

MINUTES

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Board of Supervisor Hearing Room
105 East Anapamu Street, 4th Floor
Santa Barbara, CA

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**

Members Present: Naomi Schwartz, Supervisor, First District; Susan Rose, Supervisor, Second District (SBCAG Vice-Chair); Gail Marshall, Supervisor, Third District; Joni Gray, Supervisor, Fourth District; Joe Centeno, Supervisor, Fifth District; Victoria Pointer, Mayor, City of Buellton; Richard Weinberg, Mayor, City of Carpinteria; Jack Hawxhurst, Mayor, City of Goleta; Sam Arca, Mayor, City of Guadalupe (arrived at 8:40 a.m.); Dick DeWees, Mayor, City of Lompoc; Gregg Hart, Councilmember, City of Santa Barbara; Bob Orach, Councilmember, City of Santa Maria; David Smyser, Councilmember, City of Solvang, Tim Gubbins, Caltrans District 5 Representative.

Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Jim Kemp, Executive Director; Michael Powers, Deputy Director of Planning; Stephen VanDenburgh, Deputy Director of Programs, Robert Perkins, Administrative Services Officer; Kent Epperson, TDM Program Administrator; Heather Diez, Transportation Program Coordinator, Debbie Barber, Public Information Officer; Cathy Muneio, Executive Secretary; Kevin E. Ready, Sr., Senior Deputy County Counsel.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

Vice-Chair Rose called for the pledge of allegiance.

3. **Recess to Closed Session:**

No closed session was held.

4. **Convene in Open Session**

5. **Approval of Minutes: September 18, 2003**

Regular Meeting Minutes

Supervisor Marshall asked that a sentence be added to her statement on page 11 stating that "The Board needed to come to a consensus and move away from a polarized position."

Supervisor Schwartz asked that on Page 10 the word "partially" be changed to read "not fully" funded projects.

Mayor Weinberg said that on Page 10 the words "does have the people" be replaced with "could provide the people with a consultant".

Board Retreat Meeting Minutes

Mayor Weinberg asked that the "D" be added after the word Measure on Page 3.

Supervisor Gray moved approval of the minutes of the regular Board meeting of September 18, 2003. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Schwartz and carried with Councilmember Orach abstaining and Mayor Arca absent.

A motion was made by Supervisor Gray to approve the minutes of the Board retreat held on September 18, 2003. The motion was seconded by Mayor Weinberg and carried with Supervisor Rose and Councilmember Orach abstaining and Mayor Arca absent.

6. **Public Comment**

Supervisor Schwartz asked about the status of her previous request that a coordination effort be made between agencies sponsoring construction projects on the South Coast to improve public information and and minimize conflicts and traffic congestion during construction. She asked Mr. Kemp to place this item on a future agenda.

Mr. Kemp stated he would place this item on an agenda for discussion and explained that this effort was not currently included in the agency's Overall Work Program. He suggested that a good place for this task to reside would be with Fluor Enterprises, the consultant that coordinates the delivery of Measure D projects. Flour's contract would be on the Board agenda by the end of the year for renewal, and the issue would be discussed with the Board at that time.

Supervisor Schwartz asked that staff let the Board know if forming a subcommittee would help move this effort forward.

Mayor Arca arrived.

7. **Approval of Consent Calendar**

Supervisor Gray moved approval of the consent calendar. The motion was seconded by Mayor Arca and carried unanimously.

8. **Caltrans District Director's Report**

Tim Gubbins, the Deputy District Director for Program Project Management presented the staff report.

Mayor DeWees asked who was paying for the Hwy 101 Santa Barbara upgrade for planting and irrigation on the Hwy 101.

Mr. Gubbins responded that this was a Caltrans SHOPP funded project.

Mayor Weinberg asked if the City of Goleta had plans to replace the Los Carneros Bridge in the future.

Mayor Hawxhurst replied that the City of Goleta did have plans and pointed out that this bridge was a railroad bridge and not the bridge overcrossing the freeway.

Councilmember Smyser asked about Item 5 in the response letter from Caltrans regarding questions asked of Caltrans at the September Board meeting. Mr. Albright, responding for Caltrans, explained in the letter the State's policy about removal of advertising signs in the State right-of-way. Mr. Albright's letter stated that no one from the media or public had complained to Caltrans regarding the removal of signs. Councilmember Smyser said it would be helpful if the public had some way of being notified where they could pick up their signs after they have been removed.

Supervisor Gray asked about the attachment to the Caltrans letter regarding the names and terms of Commissioners on the California Transportation Commission. She asked if the Commissioner's terms were dependent on the governor's term or were independent of the governor's term. Mr. Gubbins responded that they independent of the governor's term.

Mayor Weinberg asked when the Final EIR and review by the National Marine Fisheries Agency would be completed for the 101 Operational Improvements.

Mr. Robert Miller, Project Manager from Caltrans, said that their review should be completed by the end of November or first of December.

Mayor Pointer asked if Caltrans could paint over the word "the" on the Avenue of "the" Flags exit sign on Highway 101. Mr. Miller said he would look into this request.

9. **Funding Obligation Deadline For Northwest Presidio Reconstruction Project**

Ms. Diez presented the staff report. She stated that staff recommended that the obligation deadline for this project be extended from November 1, 2003 to May 1, 2004 by which time State Parks must obligate \$425,000 in Transportation Enhancement funds, or \$250,000 in TE funds awarded in March 2003 would be unprogrammed from the project.

Mr. Jackman with the Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation gave a brief history of the project explaining the reasons for the delay in obligation of the TE funds and indicating that they could meet the proposed deadline extension to May 1, 2004.

Mr. Donaldson, Architect for the project, said they had run into difficulty with the federal Section 106 when it was initially decided to include four entire blocks totaling 64 structures. This has been revised to limit the review to 3 structures.

Mr. Scott Wenz stated that in times of fiscal constraints this type of project should not be happening and said that the property had changed from serving as commercial use and residential use to an historical site.

A motion was made by Supervisor Schwartz, seconded by Councilmember Hart and unanimously carried to approve an extension of the deadline from November 1, 2003 to May 1,

2004, by which time the State Parks must obligate \$425,000 in Transportation Enhancement program funds on the Northwest Presidio Reconstruction project, or the \$250,000 in additional TE funds will be unprogrammed from the project.

10. **Highway 101 Implementation Plan**

Mr. Kemp presented the staff report.

Supervisor Schwartz requested that funds not needed for the Implementation Plan remain in the Measure D fund balance for the 101 project. She also requested that the specific operational improvements project be listed individually expenditure plan amendment. These changes would modify recommendations A(2)(a) and A(2)(c).

Mayor Pointer said that in one area of the Congestion Relief Report it stated that "lanes were going to be added", and in another area of the report it stated that "lanes and/or use the highway shoulders and right of ways" to widen the freeway. She said that Caltrans and SBCAG were holding the option of adding lanes by making a lane in the shoulder and she said she was not sure that this is what the Board was supporting.

Mr. Kemp said that in either case there would be lanes added. He said that safety issues would be taken into account in deciding how lanes would be added.

Mayor Pointer stated for the record that she thought this was deceiving. She said when you say widening lanes it seems like there should be additional lanes added that would not interfere with the present right of ways or shoulders.

Mayor Arca asked if widening the lanes could be made a priority and capacity enhancement follow as a priority. He stated that all the issues needed to be spelled out very specifically because he is concerned that the board's decision could be changed in the future. He said that these methodologies would be very important over the next fifty years.

Mayor Weinberg said that the Board needed to be careful not to try to design the freeway as it makes its approval as there are many design options available. He explained that there were certain areas in Montecito where to accommodate six lanes there would need to be a reduction in width on some of the shoulders. He noted that the intent was to widen the freeway and reduce congestion.

Councilmember Orach asked if the \$200,000 deficiency of the Coastal Express was SBCAG's share.

Mr. Kemp said that \$200,000 was SBCAG's share and that VCTC was supportive of expanded service. He noted that the Coastal Express Policy Steering Committee voted recently to support continuation of the service.

Supervisor Rose asked how many people were riding the Coastal Express daily.

Mr. Kemp responded between 250 and 300 people were riding these buses each day.

Supervisor Centeno explained that the intent was to get cars off of the road and asked if there was an analysis on how many transit riders would divert to cars if the bus service wasn't available to them.

Mr. Kemp said that there wasn't a current survey to say what the alternative mode would be if these people weren't riding the Coastal Express.

Supervisor Schwartz said she was skeptical of the Coastal Express when it was first implemented, but she was now a supporter. She said that this was a very well run transit service noting with increasing ridership and good fare box recovery ratio. She indicated that ridership surveys are conducted each year and that this might help answer Supervisor Centeno's question.

Councilmember Smyser said he had previously raised questions about the Coastal Express and funding, but that his opinion had changed and now he was in support of its expansion. He stated that staff had done an excellent job of including this service as part of the solution and that transit would play an important role when construction begins on the operational improvements.

Mayor DeWees asked about Recommendation B that stated that widening to six lanes was the priority and that other alternatives would be studied. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Kemp said the intent of this policy was to make it clear that when the Implementation Plan is completed there will be a list of congestion relief projects and that the list will include a project to widen 101 along with other alternatives. He said the design of the widening project needed to be evaluated whether it would become an HOV or mixed flow lane to determine what would work best.

Supervisor Rose said that the word "widening" was the word the Board was struggling with and asked if the Board could mandate a project that would add two additional lanes. She said she had heard Mr. Albright say that we couldn't mandate a project up front.

Kevin Ready stated there was a semantic difference between widening and adding lanes. When the public voted for Measure D they were voting for adding lanes. He explained that there are certain areas where you may or may not be able to add lanes within the existing rights of way. The policy mandates increasing capacity by adding lanes, but does not specify whether it is done within the existing right of way.

Mayor Pointer said she agreed with the design issue, but it was not clearly spelled out. She stated it was her wish to add lanes where they could be added. She stated that using the shoulders should be saved for future use and said she hoped that the Board could somehow incorporate the wording "widening with additional pavement" into the Implementation Plan.

Supervisor Rose stated there was a difference of perspective among board members regarding how the widening would be accomplished. She said she did not know how much the Board could mandate or prioritize.

Mr. Ready said that Recommendation A and B were completely different things. Recommendation A would amend an expenditure plan that was set by an ordinance that was voted on by the people, and the only way it could be changed was by a vote of the people or a super-majority of votes of the SBCAG Board. The same requirements would apply to any revisions to Recommendation A if approved by the board. Recommendation B would set the policy, but a future board could change the policy.

Mayor DeWees stated that it has to be made clear that the board intends to add lanes to the freeway, but that this could involve using the shoulders in certain areas.

Supervisor Rose noted that the board had previously decided that the funds approved for the County Rail Study would be used in the IP to help pay for the rail components. She expressed her concern that the scope of the Rail Study had been narrowed and said that all types of passenger rail need to be evaluated.

Mr. Kemp said rolling this study into the IP was a decision that the SBCAG Board made based on a recommendation by the South Coast Subregional Committee and TTAC. He explained that the county wide plan was going to look at all types of rail and the intercity rail component was ongoing. Amtrak has a 20 year plan to call for additional service and capital improvements. He said that the funds that were going to be used for the Rail Plan were now going to be used to look at ways to reduce congestion using commuter rail as part of the Implementation Plan.

Supervisor Rose said this was a very narrow way of approaching it and she was disappointed that it was not getting a high level of analysis.

Supervisor Centeno said he wanted some clarification on whether there would be six lanes no matter what else was done.

Mr. Kemp said that the policy was that when the Implementation Plan is complete that the project to widen 101 by adding lanes will be included on the list of projects. The Board will have to make decisions in the future on the recommended projects.

Chair Rose asked for public comment.

David Fortson with SBCAN said he supported the use of Measure D funds for operational improvements, expansion of the transit service and the Implementation Plan, but he thinks that widening is a mistake. He said that the other concepts have a chance of providing congestion relief and recommended that the board direct staff to explore funding for expanded commuter oriented transit service to relieve congestion. He stated that the MTD was an essential component of providing transportation relief in the south coast.

Grant House, representing COAST, indicated that COAST supports the proposed reallocation of Measure D funds. All the jurisdictions had signed an MOU to participate in the Implementation Plan and COAST supported the Implementation Plan as long as it follows the MOU and does not mandate a particular outcome such as a widening project.

Barry Siegel said he supported Recommendation A. He encouraged the board to direct that the IP be conducted on an impartial basis and that the projects recommended through the IP be evaluated for effectiveness in relieving congestion.

Scott Wenz, representing CAB and Streets are Us, stated that the project should move forward with a mandate of three additional lanes. He said that CAB asked for this study 4 ½ years ago but Caltrans wouldn't do it. He supports the use of buses, but state that heavy rail is not cost effective

Roger Horton, member of the City Council for the City of Santa Barbara, and a member of the Jobs/Housing Steering Committee, said the population would significantly increase by 2025. He stated there were unique problems on the south coast that needed to be dealt with due to

limited physical space. He urged moving forward with the IP as quickly as possible. He said that the rail study needs to be a large part of the Implementation Plan because it would have little impact on the environment and is cost effective.

Dan Secord, Mayor Protem for the City of Santa Barbara, asked the Board to approve the staff recommendations and the Implementation Plan. He said the Board had heard both sides and now it was time to make a decision. He stated that it would be great to send a message to the state with a unanimous vote in favor of the Implementation Plan from the SBCAG Board.

June Pujo said she had followed the development of the deficiency plan and would be looking at the city's interest as the progress unfolds. She stated a meeting of the City of Santa Barbara's Transportation and Circulation Committee was held on October 2nd to discuss recommendations regarding the IP. She distributed a letter describing the outcome of this meeting which was prior to the staff recommendation before the Board today. Ms. Pujo said that the TC&C strongly supported the Implementation Plan and the MOU and that it was critical to any successful long term solution on the south coast.

Gregory Grandrud, representing himself, Fix 101.org, and SB Taxpayers Association and SB Industrial Association, read into the record a letter from the Police Officers Association supporting the widening of 101. He indicated that the organizations he represents feel that a study is not necessary and that they preferred that the Board move forward with a PSR for a widening project. He said that he would support the Implementation Plan if it included the addition of lanes as the priority.

Bonnie Raisin said that lanes needed to be added and that most will be able to put up with the inconvenience during construction. She also said that HOV and toll lanes were a good idea but that a \$1.6 million study is not necessary.

Supervisor Gray said that it has been important to hear what the South Coast was experiencing on the freeway every day. She said she agreed with Mr. Secord that a unanimous vote would send a message to the state and that the Board should support what the community voted for when they approved Measure D. She supports the allocation of Measure D funds to complete the 101 improvements. She said she did not want it to take 15 years to widen the freeway and that the north county would cooperate. She noted that the cost of the Implementation Plan was small when you looked at the big picture and noted that it was confusing to have the Coastal Express funding tied in with the Measure D allocations.

Supervisor Schwartz said that the consensus on this issue begins with the SBCAG Board and if this couldn't be achieved within this Board then the Board can't expect the community to come to a consensus. She said that there was a revised staff recommendation which reflected the north county board member's concerns and pointed out that the new policy language that was added was responsive. She indicated would support staff's recommendation, but said she could not go beyond the current recommendation to revise wording because it might preclude certain viable options. She said that everyone has the same goal of enabling people to move on the 101 and that perhaps through the Implementation Plan a list of projects will be developed that will be more cost effective and quicker than others.

Mayor DeWees asked why the south county needed to do an Implementation Plan to widen a highway and the north county didn't.

Mr. Miller stated that there was more public involvement in the South Coast which makes the process of making decisions more complex.

Mayor DeWees pointed out that funding would be required before projects could be implemented and wondered how long the IP might sit on the shelf before funding would be available.

Mr. Kemp responded that it would depend on where the funding comes from in the future. He explained that the intention of the plan was to spin off early implementation projects if there are obvious projects that have consensus, and start working on those as quickly as possible. He said that the widening would take many years of future funding cycles.

Mayor Weinberg said he supported the Implementation Plan. He stated that the 101 operational improvement projects are on schedule and moving forward and that this will help reduce congestion and will be consistent with future widening. Mayor Weinberg also said that the 101 could not be widened until the overpasses are widened and that no matter what congestion needs to be relieved and the quickest way would be through the Implementation Plan.

Mayor Arca called for unification and a return to the basics. He said the Board members support alternative transportation. He also requested that the intent of Measure D be reaffirmed. He asked a series of questions of Caltrans and SBCAG staff regarding ways to ensure that the intent of Measure D as approved by the voters was carried out.

Mayor Pointer restated her concern that adding lanes must include physical widening where possible and asked what language might be included in the policies to address this concern.

Mr. Kemp responded that the language that was before the Board accomplishes what Mayor Pointer requested. He said that the Board was going to need to trust that Caltrans and SBCAG were going to do the best job they could to see that this project is completed. Mr. Kemp said his concern was the shape and configuration of the widening were dictated then it might tie our hands on the type of project that could be recommended and could preclude most cost effective solutions.

Mr. Ready said he needed to correct his previous statement about what the Measure D ballot measure said. He said the information about specific projects was included in the ballot information pamphlet and did not appear in the actual ballot measure language.

Councilmember Smyser said there would be an opportunity to revisit this item as it moved along in the process. He said that board members may not be getting everything that they want but that all of them will be getting what they consider essential for their constituents. He indicated that he supported staff's recommendation. He also said that a unanimous vote would make a statement not only to the constituents but to the state.

Councilmember Hart said that one of the most significant actions was allocating Measure D funds for the operational improvements. He said he did remain concerned that Caltrans will have difficulty maintaining the schedules for these projects and urged that they communicate with SBCAG when there is schedule slippage. He asked staff to confirm that the IP will examine the interrelationships of the 101 corridor south of Milpas to the rest of the South Coast corridor and local streets.

Mr. Kemp confirmed that the IP includes the entire South Coast corridor and he felt certain that one of the criteria that will be used to evaluate potential improvement projects is the effect that the project will have on other areas of the corridor including local streets.

Councilmember Hart said that the funds for the County Rail Plan were rolled into IP because we didn't have any funds initially to carry out the IP and that a lot of funding has since been secured. He is concerned that the rail plan portion of the IP wouldn't be the same as what was originally proposed when it was on its own. He asked if in the future, additional funding could be allocated to complete the County Rail Plan.

Mr. Kemp indicated that the board could allocate Measure D or other discretionary funds in the future for a follow-on county rail plan.

Mayor Hawxhurst said he thought that there was a complete package of options before the Board with an element of long range planning for the whole region as well as immediate actions. He stated that the near term impact of the operational improvements on congestion will emphasize the need to stop adding jobs on the south coast and to hurry up to develop alternative modes prior to construction starting. He requested that the planning term in the Implementation Plan be extended to 2030.

Supervisor Centeno stated that this corridor is a state highway, not a local street and was used in primarily by commuters from Ventura and Carpinteria. He believed that capacity needed to be increased. He said that those in the north county are not as affected but that he would support the recommendations given the assurances that staff will follow through with the actions indicated in the policy direction.

Councilmember Orach said it was horrendous to see the traffic and a strong message needed to be sent to Caltrans that we are ready to do something about it. He encouraged the board to take action. In regards to rail between Ventura and Santa Barbara, he said it was an expensive venture but that he would like to see it studied and planned on supporting the plan.

Supervisor Marshall said that this was a plan that had matured over time and that staff had done a commendable job in listening and putting into writing all of the Board's concerns. She said that the Implementation Plan was a plan that was going to get results and it was time for action.

Supervisor Rose spoke in support of the plan.

Supervisor Schwartz stated she represented about 80,000 people who live along this portion of the corridor and that her constituents were very concerned about getting answers. She said they will want to know what the projects will cost and when they will be completed. She said she was reminded back in 1993 when SBCAG struggled with the same corridor and ultimately approved the operational improvements which have not yet been constructed. She said she was pleased that a mechanism had been identified to make those improvements a reality and these projects would add some relief when they are completed. Supervisor Schwartz said she was impressed that two of the City of Santa Barbara Council members had spoke in support of the Implementation Plan. She thanked the members of the public and agencies that have been working with SBCAG to bring funding to this process. She also acknowledged Assemblywoman Jackson's representative who was in attendance and stated that strong advocacy was necessary.

Supervisor Schwartz moved to approve the staff recommendation with two revisions: 1) that the specific 101 operational improvement projects be included Recommendation A(2)(a) and 2) that any Measure D funds not needed for the the Implementation Plan be returned to the Highway 101 project reserve.

The motion was seconded by Mayor Weinberg and carried with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Centeno, Gray, Marshall, Rose, Schwartz; Mayors Arca, DeWees, Hawxhurst, Weinberg; Councilmembers Hart, Orach, Smyser.

Noes: Mayor Pointer

Councilmember Orach left at 11:40 a.m.

11. **STIP FUNDING FOR PPM AND RIDESHARE/TRAFFIC SOLUTIONS**

Mr. Kemp presented the staff report.

Mayor Hawxhurst asked what year the funding that was being requested was for.

Mr. Kemp responded that the STIP funds budgeted for both the PPM and Rideshare program are in the current fiscal year.

Mayor Arca moved to allocate \$269,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange funds to replace STIP revenues for Project Planning Programming and Monitoring and Rideshare/Traffic Solutions appropriated in the adopted SBCAG FY 03-04 budget. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Gray and carried unanimously.

12. **SOUTH COAST TRANSIT PRIORITIES PROJECT**

Mr. Kemp presented the staff report explaining the history of this project and recent MTD Board actions. He indicated that despite repeated inquiries of FTA to determine the status of the current electric bus bid protest, he had been unsuccessful. He described what would happen to the programmed CMAQ funds if the project does not go forward.

Supervisor Gray asked if the remaining CMAQ funds could be allocated for the Coastal Express.

Mr. Kemp responded that they could not be used for this purpose since the Coastal Express had already used its 3 year eligibility for CMAQ funds.

Mayor Hawxhurst asked if the changes that MTD was requesting would be reevaluated using CMAQ evaluation criteria.

Mr. Kemp said he had not received a formal request from the MTD to change the projects, but when he did the revised project would need to be rescored for CMAQ funding.

Mayor Hawxhurst asked what would happen if the project does not score high enough to receive CMAQ funds when the revised project is scored.

Mr. Kemp said that there was no doubt that it would score lower than the original score. If the project score falls below the funding cutoff line, then it would be up to the board whether to continue its funding support for the project.

Mayor Hawxhurst asked if there was an alternative project if the revised project did not score well.

Mr. Kemp mentioned that one potential project would be the North County Intercommunity Transit Service Three Year Pilot Program but noted that it could be used for any transit capital project that results in an emission benefit.

Steve Maas with the MTD gave a brief update on the bus procurement. He explained the evolution of the project from the original 39 electric buses in the 2002 FTIP to the current proposed scope of 11 clean diesel replacement buses and 12 electric buses. He explained that the MTD has an immediate need to replace the existing Villager buses and is planning to proceed with the procurement of diesel replacements. He indicated that the MTD is prepared to fund the diesel replacements using its own funds, but indicated they would prefer to use the CMAQ funds to preserve MTD funds for transit services.

Supervisor Centeno asked the cost difference between the cost of electric buses and clean diesel buses.

Mr. Maas stated that the clean diesel buses should cost around \$260,000 and that the electric bus bid came in higher than anticipated and was rejected. He said that they hoped that the bid for the electric buses would come in around the \$500,000 range. He said before they go out for another procurement MTD would be looking at what was best for the south coast.

Councilmember Smyser said he was unimpressed with the way the process had gone. He stated that three Board meetings ago he had asked MTD for a concise answer to some of his questions he had relative to the electric buses and was told that he could have confidence in the report that was before him at the time. He said that he had heard three different purchase plans since that time and that he was very unhappy on what was produced to date and said that he had heard a different story each time MTD reported to the SBCAG Board. He requested some straight answers from the MTD regarding the cost and timeline for the electric buses.

Steve Maas said that the cost of the buses would depend on the bids and the timeline would be worked out closely with their partners.

Supervisor Rose said that when this was looked at a few years ago that this bus expansion was suppose to be part of the future planning process for her District in regards to the housing element and that transportation played an important role. She expressed her disappointment in the project.

Chair Rose asked for public comment.

Gregory Grandrud said he appreciated Councilmember Smyser's comments. He said if they want advanced technology that would reduce pollution then they should look at purchasing diesel-electric hybrid buses. He does not feel that the electric buses are viable.

Scott Wenz said that electric buses would transfer pollution to another area. He referred to the charter for MTD that says that a bus must be certified by the federal government before

purchasing that bus. He said not one bus had been submitted for testing and the electric bus purchase program needed to be dissolved.

Sherrie Fisher with the MTD said she had been the MTD representative at the last SBCAG meeting when this issue was discussed. She stated there was not an exact timeline for procurement and that the bids for electric buses came in at \$580,000 so the MTD Board cancelled that RFP.

Supervisor Rose asked what this meant compared to four years ago when this project was first programmed and noted her concerns about ever seeing this project off the ground. She said the Board needs to revisit this item again and asked what this would mean to the routes, etc.

Ms. Fisher said it was MTD's intention to meet with all of the various agencies to see what their needs were.

Supervisor Schwartz asked that in the future Mr. Gleason and one member of the MTD Board could attend the SBCAG Board meetings. She said that in the process the bus order had changed from the original 39 buses to 23 buses and that reducing the order of buses in half did not mean an expanded service. Supervisor Schwartz said that a relationship needed to be established that would rebuild the confidence of the SBCAG Board and said that the SBCAG could not move forward to fund this project unless questions are answered and a relationship is established.

Councilmember Hart thanked Ms. Fisher. He said that recently, he was pleasantly surprised with the MTD and their staff and that they had been very forthcoming to his committee and staff members at the city of Santa Barbara. He said that new leadership on the MTD Board had an effect and that we may be finding answers to questions that were previously asked and asked for patience.

Mayor Hawxhurst asked how SBCAG would handle a new project such as the North County Intercommunity Transit Service that could be added to the list of projects when the project originally was not included with the other projects that were scored.

Mr. Kemp responded that this was a Board policy question. He said if the Board has a particular project that it has programmed and then decides not to do this project, the funds then would become available for another project. He explained that these funds are apportioned to our region on an annual basis and the funds lapse 3 years after the year of apportionment.

Mayor Hawxhurst confirmed that the MTD project qualified for CMAQ because it would remove cars from the road and reduce bus emissions. If the project were dropped, it would result in a loss of benefits that would have to be made up by other projects.

Councilmember Smyser stated that one of his concerns was that the procedural integrity for this project had been lost with all of the changes that had been made to the project since the proposal was first submitted four years ago. He indicated that there is a fairness issue when agencies are permitted to change the project after funds have been awarded.

Supervisor Rose indicated that this is an information item and that MTD would continue to present monthly status reports on the electric bus project.

Committee Reports

None

Executive Director's Report

Mr. Kemp reported that SBCAG would be doing paperless Board packet mailings in the near future with the exception of the Boardmembers and alternates. Copies of the board meeting agendas, minutes and staff reports can be downloaded from the SBCAG website.

Communications

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p.m.