

JTAC STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Draft Fast Forward 2040 and Draft Supplemental EIR

MEETING DATE: May 4, 2017

AGENDA ITEM: 4

STAFF CONTACT: Peter Imhof, Michael Becker

RECOMMENDATION:

- a. Recommend SBCAG Board adoption of draft Fast Forward 2040
- b. Recommend SBCAG Board certification of the draft Supplemental EIR

SUMMARY:

Staff is seeking JTAC's recommendation for Board adoption of draft Fast Forward 2040. Comments received since the April JTAC meeting have been considered and incorporated or addressed as appropriate in the draft plan. SBCAG's consultant will present the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) and staff also seeks JTAC's recommendation for SBCAG Board certification of the document. The SBCAG Board will consider both items during its May and August 2017 meetings.

DISCUSSION:

Staff presents the next iteration of draft Fast Forward 2040 (Attachments 1, body, and 2, appendices) for the Committee's consideration. During the April meeting, staff requested comments from Committee members by April 14th. The City of Santa Barbara requested to have the Union Pacific Railroad Bridge at Cabrillo Boulevard project listed as a constrained project to reflect the commitments that have already been made. Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) requested all listed projects be given identification numbers. The changes requested by the City of Santa Barbara and MTD have been integrated into the draft plan. Following the meeting, both the City of Goleta and the Air Pollution Control District provided comments (Attachments 3 and 4). Staff carefully considered the comments and made changes to the draft plan as appropriate. Staff will discuss the comments and any resulting changes in more detail during the presentation of this item.

In addition to changes made in response to Committee member comments, staff also rephrased language throughout the document as related to funding in response to the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB 1, Beall, 2017). SB 1 removed the need to consider speculative sources of funding to achieve fiscal constraint. Previously, the plan speculated that state gas tax revenues would return to their historical average.

Staff is seeking the Committee's recommendation that the SBCAG Board adopt draft Fast Forward 2040. SB 375 requires two separate hearings. Staff will bring the draft to the Board in May and then again for adoption at its August 2017 meeting.

Member Agencies

Buellton ■ Carpinteria ■ Goleta ■ Guadalupe ■ Lompoc ■ Santa Barbara ■ Santa Maria ■ Solvang ■ Santa Barbara County

A Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) has been prepared by SBCAG and Rincon Consultants to satisfy CEQA requirements (Attachment 5). A public comment period began on April 17th and will conclude on May 31st. The DSEIR supplements the currently certified EIR from the 2040 RTP-SCS (Attachment 6), which will require re-certification alongside the certification of the DSEIR. SBCAG's consultant will present the DSEIR, focusing on the differences between the EIR and DSEIR, and will be available to answer questions. A public meeting will be conducted at SBCAG's office on May 4 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM.

NEXT STEPS:

Following the May JTAC meeting, draft Fast Forward and the DSEIR will be available for comment by the public and SBCAG Board. A list of key dates follows:

- May 4 – DSEIR Public Meeting, SBCAG, 6:00 – 8:00 PM
- May 11 – Draft Fast Forward 2040 and DSEIR considered for recommendation by SBCTAC
- May 18 – Public Hearing #1, Draft Fast Forward 2040 and DSEIR presented to the SBCAG Board
- May 31 – DSEIR public comment period closes
- August 17 – Public Hearing #2, Draft Fast Forward 2040 and DSEIR considered by the SBCAG Board

Attachments:

1. Draft Fast Forward 2040 **(web posting only)**
2. Draft Fast Forward 2040 Appendices **(web posting only)**
3. City of Goleta Comments
4. Air Pollution Control District Comments
5. Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report **(web posting only)**
6. 2040 RTP-SCS Environmental Impact Report **(web posting only)**



April 14, 2017

SENT VIA EMAIL

CITY COUNCIL

Paula Perotte
Mayor

Stuart Kasdin
Mayor Pro Tempore

Roger S. Aceves
Councilmember

Michael T. Bennett
Councilmember

Kyle Richards
Councilmember

CITY MANAGER
Michelle Greene

Mr. Peter Imhof
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
260 North San Antonio Creek Road, Suite B
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

RE: Draft Fast Forward 2040 SBCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy Comments

Dear Mr. Imhof,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Fast Forward 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (Draft Plan), as provided to the SBCAG Joint Technical Advisory Committee on April 6, 2017. City staff reviewed the Draft Plan and submits the following comments for your consideration:

- With respect to the Future Baseline vs. Preferred Scenario discussion on page 57, we think it is important to note that the preferred scenario is not consistent with the City's/County adopted land use policies within our General Plans. Adding this clarification might help avoid confusion for readers of the document.
- In the "External Traffic" discussion on pages 64-65, there are references to average daily traffic (ADT) during the discussion of PM, or evening, peak-hour traffic impacts. ADT and PM are two different units of measure. Consider adding an explanation about how the two measures are different and include the methods for comparing ADT with PM peak hour trips for clarification purposes.
- To provide illustrative examples, please add "...for example Fairview and Storke/Glen Annie interchanges" at the end of the first bullet on page 66.
- For the discussion of Goleta arterials on page 66, please change "Many arterials..." to "The arterials..." to better reflect existing conditions.

- For the discussion of Calle Real on page 66, it would be helpful to add some details about Measure G (2012). Measure G 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.
- For the discussion on Hollister Avenue on page 66, please add a reference that the City's Complete Streets project for Hollister Avenue in Old Town will divert more trips to US 101.
- For the discussion of the Congestion Management Program on pages 84-85, please note that Goleta intends to perform deficiency plans for Fairview and Storke/Glen Annie interchanges. No changes to the Draft Plan are necessary as this detail is provided for your information only.
- On page 88, second paragraph last line, clarify that SB 743 does not require local jurisdictions to designate infill opportunity zone.
- For the first bullet under "Bicycle Network Gaps" on page 100, please add "Complete Streets" in front of "corridor plan" to better reflect the scope of the project.
- The heading "Freight" on page 102 seems misplaced. This heading might be more appropriate before the section on "Goods Movement" on page 103. "Intermodal Connectivity" could then be its own heading.
- For Figure 67 on page 105, we suggest using two difference figures so that bicycle and pedestrian collisions are shown on a scale that can better illustrate trends. Also, it would be helpful to include a list or description of the main causes for bicycle and pedestrian collisions if it's not already included.
- On page 110, consider adding a paragraph discussing the Goleta Train Depot under the "Rail" heading before the references to the illustrative projects. The Goleta Train Depot is part of the Programmed list of projects under SBCAG heading and it is a significant component to achieving commuter rail service.
- On page 111, under Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, consider including a reference to the Goleta Train Depot improvements as another tool for serving airport customers.
- The reference to Fowler Road on page 111 needs to be revised. Fowler Road will be improved but will not extend through to Fairview Avenue.
- On page 113 under "Opportunities and Challenges", we suggest including a statement about increasing truck traffic for last mile services from online vendors such as Amazon.

- On page 117, last sentence, the Draft Report states that the preferred scenario maximizes region-wide benefits and minimizes detrimental effects. Consider adding qualifying language as the preferred scenario only minimizes detrimental effects as compared to the other scenarios.
- Page 118 includes a bulleted list of the benefits of the preferred scenario as compared to future baseline. Please consider including a list identifying the factors that will not be addressed or will be a result of the preferred scenario. This information could inform future updates. Also, consider adding bullets to describe how the preferred scenario benefits the north county differently from the south county and visa versa.
- The “Transit and Land Use” section starting on page 127, might benefit from more detail regarding commuter rail. Commuter rail and bus transit are both important transit solutions.
- Please confirm the percentages in paragraph 2 on page 158. At first glance, they do not seem to make sense. For example, when comparing a 683% increase in CVMT under future baseline and 82% under the preferred scenario the referenced reduction of 77% CVMT does not seem to make sense.
- The Draft Plan “Conclusion” is included starting on page 211. Consider adding a summary of the commuter rail function in our County and how the Draft Plan utilizes and benefits from strategies to improve this transit service.
- Appendix 1 includes the glossary and acronyms. Add CAFE (from page Draft Plan 33) to the list of acroynms.
- Appendix 2 includes a list of projects. Comments regarding this list were previously sent to you under separate cover.
- In Appendix 5, page 111, the date “October 2015” is written “October 2105.”

We look forward to working on the finalization of the 2040 Fast Forward Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. Don't hesitate to contact us if you have any questions regarding this input.

Sincerely,



Anne Wells
Advance Planning Manager



Rosemarie Gaglione
Public Works Director

cc: James Winslow, Senior Project Manager
Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner

ATTACHMENT 4

<http://meetings.sbcag.org/Meetings/Joint%20TTAC%20TPAC%20JTAC/2017/02%20Feb/JTAC/Item%204%20FF2040%20Draft%20Chapters%201%20&%202.pdf>

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Page 5 – Federal Clean Air Act: no comments, seems OK

Page 7 – SB 375 discussion: doesn't state what the regional GHG targets are. Should state the target and projected reduction.

Page 7 – CEQA: Since SBCAG intends to rely on LOS as their CEQA significance threshold, the document should clearly state that here.

Page 8 – California Clean Air Act: Can state that the County's attainment status shifted to Nonattainment Transitional by operation of law at the end of 2016. This has not been published yet, but should be finalized before this document is finalized.

Page 26 – Figure 14: This table seems to be percentage changes in each metric from 1990 to 2010. It doesn't show absolute mode share. Suggest showing absolute values in 1990 and in 2010 for each metric. This would allow you to clearly see what percent of workers use transit, what percent carpool, etc. and how those rates have changed over time. Alternately, suggest using a different title. As is it appears it could be confused for a chart that shows mode share.

Page 35-45 – Air Quality Setting: suggest adding a discussion of the draft scoping plan, which should be finalized this year.

Chapter 2

Page 4 – States goals and objectives: suggest stating what the GHG reduction target is.

Page 11 – Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures: for numerical objectives, suggest including the actual objective.

Chapter 3

<http://meetings.sbcag.org/Meetings/Joint%20TTAC%20TPAC%20JTAC/2017/03%20March/JTAC/Item%204/Item%204,%20Attach%20%20-%20Draft%20Chapter%203.pdf>

Page 32-33: talks about congestion management and SB 743. Says lead agencies will still need to do an LOS analysis to evaluate consistency with the congestion management plan, but not for CEQA. – no comments

Page 33: talks about SIP requirements – no comments

Page 46: the first section under "Freight" talks about bikeway and park-and ride projects. Maybe this should be under the active transportation section?

Page 47: Under safety, talk about Santa Barbara City's Vision Zero target? Have other jurisdictions adopted similar targets?

Page 49: Transportation Security. Talk about climate change mitigation? DOT guidance for reference: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate_change/documents/FR3_CA_Climate_Change_Active_Transportation_Guide_2013-02-26_.pdf#zoom=65

UCSB document: <http://ocpc.msi.ucsb.edu/pdfs/ClimateDisturbanceRpt.pdf>

Page 50: Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Management goes by the acronym SBCOEM (with the C)

Page 51, bottom: reference to our Clean Air Plan- adjust to read, "Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District's Ozone Plan, which is the region's contribution..."

Page 57: to the discussion on autonomous and connected vehicles, suggest adding this: However, while these technologies may increase efficiency and reliability, it is not clear that they will reduce the number of vehicles on the road – they may even increase that number.

Page 58: EV readiness: suggest changing the name to ZEV readiness. Talk about both battery electrics and fuel cell electrics.

Talk about CEC grant to fund charging locations along the 101:

http://www.energy.ca.gov/releases/2016_releases/2016-04-13_ev_chargers.html

Talk about CEC grant for ZEV readiness implementation: http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/GFO-16-601_NOPA.pdf (SLOAPCD is lead, SBCAPCD and Ventura APCD are participating as subcontractors)

Chapter 4

<http://meetings.sbcag.org/Meetings/Joint%20TTAC%20TPAC%20JTAC/2017/03%20March/JTAC/Item%2004/Item%204,%20Attach%203%20-%20Draft%20Chapter%204.pdf>

Page 2: identifies per capita GHG reductions from the preferred scenario – this could be compared to the plan goals to show whether they will be met.

Page 10: either at the end of the second bullet or at the end of the Policies section consider adding text along these lines: "In discussion of infill development it is important to note that sensitive land uses (residences, schools, medical facilities, etc.) should not be sited within 500 feet of Highway 101, based on guidance from California Air Resources Board, and numerous studies showing adverse health effects of living near highly traveled roadways." If another location in the document is preferable for this text, please include there.

from Page 20: Table 3 has "Agriculture/Public Lands/Open Space" at 85.68% and "Public lands & open space" at 4.17%. The overlap is a little unclear and it seems that ag land and the national forest have been lumped together. If the data is easily available, I'd suggest listing "National Forest" percentage, "Agricultural Land" and other "Open Space" (or some other category that captures what isn't agricultural or national forest).

Page 41: identifies that daily VMT would increase more in the preferred scenario vs the baseline scenario. Any discussion why this is?

Page 43 through 45: Table 6 or in the text (maybe Figure 32?). Suggest showing absolute GHG emissions, in addition to GHG per capita. Suggest showing them in Metric tons CO₂e/year, to be consistent with units used for cap and trade and state scoping plans.

Page 45: Figure 31: Show the units (lb CO₂e/day/person)

Page 47: states that on-road fuel consumption will increase, but Figure 35 shows a decrease. This doesn't seem to match.

Page 50: states that VMT per capita will be lower under the preferred scenario compared to the baseline. This doesn't seem to be consistent with the statement on page 41. (unless the baseline and preferred scenarios show different rates of population growth)

Page 50: alternate mode share. Suggest stating changes as percentage points, rather than percentages (all trips = 0.58 percentage points over 2010 and 0.46 percentage points over baseline) (workers = 0.67 percentage points over 2010 and 0.43 percentage points over baseline)

Page 50: states that congestion would increase less under the preferred scenario compared to baseline. That doesn't seem to match the statement on page 41 about daily CVMT and VHD.

Page 51: more parts that seem inconsistent when talking about VMT, VHT, VHD between this page and page 41. Is this because Page 41 is focusing on south coast whereas this section is talking county-wide? The tables on Page 54 seem to show that is the explanation. If so – maybe a little more in the text to clarify.

Page 56: similar to comments on Alternate mode share, suggest stating differences as percentage points rather than percent for transit ridership, accessibility, drive-alone mode share (the metrics that you express as percent of total population).

Page 59: same comment for Transit accessibility and active transportation mode share discussions.

Page 75: talks about environmental justice air quality concerns, includes reference to EIR mitigation measures for development within 500 feet of roadways

Page 81: shows forecasted population changes within 500 and 1,000 feet of 1010 corridor. This is a good way to show near-roadway development patterns.