depth on transportation safety for the active modes.

### Transportation Security

The region’s transportation network is at risk of the impacts of natural disasters, such as fires, mudslides, earthquakes, or flooding, and also from a potential terrorist attack. Planning for any potential disruption is a necessity and is the responsibility of various federal, State, and local agencies. Assets to be considered are the region’s highways, local streets and roads, airports, transit systems, and the harbor facility. In addition to considering a local security threat, the region needs to also consider the impacts of incidents outside of the region, such as the closure of I-5. Though SBCAG is not directly responsible for transportation security or the response to incidents, the agency is uniquely positioned as a forum for regional communication as well as a resource of knowledge on the region’s transportation assets.

---
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Santa Barbara County falls into the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (OES) Southern Region service area. OES is the primary State agency responsible for the planning and response to security incidents. OES has plans in place for the response to a variety of types of incidents and manages the response efforts of all State agencies. OES works closely with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region IX. FEMA provides support during and after security incidents and manages the federal response.

The Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Management (SBCOEM) provides planning and response efforts at the regional scale. SBCOEM falls under the jurisdiction of the County, though it works with each of the region’s eight cities to coordinate efforts and develop incident response plans. In 2013, SBCOEM updated the region’s Emergency Management Plan. The plan defines the responsibilities for County departments and local agencies in response to incidents. SBCAG is not assigned a role in the plan.

In addition to the federal, State, and County agencies and plans, there are several local programs that also assist with transportation security. Transit providers are working to protect their systems and passengers by installing and maintaining video surveillance systems onboard buses and at transit facilities. Several also have emergency power systems. SBCAG facilitates the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program which works to quickly clear minor incidents from the more heavily traveled portions of US 101. The Highway Call Box program, also facilitated by SBCAG, enables motorists to contact emergency personnel from many roadside locations throughout the region. Finally, Caltrans District 5 maintains several variable message signs to quickly disseminate important information to motorists.

Recent incidents in the Big Sur area of Monterey County, including the loss of the Pheiffer Canyon Bridge and significant mudslides, highlight the need for transportation security and planning for emergencies.

**A Performance-Based Approach**

President Obama signed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) into law on July 6, 2012. This law placed a greater emphasis on a performance-based approach to metropolitan planning. The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, passed by Congress on December 3, 2015 and signed into law on December 4, 2015, continues this emphasis.

As required by MAP-21 and the FAST Act, SBCAG now follows a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making in support of the national and regional goals. SBCAG is required to establish quantifiable performance measures and targets to use in tracking progress towards attaining these planning goals. The establishment of performance measures and targets must happen in coordination with both State transportation plans and providers of public transportation to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable. 23 U.S.C. 134 (h).

Consistent with this mandate, SBCAG has organized Fast Forward 2040 to fit the RTP-SCS goal framework and crafted objective, quantifiable performance measures that are keyed to the five plan goals: (1) the environment, (2) mobility and system reliability, (3) safety and public health, (4) social equity, and (5) a prosperous economy. The goal framework and the performance measures are based on Caltrans’ Smart Mobility framework and in synchrony with the performance-based approach required by federal law. The preferred future scenario in the Sustainable Communities Strategy was developed and selected based on how well the scenario is expected to achieve the five plan goals and meet the region’s transportation needs, applying the performance measures.

As federal performance measure rulemakings under MAP-21 and the FAST Act become final, SBCAG will also integrate the final federal performance measures into the RTP-SCS. Consistent with the statutory
timeframes, SBCAG will also set performance targets through a public process in coordination with the State of California and regional stakeholders.

**Improving the System: Transportation Projects**

This section outlines regional transportation projects. The next section discusses programs and strategies. Combined, the two sections form the Regional Transportation Implementation Strategy. This strategy contains the Regional Transportation Plan components required by federal law: operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods, capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and proposed transportation and transit enhancement activities. Fiscally constrained projects and programs in this implementation strategy collectively form the transportation component of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

- The transportation projects are divided into three project lists—Programmed (Measure A and Other), Planned, and Illustrative—based on the status of funding (see Appendix 2).
  - The Programmed Projects List includes projects that are funded. For the purposes of this list, “funded” means that money is programmed for funding, including (for construction projects) money for at least a portion of the construction phase. Also, although future programming action may be required, there is a plan in place to secure the funding. Most programmed projects are short-range (through 2020) projects.
  - The Planned Projects List includes projects that have little or no money programmed for funding. Funding sources have, however, been identified and the projects are expected to receive funding within the timeframe of Fast Forward 2040. Most planned projects are long-range projects.
  - The Illustrative Projects List includes additional projects for which sufficient funding is not anticipated within the timeframe of Fast Forward 2040.

- Together, the programmed and planned projects constitute the fiscally constrained list of projects.
- Projects in the lists include highway, streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian, transit, rail, and aviation projects, as well as intelligent transportation systems (ITS) and transportation demand management (TDM) projects.
- Primarily for informational purposes, Appendix 2 also includes a list of airport projects.
- The Action Element contains regional, long- and short-range, transportation programs and strategies related to intermodal connectivity, goods movement, coordinated public transit—human services transportation, safety and security, and environmental mitigation. It also includes an airport ground access improvement program and an enhanced transit strategy.
- The programs and projects contained in the Action Element are consistent with the Congestion Management Program (CMP).
- Since Santa Barbara County is an attainment area for the federal 1-hour ozone standard and an attainment/unclassifiable area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, SBCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan is not required to demonstrate transportation conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). SBCAG does, however, develop transportation control measures (TCMs) for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District’s Ozone Plan, which is the region’s contribution to the State Implementation Plan.

Table 13 summarizes some of the major projects from Action Element in the 2040 RTP-SCS that have been completed.

---

98 23 U.S.C. §134(i)(2)(F), (G), and (H).
Table 13: Major Projects Completed Since the Previous RTP Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Overhead Replacement Project</td>
<td>US 101 and Los Carneros Road interchange – widen approach to SB ramp and replace the railroad bridge.</td>
<td>Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros at Calle Real Roundabout</td>
<td>Install a roundabout at the intersection of Los Carneros and Calle Real to replace a three-way stop.</td>
<td>Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros Road Capacity Improvement</td>
<td>Widen Los Carneros Road from Hollister Ave to city limit.</td>
<td>Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Carneros/Calle Koral Operational Improvements</td>
<td>Add additional NB through lane on Los Carneros and signal modifications to allow for the construction of a WB leg.</td>
<td>Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Road Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>Install additional NB lane on Storke Road from Hollister Ave to the SB US 101 on-ramp.</td>
<td>Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVP-Hummel to California Ext+ I/S @ SR 135</td>
<td>Construction of two-lane road with class II bike lane on Union Valley Parkway, Hummel to Blosser and Bradley.</td>
<td>County, Santa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara/Ventura County HOV Lanes, US 101 Widening Phase II</td>
<td>Highway widening (4 to 6 lanes) with HOV lanes between Mobile Pier Road undercrossing in Ventura County to south of Casitas Pass Road in Santa Barbara County.</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 246/154 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Construct a roundabout at the intersection of SR 246 and SR 154.</td>
<td>Caltrans, County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 246/La Purisima Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Construct a roundabout at the intersection of SR 246 and La Purisima Road.</td>
<td>Caltrans, County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, as this plan was under development several other major projects were under construction, including: Phase 1 of the SR 246 passing lanes project and the Linden and Casitas Interchanges project.

Coastal Act Section 30251 states that the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas should be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Care should be taken to comply with the Coastal Act when implementing applicable projects. Additionally, US 101 along the Gaviota Coast was recently designated as a State Scenic Highway and a high level of consideration should be taken to maintain the corridor’s aesthetic values.

Highways
The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) provided the majority of the highway projects listed in Appendix 2. Caltrans is the owner and operator of the State Highway System (SHS) and is responsible for planning, designing, building, operating and maintaining the SHS.

SBCAG and Caltrans work together to identify deficiencies of the system, establish priorities, and work to secure funding to meet the greatest needs. Caltrans identifies needs and deficiencies in several ways, such as system plans (route or transportation concept reports, corridor system management plans, the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, etc.) and the 10-Year State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) Plan.

The purpose of the SHOPP is to operate, maintain, and preserve the SHS. The 10-Year SHOPP Plan identifies needs and is updated every other year. Capital improvements programmed in the SHOPP are limited to maintenance, safety, and rehabilitation of the transportation infrastructure; the SHOPP is not used to expand capacity. Caltrans nominates projects to be funded with SHOPP funds and local agencies have an opportunity to comment on the SHOPP.
The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a five-year capital improvement program of transportation projects both on and off the SHS. Caltrans receives funds for administration and continued maintenance, rehabilitation, and operation of the SHS first. Then Caltrans and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), such as SBCAG, establish priorities and nominate projects in coordination with one another in order to prepare transportation improvement plans (TIPs) to use the remaining funds for expansion of the system. RTPAs prepare Regional Transportation Improvement Plans (RTIPs), which receive 75 percent of the STIP, and Caltrans prepares an Interregional Transportation Improvement Plan (ITIP), which receives 25 percent of the STIP. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopts the STIP. The CTC relies heavily on projects listed in the RTP for programming.

See the full list of regionally-significant highway projects with project descriptions in Appendix 2. Each project indicates the “year operational,” making it easy to distinguish the short-range and long-range actions.

**Congestion Management Programming**
The highway projects listed in SBCAG’s 2016 Congestion Management Plan are also listed in this plan. There is consistency between the two plans.

**Streets and Roads**
The County of Santa Barbara and the incorporated cities within the County provided the majority of the streets and roads projects in the Fast Forward 2040 project lists in Appendix 2. The projects include regionally significant projects, community plans and circulation elements, Environmental Impact Report (EIR) documents, corridor studies, etc.

Streets and roads projects in Fast Forward 2040 include bridge replacements, roundabouts, full- and turning-lane additions, intersection improvements, road extensions, road widenings, maintenance and rehabilitation projects, etc. See the full list of projects with project descriptions in Appendix 2.

**Congestion Management Programming**
The streets and roads projects listed in SBCAG’s 2016 Congestion Management Plan are also listed in this plan. There is consistency between the two plans.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian**
The County of Santa Barbara and the incorporated cities within the County provided the majority of the bicycle and pedestrian projects in Fast Forward 2040 (Appendix 2). The projects include both named projects as well as the implementation of various plans, with specific projects identified as determined by successful grant applications. The recently adopted *Toward an Active California* (Caltrans, 2017) features policies and actions guiding Caltrans accommodation of the active modes on the state highway system.

Since the creation of the State’s Active Transportation Program in 2013, several of the region’s jurisdictions have created Active Transportation Plans, as has SBCAG. These plans include locally and regionally important bicycle and pedestrian projects. Many projects identified in these plans are included in the programmed and planned project lists. Each jurisdiction is working to implement the plans and construct the balance of the projects as funding becomes available.

The project lists also include many bicycle and pedestrian projects integrated within street or highway projects. Class II bike lanes, for example, are striped lanes for one-way bike travel on a street or highway; they are often constructed as part of other street or highway improvements. Sidewalks are also often constructed as part of streets and roads projects. To facilitate bike trips and intermodal connectivity, SBCAG encourages transit operators and Amtrak to provide bicycle racks or other, appropriate bike storage on buses and Pacific Surfliner trains.
Fast Forward 2040 recognizes the need for the California Coastal Trail in the coastal areas of Santa Barbara County and includes several projects that will improve the trail. SBCAG will coordinate with appropriate agencies for the development of the California Coastal Trail throughout Santa Barbara County.

Safe routes to school are also an important component of bicycle and pedestrian projects. A combination of Measure A funding and Active Transportation Program grants have enabled the inclusion of numerous Safe Routes to School projects.

**Transit**

The County of Santa Barbara and the cities within the County, along with the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District, provided the majority of the transit projects in Fast Forward 2040 (Appendix 2). Projects for the Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies Easy Lift and SMOOTH (Santa Maria Organization of Transportation Helpers) are also included. The projects include regionally-significant projects from Measure A, 101-In-Motion, the North County Transit Plan, short range transit plans (SRTPs), etc.

Most of the projects—more than 80 percent of the total cost of transit projects—are for transit operations. Most of the capital projects are for bus replacements, as well as bus acquisition in anticipation of long-term increases in service demand. There are some transit facility capital improvement projects in Fast Forward 2040, such as Lompoc’s Transit Transfer Center and Transit Operations Center.

Measure A transit projects include the North County and South Coast Specialized Transit for Elderly and Disabled Programs, which help reduce fares charged to the elderly and the disabled by funding the operating expenses of specialized transit service providers. Other Measure A projects include the North County and South Coast Interregional Transit Programs, which will help maintain and expand bus service between North County and South Coast regions and between Santa Barbara County and adjoining counties.

See full list of regionally-significant transit projects with project descriptions in Appendix 2.

**Enhanced Transit Strategy**

A cornerstone of SBCAG’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is an enhanced transit strategy. The enhanced transit strategy provides that new funding capacity for transit be applied where transit demand is greatest and be used in ways consistent with the underlying land use assumptions which also contribute to the overall SCS, i.e., to support transit-oriented development. Fast Forward 2040 forecasts roughly $200 million will be available to 2040 to provide such transit enhancements. This funding is forecasted to come from competitive grant programs and therefore the enhancements are not specified at this time.

**Rail**

Caltrans and SBCAG provided the rail projects in the Fast Forward 2040 project lists in Appendix 2. SBCAG remains committed to implementing commuter rail options consistent with 101-In-Motion and Coastal Act requirements.

The 101-In-Motion consensus package included the implementation of commuter rail from Camarillo to Goleta with stops in Oxnard, Ventura, Carpinteria, and Santa Barbara. Commuter rail would require not only that Union Pacific allow use of its right-of-way, but also that improvements be constructed on the existing rail corridor. An incremental approach to providing commuter rail service is to provide commuter-friendly intercity passenger rail service by rescheduling Amtrak service. One of the major rail projects in Fast Forward 2040 is the Measure A project Commuter and Passenger Rail Planning and Service Improvements. Under this project, Measure A funds may be used to revise Amtrak Pacific Surfliner schedules to improve service for commuters and to plan for implementation of new commuter train service. SBCAG member agencies are
also assisting commuter rail service through supporting local projects. For example, the City of Goleta is proposing a Goleta Train Depot, which would facilitate daily commuter access by rail to employers in Goleta.

Most of the other rail projects in Fast Forward 2040 are sidings, which would facilitate all types of rail service. Fast Forward 2040 is also consistent with the LOSSAN (Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency) Strategic Plan. Many of the LOSSAN projects, however, are on the Illustrative list due to the limited availability of State funds to implement the projects. See full list of regionally-significant rail projects with project descriptions in Appendix 2.

Aviation
The airport projects in the RTP-SCS project lists in Appendix 2 were taken from the California Aviation System Plan Capital Improvement Plan. The Caltrans Division of Aeronautics prepares the California Aviation System Plan (CASP); the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is one of the elements in the CASP. The CIP "is a ten-year compiled listing of capital projects submitted to the Department for inclusion in the CASP, predominantly based on general aviation airport (GAA) master plans or other comparable long-range planning documents."99 Airport managers submit project information to Caltrans. Caltrans updates the CIP every two years. The CIP is not fiscally constrained.

The CTC selects projects for the Aeronautics Program from the CIP, so projects must be in the CIP in order to receive State funding.

Airport Ground Access Improvement Program
Because SBCAG's planning area includes primary air carrier airports100—the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and the Santa Maria Public Airport—SBCAG's RTP must include an airport ground access improvement program.101

The purpose of airport ground access projects is to optimize ground transportation to and from airports. Ground access to airports includes improvements to off-airport roadways, highways, public transit systems, passenger shuttle systems, parking lots, and other transportation-related modes and facilities. Enhancements to these facilities seek to provide more convenient and predictable access for passengers, employees, air cargo traffic, and general aviation users.102

Both of the primary airports in Santa Barbara County are served by public transit. The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is served by Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) and the Santa Maria Public Airport is served by Santa Maria Area Transit (SMAT).

The Fast Forward 2040 Airport Ground Access Improvement Program includes projects such as the following (see also Appendix 2):

Santa Maria Public Airport
  • Google Transit Subscription: Incorporate SMAT’s service schedules into the Google Transit feed.

---

100 A "primary air carrier airport" is defined by the FAA as an airport having at least 10,000 annual scheduled passenger boardings.
Santa Barbara Municipal Airport

- **Fowler & Ekwill / Fairview / Kellogg / Route 217**: Local road improvements & interchange modifications at Ekwill and Fowler Roads.
- **Fairview Avenue/US 101 Interchange Ramp Modifications**: Add a westbound through lane on the NB off ramp and an additional NB right turn lane for access to NB US 101.
- **Goleta Train Depot**: In conjunction with enhanced rail service, this proposed project could add another means of ground connection for airport customers.

Also, although only an illustrative project at this point, Santa Barbara MTD enhanced transit service to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is a potential enhancement. The draft Airport Master Plan for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport considers changes to parking, hangers, roadways and airport access. However, it does not assume any changes to current transit levels.

Airport access is an important issue, in which SBCAG is particularly involved due to its role as the Airport Land Use Commission. SBCAG would like to see both primary air carrier airports in the County be fully and easily accessible by car, transit, bicycle, and foot, with parking provided for both cars and bicycles.

See the full list of planned aviation projects with project descriptions in Appendix 2.

Maritime

The Santa Barbara Harbor accommodates a variety of commercial and recreational use. The harbor was created by the construction of a breakwater in the 1920s. The harbor breakwater was expanded in the 1980s to create the current harbor facility. Due to the design of the breakwater, and littoral drift of sand and sediment, the harbor requires frequent dredging. In 1972, the City of Santa Barbara and the US Army Corps of Engineers came to an agreement on harbor dredging. The US Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for the navigation channel and the City is responsible for the remainder of the harbor. In 2016, the US Army Corps completed a Draft Environmental Assessment for the maintenance dredging program. A total of 600,000 cubic yards of materials are permitted to be dredged through semiannual dredging operations. The materials are pumped via a temporary pipeline to East Beach to replenish the sand lost by the interrupted littoral drift caused by the harbor facility.

Improving the System: Transportation Programs and Strategies

This section discusses programs and strategies. The previous section outlines a regional transportation implementation strategy for transportation projects. Combined, they form the regional transportation implementation strategy that is required by federal law.

Intelligent Transportation Systems

Regional Snapshot

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is the application of telecommunications technology to improve the information flow to transportation users. Examples include changeable message signs posting alerts of road closures, internet-accessible maps showing congested areas or streaming video of traffic flow, highway call boxes to report emergencies, traffic signal synchronization systems, next bus arrival announcements, and vehicle locator devices.

There are a number of ITS programs and projects in Santa Barbara County. SBCAG developed and manages a system of call boxes along State Routes 1, 101, 154, and 166. The County and the Cities of

104 23 U.S.C. §134(i)(2)(F), (G), and (H).
Santa Barbara and Santa Maria have utilized the synchronization of existing traffic signals along major urban arterials to facilitate the flow of traffic. Caltrans and the County are using closed circuit television (CCTV) for freeway and intersection monitoring purposes. ITS transit projects, such as signal priority, have been developed in the upper State Street corridor in Santa Barbara.

SBCAG participated in a collaborative effort with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), along with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), RTPAs, and public transit operators on the Central Coast region of California (Counties of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz) to identify and implement ITS projects and strategies to improve the efficiency of the transportation system on the Central Coast. The process resulted in the Central Coast ITS (CCITS) Implementation Plan, which was completed in 2007. The CCITS Implementation Plan addressed the use of telecommunications and defined technology-based opportunities to enhance the operation and management of all modes of travel on the Central Coast.

The CCITS Implementation Plan included an overview of existing and planned ITS projects on the Central Coast, a “road map” for ITS project development using FHWA’s principles of systems engineering and the regional architecture, an overview of federal funding requirements, identification of potential funding sources, and recommended strategies for ITS project procurement methods, and recommended ITS program management principles. The Plan resulted in a tri-County regional ITS architecture and a Santa Barbara County ITS architecture for which future ITS projects could be designed from, utilizing principles of systems engineering. One of the main benefits of a regional architecture is that it encourages more efficient integration among systems. For example, if an agency wants to develop a traveler information website and post real-time traffic data from existing CCTV cameras, the project manager can review the CCITS Implementation Plan and the regional architecture to determine which agencies are providing this service, what the cameras are capable of providing, where the visual data is being transmitted to, and if any other agencies have entered into any cooperative or data sharing agreements for these CCTV images. To date, all projects in Santa Barbara County that have utilized federal funds for ITS projects have utilized the regional architecture developed by the CCITS Implementation Plan.

Some of the projects recommended in the CCITS Implementation Plan have been completed, as mentioned above. Appendix 2 shows the ITS projects included in this RTP-SCS. Each project indicates the “year operational,” making it easy to distinguish the short-range and long-range actions.

Opportunities and Challenges
New emerging technologies are developing that have the potential to fundamentally alter travel patterns and how goods and services are delivered. In 2015, the FHWA prepared an ITS Strategic Plan to focus implementation on two core areas: 1) implementation of connected vehicles, which refers to vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle to infrastructure (V2I) wireless communication, and 2) advancing vehicle automation. Automated vehicles are those in which at least some aspect of a safety-critical control function (e.g., steering, throttle, or braking) occurs without direct driver input. Automated vehicles may be autonomous (i.e., use only vehicle sensors) or may be connected (i.e., use communications systems such as connected vehicle technology, in which cars and roadside infrastructure communicate wirelessly). These emerging technologies have the potential to make the transportation system safer, more efficient and reliable, and to reduce criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. The challenge for SBCAG is to determine its role and

---

105 Central Coast ITS Implementation Plan, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments & TransCore, 2007.
responsibility in this emerging field and to keep member agencies and decision-makers informed of these emerging technologies and how they affect the regional transportation system and influence local communities. While these technologies may increase efficiency and reliability, it is not clear that they will reduce the number of vehicles on the road or vehicle miles travelled.

SBCAG is closely monitoring developments in emerging transportation technologies, including autonomous and connected vehicles, alternative fuels, ride-sharing and automated mobility services. This field is evolving quickly and SBCAG intends to seek funding to update the CCITS Implementation Plan as the rate, scope and effect of the adoption of these new technologies become clearer.

Transportation Demand Management
SBCAG provided the majority of the transportation demand management (TDM) projects in the RTP-SCS project lists. SBCAG’s Traffic Solutions division is devoted to promoting and encouraging alternatives to driving alone, with the goals of reducing traffic congestion, air pollution, and vehicle miles driven, as well as improving the quality of life for employees, visitors, and residents of Santa Barbara County. Traffic Solutions’ objectives are:

- To provide a county-wide TDM program and ridesharing information.
- To develop programs benefiting the public and to provide information about transportation choices through education, outreach and public participation.
- To promote cooperative relationships with local businesses, government agencies, and community groups and individuals to expand participation in commuter programs.

Traffic Solutions provides information, assistance, and referrals to people looking for an alternative to driving alone. Traffic Solutions manages the Smart Ride portal, which is a “one-stop shop” on-line webpage that provides commuter matching for carpools and vanpools; a transit trip planning tool; a commuter savings calculator; and a platform for employer commuter benefits programs. Traffic Solutions also manages the FlexWork Santa Barbara program and organizes CycleMAYnia, a month-long celebration which promotes a wide range of bicycle events to highlight the utility of bicycles for both commuting and recreation. Traffic Solutions receives funding from sources such as Measure A and various State and federal grant programs. See Appendix 2 for TDM projects included in the RTP-SCS. Each project indicates the “year operational,” making it easy to distinguish the short-range and long-range actions.

ZEV Readiness
SBCAG has supported the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District’s (APCD) efforts in taking the lead on ensuring that our region is “ZEV ready” for deployment of electric and alternative fueled vehicles through the horizon year of the RTP-SCS. The Plug-In Central Coast EV Readiness Plan, the APCD’s EV Charging Station Infrastructure Program, and the other alternative fuels and hydrogen infrastructure planning efforts the APCD is currently undertaking, all complement and support the State of California’s efforts in implementing zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) statewide. The California Air Resources Board’s ZEV Rule (established in 1990) and subsequent amendments seek to reduce pollution by implementing technology improvements directly at the source by working with auto manufacturers. The program has been successful to date and has incentivized technology improvements in the auto sector and encouraged innovation and further development of fuel cell electric vehicles, battery electric vehicles, and other technologies. In addition, Governor Brown’s Executive Order B-16-2012 established several milestones, one of which was: “By 2025, over 1.5 million ZEVs will be on California roadways and their market share will be expanding.”

The APCD has taken a lead role in working with the air districts in Ventura and San Luis Obispo counties and the Community Environmental Council in securing grants to lay the ground work for planning electric vehicle infrastructure in the Central Coast region. These work efforts culminated in the preparation of the Plug-In
Central Coast’s EV Readiness Plan that includes a vision for electric vehicle adoption and infrastructure in the Central Coast region.\textsuperscript{108} The EV Readiness Plan includes siting recommendations for electric vehicle charging sites throughout the Central Coast, taking into consideration that US 101 serves as an inter-regional connection between Southern and Northern California. Locating DC fast chargers every 30 or 40 miles along the US 101, from Ventura County through Santa Barbara County and on to San Luis Obispo County, will enable battery electric vehicles (BEVs) to take longer trips and recharge from near empty to 80 percent charge in approximately 30 minutes. The Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan also includes recommendations for locating charging stations near workplaces, regional commercial centers, and major destination centers, as well as single-family and multi-family residences, and identifies outreach strategies for marketing, training, and education for local government implementation and for members of the public.

Another key initiative in this work effort is the continued implementation of the APCD’s program to provide grants to public entities, tax-exempt non-profits, and/or private entities for electric vehicle charging stations. The grant program provides for up to $10,000 for a Level 2 charging station and up to $20,000 for a Level 3 charging station.

Starting in 2015, the APCD, with funding provided by a California Energy Commission grant, has been coordinating an effort to prepare the tri-counties region for hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicles. The plan development involves several agencies and organizations, with the APCD acting as the lead. Tasks will include preparing a hydrogen refueling infrastructure plan and a hydrogen station installation manual, meetings and workshops for civic leaders and other stakeholders, fire code and permitting training orientation, training for first responders, and assessing potential for early adoption of hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicles in municipal fleets.

The FHWA recently designated US 101 as a “signage ready” alternative fuel corridor through Santa Barbara County for electric, compressed natural gas, and hydrogen fuel. State Route 1 was designated as a “signage ready” alternative fuel corridor for electric and compressed natural gas.\textsuperscript{109}

The California Energy Commission administers a State grant programs to fund the deployment of electric vehicle charging stations along major state freeways and highways, and to support zero emission vehicle readiness.

**Environmental Mitigation Program**

As a regional planning document, Fast Forward 2040 allows for early consideration of broad mitigation strategies. In fact, Fast Forward 2040 must include a "discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the" plan. "The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level."\textsuperscript{110} In developing this discussion, SBCAG must "consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate: (1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or (2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available."\textsuperscript{111} Comparison of the Regional

\textsuperscript{108} Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan for Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties (Central Coast), EV Communities Alliance, April 2014.


\textsuperscript{110} 23 C.F.R. §450.322(f)(7).

\textsuperscript{111} 23 C.F.R. §450.322(g).
Transportation Plan (RTP) to maps and inventories can help identify the most appropriate areas for mitigation such that it is conducted in a regional, rather than piecemeal, fashion. The RTP Guidelines further state that SBCAG should “make a concerted effort to ensure any actions in the RTP do not conflict with conservation strategies and goals of the resource agencies.”

The Supplement to an Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) associated with this plan serves as the first tier of environmental review for identified transportation improvement projects and programmatically evaluates the environmental impacts of Fast Forward 2040. The SEIR identifies mitigation measures that programmatically apply to individual transportation projects based on a review of general project parameters and locations for all potentially significant environmental impacts of the Fast Forward 2040. Transportation project sponsors are responsible for more in-depth, project-level environmental analysis and mitigation to more precisely quantify impacts and specify mitigation measures based on project-level design details and site-specific review. However, where applicable, the RTP-SCS can provide a framework for mitigation at a regional level.

The SEIR contains a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that is intended to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the SEIR are effectively implemented by the applicable jurisdictions. The applicable jurisdictions with projects contained in Fast Forward 2040 are encouraged to adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) or an adaptation of it specific to its independent discretion and/or special expertise.

The prior 2040 RTP-SCS recommended additional components of an environmental mitigation program that go beyond the MMRP contained in the EIR. These components include:

- Mitigation Banking
- Land Use

For more information regarding the Environmental Mitigation Program, please refer to Section 7.9 of the 2040 RTP-SCS (SBCAG, August 2013). For specific information regarding mitigation for the Fast Forward 2040 RTP-SCS, see the Fast Forward 2040 SEIR (SBCAG, August 2017).

---

112 2010 RTP Guidelines, 23.
113 CEQA Guidelines §15097(d).
CHAPTER 4:  
Integrating Transportation and Land Use

Where people live, work, and play, and how they travel between the locations of those activities, now and in the future, is at the heart of a Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The diversity of land uses, their disposition, and the density of development are determining factors for how people choose to travel. This chapter explores the region’s land use and travel patterns, the demographic growth that will force new demands on both, and presents a vision for how they can work together to satisfy the goals important to the region while also meeting the State’s greenhouse gas reduction targets. Neither land use changes nor transportation investments in isolation can address these issues; a balanced approach is necessary to ensure the region is well-positioned to address its long-term needs.

Purpose

As required by Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities Strategy component of the Regional Transportation Plan is intended to integrate an analysis of population growth, land use, and housing need into the long-range transportation planning process. The Sustainable Communities Strategy seeks to address transportation planning holistically, understanding transportation patterns in the context of existing and possible future land use and housing configurations. SB 375 specifically requires the Sustainable Communities Strategy to identify areas within the region sufficient to house the entire forecasted population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, and to accommodate regional housing need for the eight-year period from 2014 to 2022 across the region’s nine local jurisdictions. If feasible, a Sustainable Community Strategy is supposed to “set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve . . . greenhouse gas reduction targets” approved by the State.114

Benefits

As much as the Sustainable Community Strategy is calibrated to achieve the State’s larger goals, it also seeks to meet the region’s own goals and needs and to create a roadmap for preserving and enhancing quality of life in the Santa Barbara County region. If successful, the Sustainable Community Strategy will articulate a solution to the conundrum of how to grow sustainably - in a way that simultaneously protects the environment, enhances mobility, serves the needs of all socio-economic groups, promotes public health and safety, and keeps the region on a path to economic growth and prosperity.

The challenges we face as a region are clear. Without a proactive approach and a sound vision for the future, forecast population and job growth will lead to increasing housing costs, longer commute trips, more congestion and greater transportation costs, measured in time, money and aggravation, with attendant harm to both the environment and the economy. While there is no perfect or easy solution to these challenges that do not involve at least some trade-offs, the major benefit of a Sustainable Community Strategy is the identification of an optimized solution that harmonizes land use and transportation and keeps Santa Barbara County healthy, happy and moving. Ultimately, the preferred scenario embraced by this plan balances competing considerations in a way that maximizes region-wide benefits and minimizes detrimental effects as compared to all other scenarios.

Compared to the future baseline scenario in 2040, the preferred scenario:  

- Reduces overall vehicle miles traveled by 19 percent, vehicle hours traveled by 16 percent, and average daily traffic (ADT) volumes by eight percent.
- Reduces overall congestion (as measured by congested vehicle miles traveled) by 35 percent compared to the future baseline scenario.
- Reduces average vehicle trip time by 11 percent and average vehicle commute time for workers by five percent.
- Saves residents and workers almost $500,000 annually in auto operating costs (a 19 percent reduction).
- Achieves an overall increase in transit accessibility (the percentage of population within a high quality transit corridor) of 24 percent, and nine percent overall from 2010.
- Achieves an increase in transit accessibility for low income populations (the percentage of low income population within a high quality transit corridor) of 81 percent, and 17 percent from 2010.
- Increases transit ridership by 10 percent (52,240 daily trips for the preferred scenario versus 47,450 for the future baseline), a 52 percent increase from 2010 numbers, and results in a seven percent increase in alternative trip (biking, walking, and transit) mode share.
- Apportions 73 percent of new housing growth to infill areas (compared to 23 percent in the future baseline scenario).
- Develops 4,165 fewer acres to accommodate growth (3,727 total acres for the preferred scenario versus 7,892 acres total for the future baseline scenario).

In addition, the preferred scenario results in a reduction in per capita vehicle greenhouse gas emissions of 13.3 percent in 2020 and 17.7 percent in 2035.

\[115\] See the System Performance section later in this chapter for additional details.

\[116\] Defined as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes per peak commute hour.
Demographic Change

Santa Barbara County experienced a growth rate of 1.18 percent between 2014 and 2015. This represents one of the highest population growth rates the county has seen in the past 15 years, second to the 1.40 percent growth rate experienced in 2013 and higher than the average growth rate of 0.06 percent over the previous 15 years. The tri-county population of Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties grew by 0.7 percent in the last year, which is also slightly higher than the average growth rate over the last 10 years. San Luis Obispo County accounted for 0.3 percent of the tri-county population growth, and Ventura County grew by 0.6 percent.

Both natural increases (more births than deaths) and a positive net migration (more people entered the area than left the area) have accounted for the positive population increase in Santa Barbara County. However, most of the increase in population is due to natural increase. Compared to 2014, more of the population increase in 2015 came from migration. As shown in Figure 68, the county has had a positive net migration trend for the past three years after seeing a negative net migration for five years prior due to economic conditions and other factors. Figure 69 provides recent population growth rates.

Figure 68: Santa Barbara County Population Growth and Components of Change, 2001-2015

SBCAG developed a Regional Growth Forecast (RGF) in concert with the development of the prior RTP-SCS and was adopted by the SBCAG Board in December 2012. The RGF total forecast of population, employment and housing projections are utilized as inputs in the RTP-SCS preferred scenario modeling as a baseline forecast, although sub-regional allocations differ between the RTP-SCS preferred scenario and the RGF.¹¹⁷

Over the course of the 2010-2040 forecast period, the county-wide population is forecast to increase by 96,100 persons from 423,895 to 520,000 or 23 percent. The unincorporated North County and the City of Santa Maria are forecast to have the largest numerical growth. See the following figure.

¹¹⁷ The RGF baseline sub-regional allocations are based on the assumption that there is no change in existing land use policy at the local government level. The RTP-SCS depend upon the adoption and implementation of the specific policy and land use changes recommend in this document.
There are 142,000 households in the County. The average household size is 2.9 persons per household, at record levels due to increasing housing costs and low vacancy rates primarily in the South Coast. Families make up 66 percent of the households in the County. This figure includes both married-couple families (49 percent) and other families (17 percent). Of other families, 7 percent are female householder families with no husband present and have children under 18 years. The female households with children are more likely to be in the lower income categories and spend larger proportions of their incomes for housing. Nonfamily households make up 34 percent of all households in the County. Most of the nonfamily households were people living alone, but some are composed of people living in households in which no one was related to the householder. Due to the large student population and high housing costs in the South Coast, unrelated occupants may need to combine income to afford a rental unit. In the North County, workers in lower paying agricultural jobs may need to also combine incomes to afford a rental unit. Figure 71 provides a breakdown of types of households in Santa Barbara County.

**Figure 71: Types of Households in Santa Barbara County, 2014**

Source: American Community Survey 2010-2014

Countywide there are a total of 153,600 housing units, 8 percent of which are vacant. Of the total housing units, 65 percent were in single-unit structures, 30 percent were in multi-unit structures, and 5 percent were mobile homes. Figure 72 highlights the housing types in the region.

**Figure 72: Types of Housing Units in Santa Barbara County, 2014**

Source: American Community Survey 2010-2014

Over the course of the 2010-2040 forecast period, county-wide households are forecast to increase by 31,700 households from 142,100 to 173,800 or 22 percent. The unincorporated North County and the City of Santa Maria are forecast to have the largest numerical growth (see Figure 73).
Seventeen percent of the County population are living in poverty. An estimated 21 percent of related children under 18 are below the poverty level, compared with 7 percent of people 65 years old and over. An estimated 10 percent of all families and 27 percent of families with a female householder and no husband present have incomes below the poverty level. See Figure 74 for poverty rates in the region.

The median monthly housing costs for mortgaged owners in Santa Barbara County is $2,286, non-mortgaged owners $512, and renters $1,357. An estimated 44 percent of owners have mortgages, 16 percent of owners are without mortgages. Fifty-eight percent of renters in Santa Barbara County spend 30 percent or more of household income on housing (see the following figure).
Over the course of the 2010-2040 forecast period, county-wide employment growth is forecast to increase by 55,650 jobs, from 192,100 to 240,700 or 29 percent (see Figure 76). The unincorporated North County and the City of Santa Maria are forecast to have the largest numerical growth.

**Figure 76: Existing and Forecast 2010-2040 Employment Growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>43,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria City</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>12,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara City</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta City</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc City</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton City</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang City</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria City</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Housing Needs Assessment**

Based on the California State Department of Finance population forecasts and other factors, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required by law to make an official determination of housing need through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. Pursuant to this process, in April 2012, HCD provided SBCAG with its determination of regional housing need for the 8.75-year projection period from January 1, 2014 through September 30, 2022 of 11,030 housing units.

Through a public process conducted in parallel with the RTP-SCS scenario development, SBCAG developed a methodology for allocating this regional housing need among the nine SBCAG member jurisdictions, based on statutorily defined factors and relevant information provided by SBCAG member jurisdictions. The SBCAG Board adopted this RHNA methodology in December 2012 together with the 2012 RGF and subsequently adopted a RHNA Plan in July 2013 following this methodology. Because the RHNA process occurs every eight years, the RHNA Plan will not be updated in this RTP-SCS planning cycle.

---

118 See Gov. C. §65584 et seq.
119 See Gov. C. §§65584.04(d),(e); 65584.04(b)(1).
The adopted RHNA methodology allocates identified housing need to SBCAG member jurisdictions based on forecast population and household growth and other factors in a two-step process:

- In the first step, housing need is allocated to the housing market area level (North County and the South Coast), giving weight to three statutory factors: existing jobs (80 percent), job growth (10 percent) and household growth (10 percent).
- In the second step, housing need is allocated from the market area level to the jurisdiction level based on existing, available residential land use capacity. In this manner, the methodology addresses important planning factors by market area and results in an allocation within the existing overall residential land use capacity of each jurisdiction.

By heavily weighting existing jobs, this RHNA methodology focuses on the existing jobs/housing imbalance and favors a housing allocation to the South Coast market area, where most existing jobs in the region are located. SBCAG is required to assign the allocations to each jurisdiction according to four household income levels (very low, low, moderate and above moderate). Distribution of units by income level adjusts the proportion of low and very-low income groups in each jurisdiction so that every jurisdiction is allocated its fair share of affordable housing. Table 14 below shows the resulting housing needs allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14: Regional Housing Need Allocation 2014-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Coast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Ynez Valley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lompoc Valley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Maria Valley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG 2012 Regional Housing Need Allocation

SB 375 requires the SCS to “identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to (Government Code) Section 65584.” The SCS preferred scenario meets this requirement and supplies enough residential housing capacity by jurisdiction to accommodate the eight-year housing need of 11,030 units projected for the 2014-2022 period for the SBCAG region. Available housing capacity in each SBCAG member jurisdiction in the SCS preferred scenario appears to be adequate to accommodate each jurisdiction’s respective share of housing need as allocated by SBCAG’s adopted RHNA methodology. Available residential capacity in each jurisdiction is thus sufficient to accommodate at minimum that jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need and SBCAG’s RHNA allocation plan allocates housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern of the RTP-SCS.

The UPlan land use capacities shown in Table 15 represent the theoretical maximum residential capacity available based on generalized UPlan land use categories and assumed land uses within the SBCAG land

\[120\] Gov. C. § 65080(b)(2)(B)(iii).
use model for the RTP-SCS preferred scenario. The capacities shown do not necessarily reflect actual available capacity in adopted local General Plans. Adopted General Plans, not the RTP-SCS, determine allowable land uses and actual available land use capacity in each jurisdiction.

Whether, when and how to implement the RTP-SCS preferred scenario is solely up to each SBCAG member jurisdiction to decide through its local land use planning process. Land uses assumed in the RTP-SCS preferred scenario do not represent a commitment or intention by any SBCAG member jurisdictions to implement them. Table 15 also shows the correspondence between modeled land use capacities for the preferred scenario and identified housing need by jurisdiction, including very low and low income categories.

SBCAG’s adopted RHNA methodology was explicitly crafted to address the State’s housing goals. Because the SCS is consistent with the allocation of housing units under the RHNA plan, the SCS also meets the State housing goals articulated in State housing law.

Table 15: RHNA Housing Need vs. UPlan Land Use Capacity – Preferred Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>UPlan Land Use Capacity</th>
<th>RHNA Housing Need</th>
<th>UPlan Land Use Capacity Minus RHNA Housing Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 DU/Acre Only</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>20 DU/Acre Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>24,693</td>
<td>29,492</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>14,723</td>
<td>14,953</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley M.A.</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>3,868</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc Valley M.A.</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>9,047</td>
<td>6,199</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Valley M.A.</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Total</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>13,932</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>41,387</td>
<td>62,302</td>
<td>4,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG 2012 Regional Housing Need Allocation, UPlan Land Use Model
Land Use Strategies and Policies

Strategies
Fast Forward 2040 starts with land uses allowed by existing, adopted local General Plans. The preferred scenario then proposes selective intensification of residential and commercial land uses in urban areas proximate to existing transit. Within the preferred scenario, forecast population growth is distributed consistent with the assumed pattern of allowable land uses.

The preferred scenario is a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)/Infill plan in that it strives to accommodate future growth within existing urban areas along transit corridors. The intent of these proposed changes is to shorten trip distances and reduce vehicle miles traveled and emissions by

1. directly addressing regional jobs/housing imbalance by providing more housing on the jobs-rich South Coast and more jobs in bedroom communities in the North County, and
2. promoting more trips, both local and inter-city, by alternative transportation modes, especially public transit.

As required by SB 375, allowable land uses in the preferred scenario are adequate to accommodate all forecast population, household and employment growth and to meet identified housing need.

Land use change assumptions shown in this scenario have been made based on the location of existing transit routes and service, as well as SBCAG member agency planning staff input, consistent with local planning updates of government plans. The preferred scenario shifts more housing growth to the South County to rely more heavily on transit and address jobs/housing imbalance in infill areas over time. To a large degree, existing General Plans and the long-range land use planning of SBCAG member jurisdictions are already in line with this regional vision for growth. In that sense, Fast Forward 2040 is the beneficiary of a considerable body of far-sighted planning work at the local level.

Policies
Policies within Fast Forward 2040 (Chapter 2) are intended to support the regional vision outlined in the preferred scenario and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. In particular, Policy 1.1 emphasizes the coordination of transportation and land use planning and encourages local agencies to:

- Make land use decisions that adequately address regional transportation issues and are consistent with the RTP-SCS.
- Promote better balance of jobs and housing to reduce long-distance commuting by means of traditional land use zoning, infill development\(^{121}\), and other, unconventional land use tools, such as employer-sponsored housing programs, economic development programs, commercial growth management ordinances, average unit size ordinances and parking pricing policies.
- Plan for transit-oriented development consistent with the RTP-SCS by:
  - concentrating residences and commercial centers in urban areas near rail stations, transit centers and along transit development corridors.
  - designing and building “complete streets” serving all transportation modes that connect high-usage origins and destinations.
- Preserve open space, agricultural land and sensitive biological areas.
- Identify, minimize and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and, in particular, require mitigation of traffic impacts of new land development through on-site and related off-site improvements for all

\(^{121}\) It is important to note that sensitive land uses should not be sited within 500 feet of US 101, based on guidance from the California Air Resources Board.
modes of transportation, including incentives to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.

**Transit and Land Use**

The preferred scenario focuses new growth in an urban infill pattern oriented around transit service. For future development meeting the definition of “transit priority project,” Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) contemplates and provides for streamlined environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To qualify for this streamlined review, projects must meet certain residential densities and be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in the RTP. A “major transit stop” is defined in relevant part as “a site containing an existing rail transit station…or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.” A “high quality transit corridor” is a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes per peak commute hour. In addition to meeting proximity to transit and other criteria, transit priority projects must provide a minimum net residential density of 20 units per acre.

**Transit Priority Areas and High-Quality Transit Corridors**

Only a few areas in the City of Santa Barbara, City of Goleta, and the unincorporated County have both the required bus headways, rail stations, and residential densities to qualify as planning and transit priority areas under the preferred scenario. Figure 77 identifies these locations. Provided they meet all other requirements, projects with the minimum residential densities within these areas can qualify as “transit priority projects” as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21155(b) that would be eligible for streamlined environmental review under CEQA.

With the intention of informing future development and transit investment, and with an eye to future application of Senate Bill 375’s CEQA streamlining provisions, Fast Forward 2040 also designates certain areas possessing the requisite residential densities, but not yet the minimum transit frequencies, as future planning and transit priority areas. At such time as future transit enhancements increase bus frequencies sufficiently along these routes to meet the definition of “major transit stop” or “high-quality transit corridor” and requisite, additional programmatic environmental review has been completed, these areas would also eligible for consideration as planning and transit priority areas. Areas within the vicinity of rail stations meet the definition of transit priority areas and improvements to rail services will not result in changes.

Figure 78 through Figure 80 identify future planning and transit priority areas.
Figure 77: Existing Transit Priority Areas
Figure 78: Future Transit Priority Areas – South Coast Region
Figure 79: Future Transit Priority Areas – Santa Maria Region
Figure 80: Future Transit Priority Areas – Lompoc Region
Existing Land Use

Existing land uses and resource areas were integrated into the RTP-SCS in various forms compiled in geographic data that acted as constraints future growth during SCS scenario development. The SCS preferred scenario focuses new development in existing urbanized infill locations avoiding resource areas identified in a Regional Greenprint. The RTP-SCS accounts for existing county land uses including the significant proportion of its land area that is in undeveloped national forest lands, federally-owned or in agricultural uses. The RTP-SCS accounts for the land uses of the eight incorporated cities, five Supervisorial Districts with their eleven unincorporated area community plans.

Existing Development Patterns

Approximately 46 percent or 751,180 acres of the total 1,633,000 acres countywide is federally owned in the jurisdiction of either the Los Padres National Forest or Vandenberg Air Force Base. State or local government and conservancy-owned lands constitute approximately 3 percent. Privately owned land represents 51 percent of the total and approximately 47 percent of the privately owned land is in some form of agricultural zoning. A number of government agencies are represented in Santa Barbara County on the local government level. Figure 81 provides an inventory of the most significant sub-regions and the respective responsible government agencies.

Figure 81: Santa Barbara County Land Status

Source: County of Santa Barbara, Long Range Planning Division, 2010
Local Governments
Santa Barbara County is home to eight, incorporated cities (from north to south: Guadalupe, Santa Maria, Lompoc, Buellton, Solvang, Goleta, Santa Barbara and Carpinteria), in addition to the County itself.

As required by law, each city in the Santa Barbara region, as well as the unincorporated County, has a general plan containing at minimum seven statutorily required elements, among them a land use element and housing element that designate appropriate land uses throughout the jurisdiction, accommodate each jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need and define specific goals, policies, and objectives that the local jurisdiction has determined to be important.

A city or county may also provide for land use planning by developing community or specific plans for smaller, more specific areas within its jurisdiction. These more localized plans provide for focused guidance for developing a specific area, with development standards tailored to the area, as well as systematic implementation of the general plan. The County of Santa Barbara, and the Cities of Santa Maria and Santa Barbara have numerous community and sub-regional plans. Santa Barbara County has a total of eleven community plans for areas including Los Alamos, Orcutt, Cuyama, Santa Ynez, Montecito, Summerland, Toro Canyon, Mission Canyon, Isla Vista, Eastern Goleta Valley, and the Gaviota Coast. The County of Santa Barbara unincorporated area is divided into five Supervisorial Districts with similar population sizes of approximately 85,000 persons.

Each incorporated city has both existing city limits and a designated sphere of influence that determines a plan for the probable, future physical boundaries and service area of the local government. It defines the primary area within which urban development is to be encouraged and serves as an essential planning tool to combat urban sprawl and provide well-planned, efficient urban development patterns, giving appropriate consideration to preserving prime agricultural and other open space lands. The Cities of Santa Maria and Santa Barbara have spheres of influence outside their city limits, while the remaining jurisdictions spheres are coterminous to their city limits.

Los Padres National Forest
The primary segment of the Los Padres National Forest includes lands within San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura and Kern Counties, with a small extension into Los Angeles County.

Tribal Government
The Santa Barbara County region is home to one Native American reservation for the Chumash Tribe, represented by its tribal government. As land use authorities, tribal governments have sovereignty to determine appropriate land uses on their reservations. The Chumash Reservation is located in the Santa Ynez Valley adjacent to Highway 246.

Vandenberg Air Force Base
Santa Barbara County’s location on the Pacific Ocean makes it a strategic location for certain military operations, including missile launch testing and training. Santa Barbara’s military installation, Vandenberg Air Force Base, is one of the region’s largest employers and is located in a coastal location near the City of Lompoc.

University of California, Santa Barbara
The main campus of the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) consists of 1,054 acres west of the City of Goleta, located on a coastal bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean. In addition to the main
campus, UCSB has various, extensive property holdings surrounding the community of Isla Vista. As one of the country’s premier research and teaching institutions with over 20,000 students and 6,500 degrees conferred each year, UCSB makes a significant contribution to the cultural and academic life of the region and is also the region’s largest employer. The University’s approximately $1 billion economic contribution to the regional economy accounts for 5.3 percent of all Santa Barbara County economic activity, making it one of the county’s single biggest economic influences.

Urbanized Areas-Urban Clusters
The 2010 Census defines urban areas as a densely settled core of census tracts and/or census blocks that meet minimum population density requirements of at least 1,000 people per square mile. The Census Bureau identifies two types of urban areas: Urbanized Areas of 50,000 or more people and Urban Clusters of at least 2,500 and less than 50,000 people. “Rural” encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within an urban area.

- The 2010 Santa Barbara County urban area population total is 402,799.
- The 2010 Santa Barbara County rural population total is 21,096.
- The population of Urbanized Areas in Santa Barbara County in 2010 is:
  - Santa Barbara 195,861
  - Santa Maria 130,447
  - Lompoc 51,508
- The population of Urban Clusters is:
  - Solvang-Buellton-Santa Ynez 14,862
  - Guadalupe 7,080
  - Vandenberg AFB 3,047

The following figures depict the boundaries of the urban areas in Santa Barbara County.

Figure 82: South Coast Urban Areas

Source: Census 2010

---

Land Use Model Categories

The following summary table of generalized land use categories from the SBCAG regional land use model shows that open space, public lands, and agriculture combined are by far the most prevalent land uses in the region, comprising approximately 86 percent or 1.5 million acres of the County-wide total land area of 1.6 million acres, followed by the Vandenberg Air Force Base military category with 6 percent or 100,400 acres. With its principal purpose of scenario modeling to accommodate forecast growth, the SBCAG regional land use model focuses principally on commercial, residential and industrial land uses. Of the urban land use categories, low-density residential has the largest proportion, with 1.3 percent or 23,000 acres.

Source: Census 2010
### Table 16: Summary of Generalized Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Land Use Category</th>
<th>AREA (Acres)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Public Lands/Open Space</td>
<td>1,457,658</td>
<td>85.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Commercial</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density residential</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low density residential</td>
<td>22,803</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density residential</td>
<td>15,306</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>100,399</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Uses High Density Commercial &amp; High Density Residential</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Uses Industry &amp; High Density Residential</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Uses Low Density Commercial &amp; High Density Residential</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Uses Low Density Commercial &amp; Low Density Residential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Uses Low Density Commercial &amp; Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed uses</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lands &amp; open space</td>
<td>70,872</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation Casino</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Corridor</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Services</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low density residential</td>
<td>8,615</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Commercial</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,701,238</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UPlan land use model, 2016*

### Protected Lands

Existing land uses include a range of protected lands, such as open space, habitat, farmland and other resource areas. These resource areas were compiled in geographic data as a “Regional Greenprint” and act as constraints to development of land within the Fast Forward 2040 land use assumptions. The SCS preferred scenario focuses new development in infill locations in existing urbanized areas, avoiding resource areas identified in the Regional Greenprint.

---

123 The UPlan model limits land use classifications to the generic categories listed in the table.

124 The Land Trust of Santa Barbara County is preparing a Conservation Blueprint that could help provide additional information important for a coordinate regional approach to mitigation that supports regional conservation priorities, as well as open space and agriculture priorities.
The regional-scale figures that follow illustrate the general locations of resources such as protected, sensitive or special status species areas, open space and conservation areas, and farmlands included the Regional Green-print. The RTP-SCS policies make explicit the commitment to protecting these resource areas and avoiding the location of future growth in these resource areas. To limit the complexity of the following maps, additional geographic information included in the Green-print analysis are not separately shown. Some of the additional information includes lands subject to conservation and the Williamson Act, areas designated by the State Mining and Geology Board as areas of statewide significance, habitat connectivity areas, and the National Wetlands Inventory for vernal pools and floodplains.

Agriculture Lands
For scenario modeling purposes, agricultural land is “farmland” as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01(b). The farmland categories are developed from the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. This program is based on modern soil surveys developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which employ a soil classification system that combines technical soil ratings and current land use as the basis for farmland maps. The categories are defined as follows:

- **Prime Farmland**: The best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long term agricultural production and produce sustained high yields.
- **Farmland of Statewide Importance**: Similar to Prime Farmland but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture.
- **Unique Farmland**: Lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops and may include non-irrigated orchards.
- **Farmland of Local Importance**: Importance to the local county’s or cities’ agricultural economy as determined by each county's local advisory committee and adopted by its Board of Supervisors.
- **Grazing Land**: The existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock.

Natural Resource Areas
The natural resource areas represent plant and animal habitat from California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). The CNDDB is part of a nation-wide network of similar programs overseen by NatureServe (formerly part of The Nature Conservancy) that provide location and natural history information on special status plants, animals, and natural communities. Also shown is sensitive habitat in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Overlays and Riparian Corridor Overlays adopted by the County of Santa Barbara as part of the General Plan.

Open Space
The open space and conservation areas represent the Protected Areas Database developed by the U.S. Geological Service (PAD-US) and include lands held in ownership for permanent or long-term open space use. These include national parks and forests, public lands, State and local parks and reserves, lands held by non-profit organizations, conservation easements and many other areas. The Protected Areas Database was developed with aggregated datasets from the Bureau of Land Management, the GreenInfo Network and The Nature Conservancy. Other federal, state, local, non-governmental organizations and land trusts provided data that was more limited in scope.
Figure 84: Agricultural Categories

Source: California State Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2014

Figure 85: Natural Resource Areas

Source: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Plant and Animal Habitat, California Natural Diversity Database. Sensitive Habitat is a representation of the Board of Supervisors adopted Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Riparian Corridor overlays.
Figure 86: South Coast Open Space and Conservation Areas

Source: US Geological Service, Protected Areas Database (PAD-US), May 2016

Figure 87: Gaviota Coast and North County Open Space and Conservation Areas

Source: US Geological Service, Protected Areas Database (PAD-US), May 2016
SBCAG’s Sustainable Communities Strategy

**Developing the SCS**

To ensure opportunity for meaningful input and involvement in the development of the RTP-SCS and to meet the requirements of state law, SBCAG adopted a Public Participation Plan specific to the RTP-SCS process in September 2015. The SBCAG public participation process for development of Fast Forward 2040 consists of three outreach phases: (1) RTP-SCS Scoping and Goal-Setting, (2) Alternative Transportation / Land Use Scenarios, and (3) Draft RTP-SCS and Preferred Transportation / Land Use Scenario Adoption. The outreach begins with a wide scope and narrows throughout the development of the RTP-SCS until plan adoption, as shown in the figure below.

*Figure 88: Phases of the 2040 RTP-SCS Public Participation Process*

The first phase focuses on direct stakeholder outreach to seek input on the scope of alternative scenarios to be considered in the planning process. Past experience has shown direct outreach to be an effective method for encouraging meaningful participation and input. SBCAG staff met with numerous groups, both public sector and private sector organizations, as part of the key stakeholder meetings during this first phase of the public participation process.

During the second phase of the public participation process, SBCAG held two public workshops (one each in North and South County) to report the preliminary results of the alternative land use and transportation scenario modeling and obtain stakeholder feedback.

The third phase of the public participation process is to allow public comment meeting on the draft RTP-SCS and draft environmental document through two noticed public meetings before the SBCAG Board of Directors. As provide by the Public Participation Plan and state law, there was a 45-day public comment
period for the draft RTP-SCS and supplemental EIR in addition to the 55-day comment period on the draft SCS.

As for the previous planning cycle, the process of RTP-SCS development was guided by a Joint Technical Advisory Committee (JTAC), composed of members of the SBCAG Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC), made up of public works directors or other senior engineering staff from the county, cities, and transit agencies, and the SBCAG Technical Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC), made up of planning directors or other senior planning staff from the county, cities, and transit agencies. This advisory committee provided invaluable input and direction into the formulation of RTP-SCS.

Development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy involved the study of eight separate land use and transportation scenarios, each analyzing different combinations of land use and transportation variables. The preferred scenario was selected from these scenario options on the basis of scenario performance as quantified by the adopted performance measures tied to the overall Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP-SCS) goals. All scenarios applied the same region-wide population, employment and housing projections from the 2012 SBCAG Regional Growth Forecast. Sub-regional distribution of forecast population growth varies by scenario consistent with allowable land uses, residential land use capacity and policy assumptions.

1. **Future Baseline.** The future baseline scenario shows forecast population growth distributed in accordance with land uses allowed by existing local General Plans, assuming current sub-regional growth trends continue (which show population growth occurring predominantly in the North County and City of Santa Maria). It includes all programmed and planned Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) transportation projects.

   The future baseline scenario is essentially a “business as usual” scenario, which assumes the following:
   - Existing, adopted General Plan land uses,
   - Construction of programmed and planned RTP projects.

   The future baseline uses the UPlan land use model to distribute the regional population, household and jobs projected by the 2012 Regional Growth Forecast (RGF) in 2020, 2035 and 2040 to allowable adopted land uses in all jurisdictions throughout the region. Distribution of population, households, and jobs to the sub-regional level matches the RGF allocation.

   The future baseline scenario is the starting point for delineation of other alternative scenarios which are considered in the RTP-SCS and is the primary basis for comparison of other scenarios.

2. **No Project.** This scenario is identical to the future baseline, but omits any new RTP projects, except already programmed projects.

3. **Transit-Oriented Development/Infill.** By selectively increasing residential and commercial land use capacity within existing transit corridors, this scenario tests land use changes that shift a greater share of future growth to these corridors. Land use change assumptions shown were made based on location of existing transit routes and service in consultation with SBCAG member agencies. Assumed changes in land use capacity reflect local planning discussions about possible future land use and General Plan and Community Plan updates presently under discussion at the local level. Similar to Scenario 6, future growth distribution directly addresses jobs/housing balance issues by emphasizing job
growth in the North County and housing growth in the South County. The scenario includes all new programmed and planned RTP projects, including limited new bus transit service, as modeled in Scenario 1.

4. **Urban Area Expansion.** Growth occurs in this scenario on land made available at the urban fringe in a low-density pattern. In lieu of new infill areas, development occurs on land contiguous with and adjacent to the urban edge. Delineation of this scenario was based on local agency input, with reference in many instances to land use changes proposed in the past. Programmed and planned RTP projects are included.

5. **Blended Infill/Expansion.** This scenario is a hybrid scenario which combines the land use elements of both the TOD/Infill and Urban Area Expansion scenarios (Scenarios 3 and 4). Growth distribution occurs based on increased residential and commercial land use capacity both in core urban areas along transit lines as in Scenario 3 and at the urban edge as for Scenario 4. The same programmed and planned RTP projects are included as for Scenarios 3 and 4.

6. **North County-weighted Jobs, South County-weighted Housing Emphasis.** This scenario begins with existing, adopted land uses, but applies model weightings to make specific growth distribution assumptions emphasizing job growth in the North County and housing growth in the South County, within existing available land use capacity. Unlike the future baseline scenario, it does not continue past growth trends. Unlike Scenario 3, growth is distributed consistent with land uses designations in adopted General Plans and the distribution places no explicit emphasis on TOD or infill. Infill occurs, but only to the degree that locally adopted land use designations allow.

7. **TOD/Infill + Enhanced Transit.** Based on the land use pattern from the TOD/Infill scenario, this scenario enhances transit by maximizing alternative mode projects using all available flexible funding sources for transit and assuming possible new funding sources for transit. It makes specific transit enhancements, generally doubles bus frequencies along existing local and intercity transit routes during peak periods and selectively adds new routes.

8. **Historic Commute Trend Continued.** A variation on the future baseline Scenario 1, this scenario changes the in-commuting assumption so that net in-commuting doubles over twenty years, continuing the historic growth in in-commuting.

Four of the scenarios studied (Scenarios 3, 5, 6 and 7) meet the minimum requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) with respect to greenhouse gas emission targets and were potentially eligible for consideration as the preferred scenario in the RTP-SCS. Each of these four scenarios meets SBCAG’s greenhouse gas emission target of zero net growth in per capita emissions from passenger vehicles in for 2020 and 2035. However, because Scenario 7 considers expansion of transit beyond resources anticipated to be reasonably available, it is not fiscally constrained and therefore not eligible.

**SB 375 GHG Reduction Targets**

Fast Forward 2040’s forecasted development pattern for the region, when integrated with the transportation network and policies, achieves the California Air Resources Board (ARB) target for reduction of GHG emissions from passenger vehicles for both target years 2020 and 2035.\(^{125}\) In 2010,

based on SBCAG’s recommendation, the ARB set a SB 375 target for SBCAG of zero growth in per capita GHG emissions from passenger vehicles through the years 2020 and 2035. SBCAG focused on the achievement of this target as a threshold requirement in the analysis of alternative scenarios studied for the RTP-SCS. For the preferred scenario, GHG emissions per capita from passenger vehicles are expected to decrease to 16.28 pounds per day in 2020 and 15.44 pounds per day in 2035 from 2005 base year per capita emissions of 18.77 pounds per day, a reduction of 13.3 percent in 2020 and 17.7 percent in 2035.126 This expected reduction causes the preferred scenario to perform substantially better than both the zero growth target set by the ARB and the future baseline scenario (which meets the ARB target in the year 2020, but does not by the horizon year 2035). ARB is currently in the process of updating the SB 375 GHG targets. Updated targets will apply to the next iteration of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, due in 2021.

Technical Methodology
During spring 2015, SBCAG prepared an updated memorandum describing the technical methodology to be used to estimate greenhouse gas emissions in the Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy update. The technical methodology was reviewed by SBCAG’s Technical Planning Advisory Committee and was subsequently forwarded on to the California Air Resources Board staff liaison in June 2015. This technical methodology was revised in response to ARB comments and resubmitted in June 2016. The final technical methodology is included in Appendix 3. In developing and analyzing alternative land use and transportation scenarios, staff followed this technical methodology.

To meet the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) to plan and program transportation investments while taking land use and growth into account, SBCAG relied on its multi-modal computer regional travel demand model and an integrated land use modeling capability. Together, the land use and travel models allowed the study and analysis of a range of alternative land use and transportation scenarios to determine transportation system performance for any set of land use and transportation assumptions. Following certain post-processing steps (e.g., base year back-casting and integration of external trip calculations), travel model outputs were further converted into air quality measures using a third model, the California Air Resources Board 2014 Emissions Factors model (EMFAC).

Following definition in the UPlan land use model and analysis using the TransCAD travel demand model and EMFAC air quality model, alternative land use and transportation scenarios were evaluated to determine their performance against the RTP-SCS performance measures discussed in Chapter 2. Since performance measures are tied to the RTP-SCS goals, scenario performance indicates how well given scenarios perform with respect to the RTP-SCS goals and objectives.

To evaluate the scenarios studied, the performance of modeled scenarios for each target year (2020, 2035 and 2040) is compared with the base year and the future baseline year. As a threshold determination, scenarios studied had to meet the SB 375 GHG emission targets in order to be viable as candidates for consideration as the preferred RTP-SCS scenario. To determine compliance with the SB 375 GHG emission targets, per capita GHG passenger vehicle emissions for each scenario and target year were compared with the 2005 base year emissions. Only those scenarios meeting at minimum the SBCAG regional GHG target of zero net increase in per capita GHG emissions from base year emissions

126 The conclusions stated in this chapter are based only on the effects of the RTP-SCS land use and transportation scenario as required by SB 375 and does not include the effects of other State measures, such as the Pavley and Low Carbon Fuel Standards.
were qualified for further consideration. Ultimately, with decision-maker input and feedback from public outreach, the preferred scenario was selected by the SBCAG Board from among the range of scenarios meeting the GHG target, taking into account scenario performance across a range of performance measures.

Of note, the technical methodology employed does not account for the possible effects of emerging transportation technologies, such as autonomous and connected vehicles and autonomous shared ride services. Although certain of these new technologies hold out the promise of vastly improved transportation system performance, the rate and scope of the market penetration of these new technologies, as well as of their actual effect on system performance in practice, are still too uncertain to model reliably.

**Elements of the Preferred Scenario**

The preferred scenario comprises three core, inter-related components: (1) a land use plan, including residential densities and building intensities sufficient to accommodate projected population, household and employment growth; (2) a multi-modal transportation network to serve the region’s transportation needs; and (3) a “regional greenprint” cataloguing open space, habitat, farmland and other resource areas as constraints to urban development.

**Land Use**

Central to the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is a land use plan identifying the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region. Starting with land uses allowed by existing, adopted local General Plans, the land use plan selectively provides for intensification of residential and commercial land uses in urban areas proximate to existing transit. The intent of these changes is ultimately to shorten trip distances and reduce vehicle miles traveled by (1) directly addressing regional jobs/housing imbalance by providing more housing on the jobs-rich South Coast and more jobs in bedroom communities in the North County, and (2) promoting more trips, both local and inter-city, by alternative transportation modes, especially public transit.

Allowable land uses in the preferred scenario are adequate to accommodate forecast population, household and employment growth and to meet identified housing need. For the preferred scenario, forecast population growth is distributed consistent with this pattern of allowable land uses.

**Existing General Plans**

The preferred scenario starts with land uses allowable under the adopted General Plans of each SBCAG member jurisdiction. SBCAG used the generalized land use categories of the UPlan model to replicate existing, allowable land uses for all jurisdictions. These existing, allowable land uses are the basis for the future baseline and no project scenarios and the starting point for development of the other scenarios.

**Assumed Land Use Changes**

The preferred scenario assumes selected changes to the land uses allowable under adopted General Plans to promote infill and transit-oriented development along existing transit routes within certain urbanized areas. These assumed changes were developed in close coordination with the planning staff of affected jurisdictions. In these core areas, residential and/or commercial densities are increased within close proximity to transit in order to facilitate transit, bike and walking trips. Specific sites or areas for suggested intensification were chosen in consultation with local agency planning staff based on plans in

---

process and land use changes that might realistically be contemplated. However, because the SCS is a regional plan, what is important to the functioning of the plan is the overall pattern of land use relative to the transportation system, rather than individual sites. In accommodating future growth, the Fast Forward 2040 preferred scenario is consistent with local agencies’ adopted General Plans and relies principally on available land use capacity in these plans. Intensifications of land use along transit corridors are consistent with local draft plan updates currently under discussion and local planning department input.

City of Santa Maria
In the City of Santa Maria, the preferred scenario increases residential densities chiefly along Broadway and Main Street, two key arterials in the city presently served by transit. Existing land uses along these two streets are changed from high density commercial to a mixed use designation that allows for either high density commercial or high density residential use (or both). With this change, residential densities are able to be developed at 20 units per acre (high density residential within UPlan), together with high density commercial uses.

City of Lompoc
The SCS intensifies residential and commercial densities in the City of Lompoc along H Street and Ocean Avenue, two major streets served by transit within the city. Existing land uses along these two streets are changed from medium density residential and high density commercial to a mixed use designation that allows for either high density commercial or high density residential use (or both). With these changes, residential densities increase from 5 units per acre to 20 units per acre, together with high density commercial uses.

South Coast
On the South Coast, selective intensification of land uses is proposed within the City of Goleta and the unincorporated Goleta area at Hollister Avenue intersections with Turnpike, Patterson, and other select locations. Proposed land use intensification would also occur further east, near the intersection of State Street and Modoc.

The following figures show proposed land use changes throughout the region under the preferred scenario. For reference, proposed land use changes are highlighted with a bold black line and hatching, as seen in the legend below:
Figure 89: Proposed Land Use Changes – Goleta Area
Figure 90: Proposed Land Use Changes – Lompoc Area
Figure 91: Proposed Land Use Changes – Santa Maria Area
Accommodating Forecast Growth

In Fast Forward 2040, sufficient land use capacity is made available within the land use model environment to accommodate all growth in population, households and employment projected in the Regional Growth Forecast (RGF). The discussion above describes future growth predicted by the RGF in detail. The preferred scenario identifies areas within the region sufficient to house all the forecast population of the region to the plan horizon year as well as identified housing need.\textsuperscript{128} The UPlan land use model distributes RGF County-wide population growth consistent with allowable residential land use capacities, as modified in the SCS. Similarly, the land use model distributes predicted employment growth across the region consistent with commercial land use capacities. The UPlan land use model takes into account all lands within the region, including SBCAG local agencies and other entities outside of SBCAG member agency land use authority, such as UCSB, that provide jobs or housing. Specifically, the UPlan land use model, coupled with special generators input into the RTDM, begin with a starting population of 423,800 in 2010. Based on and consistent with the RGF, it accommodates forecast population growth of 10,986 people to a total population of 445,981 by 2020, 83,682 people (for a population of 507,482) by 2035 and 96,165 people (to a total population of 519,965) by 2040.

Table 17 shows the correspondence between modeled land use capacity for the preferred scenario and the forecast population growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>UPlan Land Use Capacity</th>
<th>RGF Forecast Household Growth</th>
<th>UPlan Land Use Capacity Minus RGF Household Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>29,492</td>
<td>17,790</td>
<td>11,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>14,953</td>
<td>9,139</td>
<td>5,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>5,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley M.A.</td>
<td>3,868</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>2,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc Valley M.A.</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>6,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>6,199</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>5,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Valley M.A.</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>9,505</td>
<td>11,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>8,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Total</td>
<td>13,932</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>10,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>62,302</td>
<td>29,660</td>
<td>32,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG 2012 Regional Growth Forecast, UPlan Land Use Model

Distribution of population and employment in the preferred scenario is shown in Table 18. This same distribution is displayed graphically as pie charts in Figure 92 and Figure 93. Figure 94 through

\textsuperscript{128} See Gov. C. § 65080(b)(2)(B)(ii).
Figure 97 show sub-regional household distribution geographically. Although County-wide growth totals are equal across the preferred scenario, the future baseline and all other scenarios studied, the sub-regional distribution of growth differs between the future baseline, the preferred scenario that forms the basis of the SCS and other scenarios studied according to assumed land use pattern and other assumptions. The SCS seeks to address the jobs/housing balance directly by allotting more jobs to the North County and more housing to the South Coast.

### Table 18: 2010-2040 Household and Jobs Distribution – Preferred Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buellton</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lompoc</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7,908</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>8,298</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>33,362</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,626</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,981</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 92: 2010-2040 Household Distribution – Preferred Scenario**

![Figure 92: 2010-2040 Household Distribution – Preferred Scenario](image-url)
Figure 93: 2010-2040 Jobs Distribution – Preferred Scenario
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Figure 94: 2010-2040 Household Distribution – Preferred Scenario – South Coast Region
**Figure 95: 2010-2040 Household Distribution – Preferred Scenario – Santa Maria Valley**
Figure 96: 2010-2040 Household Distribution – Preferred Scenario – Lompoc Region
Figure 97: 2010-2040 Household Distribution – Preferred Scenario – Santa Ynez Valley
Transportation

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) requires SBCAG to identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region. The Fast Forward 2040 preferred scenario models the regional transportation network, including all of the fiscally constrained programmed and planned projects listed and addressed in detail in Chapter 3 and Appendix 2. The SBCAG regional travel model incorporates a truly multi-modal network, including not only roads and highways, but also the transit system and bike routes as well as walking trips.

Fast Forward 2040 takes a performance-based approach to modeling and understanding diverse types of transportation investments. With this focus, a broad range of elements comprise the transportation system and investments in the RTP-SCS:

- maintenance and rehabilitation of existing and future facilities;
- operation and strategic expansion of public transit;
- strategic road and highway expansion and operational improvements that focus on alleviating major bottlenecks and congestion points;
- bicycle and pedestrian retrofits and new facilities; and
- programs and planning (e.g., programs and transportation system management strategies, including technology and demand management programs, which allow for greater optimization of existing transportation infrastructure).

The specific projects and improvements included in the RTP-SCS are listed and addressed in detail in Chapter 3 and Appendix 2.

Any transportation project not specifically exempted by SB 375 (especially projects programmed on or before December 31, 2011 contained in the State Transportation Implementation Program (STIP) or specifically listed in a local sales tax ballot measure, such as Measure A) may be considered for modification or re-prioritization. Hence, inclusion of all projects on the programmed and planned lists that are not funded by Measure A or the STIP were subject to re-prioritization during the development of the RTP-SCS. However, modeling analysis indicates that individual, non-exempt programmed and planned projects have only minimal effects on scenario performance, except with respect to congestion and delay. Also, as discussed in Chapter 5, limitations on some funding sources restrict how funding may be applied and therefore also limit project re-prioritization to some degree. For example, federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds under the FAST Act can be applied to highway and bridge projects on public roads, as well as transit capital projects, but not to transit operation.

Enhanced Transit Strategy

In addition to the other components of Scenario 3, the preferred scenario includes an enhanced transit strategy that creates a framework for future transit service expansion at such time as new revenue sources may become available. Similar to Scenario 7, this scenario would include both land use components and enhanced transit components beyond those listed in the programmed and planned projects list. However, different from Scenario 7, it would not make a blanket commitment to specific transit enhancements based on speculative future funding. Instead, recognizing the uncertain nature of future, new revenue sources, it takes a targeted, balanced and flexible approach to expanding transit service as needed in the future. Specifically, the enhanced transit strategy included in the preferred scenario commits to transit service expansion as new revenue sources become available (1) when transit enhancements are actually needed (defining quantitative triggers to determine when such need exists) and (2) while protecting existing funding for competing local
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demands, such as street and road maintenance. Because it is a general strategy, it does not change the list of fiscally constrained, programmed and planned transportation projects. There is, however, roughly $204 million of forecasted revenue over the life of the plan expected to be available for implementing the enhanced transit strategy. The enhanced strategy is an important component of the SCS and SBCAG will take a proactive approach in its implementation.

**Protected Areas**

As discussed earlier in this chapter (see Figures 84 - 87), development of Fast Forward 2040 involved compilation and consideration of information regarding open space, habitat, farmland and other resource areas as defined by Gov. Code Section 65080.1 in a “Regional Greenprint,” which act as constraints to development within Fast Forward 2040’s land use assumptions. The SCS preferred scenario focuses new development in infill locations in existing urbanized areas, avoiding resource areas identified in the Regional Greenprint.

The RTP-SCS policies (see Chapter 2) make explicit the commitment to protecting these resource areas and avoiding the location of future growth in places that would encroach on them.

**Performance of the Preferred Scenario**

To evaluate alternative scenarios and guide selection of the preferred Fast Forward 2040 scenario, SBCAG applied performance measures related to the five, adopted goal areas outlined in Chapter 2: environment, mobility and system reliability, equity, health and safety, and a prosperous economy. These performance measures allowed quantification, comparison and evaluation of the effectiveness of the alternative land use and transportation scenario candidates in achieving the plan goals.

The preferred scenario ultimately selected by the SBCAG Board based on this information and public input best achieves the plan goals, performing well against virtually every performance measure in all five goal categories. The preferred scenario also performs substantially better across virtually all performance measures and goal areas than the future baseline scenario, which represents the forecast conditions that would apply if Fast Forward 2040 were not adopted.

Table 19 lists selected performance results for the preferred scenario for all five goal categories. The discussion below highlights certain of these performance measures for each goal area. Performance results for all of the Fast Forward 2040 scenarios considered (not including those scenarios that did not meet the minimum greenhouse gas reduction requirements of California Senate Bill 375), are included at the end of Appendix A3.

Although the preferred scenario would perform better than the future baseline scenario across most goal areas and measures, the preferred scenario still involves trade-offs. In particular, even while congestion improves overall system-wide, local congestion on the South Coast would be worse in 2040 under the preferred scenario than the future baseline scenario.

Daily congested vehicle miles traveled (CVMT) on the South Coast in 2040 would increase by 67 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario, compared to 92 percent for the preferred scenario, which is 15 percent higher than the future baseline scenario. Daily vehicle hours of delay (VHD) on the South Coast in 2040 would increase by 225 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario, compared to 291 percent for the preferred scenario, which is 20 percent higher than the future baseline scenario.

---

132 Note that ARB’s regional target-setting for SBCAG’s GHG emissions under SB 375 used a base year of 2005. For other performance measures not linked to the SB 375 target, a more recent base year of 2010 is shown.
baseline scenario. Similarly, daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on all South Coast area roadways would increase by 21 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario, compared to 26 percent for the preferred scenario, which is 4 percent higher than the future baseline scenario. Finally, daily vehicle hours traveled (VHT) on all South Coast area roadways would increase by 20 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario, compared to 26 percent for the preferred scenario, which is 5 percent higher than the future baseline scenario. \(^{133}\)

Conversely, daily congested vehicle miles traveled (CVMT) on all other non-South Coast roadways in 2040 would increase by 683 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario (2,072,110 vs 264,727), compared to 82 percent for the preferred scenario (482,664 vs 264,727), which is 77 percent lower than the future baseline scenario (482,664 vs 2,072,110). Daily vehicle hours of delay (VHD) on all other non-South Coast roadways in 2040 would increase by 155 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario (6,789 vs 2,660), compared to 32 percent for the preferred scenario (3,518 vs 2,660), which is 48 percent lower than the future baseline scenario (3,518 vs 6,789). Similarly, daily vehicle miles traveled on all other non-South Coast roadways would increase by 50 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario, compared to six percent for the preferred scenario (6,464,572 vs 6,074,769), which is 29 percent lower than the future baseline scenario (6,646,572 vs 9,110,985). Finally, daily vehicle hours traveled on all other non-South Coast roadways would increase by 45 percent from existing conditions under the future baseline scenario (181,918 vs 125,665), compared to eight percent for the preferred scenario (135,549 vs 125,665), which is 25 percent lower than the future baseline scenario (135,549 vs 181,918).

To some degree, increased congestion is inevitable because vehicle trips would increase by approximately 23 percent during the plan period, while road capacity increases only slightly. Total vehicle trips remain roughly constant across scenarios (1,617,138 for the future baseline scenario, 1,607,198 for the preferred scenario) and represent a jump from 2010 trips (1,307,525) [+24/+23 percent]. Meanwhile, the network supply (measured in lane miles) remains constant across scenarios and increases from 2010 by only 2.1 percent.

\(^{133}\) The System Performance section, later in this chapter, provides additional detail.
### Table 19: Performance Results – Preferred Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>GHG Emissions Per Capita (Lbs. per day)</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>-3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Alternative Transportation Trips (No School Bus)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Alternative Transportation Trips (Includes School Bus)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility &amp; System</td>
<td>Average Travel Distance (All Trips) [Miles]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Average Travel Time (All Trips) [Minutes]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Commute Time (Workers) [Minutes]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Transit Ridership</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34,414</td>
<td>4,041</td>
<td>42,720</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>44,044</td>
<td>9,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Accessibility (% of Jobs Within a High Quality</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Corridor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%) of Population Within a High Quality Transit Corridor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Drive-Alone Mode Share (All Trips)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>49.68</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Drive-Alone Mode Share (Workers)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>86.84</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>86.24</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Transit Accessibility for Low Incomes (% of Jobs Within</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>57.38</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>56.70</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a High Quality Transit Corridor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Accessibility for Low Incomes (% of Population</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>54.78</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>53.86</td>
<td>45.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within a High Quality Transit Corridor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Peak Trip Time for Low Income Communities</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Active Transportation Mode Share (%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosperous Economy</td>
<td>Net Cost Avoided (Money)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Travel Savings (Time) [Minutes] Per Capita</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Commuter Savings (Time) [Minutes]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model
The preferred scenario results in more congestion on the South Coast essentially because, in order to reduce vehicle miles traveled and vehicle emissions region-wide, it distributes more population growth to the South Coast than would occur under the future baseline scenario. (The future baseline scenario, by contrast, continues the trend of the past decade of population growth predominantly in the North County). As a result, the preferred scenario distribution also results in more local South Coast trips. South Coast congestion is an existing issue, and would worsen in the future even under the future baseline scenario.

Regardless, because of its important overall benefits, selection of the preferred scenario is justified, even despite increased local congestion in some areas. As a requirement of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) and a fundamental premise of the plan, the RTP-SCS must accommodate forecast future growth somehow. There is no perfect or easy solution to this challenge. The only viable approach to accommodating growth and simultaneously meeting SB 375 emission targets is an approach that relies on a land use solution that addresses jobs/housing balance using an infill approach within existing urban areas. In accommodating future growth, the RTP-SCS preferred scenario relies to a very large degree on available land use capacity in adopted General Plans and the foresighted, accumulated planning work at the local level. It varies from adopted plans only in ways that are consistent with local draft plans currently under discussion.

Ultimately, the preferred scenario balances competing considerations in a way that maximizes region-wide benefits and minimizes detrimental effects. Compared to the future baseline scenario in 2040, the preferred scenario:

- Reduces overall vehicle miles traveled by 19 percent, vehicle hours traveled by 16 percent, and average daily traffic (ADT) volumes by eight percent.
- Reduces overall congestion (as measured by congested vehicle miles traveled) by 35 percent compared to the future baseline scenario.
- Reduces average vehicle trip time by 11 percent and average vehicle commute time for workers by five percent.
- Saves residents and workers almost $500,000 annually in auto operating costs (a 19 percent reduction).
- Achieves an overall increase in transit accessibility (the percentage of population within a high quality transit corridor\textsuperscript{134}) of 24 percent, and nine percent overall from 2010.
- Achieves an increase in transit accessibility for low income populations (the percentage of low income population within a high quality transit corridor) of 81 percent, and 17 percent from 2010.
- Increases transit ridership by 10 percent (52,240 daily trips for the preferred scenario versus 47,450 for the future baseline), a 52 percent increase from 2010 numbers, and results in a seven percent increase in alternative trip (biking, walking, and transit) mode share.
- Apportions 73 percent of new housing growth to infill areas (compared to 23 percent in the future baseline scenario).
- Develops 4,165 fewer acres to accommodate growth (3,727 total acres for the preferred scenario versus 7,892 acres total for the future baseline scenario).

In addition, the preferred scenario results in:

- A reduction in per capita vehicle greenhouse gas emissions of 13.3 percent in 2020 and 17.7 percent in 2035.

\textsuperscript{134} Defined as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes per peak commute hour.
• A reduction in vehicle emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) by 11 percent in 2020 and 20 percent by 2035 and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions 10 percent by 2020 and 18 percent by 2035.

• A reduction in per capita on-road motor vehicle fuel consumption from 0.78 to 0.47 gallons per day.

The preferred scenario also includes an enhanced transit strategy, which may eventually help to reduce local congestion. At present, average travel time for transit (106 minutes) exceeds average travel time for vehicles (14 minutes) by a wide margin, so there is little incentive to switch to transit use even with doubling frequencies. Additional funding sources are needed to allow greater investment in transit under this strategy.

Environment
One of the goals set by SBCAG is to foster patterns of growth, development and transportation that protect natural resources and lead to a healthy environment. SBCAG has set various, more specific objectives, such as reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) and criteria pollutant emissions, encouraging affordable and workforce housing and mixed-use development within urban boundaries, and promoting transit use and alternative transportation. It also aims to reduce vehicle miles traveled and preserve open space and agricultural land.

Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions & Related Measures

Senate Bill 375 Greenhouse Gas Targets
As noted above, Fast Forward 2040 meets and exceeds the California Air Resources Board zero per capita growth targets for reduction of GHG emissions from passenger vehicles for both target years 2020 and 2035. If the preferred scenario is implemented, GHG emissions per capita from passenger vehicles are expected to decrease to 16.28 pounds per day in 2020 and 15.44 pounds per day in 2035 from 2005 base year per capita emissions of 18.77 pounds per day, a reduction of 13.3 percent in 2020 and 17.7 percent in 2035, substantially better than both ARB’s zero per capita growth targets and the future baseline scenario.

Figure 98 below shows the passenger vehicle carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions per capita calculated for the future baseline and preferred scenario. For reference, Figure 99 provides the GHG emissions with and without Pavley fuel efficiency standards which the SCS is not allowed to take credit for.
Clean Air Act Section 176 Compliance
Fast Forward 2040 must also comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act. As described in Chapter 2, the Santa Barbara County region is designated as an attainment/maintenance area for the 8-hour federal ozone standard and is therefore not subject to federal conformity requirements. A summary of criteria pollutants (which contribute to ozone formation) for the future baseline scenario and the preferred scenario is included in this section for reference.

Figure 100 and Figure 101 show the total on-road emissions associated with the future baseline scenario compared with the preferred scenario out to the year 2040. As shown, ROG and NOx emissions are forecast to continue to decline under both scenarios. The reductions primarily result from State and federal controls on light-duty vehicles and heavy-duty diesel emissions, as well as the natural attrition of older vehicles being replaced by newer vehicles (fleet turnover). The figures also show the co-benefits of the implementation of the preferred scenario. Implementation of the preferred scenario would further reduce ROG emissions by 11 percent in 2020 and 20 percent by 2035. The preferred scenario would reduce NOx emissions by 10 percent by 2020 and 18 percent by 2035.
Another performance measure that was identified within the environment category was On-road Fuel Consumption per Capita. Figure 102 shows that fuel consumption of gasoline and diesel is forecast to increase through the year 2035. However, with the implementation of the preferred scenario, fuel consumption would increase at a much lower rate when compared with the future baseline scenario.
Figure 103 illustrates the on-road fuel consumption per capita for both the future baseline scenario and preferred scenario. When accounting for population changes in the region, implementation of the preferred scenario reduces on-road fuel consumption per capita rates in the future years, both compared with the year 2010 and the future baseline scenario.

**Figure 103: On-Road Motor Vehicle Fuel Consumption per Capita**

![Graph showing fuel consumption per capita from 2010 to 2040 for Future Baseline and TOD/Infill (Preferred)]

**Land Use & Other Measures**

SBCAG prioritized the preservation of open space, sensitive habitat areas, and agricultural land as a principal land use objective. The preferred scenario achieves this objective by selectively concentrating growth in core urban areas, effectively limiting overall land use growth, as seen below:

**Land Use Measures**

*Percent of Agricultural Land and Open Space Retained per Year: 100 percent of agricultural land and open space are retained for both the future baseline and the preferred scenario.*

*New Housing Capacity Within High Quality Transit Corridors:* The future baseline and preferred scenario differ substantially for this metric in that the preferred scenario selectively proposes to re-assign large areas of underdeveloped land within the four major metropolitan areas (Cities of Santa Barbara, Goleta, Santa Maria, Lompoc) to mixed use high density residential and commercial. The future baseline makes no such changes. With the proposed changes, the preferred scenario would have a zoning capacity of 2,016 acres within existing or future high quality transit corridors compared to the future baseline’s zoning capacity of 670 acres.

*Percent of New Housing Unit Capacity Accommodated by Infill Development:* The future baseline and preferred scenario differ in that the preferred scenario aims to concentrate housing unit growth within infill areas, whereas the future baseline continues an existing pattern of development. As such, the preferred
scenario apportions approximately 73 percent of new housing growth within infill areas and the future baseline apportions approximately 23 percent of housing growth in those same areas.\textsuperscript{135}

\textit{Total (Remaining) Acreage Available for New Development:} Similar to the above metric, the future baseline and preferred scenario differ in that the preferred scenario aims to concentrate housing and commercial development growth into a more compact form, whereas the future baseline continues a historic pattern of lower density development. As such, the preferred scenario develops less acreage from 2010 to 2040 than the future baseline; 3,727 total for the preferred scenario versus 7,892 acres total for the future baseline. The total remaining acreage available for development for the preferred scenario drops from 20,919 acres in 2010 to 17,193 in 2040 (18 percent of capacity developed) and the future baseline scenario drops from the same 20,919 acres in 2010 to 13,028 (38 percent of capacity developed). The preferred scenario, therefore, develops 47 percent less acreage compared to the future baseline by 2040.

\textit{Average Density (Dwelling Units Per Acre):} Average density of developed dwelling units indicates how household development will change over the 2010 to 2040 time period for both scenarios. The future baseline and preferred scenario differ in that the preferred scenario aims to develop housing at higher densities, whereas the future baseline develops housing at lower densities. County-wide, the average developed density was 1.76 dwelling units per acre in 2010. It is expected to increase to 1.80 by 2020, 1.96 by 2035, and 1.99 by 2040 for the future baseline scenario; a 13 percent increase in density from 2010. The preferred scenario envisions an average density of 1.80 by 2020, 2.03 by 2035, and 2.08 by 2040; an 18 percent increase in density from 2010 and a 4.5 percent increase from the future baseline.

\textit{Other Environmental Measures}
SBCAG looked at the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita as an environmental goal. The preferred scenario decreases per capita VMT, as seen below:

\textit{Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Per Capita:} In 2010, daily per capita VMT was 22.09. In 2020, 2035, and 2040, daily per capita VMT decreases to 21.69, 20.82, and 20.82. The total decrease is 5.8 percent from 2010, and a full 19 percent decrease from the corresponding 2040 future baseline (25.7).

SBCAG also measured the percentage of alternative transportation trips associated with each scenario. The preferred scenario increases the percentage of alternative transportation trips, as seen below:

\% Alternate Mode Share (All Trips): The preferred scenario achieves an increase in alternate modes of transportation, including transit, walk and bike, for all trips. In 2010, these alternate modes of transportation represent 6.17 percent of all trips. In 2020, 2035, and 2040, alternate modes of transportation represent 6.46 percent, 6.73 percent, and 6.75 percent of all trips. The total increase is 8.6 percent from the 2010 percentage, and 6.7 percent from the corresponding 2040 future baseline percentage (6.29 percent).

\% Alternate Mode Share (Workers): The preferred scenario also achieves an increase in alternate modes of transportation, including transit, walk and bike, for worker trips. In 2010, these alternate modes of transportation represent 4.54 percent of worker trips. In 2020, 2035, and 2040, alternate modes of transportation represent 4.81 percent, 5.18 percent, and 5.21 percent of worker trips. The total increase

\textsuperscript{135} Infill defined as non-redevelopment new housing within 1,000 feet of existing housing.
is 12.9 percent from the 2010 percentage, and an 8.2 percent increase from the corresponding 2040 future baseline percentage (4.78 percent).

**Mobility & System Reliability**

In the second goal category, SBCAG focuses on mobility and transportation system reliability. The preferred scenario seeks to optimize the transportation system to improve accessibility to jobs, schools, and services, allowing the unimpeded movement of people and goods, as well as ensuring the reliability of travel by all modes. The objectives are to reduce travel times for all modes and congestion, to increase bike, walk and transit mode share and to employ best available transportation system management (TSM) technologies to make travel reliable and convenient.

Although overall traffic volumes and congestion increase in absolute terms in the preferred scenario due to population increases, they increase substantially less than they would for the future baseline condition and no-build scenario. Thus, the preferred scenario would reduce expected traffic, travel distances and congestion when compared to the expected conditions, were the preferred scenario not implemented.

Local congestion on the South Coast on U.S. 101, an issue recognized by the 101-In–Motion study and past RTPs, remains an issue by 2040. Local conditions in the North County would fare substantially better with the preferred scenario than under the future baseline scenario.

Transit ridership would increase under the preferred scenario by 59 percent from 2010 and 15 percent compared to future baseline conditions, while the percentage of population living within one half mile of transit service would increase substantially. Meanwhile, the share of drive-alone trips would steadily decrease.

**System Performance**

SBCAG compiled a variety of performance measures to assess transportation system performance. They are presented for an average weekday and are listed below:

**Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes:** Overall daily traffic volumes in year 2040 within Santa Barbara County would increase in absolute terms from existing conditions; 29 percent for the future baseline scenario and 18 percent for the preferred scenario. The preferred scenario represents an eight percent reduction in ADT from the future baseline scenario.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT):** VMT in year 2040 within Santa Barbara County would similarly increase in absolute terms from existing conditions; 40 percent for the future baseline scenario and 13 percent for the preferred scenario. The preferred scenario represents a 19 percent reduction in VMT from the future baseline scenario. VMT is computed as a combination of the number of vehicles in the system and their distance traveled.

**Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT):** VHT in year 2040 within Santa Barbara County would similarly increase in absolute terms from existing conditions; 36 percent for the future baseline scenario and 14 percent for the preferred scenario. The preferred scenario represents a 16 percent reduction in VHT from the future baseline scenario. VHT is computed as the product of the roadway link volume and the roadway link travel time, summed over all roadway links. “Links” are individual roadway segments within the travel model.
Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD): VHD in year 2040 within Santa Barbara County would increase in absolute terms from existing conditions; 202 percent for the future baseline scenario and 205 percent for the preferred scenario. The preferred scenario represents a one percent increase in VHD from the future baseline scenario. VHD is computed as the congested vehicle time minus vehicle free flow time multiplied by vehicle volumes in a typical weekday 24-hour period. As a comparison, VHD in year 2040 for no build conditions would increase by 370 percent, due primarily to the lack of U.S. 101 high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. The preferred scenario represents a 35 percent reduction in VHD from the no build scenario.

Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT): Congested vehicle miles traveled in year 2040 within the Santa Barbara County area would similarly increase in absolute terms from existing conditions; 190 percent for the future baseline scenario and 90 percent for the preferred scenario. The preferred scenario represents a 35 percent reduction in CVMT from the future baseline scenario. Congested VMT (CVMT) is defined as roadways with a volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) of over 0.9. As a comparison, CVMT in year 2040 for no build conditions would increase by 288 percent, due primarily to the lack of U.S. 101 high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. The preferred scenario represents a 52 percent reduction in CVMT from the no build scenario.

The above metrics (average daily traffic volumes, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours of delay, and congested vehicle miles traveled) are presented in Table 20 for daily regional level performance and Table 21 for daily subregional level performance. The above metrics are also presented in Table 22 for PM peak period regional level performance and Table 23 for PM peak period subregional level performance which roughly mirrors the percentage changes in the daily metrics.

Table 20: 2010-2040 Regional Level Performance (Daily)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040 Future Baseline</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>2040 Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>% Change – Preferred vs. Future Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>43.704</td>
<td>56.468</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51.721</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>9.308</td>
<td>13.014</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10.532</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>192.888</td>
<td>262.782</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>220.238</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>7.978</td>
<td>24.055</td>
<td>202%</td>
<td>24.319</td>
<td>205%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>190%</td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model

---

136 Congested vehicle time minus vehicle free flow time multiplied by vehicle volumes in a typical weekday 24-hour period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040 Future Baseline</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>2040 Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>% Change, Preferred vs. Future Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Barbara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>13.232</td>
<td>15.508</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16.936</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>38.683</td>
<td>45.263</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48.553</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>3.815</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6.119</td>
<td>168%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goleta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1.707</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>28.540</td>
<td>35.601</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36.136</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>3.039</td>
<td>13.451</td>
<td>343%</td>
<td>14.681</td>
<td>383%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lompoc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>3.427</td>
<td>3.848</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>6.643</td>
<td>7.695</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6.982</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>127%</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Maria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>10.544</td>
<td>14.373</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12.377</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>2.366</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>37.673</td>
<td>53.923</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45.317</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>287%</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>416%</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>159%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>9.343</td>
<td>13.859</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9.768</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>4.173</td>
<td>6.440</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4.224</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>81.349</td>
<td>120.301</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>83.250</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>4.828</td>
<td>151%</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>1.993</td>
<td>733%</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SBCAG Travel Model*
### Table 22: 2010-2040 Regional Level Performance (PM Peak Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040 Future Baseline</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>2040 Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>% Change – Preferred vs. Future Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>2.486</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>42.237</td>
<td>62.748</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55.159</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>4.941</td>
<td>12.677</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>11.811</td>
<td>139%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>207%</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model

### Table 23: 2010-2040 Subregional Level Performance (PM Peak Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040 Future Baseline</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>2040 Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>% Change – 2010 to 2040</th>
<th>% Change – Preferred vs. Future Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Barbara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>2.592</td>
<td>3.116</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>9.430</td>
<td>12.125</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14.414</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4.885</td>
<td>154%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goleta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>7.266</td>
<td>11.205</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12.413</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>4.304</td>
<td>153%</td>
<td>5.283</td>
<td>211%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>131%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lompoc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Maria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>7.222</td>
<td>10.684</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8.851</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>186%</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>353%</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes [Millions]</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) [Thousands]</td>
<td>16.980</td>
<td>27.181</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>18.101</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) [Thousands]</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>4.304</td>
<td>338%</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT) [Millions]</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>811%</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model
**Congested Lane Miles:** This metric measures the number of AM and PM peak period\(^{137}\) lane miles that have congested travel, defined as a volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) of over 0.9, along U.S. 101, the backbone of Santa Barbara County’s transportation network. 2040 peak period lane miles for both the future baseline and preferred scenario within Santa Barbara County are compared to each other as well as to 2010.

Figure 104 and Figure 105 below illustrate this comparison. Congested lane miles for both 2040 scenarios within the Santa Barbara County area would increase in absolute terms from existing conditions; 12.17 miles in the AM peak period and 132.49 miles for the PM peak period for the future baseline scenario and 27.94 miles in the AM peak period and 81.49 miles for the PM peak period for the preferred scenario. The preferred scenario represents a 24 percent reduction in congested lane miles combined for both peak periods from the future baseline scenario.

**Figure 104: US 101 AM Peak Period Congested Lane Miles**

\(^{137}\)AM and PM peak period is defined in the SBCAG Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) as 7-9 AM and 4-6 PM, respectively.
**Figure 105: US 101 PM Peak Period Congested Lane Miles**

*Average Vehicle Trip Time:* Average one-way vehicle trip time is estimated to be 14.18 minutes in 2010. For the preferred scenario, it increases to 14.19 minutes in 2020, but then decreases over the long term to 13.84 in 2035 and 13.89 in 2040, a two percent reduction from 2010 and a full 11 percent reduction from the 2040 future baseline scenario (15.61 minutes).

*Average Vehicle Commute Time (Workers):* Average one-way vehicle commute time for workers is estimated to be 15.38 minutes in 2010. For the preferred scenario, it increases to 15.72 minutes in 2020, but then decreases over the long term to 15.05 in 2035 and 14.97 in 2040, a three percent reduction from 2010 and a five percent reduction from the 2040 future baseline scenario (15.76 minutes).

*Transit Ridership:* The preferred scenario achieves an increase in transit ridership. In 2010, daily transit ridership is approximately 34,410 boardings. Total transit ridership would be approximately 40,540 in 2020, 80,800 in 2035 and 52,240 in 2040. The total increase is 52 percent from 2010 ridership numbers, and a 10 percent increase from the corresponding 2040 future baseline numbers (47,450).

*Transit Accessibility (Populations):* The preferred scenario achieves an increase in transit accessibility. The overall percentage of population within a high quality transit corridor increases, from 18.45 percent in 2010 to estimates of 31.58 percent, 33.93 percent, and 34.33 percent in 2020, 2035 and 2040 respectively. The total increase is 86 percent from 2010 percentages, and a 24 percent increase from the corresponding 2040 future baseline numbers (27.66 percent).

*Transit Accessibility (Jobs):* The accessibility in percentage of jobs within a high quality transit corridor increases from 30.93 percent in 2010 to 45.54 percent in 2020, but decreases to 42.04 percent in 2035 and 40.86 percent in 2040 due to increasing job opportunities in the Lompoc and Santa Maria areas. This same trend is present in the future baseline scenario (46.48 percent in 2020, 43.53 percent in 2035, 42.30 percent in 2040).

*Percent Drive-Alone Mode Share (All):* Focusing on the percentage of drive-alone mode share for all trips, the preferred scenario decreases the percentage from 50.21 percent in 2010 to 49.68 percent in 2020,
49.78 percent in 2035, and 49.68 percent in 2040. This means that, under the preferred scenario, fewer people overall drive alone and are more likely to use public transportation or other alternative modes, as evidenced by the percent of transit usage above.

**Percent Drive-Alone Mode Share (Workers):** Focusing on the percentage of drive-alone mode share for worker trips, the preferred scenario decreases the percentage from 86.84 percent in 2010 to 86.59 percent in 2020, 86.24 percent in 2035, and 86.21 percent in 2040. This means that, under the preferred scenario, fewer workers drive alone to their workplace and are more likely to commute using public transportation or other alternative modes, as evidenced by the percent of transit usage above.

**Transit Forecast**

Transportation service providers, as well as SBCAG and the Santa Barbara County Transit Advisory Committee (SBCTAC), continually evaluate changing transit demand and expand or improve service accordingly. Some recent transit improvements include the following:

- Greyhound relocated its Santa Maria location to the Santa Maria Transit Center.
- Guadalupe Transit began offering full-day Saturday service and new Sunday service.
- MTD began operating a new route, Route 38, serving the UCSB campus community.
- The Wine Country Express, Breeze Route 100, and Breeze Route 200 began offering Saturday service.
- The Clean Air Express began twice-a-day Saturday service between Santa Barbara and the Santa Ynez Valley.
- The Coastal Express Limited, provided by MTD, ceased operations and the Ventura–Santa Barbara/Goleta market is now covered solely be the VISTA service.

Figure 106 and Figure 107 summarize the 2040 average weekday transit ridership forecast for the entire county for the future baseline scenario and the preferred scenario. This forecast does not include Amtrak, Greyhound, or Santa Barbara Airbus services, as they do not fall under any Santa Barbara service providers’ control.

By 2040, total weekday ridership County-wide for the future baseline scenario is forecast to increase from approximately 34,210 to 46,700, a 37 percent increase. MTD ridership is projected to increase from 20,850 to 27,240, a 31 percent increase. However, MTD’s share of county ridership is expected to decrease from 61 percent to 58 percent by 2040 due to increases in ridership shares by other operators such as the VISTA (Ventura Intercity Service Transit Authority) Coastal Express, Clean Air Express, and SMAT. Ridership for SMAT, the second largest transit operator in the County, is forecast to increase from 7,280 in 2010 to 10,790 by 2040, a 48 percent increase. This represents a 23 percent share of total county ridership and an increase of two percent from 2010.

---

**Note:** It is important to note that these 2010 and 2040 ridership numbers are based on modeled values and these values differ from actual 2010 counts. During calibration and validation of the travel mode, there was little transit trip data available in the California Household Travel Survey (CHTS), so ridership was estimated using a simple conversion from annual to daily ridership, which results in over or underestimation of some transit services. Some level of accuracy is inevitably lost but the overall mode share percentage matches survey data. Most importantly, the relationship from existing to future year ridership is what is most relevant.

**Note:** 2009-2010 actual weekday average daily passengers for MTD are 26,403 and the 2010 share of County ridership is 79.6%.
Figure 106: 2040 Weekday Transit Ridership Forecast – Future Baseline Scenario

Figure 107: 2040 Weekday Transit Ridership Forecast – Preferred Scenario

Compared to the future baseline, total weekday ridership County-wide for the preferred scenario in 2040 is forecast to increase from approximately 34,210 to 52,020, a 52 percent increase from 2010 and an 11 percent increase from the future baseline. MTD ridership is projected to increase from 20,850 to 34,260, a 64 percent increase and a 26 percent increase from the future baseline. MTD’s share of county ridership is expected to also increase from 61 percent to 66 percent by 2040, due to intensification of households and population on the South Coast. Ridership for SMAT, the second largest transit operator in the County, is forecast to increase from 7,280 in 2010 to 9,540 by 2040, representing an 18 percent share of total county ridership, down from 21 percent in 2010.
By 2040, the combination of Clean Air Express and VISTA Coastal Express, along with other express services, is expected increase from 2,860 to 5,040 riders for the future baseline scenario, a 76 percent increase. This increase represents about 11 percent of total county transit ridership, up from eight percent in 2010. This is in contrast to the preferred scenario, which relies less heavily on north county/south coast express transit. In absolute terms, these express services are expected to increase ridership from 2,860 to 4,740 for the preferred scenario, a 66 percent increase from 2010 and a six percent decrease from the 2040 future baseline. This increase represents about nine percent of total county transit ridership, up from eight percent in 2010.

Equity

*New Affordable and Workforce Housing (Indicated by Density) [Units Within 20 Du/Acre Zones]*: The future baseline and preferred scenario differ in that the preferred scenario aims to concentrate housing and commercial development growth into a more compact form, whereas the future baseline continues a historic pattern of lower density development. As such, the preferred scenario develops greater amounts of new affordable and workforce housing from 2010 to 2040 than the future baseline; 22,820 units total for the preferred scenario versus 17,069 units total for the future baseline. The preferred scenario, therefore, develops 34 percent more new affordable and workforce housing compared to the future baseline by 2040.

*Transit Accessibility for Low Incomes*: The preferred scenario achieves increases in transit accessibility for low income populations. The overall percentage of low income population within a high quality transit corridor increases, from 8.33 percent in 2010 to estimates of 46.14 percent, 54.78 percent, and 153.86 percent in 2020, 2035 and 2040 respectively. The total increase is 546 percent from 2010 percentages, and an 81 percent increase from the corresponding 2040 future baseline numbers (29.75 percent).

*Average Trip Time for Low Income Communities (Minutes)*: Average one-way vehicle trip time is estimated to be 15.26 minutes in 2010. For the preferred scenario, it decreases to 14.61, 14.22, and 14.43 minutes in 2020, 2035, and 2040 respectively, a five percent reduction from 2010 and a full 15 percent reduction from the 2040 future baseline scenario (16.93 minutes).

Health & Safety

Fast Forward 2040 seeks to improve public health and ensure the safety of the regional transportation system. Plan objectives are to reduce the number of accidents, injuries, and fatalities on the transportation system. SBCAG also intends to improve public health by increasing physical fitness by increasing rates of bicycling and walking trips and increase public outreach and education about these health and safety issues.

*Active Transportation Mode Share (percent) (All Trips)*: The preferred scenario achieves an increase in active transportation (bike and walk) mode share for all trips. In 2010, bike and walk mode share represented 4.83 percent of all trips. In 2020, 2035, and 2040, active transportation mode share represents 4.91 percent, 5.00 percent, and 5.02 percent of all trips. The total increase is four percent from the 2010 percentage, and a five percent increase from the corresponding 2040 future baseline percentage (4.81 percent).

*Active Transportation Mode Share (Worker Trips)*: The preferred scenario also achieves an increase in active transportation (bike and walk) mode share for worker trips. In 2010, bike and walk mode share represented 3.74 percent of worker trips. In 2020, 2035, and 2040, bike and walk mode share
represented 3.72 percent, 3.96 percent, and 3.98 percent of worker trips. The total increase is six percent from the 2010 percentage, and a five percent increase from the corresponding 2040 future baseline percentage (3.78 percent).

Prosperous Economy
The fifth goal that SBCAG has set for Fast Forward 2040 concerns a prosperous economy. Fast Forward 2040 aims to achieve economically efficient transportation patterns and promote regional prosperity and economic growth. As objectives to reach this goal, Fast Forward 2040 seeks to reduce congestion, optimize the network performance in order to reduce time lost to commuting, reduce commute costs and encourage measures that bring worker housing closer to job sites and promote a mix of land uses responsive to the needs of businesses, including agriculture and tourism.

*Net Travel Savings (Time)*: The preferred scenario achieves greater net reductions in travel time compared to the future baseline. In 2010, average travel time for all trips was 14.18 minutes County-wide. The future baseline increases average travel time to 15.05, 15.47, and 15.61 minutes County-wide for 2020, 2035, and 2040 respectively. The preferred scenario increases average travel time to 14.19 in 2020, but decreases to 13.84 and 13.89 minutes County-wide for 2035 and 2040 respectively. The total decrease by 2040 for the preferred scenario is two percent from 2010 minutes, and an 11 percent reduction from the corresponding 2040 future baseline number.

*Net Commute Savings (Time)*: The preferred scenario achieves greater net reductions compared to the future baseline. In 2010, average commute time for workers was 15.38 minutes County-wide. The future baseline increases average commute time to 15.80, 15.85, and 15.76 minutes County-wide for 2020, 2035, and 2040 respectively. The preferred scenario increases average commute time to 15.72 in 2020, but decreases to 15.05 and 14.97 minutes County-wide for 2035 and 2040 respectively. The total decrease by 2040 for the preferred scenario is three percent from 2010 minutes, and a five percent reduction from the corresponding 2040 future baseline number.

*Net Cost Avoided (Money)*: The preferred scenario achieves greater cost reductions compared to the future baseline. In 2010, annual auto operating costs, set to 19.3 cents/mile and value of time set to $7.05/hour, cost drivers 1.858 million dollars County-wide. Without any adjustments to the auto operating cost assumptions, the future baseline increases annual auto-related expenditures to 2.100, 2.518, and 2.597 million dollars County-wide for 2020, 2035, and 2040 respectively. Without any adjustments to the auto operating cost assumptions, the preferred scenario increases auto expenditures to 1.872, 2.051, and 2.102 million dollars County-wide for 2020, 2035, and 2040 respectively. The total increase by 2040 for the preferred scenario is 13 percent from 2010 costs, and a 19 percent reduction from the corresponding 2040 future baseline.

*Average Vehicle Trip Distance (All Trips and Work Trips)*: The average one-way vehicle trip distance for all trips was 8.00 miles in 2010. The preferred scenario envisions a decrease to 7.81, 7.42, and 7.40 miles in 2020, 2035, and 2040, respectively. By 2040, the preferred scenario achieves an eight percent reduction from 2010 and a full 19 percent reduction from the 2040 future baseline scenario (9.08 miles). For work trips only, the average one-way vehicle trip distance was 8.57 miles in 2010. It is expected to increase to 8.83 miles in 2020 and then decrease to 8.19 in 2035. The preferred scenario envisions an average vehicle trip distance for work trips of 8.06 miles in 2040, a six percent reduction from 2010 and a seven percent reduction from the 2040 future baseline scenario (8.67 miles).
Environmental Justice

The environmental justice analysis of the Fast Forward 2040 preferred scenario indicates that benefits are equitable between the communities of concern and the overall population.

Over the last several decades, federal regulations and guidance have been promulgated to ensure that regional transportation planning meets the spirit and intent of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The Federal Highway Administration requires that all federally funded transportation planning and actions involve an assessment of environmental justice issues that considers effects on minority and low-income populations. These federal environmental justice directives are intended (1) to ensure opportunities for full participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process, and (2) to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high, adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority and low-income populations. In keeping with these requirements, Fast Forward 2040 strives to assure that all socio-economic groups are adequately served and receive their fair share of transportation benefits and that no group or community bears a disproportionate amount of the costs or impacts of transportation investments. Public information and involvement are also fundamental elements of SBCAG's planning process.

Process

This section evaluates the performance Fast Forward 2040 with respect to social equity and environmental justice measures. The information presented was compiled from multiple sources, including the 2010 U.S. Census, and the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. In compliance with the applicable federal guidelines associated with environmental justice analysis, demographic information is first used to determine areas where concentrations of minority, low-income, low mobility, or low community engagement populations currently live. To identify communities of concern for purposes of this analysis, populations meeting minimum concentrations are shown here, as well as their proximity to transit stops and major transportation routes. Per existing guidance, a concentration of a given population exists if the percentage of minority, low-income, etc., population is meaningfully greater than the percentage of the same group in the general population of the area. Thresholds defining the minimum population percentage needed for a concentration to exist are given in Table 24.

For the purposes of this analysis, concentrations of four, primary “communities of concern” were identified by census block groups through an analysis of demographic and socioeconomic data: minority, low-income, low mobility, and low community engagement populations. It should be noted that these four categories are not mutually exclusive. Population clusters may exist within Santa Barbara County of more than one of the categories, but only one group had to be present for a census block group to be categorized as a community of concern. The following table presents the relevant community of concern indicators, definitions, and thresholds defining minimum concentrations associated with each major category.

---

140 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act states that “no person in the United States, shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” 42 U.S.C § 2000d.

Table 24: Environmental Justice Indicators, Definitions and Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community of Concern</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Minority Population</td>
<td>Population of non-White Hispanic, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian.</td>
<td>65 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>Household income &lt;80% of median or $50,000</td>
<td>63 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Families living at or below the poverty level-(Census)</td>
<td>25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Mobility</td>
<td>Zero-Car Households</td>
<td>Households that do not have access to a vehicle.</td>
<td>25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aged Population</td>
<td>Population 75 years or older.</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Community</td>
<td>Linguistic Isolation</td>
<td>Households where English is not the primary language and English is not spoken “very well.”</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td>Population over age 25 who have not earned a high school diploma.</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Minority Populations
High concentrations of minority populations in Santa Barbara County include locations in the Old Town Goleta area, the lower east and west side of the City of Santa Barbara, and in the northwest of the City of Carpinteria. Concentrations are present throughout the City of Lompoc, including the Lompoc Federal Penitentiary and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Chumash Indian Reservation also contains a significant concentration. Concentrations are also indicated in the northern portion of the City of Santa Maria City and the entire City of Guadalupe.

- The non-White population groups of Santa Barbara County comprised 25 percent of the total population or 112,000 persons.
- Persons of Hispanic ethnicity (can be of any race) represented 44 percent of the County-wide population or 188,740 persons.
- Approximately 16 percent of the county population, or 66,521 persons, live in identified minority communities of concern and in these communities 51,951 persons or 78 percent are minority.

Low-income Populations
The location of high concentrations of low-income households is similar to that of minority populations, with additional locations indicated in Old Town Goleta and within downtown City of Carpinteria.

- The percentage of the households in Santa Barbara County with incomes less than $50,000 per year (80 percent or less of median) is 40 percent or 57,360 households.
- The median household income is $63,400.
- Approximately 14 percent of the County-wide households, or 19,884 households, live in identified low-income communities. Approximately 15,000 of these households have an income less than $50,000 per year.

The Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is “in poverty.” If a family's total income is less than the family's threshold, then that family and every individual in it is considered in poverty. Table 25 shows the census poverty thresholds for 2015. High concentrations of households living below the poverty level are located in the community of Isla Vista near the University of California Santa Barbara and the lower west and east-side of the City of Santa Barbara. The City of Lompoc in its central core and the northern portions of the City of Santa Maria and downtown City of Guadalupe also contain significant concentrations.

- The percentage of the 93,059 families in Santa Barbara County living below the poverty level is 10 percent or 9,300 families.
• The communities of concern contain 17,302 families and 6,863 of these families or 39 percent are considered living at or below the poverty level.

**Table 25: Poverty Thresholds for 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Family Unit</th>
<th>Related Children Under 18 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;65 years</td>
<td>$12,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>$11,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder &lt;65 years</td>
<td>$15,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65+</td>
<td>$14,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$24,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$33,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$39,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$43,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine+ people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, 2015

**Low-Mobility Populations**

High concentrations of existing populations with low mobility as determined by the availability of a vehicle are indicated in downtown City of Santa Barbara, Old Town Goleta, the unincorporated area between the Cities of Buellton and Solvang, central City of Lompoc and northern City of Santa Maria.

• The percentage of households in Santa Barbara County that do not have access to a vehicle is 6.8 percent, or 9,790 households.
• The total number of households in identified communities is 11,667 and 3,000, or 26 percent, of the households are without a vehicle.
• The total population in the identified communities is 30,700 persons.

High concentrations of existing populations with low mobility as determined by age over 75 years old are indicated in various unincorporated areas of the county, such as Montecito and Hope Ranch in the South Coast and Santa Ynez and Vandenberg Village in the North County.

• The percentage of the population in Santa Barbara County aged 75 or older is 6.6 percent or 28,300 persons.
• The number of persons over 75 years of age in identified communities is 5,402 or 32 percent of the 16,728 total.

**Low Community Engagement Populations**

High concentrations of the existing population with low community engagement based on the ability to speak English are indicated in the Old Town Goleta area, west-side City of Santa Barbara, central City of Lompoc, unincorporated Santa Ynez, and northwest City of Santa Maria and Guadalupe.

• The percentage of the population five years and older in Santa Barbara County for whom English is not spoken “very well” is 11.4 percent or 46,200 persons.
• Approximately 11 percent of the county population or 46,767 persons live in identified communities of concern, with 7,024 or 15 percent not speaking English “very well.”
High concentrations of the existing population with low community engagement in 2010 based on the earning of a high school diploma are concentrated in the southern portion of the City of Carpinteria, lower west-side and east-side of the City of Santa Barbara, Old Town Goleta, central City of Lompoc and unincorporated Lompoc Valley, and the northern portion of the City of Santa Maria and Guadalupe.

- The percentage of persons, age 25 years and over in Santa Barbara County who have not earned a high school diploma is 19 percent or 52,780 persons.
- Approximately 20 percent of the county population, or 89,653 persons live in identified communities of concern with 36,387 or 40 percent without a high school diploma.

The combined communities of concern meeting threshold levels for minorities and low income/households in poverty are identified in Figure 108 through Figure 112 as noted by the highlighted areas. Figure 113 through Figure 115 represent low mobility and low community engagement communities of concern: No English Spoken Well, No High School Diploma, No Vehicle Available, and Age over 75.

Also included in the figures are the major transportation routes, transit stops and transit service proximity. Service proximity is shown by measuring one quarter-mile distance from a transit stop within the community served. (Other applications may use one half-mile distance from transit stops; however, in the Santa Barbara County Region that distance essentially covers the entire urban area.) The service area is indicated by the colored band extending one quarter mile from the transit stop.

Figure 108: South Coast Communities of Concern, Minority and Poverty

Figure 109: South Coast Communities of Concern, No English/Vehicle and Age 75+
Figure 110: Santa Ynez Valley Communities of Concern, Minority and Poverty

Figure 111: S.Y. Valley Communities of Concern, No English/Vehicle and Age 75+
Figure 112: Lompoc Region Communities of Concern, Minority and Poverty

Figure 113: Lompoc Region Communities of Concern, No English/Vehicle and Age 75+
Figure 114: Santa Maria Region Communities of Concern, Minority and Poverty

Figure 115: Santa Maria Region Communities of Concern, No English/Vehicle and Age 75+
In general, identified communities of concern are located within close proximity to transit. An obvious exception is the minority and poverty community residing in the Lompoc Federal Penitentiary, which has other transportation options. For communities with populations 75 years and older, there are several high income areas on the South Coast that are not served within the quarter-mile transit service area, including Hope Ranch and several other beach communities. This is also the case for an unincorporated area south of the City of Lompoc.

The environmental justice analysis compares impacts on the communities of concern for both the future baseline and preferred scenario. Using the SBCAG travel model, the 2010 baseline population, household and employment values are compared with the 2040 future baseline values and the 2040 preferred scenario values. The analysis of the preferred scenario indicates that benefits and burdens of the projects in the preferred scenario are equitably distributed between the communities of concern and the overall population.

The variables analyzed in this process include:

Average Travel Time: Travel time is measured in minutes as the average time per person per trip across all modes of transportation, including combined drive-alone and shared rides, as well as transit, biking and walking. All types of trips are included, commuting to work, and traveling to school. The travel time analysis show access based on auto and transit and other modes travel times. Transit travel assumes that the trip includes the time required to travel to a transit stop, time spent on public transportation vehicles, the time it takes to transfer to other transit, and the time it takes to travel from the transit stop to the destination. Auto, bike, and walk times assume only the actual travel time to the final destination.

Peak Work Trips Less Than 30 Minutes: The proportion of work trips less than 30 minutes are measured as a percentage of all work trips for drive alone, carpool, and transit users. Peak work trip periods are 7:00 AM-9:00 AM and 4:00 PM-5:00 PM.

Access to Transit: Access to public transit is measured as the percentage of homes within both a quarter mile and half mile of a transit stop. This measure shows the current and future density and distribution of transit services throughout the region relative to the proximity to communities of concern.

Access to Amenities: Percentage of Population within:

- 5 Minutes of the Airport: Travel times are estimated to airport facilities in closest proximity.
- 5 Minutes of Universities: This measure of education access focuses on higher education, including universities, colleges, adult education facilities, and job training centers.
- 5 Minutes of Schools: this measure of education access focuses on K-12 school proximity.
- 5 Minutes of Healthcare: Healthcare includes hospitals and community clinics. This definition does not consider emergency response times, but rather it measures access to basic health services.
- 5 Minutes to Public Facility Amenities: Public amenities include museums and city halls.
- 5 Minutes of Parks or Beaches: Parks and beaches are defined as federal, state, and county parks; beaches; and local parks (including campgrounds, open space areas, picnic areas, recreation centers, etc.)
Results for Environmental Justice Performance Measures

The analysis of Fast Forward 2040’s preferred scenario indicates that benefits and burdens of the projects in preferred scenario are equitably distributed between the communities of concern and the overall population. The overall performance of all amenities increases by approximately one percent for both the overall population and the communities of concern. The 2040 preferred scenario results in generally positive outcomes for the communities of concern, as shown in Table 26 through Table 30, representing minority, low-income, low-mobility, and low community engagement populations. On only a few measures does the performance decline for communities of concern. For example, there is a decrease in the percentage of trips less than five minutes to airport and college/university amenities for communities of concern.

A separate analysis is performed specifically for the minority, poverty, and low-income population and low community engagement populations as well. These community groups benefit overall from the preferred scenario, however, the benefits are less pronounced for some individual indicators. Airport access performance for example is slightly lower for low-income and low community engagement populations than for the overall population. Similarly, school amenities performance for Hispanic and minority and below poverty communities’ is lower than the overall population.

Communities of Concern Comparisons with the Overall Population

The average travel time shown in the last column of Table 26 indicates that the 2040 preferred scenario, as compared to the 2040 baseline scenario and overall population, benefits communities of concern by reducing their travel times.

- The results indicate that the 2040 preferred scenario reduces drive-alone and shared ride travel time ranging from approximately -0.85 to -2.6 minutes, with an average of -1.7 minutes for both communities of concern and for the overall population.
- The transit travel times results indicate the preferred scenario reduces travel time by approximately -1.0 to -7.0 minutes, with an average of -3.1 minutes for communities of concern and -2.4 minutes for the overall population.
- The walk travel time results indicate the preferred scenario reduces travel time by approximately -0.1 to -1.2 minutes, with an average of -0.5 minutes for communities of concern and -0.6 minutes for the overall population.
- The bike travel time results indicate the preferred scenario has minimal influence on travel times, which range from 0.6 to -0.1 minutes, with an average of 0.2 and 0.3, for the communities of concern and the overall population.

The peak work trips <30 minutes shown in the last column of Table 27 indicates that the 2040 preferred scenario, as compared to the 2040 baseline scenario, benefits communities of concern by increasing the percentage of work trips that are under 30 minutes.

- The drive alone/carpool work trips results indicate the preferred scenario increases the percentage of trips <30 minutes by approximately 0.7 to 4.8 percent, with an average of 1.8 percent, for communities of concern and 1.5 percent for the overall population.
- The transit work trips results indicate the preferred scenario increases the percentage of trips <30 minutes by approximately -0.4 to 1.4 percent, with an average of 0.4 percent, for communities of concern and 0.9 percent for the overall population.
Transit access by households within one quarter mile and one half mile, as shown in the last column of Table 28, indicates that the 2040 preferred scenario, as compared to the 2040 baseline scenario, benefits communities of concern by increasing the percentage of households transit access.

- Transit access results indicate the preferred scenario increases the percentage of household’s quarter mile transit access by approximately 0.1 to 4.5 percent, with an average of 2.2 percent, for communities of concern and 3.1 percent for the overall population.
- Transit access results indicate the preferred scenario increases the percentage of household’s half mile transit access by approximately 0.0 to 0.7 percent, with an average of 0.3 percent, for communities of concern and 0.7 percent for the overall population.

Access to amenities within a five-minute travel time by all modes, as shown in the last column of Table 29 and Table 30, indicates that the 2040 preferred scenario, as compared to the 2040 baseline scenario, benefits most communities of concern by increasing the percentage of the population with access to amenities.

- The results for access to all amenities combined indicate the preferred scenario increases the percentage of the population’s access up to 5.0 percent, with an average of 0.8 percent, for communities of concern and 0.7 percent for the overall population. The Hispanic and minority population shows a -0.3 percent decline in access.
- Access to K-12 schools, hospitals, public facilities, parks and beaches results indicate the preferred scenario increases the percentage of the population’s access up to 11.5 percent, with a combined average of 3.8, for communities of concern and 4.5 percent for the overall population.
- Access to airports and college/Universities results indicate the preferred scenario decreases the percentage of the population’s access from -7.0 to 10.0 percent, with a combined average of -1.7 percent for communities of concern and -3.2 percent for the overall population.
Table 26: Average Travel Time, Population and Communities of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Communities of Concern Comparison</th>
<th>2010 Values</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>Preferred vs Future Baseline %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No H5 Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>(7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>121.9</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>(7.9)</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>(6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No H5 Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>(7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>(4.6)</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>(7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No H5 Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No H5 Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model
### Table 27: Peak Work Trips <30 Minutes, Population and Communities of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Communities of Concern Comparison</th>
<th>2010 Values</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Preferred vs 2040 Future Baseline %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive Alone/Carpool Peak Work Trips &lt;30 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Peak Work Trips &lt;30 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SBCAG Travel Model*
### Table 28: Transit Access, Total Population and Communities of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Communities of Concern Comparison</th>
<th>2010 Values</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Preferred vs Future Baseline %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Transit Access .25 Miles (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Household Transit Access .5 Miles (percent)            |             |             |                         |             |                         |                                   |
| Total Population                                       | 96.9        | 96.4        | (0.4)                   | 97.1        | 0.2                     | 0.7                               |
| Hispanic and Minority Population                       | 97.4        | 97.5        | 0.1                     | 98.0        | 0.6                     | 0.5                               |
| Below Poverty in Households                            | 98.6        | 98.7        | 0.2                     | 98.7        | 0.2                     | 0.0                               |
| Income Below 48K in Households                         | 98.4        | 98.2        | (0.2)                   | 98.4        | (0.0)                   | 0.2                               |
| Age Over 75 Population                                 | 98.9        | 99.0        | 0.1                     | 99.2        | 0.3                     | 0.2                               |
| No Vehicle Available in Households                     | 98.9        | 98.9        | 0.0                     | 99.2        | 0.3                     | 0.3                               |
| No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population           | 97.4        | 97.3        | (0.1)                   | 97.9        | 0.6                     | 0.6                               |
| English Not Spoken Well in Households                  | 98.1        | 97.7        | (0.4)                   | 98.1        | (0.0)                   | 0.4                               |
| Communities of Concern Average                         | 98.2        | 98.2        | (0.0)                   | 98.5        | 0.3                     | 0.3                               |

Source: SBCAG Travel Model

### Table 29: Amenities within 5 Minutes Travel, Population and Communities of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Individual Communities of Concern, all Modes</th>
<th>2010 Values</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Values</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Preferred vs Future Baseline %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population and Individual Communities of Concern, all Modes</td>
<td>2010 Values</td>
<td>2040 Values</td>
<td>2010 to 2040 Difference</td>
<td>2040 Values</td>
<td>2010 to 2040 Difference</td>
<td>2040 Preferred vs Future Baseline %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>(6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/Univ Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model
### Table 30: Table 29 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Individual Communities of Concern, all Modes</th>
<th>Future Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>2040 Preferred vs Future Baseline %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 Values</td>
<td>2040 Values</td>
<td>2010 to 2040 Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospital Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Amenities (public facilities) in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available in Households</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well in Households</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beach Amenities in 5 minutes (percent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Minority Population</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty in Households</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48K in Households</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75 Population</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Baseline Scenario | Preferred Scenario | **2010 Values** | **2040 Values** | **2010 to 2040 Difference** | **2040 Values** | **2010 to 2040 Difference** | **2040 Preferred vs Future Baseline %** 
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- 
No Vehicle Available in Households | | 56.1 | 52.8 | (3.3) | 60.4 | 4.3 | 7.6 
No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25 Population | | 19.1 | 16.8 | (2.3) | 20.9 | 1.8 | 4.1 
English Not Spoken Well in Households | | 17.0 | 16.6 | (0.4) | 18.1 | 1.1 | 1.5 
Communities of Concern Average | | 25.6 | 24.2 | (1.4) | 27.5 | 1.9 | 3.3 

*Source: SBCAG Travel Model*

**Environmental Justice Air Quality Impacts**

As a result of Fast Forward 2040 policies and land use scenario, the anticipated growth pattern would concentrate population adjacent to transit and other transportation facilities that results in more people being exposed to elevated health risks and nuisance odors as compared to areas of the region more distant from such facilities. On the other hand, a compact growth pattern served by an efficient and diverse transportation system facilitates a reduction in automotive travel and increases walking, bicycling, and transit use, all of which reduce individual vehicle trips and associated VMT. It is important to note that a variety of other factors contribute to the declines in contaminant emissions compared to existing conditions, including vehicle technology, cleaner fuels, and fleet turnover. However, in order to achieve the greatest VMT reductions from a compact growth pattern, development also must necessarily be in close proximity to public transit and major roadway corridors. Although the precise location and density of such development is not known at this time, Fast Forward 2040 may result in new growth close to existing air pollutant sources, potentially resulting in the exposure to air pollutant concentrations and nuisance odors. The Program Environmental Impact Report accompanying Fast Forward 2040 includes mitigation measures that would reduce impacts associated with health risk within 500 feet of freeways and high-traffic volume roadways to less than significant levels. Analysis does not account for emissions improvements through the implementation of these mitigation measures. Moreover, the currently available data on emissions and on the distribution of population is imprecise, based on averages.

Diesel particle matter is classified as the primary airborne carcinogen in the State. The California Air Resources Board reports that diesel particulate matter represents about 70 percent of the potential cancer risk from vehicle travel on a typical urban freeway. In addition, diesel exhaust has a distinct odor, which is primarily a result of hydrocarbons and aldehydes contained in diesel fuel. In addition to the health risks associated with diesel exhaust, the odors associated with diesel exhaust could be a nuisance to nearby population clusters.

Particulate matter, also known as particle pollution or PM, is a mixture of small particles and liquid droplets. Particle pollution is made up of a number of components, including acids (such as nitrates and sulfates), organic chemicals, metals, and soil or dust particles. The size of particles is directly linked to their potential for causing health problems. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is concerned about particles that are 10 micrometers in diameter or smaller because those are the particles that generally pass through the throat and nose and enter the lungs. Once inhaled, these particles can affect the heart and lungs and cause health effects. The EPA groups particulate matter into two categories:

---

• "Inhalable coarse particles" (PM₁₀), such as those found near roadways and dusty industries, are larger than 2.5 micrometers and smaller than 10 micrometers in diameter.

• "Fine particles" (PM₂.₅), such as those found in smoke and haze, are 2.5 micrometers in diameter and smaller. These particles can be directly emitted from sources such as forest fires, or they can form when gases emitted from power plants, industries and automobiles react in the air.

While toxic air concentrations, health risks, and associated odors will decrease within any given distance of mobile sources, exposure is primarily based on localized characteristics such as average daily traffic on roadway segments and wind direction, and as such, the health risks and nuisance odors adjacent to high volume roadways and transportation facilities are higher than regional averages. The Air Resources Board recommends avoiding siting new sensitive land uses, such as residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, or medical facilities, within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day. Additional non-cancer health risk attributable to proximity to freeways was seen within 1,000 feet and was strongest within 300 feet. California freeway studies show about a 70 percent drop-off in particulate pollution levels at 500 feet.

The analysis performed here uses 500 and 1,000-foot buffer areas consistent with the Air Resources Board criteria. Since ambient pollutant concentration levels are directly linked to localized emissions and cannot be easily estimated, the emissions analysis presented here focuses on pollutants that tend to have localized effects, which are generally proportionate to fine particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅). This analysis is limited to U.S. Route 101, since it has the highest overall traffic volumes with some segments exceeding the 100,000 vehicles/day threshold and the highest commercial (diesel) truck volumes in the region, particularly between downtown Santa Barbara and the Ventura-Santa Barbara County line. In Chapter 1 truck volumes are summarized for the U.S. Route 101. The highest commercial truck volumes in the region are between downtown Santa Barbara and the Ventura County line.

Using a nationwide network of monitoring sites, EPA, state, and local agencies have developed ambient air quality measurements for PM. This data is used to ensure that PM in the air is at levels that do not impair public health and the environment. Federal and State PM emissions standards are somewhat different, with the State standards being more stringent than the federal, and use somewhat different measurement methods. Figure 116 shows the State standards only. For PM₁₀, the annual average State standard is 20 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³). For PM₂.₅, the annual average State standard is 12 µg/m³. Nationally, average PM concentrations have decreased over the years and are forecast by the EPA to continue a downward trend. Their projected year 2020 annual estimated value for PM₂.₅ for Santa Barbara County is 8.9 µg/m³, less than the current 12.0 µg/m³ State annual average standard. Figure 116 and Figure 117 provide some historical data from the local monitoring sites. PM₁₀ measurements are available for specific sites in the County and Figure 116 indicates the Cities of Santa Barbara and Santa Maria are in a downward trend starting in 2007 and 2008 respectively. PM₂.₅ measurements are available county-wide and show a similar trend.

---

Figure 116: PM_{10} Air Quality Measurements 2003-2015 (State Annual Average)

![Graph of PM_{10} Air Quality Measurements 2003-2015](image)

Source: California Air Resources Board

Figure 117: PM_{2.5} Air Quality Measurements 2003-2015 (State Annual Average)

![Graph of PM_{2.5} Air Quality Measurements 2003-2015](image)

Note: Only County level data available for PM_{2.5}

Results from air quality analysis in the RTP-SCS EIR provide year 2020, 2035 and 2040 on-road mobile source diesel PM_{2.5} and PM_{10} emissions. As Table 31 indicates, the preferred scenario emissions of PM_{2.5} and PM_{10} would be less than 2011 levels, and less than emissions associated with the forecast future baseline scenario. Transportation improvements and land use patterns identified in the proposed 2040 RTP-SCS will contribute to an overall reduction of on-road vehicle emissions when compared to the existing conditions and the baseline scenario. This is due in part to the transportation improvements and the RTP-SCS future land use scenario that encourages infill and TOD. An increase in residential and commercial land use capacity within existing transit corridors leads to lower average VMT and a resulting benefit to air quality.
Table 31: On-Road Mobile Source Toxics Forecast Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Activity</th>
<th>Diesel PM$_{2.5}$ (tons/day)</th>
<th>Diesel PM$_{10}$ (tons/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Baseline Scenario</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Preferred Scenario</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 Baseline Scenario</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 Preferred Scenario</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Baseline Scenario</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Preferred Scenario</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG RTP-SCS EIR

Results for Environmental Justice Air Quality Measures

In order to assess the impacts of air quality on communities of concern, buffer areas of 500 and 1,000 feet from the Route 101 corridor were established. The following figures provide an example of the buffer area relative to the communities of concern for the major populated areas adjacent to Route 101. These two buffer areas were used to calculate the percentage of land area and population within these distances for both communities of concern and the county overall. It is important to note that since some communities of concern have overlapping boundaries, the land area is only counted once so there is no duplication of area in the “All Communities of Concern” category.

Figure 118: Areas Adjacent to US 101 and Communities of Concern, South Coast
Table 32 indicates the area contained in both the 500 and 1,000 feet buffer areas for the communities of concern as compared to the overall population. The population in communities of concern has a greater percentage of land area contained in the buffer areas compared to the overall population.

- On average, the communities of concern have a higher proportion of land area within the 500 and 1,000 foot buffer areas as compared to the overall populations land area. Table 33 indicates 0.7 percent of the county-wide region or 18.6 of the total 2,555 square miles are within 500 feet of the U.S. 101 corridor. By comparison, 2.7 percent of the communities of concern area or 3.5 of the total 129 square miles are within 500 feet of the U.S. 101 corridor.

- Similarly, 1.4 percent of the county-wide region or 35.9 of the total 2,555 square miles are within 1,000 feet of the U.S. 101 corridor. By comparison, 5.1 percent of the communities of concern or 6.5 square miles of the total 129 square miles are within 1,000 feet of the U.S. 101 corridor.

- The population categories represented by people over age 75 and those without vehicles have the highest proportions of their land area within the 500-foot buffer area with 6.7 and 9.0 percent
respectively. Similarly, people over age 75 and those without vehicles have the highest proportions of their land area within the 1,000 foot buffer area, with 12.2 and 17.7 percent respectively.

- The population categories represented by the minority, poverty, and low-income communities have 0.8, 5.1 and 1.1 percent respectively, of their land area within the 500-foot buffer area and 1.5, 10.2 and 2.1 percent respectively, of their land area in the 1,000-foot buffer area. The overall population that has a smaller 0.07 and 1.4 percent of its land area within the 500 and 1,000 foot buffer areas respectively. The all communities of concern category has 2.7 and 6.5 percent of their land area within the 500 and 1,000 foot buffer areas respectively. The poverty category has a greater percentage of its land area within the 500 and 1,000 foot buffer area than the all communities of concern.

Table 33 and Table 34 indicate the percent population growth for both the 2040 future baseline and preferred scenario within the 500 and 1,000-foot buffer areas in the communities of concern as compared to the overall population. Population growth in the buffer areas is greater for the preferred scenario than for the future baseline.

- For all population categories, the 2040 preferred scenario shows a greater percentage population growth from 2010-2020 in the 500 and 1,000-foot buffer areas as compared to the 2040 baseline scenario.

- The percentage population growth in the communities of concern 500-foot buffer areas, on average, are similar to the overall population increasing 0.8 and 1.1 percent respectively in the preferred scenario, and decreasing -1.0 and -0.4 percent respectively for the baseline scenario. Similarly, in the 1,000-foot buffer areas the population increases are on average 3.0 and 2.8 percent respectively in the preferred scenario, and decrease -1.7 and -0.7 percent respectively for the baseline scenario.

- The percentage population change in the minority, poverty, and low-income communities 500-foot buffer areas is -0.1, 0.6 and 0.1 percent respectively in the preferred scenario and -1.3, 0.0, and -0.6 percent respectively in the baseline scenario. Similarly, in the 1,000-foot buffer areas the percentage population change is -0.1, 1.5, and 3.6 percent respectively for the preferred scenario and -2.3, 0.4, and -0.8 percent respectively for the baseline scenario.

- The percentage population change for the overall population 500-foot buffer area is greater than the minority, poverty and low-income communities increasing 1.1 percent in the preferred scenario. The overall population change is -.04 percent in the baseline scenario. Similarly in the 1,000-foot buffer area the overall population change is 2.8 percent for the preferred scenario and -.07 percent for the baseline scenario. The percentage population change for the all communities of concern category 500-foot buffer area is greater than the minority, poverty and low-income communities increasing 0.8 percent in the preferred scenario. The all communities of concern category change is -1.0 in the baseline scenario. Similarly in the 1,000-foot buffer area the all communities of concern category increase 3.0 percent in the preferred scenario and decreases -1.7 in the baseline scenario.
### Table 32: Land Area within 500 and 1,000 Feet of the U.S. 101 Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Area Within Route 101 Buffer Areas</th>
<th>Total Area (Square Miles)</th>
<th>Area in 500 Foot Buffer</th>
<th>% of Area in 500 Foot Buffer</th>
<th>Area in 1,000 Foot Buffer</th>
<th>% of Area in 1,000 Foot Buffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total County</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic &amp; Minority</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48k</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Communities of Concern</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model

### Table 33: Forecast Population Growth (%) within 500 Feet of U.S. 101 Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Communities of Concern Comparison</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>2040 Population</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Population</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>Scenario vs 2040 Future Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 Foot Buffer-Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic &amp; Minority</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48k</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model

### Table 34: Forecast Population Growth (%) within 1,000 Feet of 101 Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population and Communities of Concern Comparison</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>2040 Population</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>2040 Population</th>
<th>2010 to 2040 Difference</th>
<th>Scenario vs 2040 Future Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Foot Buffer Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic &amp; Minority</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below 48k</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Over 75</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma Persons Over Age 25</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Not Spoken Well</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Concern Average</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG Travel Model
Tracking Progress, the 2013 SBCAG SCS

A review of development trends relative to the RTP-SCS preferred scenario is not a requirement of the RTP-SCS update. However, a review of development trends and implementation progress towards realization of the preferred SCS scenario is a useful analysis to gauge progress. Considering the first RTP-SCS was adopted on August 2013, any progress in this timeframe would be limited and actual development may not be specifically credited to the SCS. In theory, the preferred scenario attempts to reduce work-related commuting from the North County to the South Coast. The scenario recommends additional housing in the South Coast, so local workers have more opportunities to live closer to their workplace and, in the North County, non-residential development leading to more local jobs for workers otherwise commuting to the South Coast. An example of the North County-to-South Coast commuting issue is identified in the 2014 SBCAG State of the Commute Report, which indicates there are approximately 3,030 commuters per day or 23 percent of the City of Lompoc’s workforce commuting to the South Coast cities of Goleta and Santa Barbara for work. The City of Lompoc has a deficit of 6,000 jobs when compared to its resident workforce, while the South Coast has a 22,000 job surplus.

Based on local jurisdictions’ land use submissions for the SBCAG Congestion Management Plan (SBCAG Board adoption October, 2016), the figures below show that a larger proportion of future residential and non-residential projects are still anticipated in the North County than on the South Coast. Of the 7,557 residential units approved or under construction countywide, the South Coast’s proportion is 1,805 units or 24 percent, compared to the North County’s 5,752 units or 76 percent.

**Figure 120: Future Residential Units, South Coast vs. North County**
(Approved or Under Construction as of December, 2015)

Of the total countywide 6,276,597 square feet of non-residential square footage, the North County’s overall proportion is 4,070,000 square feet or 65 percent compared to the South Coast’s 2,206,000 square feet or 35 percent.
Consistent with SCS preferred scenario, the South Coast City of Goleta has increased its potential housing production over time and the proportion of over 1,000 future units approved or under construction in the South Coast is significantly higher than the 200 or fewer units in past five year periods. As indicated in the UCSB Long Range Development Plan, housing production at UCSB will increase the overall South Coast housing by a potential 2,000 faculty and staff units and 5,000 dorm beds. The City of Santa Barbara has averaged a consistent 400 and 600 units over prior five-year periods.

Future Workers and Employment
The following figures summarize the difference between the South Coast and North County future workers and employment. Applying a countywide average of 1.4 workers per household to new housing units and an average 360 employees per square foot density factor to all non-residential use types, a rough estimate of future workers and employment can be determined. The difference between the South Coast future workers and employment indicates a surplus of approximately 3,640 future jobs when compared to future resident workers. This surplus of jobs suggests an increase in commuting to the South Coast from workers in North County or elsewhere to fill these jobs. In the North County, there is a surplus of 3,300 future jobs when compared to future resident workers. This analysis suggests that the North County is providing a higher proportion of employment opportunities for local residents, thus reducing the need for commuting to the South Coast for employment. This forecast is consistent with the RTP-SCS preferred growth scenario.
Comparing both the existing and future employment and workers together illustrates their overall proportions. The South Coast continues to have a higher proportion of employment relative to workers, suggesting continued commuting to South Coast jobs. In the North County, it is just the opposite, with a higher proportion of workers relative to employment suggesting continued commuting from North County residences to jobs elsewhere in the South Coast.
Figure 125: North County Existing and Future Employment and Workers

In summary, a review of development trends indicates that a larger proportion of both residential and non-residential development is still anticipated in the North County than on the South Coast. However, compared to past trends, the rate of future residential development for some South Coast jurisdictions has increased, providing more housing opportunities for local workers.

Source: SBCAG, S.B. County Employment Characteristics, Sept. 2015, Table 17
 CHAPTER 5:  
Financial Element  

The financial element analyzes the cost of implementing the projects identified in the action element (discussed in Chapter 3 and listed in Appendix 2). It also provides a realistic forecast of available revenues, showing that the projects can be implemented using "committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources." The financial element demonstrates that Fast Forward 2040 is fiscally constrained.  

- The total amount of revenue anticipated from federal, State, regional, and local sources over the life of Fast Forward 2040 is approximately $6.1 billion. Measure A, the local sales tax measure, accounts for 23 percent of anticipated revenues.  
- The total cost of the projects in Fast Forward 2040 is approximately $6.1 billion: $1.6 billion for highway projects, $2.1 billion for streets and roads projects, $267 million for bicycle and pedestrian projects, $2.0 billion for transit projects, $3.7 million for intelligent transportation system (ITS) projects, $15.9 million for transportation demand management (TDM) projects, and $31 million for rail projects. Fast Forward 2040 is fiscally constrained.  
- Fast Forward 2040 revenue forecasts are largely conservative and are based on historical data. With the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB 1, Beall, 2017), SBCAG does not consider any speculative funding sources.  

Purpose  

The financial element is an integral part of Fast Forward 2040. It is used to forecast revenues available over the life of the plan (2016-2040) and the selection of projects that will implement the plan. Projects included in the plan must be fiscally constrained, i.e., sufficient revenue is forecasted for each project’s construction or implementation. The plan also includes a list of financially unconstrained projects that may be drawn from if revenues beyond those forecasted are realized. All projects are listed in Appendix 2.  

Requirements  

The 2010 RTP Guidelines list the six components of the financial element:  

- Summary of costs to operate and maintain the current transportation system;  
- Estimate of costs and revenues to implement the projects identified in the Action Plan;  
- Inventory of existing and potential transportation funding sources;  
- List of candidate projects if funding becomes available;  
- Potential funding shortfalls; and,  
- Identification of alternative policy directions that affect the funding of projects.  

Several requirements to support the six components are also listed:  

- Ensure consistency between the plan’s policies, action element, financial element, and sustainable communities strategy;  
- Project available funding, including the use of an inflationary factor;  
- Project the costs to implement the plan, including the use of a cost escalation factor;  
- Demonstrate fiscal constraint; and  
- Proposals to fill revenue shortfalls, if any.  
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Assumptions

Development of a financial element requires the acceptance of numerous assumptions. For example, revenue growth is assumed to correspond with assumed inflationary growth factors to year 2040 with the acknowledgement that a lot of externalities can occur in the interim. For competitive grant programs, the Active Transportation Program, cap and trade programs, and others, it is assumed that over time the region will receive a share relative to the region's population as compared to the statewide population—roughly 1.15 percent. While numerous assumptions are made, each was carefully considered and discussed by SBCAG staff and the project advisory committee.

Funding assumptions are based on extrapolation of past revenues, anticipated revenues as discussed in the previous paragraph, and growth factors as discussed in the next section. The passage of SB 1 restored State support for transportation in excess of pre-recessionary levels and removed the need to make a speculative assumption related to state gas taxes.

Two specific sets of assumptions are discussed in the coming sections.

Revenue Growth

SBCAG benefits from Measure A, the local sales tax initiative for transportation. The Measure A ordinance includes a variety of specifically named projects and most of these projects are expected to be partially funded by Measure A revenues. Some of the projects are not planned to be constructed or implemented until the latter years of the measure, near 2040. Therefore, the Measure A Strategic Plan considers revenue growth out to 2040 for both Measure revenues and the other sources of revenue used to supplement the funding of the listed projects. To remain internally consistent, Fast Forward 2040 relies largely on the revenue growth factors included in the Measure A Strategic Plan. The factors range between 3.5 and 3.75 percent depending on the source. There were several exceptions to the use of Measure A Strategic Plan revenue growth factors:

- The SAFE and FSP program funds are assumed to grow at one percent annually. This is based on historical growth patterns. These programs are funded by fees added to vehicle registrations.
- The MTD-UCSB Mitigation Agreement is assumed to grow at two percent annually. This assumption is based on the actual agreement. The program funds transit services serving the UCSB campus community.
- Transit passenger fares are assumed to grow at two percent annually based on historical growth patterns. These funds subsidize transit services throughout the region.
- The FAST Act highlights growth of the FTA 5339 program at 3.75 percent.

The revenue growth factor for each revenue source is shown on Table 35.

Cost Escalation

Like revenue growth, the cost escalation of many projects listed in Fast Forward 2040 is per the Measure A Strategic Plan. This is an acceptable method due to nearly all regionally significant projects being funded at least partially by Measure A revenues. The Measure A Strategic Plan escalates costs at 3.5 percent, largely in-line with revenue growth.

Fast Forward 2040 goes beyond the requirement of listing regionally significant projects by also including projects significant to member jurisdictions. Details for these projects were supplied by the staffs of SBCAG’s member jurisdictions with the explicit instruction that costs reflect the year of expenditure values, thereby being given with appropriate factors applied. In summary, regionally significant project costs are escalated...
per the Measure A Strategic Plan rate and locally significant project costs have been escalated by each sponsoring agency.

SBCAG’s Financial Projections

SBCAG takes a conservative approach to developing financial projections for Fast Forward 2040. The financial projections consider all funding sources: federal, State, and local. Included in the local funding is a variety of unique revenue sources, such as utility users’ taxes, impact fees, and others. All of the revenue sources used to develop the financial projects are described in Appendix 4. The projections are presented by five-year increment in Table 35. In addition to the revenues shown in Table 35, Fast Forward 2040 also relies on $51 million in prior year funds to complete projects being constructed as this plan was being developed. Prior year revenues are not otherwise considered as forecasted revenue. Projects relying on prior year funding are noted as such in Appendix 2.

Funding by Mode and Purpose

Most funding sources have limitations regarding the type of projects each can fund. For instance, transit funding programs for the most part cannot fund bicycle projects. Considering the primary purpose of each source, Figure 126 provides the modal breakdown of the projects proposed for funding by Fast Forward 2040. A comparison of the modal breakdown for the previous iteration of the RTP-SCS is also provided (Figure 127). The shares for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects have grown, but it is important to note that much of the funding for these types of projects, particularly bicycle and pedestrian, is based on competitive grant processes.

Figure 126: Fast Forward 2040 Funding by Mode

Figure 127: Previous RTP-SCS Funding by Mode
Table 35: Fast Forward 2040 Revenue Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 19/20</th>
<th>FY 20/21 - 24/25</th>
<th>FY 25/26 - 29/30</th>
<th>FY 30/31 - 34/35</th>
<th>FY 35/36 - 39/40</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 39/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>171,373</td>
<td>194,450</td>
<td>238,727</td>
<td>295,343</td>
<td>362,531</td>
<td>1,262,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Total</td>
<td>281,373</td>
<td>194,450</td>
<td>238,727</td>
<td>295,343</td>
<td>362,531</td>
<td>1,372,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Projects</td>
<td>281,373</td>
<td>194,450</td>
<td>238,727</td>
<td>295,343</td>
<td>362,531</td>
<td>1,372,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highway/Streets and Roads Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 19/20</th>
<th>FY 20/21 - 24/25</th>
<th>FY 25/26 - 29/30</th>
<th>FY 30/31 - 34/35</th>
<th>FY 35/36 - 39/40</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 39/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>19,973</td>
<td>24,405</td>
<td>28,985</td>
<td>34,426</td>
<td>40,887</td>
<td>148,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>19,566</td>
<td>44,197</td>
<td>79,127</td>
<td>95,162</td>
<td>75,274</td>
<td>313,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>7,635</td>
<td>10,891</td>
<td>12,935</td>
<td>15,363</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>65,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE and FSP</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>15,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Program</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>44,241</td>
<td>49,109</td>
<td>58,326</td>
<td>69,273</td>
<td>82,274</td>
<td>303,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fuel Tax Subventions</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>19,566</td>
<td>44,197</td>
<td>79,127</td>
<td>95,162</td>
<td>75,274</td>
<td>313,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding Sources</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>92,374</td>
<td>109,711</td>
<td>130,302</td>
<td>154,758</td>
<td>183,804</td>
<td>670,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Total</td>
<td>585,654</td>
<td>393,856</td>
<td>520,655</td>
<td>620,331</td>
<td>660,824</td>
<td>2,781,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Projects</td>
<td>585,654</td>
<td>393,856</td>
<td>520,655</td>
<td>620,331</td>
<td>660,824</td>
<td>2,781,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 19/20</th>
<th>FY 20/21 - 24/25</th>
<th>FY 25/26 - 29/30</th>
<th>FY 30/31 - 34/35</th>
<th>FY 35/36 - 39/40</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 39/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Fund</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>89,424</td>
<td>106,208</td>
<td>126,142</td>
<td>149,817</td>
<td>177,936</td>
<td>649,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance Fund</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>15,986</td>
<td>18,986</td>
<td>22,549</td>
<td>26,781</td>
<td>31,808</td>
<td>116,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>47,871</td>
<td>55,822</td>
<td>66,299</td>
<td>78,742</td>
<td>93,521</td>
<td>342,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5310</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>13,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>15,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311f</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>9,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5339</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>7,906</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>13,734</td>
<td>16,509</td>
<td>59,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Transit Operations Program</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>15,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTD-UCSB Mitigation Agreement</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td>7,481</td>
<td>8,259</td>
<td>9,119</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>41,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>69,552</td>
<td>76,791</td>
<td>84,784</td>
<td>93,608</td>
<td>103,351</td>
<td>428,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Total</td>
<td>244,519</td>
<td>283,531</td>
<td>329,837</td>
<td>384,129</td>
<td>447,834</td>
<td>1,689,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Projects</td>
<td>244,519</td>
<td>283,531</td>
<td>329,837</td>
<td>384,129</td>
<td>447,834</td>
<td>1,689,848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 19/20</th>
<th>FY 20/21 - 24/25</th>
<th>FY 25/26 - 29/30</th>
<th>FY 30/31 - 34/35</th>
<th>FY 35/36 - 39/40</th>
<th>FY 15/16 - 39/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>27,785</td>
<td>25,506</td>
<td>30,293</td>
<td>35,979</td>
<td>42,731</td>
<td>162,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>5,766</td>
<td>8,418</td>
<td>9,998</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>14,103</td>
<td>50,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Total</td>
<td>33,551</td>
<td>33,924</td>
<td>40,291</td>
<td>47,853</td>
<td>56,835</td>
<td>212,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Projects</td>
<td>33,551</td>
<td>33,924</td>
<td>40,291</td>
<td>47,853</td>
<td>51,499</td>
<td>207,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,145,097</td>
<td>905,761</td>
<td>1,129,510</td>
<td>1,347,655</td>
<td>1,528,023</td>
<td>6,056,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Projects</td>
<td>1,145,097</td>
<td>905,761</td>
<td>1,129,510</td>
<td>1,347,655</td>
<td>1,522,687</td>
<td>6,050,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are presented as thousands (.000).
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**Ongoing Maintenance and Operations**

Fast Forward 2040 dedicates significant portions of its forecasted revenues to the ongoing maintenance and operations of the region’s highways, streets and roads, and transit services. Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure maintenance typically lacks a dedicated funding source, though the region’s agencies utilize Measure A Local Streets and Transportation Improvements program funding to maintain bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. The addition of capacity to the highway and streets and roads networks accounts for 21 percent of the funding applied to those categories ($783 million of $3.8 billion). For transit projects, nearly all funding is obligated to maintenance and operations, with only low levels of funding allocated to the expansion necessary to accommodate a growing population and to implement the Sustainable Communities Strategy. In summary, Fast Forward 2040 recognizes the region’s transportation network is largely mature and allocates funding accordingly. Several capacity-adding projects are included to satisfy growing demand and improve on existing deficiencies.

**Fiscal Constraint**

Following the completion of revenue projections, SBCAG worked with member agencies and stakeholders to determine which projects should be included in the plan’s fiscally-constrained project lists, the timing of those projects, and the sources of funds to be used for each. In the end, it was found that the estimated project costs are within revenue projections and the plan is fiscally constrained.

**Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint**

- Total estimated cost of Fast Forward 2040 projects = $6.051 billion
- Total projected revenues for implementing Fast Forward 2040 = $6.056 billion

All projects, their estimated costs, and the construction/implementation timeframe are listed in Appendix 2.

SBCAG does not rely on speculative or new funding sources to achieve fiscal constraint. As demand for transportation continues to grow, SBCAG and the region’s jurisdictions should consider exploring other, potential new funding sources. Such potential new sources may include, but are not limited to, local sales tax initiatives, local or regional development impact fees, VMT mitigation fees, etc.

**Consistency with Transportation Improvement Programs**

As the designated MPO for Santa Barbara County, SBCAG biennially adopts a four-year program of projects called the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). It identifies the transportation projects in the
County that receive federal funding. The projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are consistent with the projects in the FTIP.

As mentioned above, SBCAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Barbara County, also biennially adopts a five-year program of projects called the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The RTIP is based on an estimate of revenues that will be available for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). (Caltrans publishes the STIP Fund Estimate every two years.) After acceptance by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), the RTIP, together with Caltrans’ Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), make up the STIP. The CTC adopts a new STIP every two years. The fund estimate in the RTP is consistent with the four-year STIP fund estimate. Fast Forward 2040 uses reasonable assumptions to project STIP revenues over the planning horizon, consistent with past funding levels. The projects in Fast Forward 2040 are also consistent with the projects in the STIP.

**Transportation Control Measures from State Implementation Plan**

Federal regulation requires that, in non-attainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan address the financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs) in the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP). SBCAG is currently in an attainment area and is not subject to this requirement. However, Chapter 3 does list the TCMs from the APCD’s 2016 Ozone Plan, which is the region’s contribution to the SIP. Projects in the RTP’s project lists (see Appendix 2) implement the TCMs. Since the project lists are fiscally constrained, they ensure implementation of the TCMs.

**Corridor System Management Plans**

The 2010 RTP Guidelines state that the “financial element of the RTP should identify funding by corridor to implement the CSMP (corridor system management plans).”

CSMPs are required by the CTC for all corridors receiving Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds from Proposition 1B. Caltrans has approved two CSMPs in Santa Barbara County, both on U.S. 101. The Santa Barbara/Ventura Corridor CSMP was approved in November 2010. It covers 50 miles of U.S. 101 from the Rice Avenue interchange in Ventura County to Winchester Canyon Drive in Santa Barbara County. The Santa Maria to Arroyo Grande CSMP was approved in June 2012. It covers 22 miles of U.S. 101 from the Clark Avenue interchange just south of the City of Santa Maria to the Grand Avenue interchange in the City of Arroyo Grande.

Proposition 1B no longer funds projects through the CMIA program. Several projects were included in the previous iteration of this plan; three have been completed and the fourth is under construction. These projects include:

- U.S. 101 Santa Maria River Bridge widening project (complete)
- Highway 135 Union Valley Parkway Interchange project (complete)
- U.S. 101 widening project from Mussel Shoals/Mobile Pier Road in Ventura County to Casitas Pass Road in Santa Barbara County (complete), and the Linden Avenue and Casitas Pass interchanges in the City of Carpinteria (under construction)

---
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Need vs. Availability of Funding

There are limits to the number of projects that can be funded via forecasted revenues. Caltrans and the region’s jurisdictions all have projects that are planned yet do not have a known source of funding for their construction or implementation. These projects are included in Appendix 2 on the Illustrative Projects list. Illustrative projects represent the unfunded portion or the region’s transportation improvement priorities. Should funding beyond what is forecasted become available, projects from this list could move to one of the two programmed projects lists or the planned projects list through an amendment of this document. Though costs are estimated, the Illustrative Projects list contains roughly $2.3 billion of unfunded projects.
CHAPTER 6: Conclusion

Summary of the Plan

Fast Forward 2040 stays the course for the region set in the Regional Transportation Plan-Sustainable Communities Strategy adopted in 2013. The previous RTP-SCS met the new requirements of Senate Bill 375 and successfully achieved the region’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emission targets in 2020 and 2035, while accommodating forecast growth and regional housing needs. Fast Forward 2040 relies on the same core strategies and planning assumptions and strives to achieve the same, broad goals as the prior plan. Because in this planning cycle there is no new Regional Growth Forecast or Regional Housing Needs Allocation process, Fast Forward 2040 utilizes essentially the same land use assumptions and housing and growth allocation as the prior plan. Some additional GHG emission reduction benefits are realized, mostly due to the effects on interregional travel of neighboring regions’ newly adopted sustainable communities strategies. However, the core tenets of the plan remain the same.

The central challenge for the Santa Barbara County region in the next few decades remains how to accommodate the significant, forecast growth in population and jobs in a way that keeps the region on a path toward sustainability and preserves the region’s exceptional quality of life. Fast Forward 2040 restates the vision of the prior plan, making targeted transportation investments and striving to correct the existing imbalance of jobs and housing as a way to reduce vehicle emissions, highway congestion and commute costs and thereby promote greater mobility, environmental sustainability, social equity, healthy lifestyles and economic prosperity.

The good news is that the region is broadly on track to realizing that vision or at least to laying the necessary groundwork to achieve that vision. With respect to land use, Fast Forward 2040 is founded on the careful planning efforts of SBCAG member agencies over the last decade, work that acknowledges regional challenges and emphasizes both (1) additional new housing in urbanized areas (especially on the South Coast) near employment centers accessible to transit and (2) economic development and job growth in the North County. At the same time, Fast Forward 2040 targets transportation investments and transit expansion that preserve and maintain existing infrastructure, add to existing transportation capacity in ways that promote more efficient transportation of people and goods (most significantly, the U.S. 101 high-occupancy vehicle lane between Ventura and Santa Barbara), and enhance alternative modes of transportation, including bikes, walking and transit.

Fast Forward 2040 respects local government autonomy with respect to land use. SB 375 imposes no requirement of consistency between Fast Forward 2040 and local General Plans, although each jurisdiction must accommodate its share of identified regional housing need. Implementation is voluntary and depends on SBCAG member agencies to continue to make land use choices that support regional goals and take regional dynamics and housing and commute patterns into account. Like its predecessor, Fast Forward 2040 should be understood as aspirational.

While Fast Forward 2040 articulates a long-term vision and strategy for accommodating regional growth and addressing regional transportation needs, it does not solve all our regional transportation issues. Transportation modeling shows that, if implemented, the plan would lead to a reduction in overall congestion, vehicle miles traveled and emissions. However, while it does better than a business-as-usual approach, it does not solve the challenge of local congestion on the South Coast, for which more detailed study is needed.
Also, funding constraints at all levels of government continue to limit what is in reach. As much as local sales tax revenue through Measure A helps with regional priorities, transportation funding as a whole remains in crisis, still waiting for long-term state and federal solutions. Beyond Fast Forward 2040’s fiscally constrained project lists is an even longer list of pressing, unmet transportation needs. Significant additional funding will be necessary to meet these needs.

An Unknown Future, Change is at the Doorstep

The world of transportation is on the cusp of revolutionary change. Emerging transportation technologies, especially autonomous and connected vehicles, alternative fuel vehicles and ride-sharing services, may upend the way people and goods move and how we use and consume transportation. Meanwhile, as more efficient, alternative fuel vehicles cause less fuel to be consumed, governments are fundamentally re-thinking the way we finance transportation infrastructure and moving away from reliance on the gas tax. Finally, transportation (and land use) policy – at least in California – is increasingly being driven by one, overriding concern: climate change and the need to reduce vehicle emissions.

While numerous transportation experts are studying the possible effects of emerging technologies, we still do not know what the future will look like or exactly how these new technologies will affect existing transportation systems. Autonomous vehicles and ride-sharing services, which may see widespread adoption in less than a decade, could substantially reduce the cost of driving, measured in both time and money. Generally speaking, as transportation costs go down, people travel more. If they can use time in transit productively, people may be willing to live farther from work and other frequent travel destinations. On balance, the more miles that vehicles travel, the more congestion, delay and other negative effects we can expect. However, as their movement would be centrally coordinated by computers not subject to the limitations of human drivers, autonomous and connected vehicles also promise to utilize existing road and highway capacity much more efficiently, perhaps making up for the increased congestion that would otherwise result from longer trips. Also, no longer constrained by human drivers’ need to sleep, autonomous freight systems can utilize highways during off-peak periods, further optimizing the use of existing highway capacity. To the degree that ride sharing services make car ownership obsolete or prohibitively expensive by comparison, the need for parking may drastically decline, with important spill-over effects on land use. Similarly, in some areas, ride-sharing services may eventually offer a more cost-effective mobility option than fixed-route public transit.

Faced with declining gas tax revenues as a result of greater vehicle fuel efficiency and increasing numbers of alternative fuel vehicles, several states, including California, are studying a road user charge as an alternative or supplement to the traditional gas tax. The backlog of unmet transportation needs and deferred maintenance on our transportation infrastructure is already huge and growing. Although the idea of a road user charge still has to garner political support, it would not only generate revenue to help pay for infrastructure, but, as a matter of good transportation policy, could counterbalance the possible effects of autonomous vehicles on trip length by dis-incentivizing longer trips.

At least since the passage of SB 375, transportation policy has increasingly been driven by concerns about climate change and the need to reduce vehicle greenhouse gas emissions. Many policy efforts to rein in vehicles emissions have taken the form of top-down regulatory mandates – not least, SB 375’s requirement for metropolitan planning organizations, like SBCAG, to develop either a sustainability communities strategy or alternative planning strategy to meet specific emission reduction targets. The same core concerns are driving transportation planning –and funding allocation- at the state level. The State’s own 2040 California Transportation Plan recognizes that cost mechanisms such as a road user charge would help achieve the
same policy goal, using a price signal to reduce vehicle miles traveled through a market-based approach, while at the same time generating revenue.

The net effect of all the changes currently in motion is potentially to disrupt current modeling and long-range transportation planning assumptions. Regional transportation plans like Fast Forward 2040 depend on the use of sophisticated land use and travel modeling tools that make assumptions about the way people, vehicles and transportation systems behave. Against the backdrop of all this uncertainty, however, it is hard to be confident about many planning assumptions, both fiscal and technical, but even more difficult to know how to change them. In the absence of certainty, the fallback position at this point is to continue to rely on historical trends and past assumptions, to assume that the future will still approximate the past, with respect to both revenue growth and traveler and vehicle behavior. SBCAG is tracking developments in these areas closely and recognizes the need to remain flexible and able to respond. SBCAG is currently in the early stages of upgrading its travel demand model in conjunction with SLOCOG and AMBAG. The upgraded travel model will be able to adjust key modeling variables and pivot as necessary to embrace whatever change as the unknown future unfolds.