

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
FAX (415) 904-5400
TDD (415) 597-5885



W11b, 11c & 11d

A-4-SBC-20-0065, A-4-STB-20-0078, A-4-STB-20-0079

APRIL 14, 2021

CORRESPONDENCE

From: [S.T](#)
To: [Qi, Isabel@Coastal](#); [Christensen, Deanna@Coastal](#); [Phelps, Jacqueline@Coastal](#)
Subject: Response to Staff appeal report
Date: Thursday, April 8, 2021 10:04:53 PM
Attachments: [my CCC response.pdf](#)
[SBCAG \(1\).pdf](#)

Please find attached my response to staff's report of my appeals, and an attachment to my response letter.

Summary of response to staff report, Appeals of CDPs

This is a brief, partial summary of my response to CCC staff's report on my CDP appeals.

- (A) CCC Staff claims that County and City planners determined in 1992 that the Olive Mill and San Ysidro intersections would require the construction of roundabout intersections to maintain an acceptable LOS for future year operations. In fact, the 1993 Montecito Community Action Plan found the Olive Mill intersection was operating at a LOS A or B in 1993, and would operate at a LOC C in 2030 with the installation of traffic signals. CCC staff had a copy of the Montecito Community Action Plan available to them at the time they prepared their report. The Plan also found the San Ysidro intersection operating at a LOS A in the AM in 1992. It was noted in a 2017 intersection evaluation prepared for the county that the San Ysidro intersection will see substantial improvements in LOS when the offramp project at Hot Springs is complete and open. Combined with a 15% reduction in VMT from 2014 levels through the intersection, as I propose in my VMT reducing alternative, the 2040 LOS may very well achieve a LOS C or better. Reducing VMT through the Olive Mill intersection by 15% will improve the LOC beyond LOS C in 2040 with signal lights, and may remove the need for signal lights all together.
- (B) City and County staff proposed the roundabout designs after developing a planning strategy that would intentionally increase development in the South Santa Barbara area by massive amounts, which they admit will substantially increase traffic volumes and Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) in the coastal zone of South Santa Barbara County. Both city and county planners stated the Olive Mill Roundabout and the San Ysidro Roundabout are specifically intended to support increases in traffic volumes and VMT that both city and county government planners will intentionally induce in South Santa Barbara County.
- (C) CCC staff was aware at the time they prepared their report that City and County planners intend to deliberately increase traffic volumes and VMT in the coastal zone of South Santa Barbara County, and CCC staff was aware at the time they prepared their report that the Olive Mill roundabout project and the San Ysidro Roundabout project are specifically intended to support the intentional increase in traffic volumes and VMT.

-

- (D) In spite of knowing the facts found in paragraph B, CCC staff excluded from their report the facts found in Paragraph B.

I will submit on Monday, April12, a compendium of documents that CCC staff had at the time they prepared their report, with notes by me pointing out specific facts and information. I have noticed possible changes to the staff report since I reviewed the report last week. Because of those possible changes, I will be submitting my full response on Monday.

Please find attached a recent document prepared by SBCAG, with highlighted areas.

Tom Becker

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 2050, the preferred scenario:

- Reduces overall vehicle miles traveled by 16 percent, vehicle hours traveled by 14 percent, and average daily traffic (ADT) volumes by one percent.
- Reduces overall congestion (as measured by congested vehicle miles traveled) by 32 percent compared to the future baseline scenario.
- Reduces average vehicle trip time by 10 percent and average vehicle commute time for workers by six percent.
- Saves residents and workers nearly \$500,000 annually in auto operating costs (a 16 percent reduction).
- Achieves an overall increase in transit accessibility (the percentage of population within a high quality transit corridor¹²) of 10 percent.
- Achieves an increase in transit accessibility for low income populations (the percentage of low income population within a high quality transit corridor) of 33 percent.
- Increases transit ridership by 5 percent (38,980 daily trips for the preferred scenario versus 36,960 for the future baseline), and results in a three percent increase in alternative trip (biking, walking, and transit) mode share.

In addition, the preferred scenario results in:

- A reduction in per capita vehicle greenhouse gas emissions of 9.4 percent in 2020 and 17.8 percent in 2035.
- A reduction in vehicle emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) by 8 percent in 2020 and 13 percent in 2035 and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions 7 percent in 2020 and 12 percent by 2035.
- A reduction in per capita on-road motor vehicle fuel consumption by approximately 0.5 gallons per day, over 16% from the baseline by 2050.

¹² Defined as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes per peak commute hour.

From: [CarsAreBasic](#)
To: [Qi, Isabel@Coastal](#); [Venegas, Denise@Coastal](#)
Subject: CAB SUMMARY - OLIVE MILL ROUNDABOUT
Date: Friday, April 9, 2021 2:26:25 PM
Attachments: [Coastal Olive Mill ex. summary 8 Apr. 2021.docx](#)

EMBEDDED IN THE SUMMARY IS THE SBCAG Corrected 2050 Regional
Transportation Plan

IF FOR SOME REASON IT HAS NOT COME THROUGH PLEASE NOTIFY CAB.

SCOTT WENZ



Cars Are Basic TM

Estab. 1998

8 April 2021

Summary of response to staff report, Appeal of CDP

This is a brief, partial summary of CAB's response to CCC staff's report on our CDP appeal.

- (A) CCC Staff claims that County and City planners determined in 1992 that the Olive Mill intersection would require the construction of a roundabout intersection to maintain an acceptable LOS for future year operations. CAB review of the 1993 Montecito Community Action Plan, found the intersection was operating at a LOS A or B in 1993, and would operate at a LOC C in 2030 with the installation of traffic signals. CCC staff had a copy of the Montecito Community Action Plan available to them at the time they prepared their report.
- (B) City and County staff proposed the roundabout design after developing a planning strategy that would intentionally increase development in the South Santa Barbara area by massive amounts, which they admit will substantially increase traffic volumes and Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) in the coastal zone of South Santa Barbara County. Both city and county planners stated the Olive Mill roundabout is specifically intended to support increases in traffic volumes that both city and county government planners will intentionally induce in South Santa Barbara County.
- (C) CAB discussion with CCC staff; they acknowledged in preparation of their report, that City and County planners intend to deliberately increase traffic volumes and VMT in the coastal zone of South Santa Barbara County. CCC staff was aware at the time they prepared their report that the Olive Mill roundabout project is specifically intended to support the intentional increase in traffic volumes and VMT.
- (D) Knowing the facts found in paragraph B, CCC staff excluded from their report the facts found in paragraph B.

CAB will submit on Monday, April12, a compendium of documents that CCC staff had at the time they prepared their report, with notes by CAB pointing out specific facts and information.

1180 Eugenia Pl. #220
Carpinteria, CA 93013
cab@CarsAreBasic.org

Please find attached a recent document prepared by SBCAG, with highlighted areas.

(Electronic Signature)

Scot Wenz

President

CAB

See Attachment below

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 2050, the preferred scenario:

- Reduces overall vehicle miles traveled by 16 percent, vehicle hours traveled by 14 percent, and average daily traffic (ADT) volumes by one percent.
- Reduces overall congestion (as measured by congested vehicle miles traveled) by 32 percent compared to the future baseline scenario.
- Reduces average vehicle trip time by 10 percent and average vehicle commute time for workers by six percent.
- Saves residents and workers nearly \$500,000 annually in auto operating costs (a 16 percent reduction).
- Achieves an overall increase in transit accessibility (the percentage of population within a high quality transit corridor¹²) of 10 percent.
- Achieves an increase in transit accessibility for low income populations (the percentage of low income population within a high quality transit corridor) of 33 percent.
- Increases transit ridership by 5 percent (38,980 daily trips for the preferred scenario versus 36,960 for the future baseline), and results in a three percent increase in alternative trip (biking, walking, and transit) mode share.

In addition, the preferred scenario results in:

- A reduction in per capita vehicle greenhouse gas emissions of 9.4 percent in 2020 and 17.8 percent in 2035.
- A reduction in vehicle emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) by 8 percent in 2020 and 13 percent in 2035 and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions 7 percent in 2020 and 12 percent by 2035.
- A reduction in per capita on-road motor vehicle fuel consumption by approximately 0.5 gallons per day, over 16% from the baseline by 2050.

¹² Defined as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes per peak commute hour.

From: SouthCentralCoast@Coastal
To: Qi_Isabel@Coastal
Subject: FW: Public Comment on April 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 11d - Appeal No. A-4-STB-20-0078 (County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department, Santa Barbara)
Date: Thursday, April 8, 2021 10:26:48 AM

In SCC email

From: shelleybadat@cox.net <shelleybadat@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2021 3:59 PM
To: SouthCentralCoast@Coastal <SouthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Public Comment on April 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 11d - Appeal No. A-4-STB-20-0078 (County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department, Santa Barbara)

I want to submit a comment to the appeal on the agenda by Thomas Becker A-4 in regard to the roundabout proposed for the intersection of San Ysidro Road and Jameson.

Having lived in the neighborhood for over 25 years and have seen the traffic patterns that change depending on the time of day, school arrival and departure I feel that the roundabout will do nothing to alleviate those issues which generally resolve themselves within ½ hour and can be mitigated in a number of less expensive and disruptive ways.

Also, the scale of the project is out of character for the neighborhood.

The push to complete this roundabout does not take into account that the neighborhood of Montecito will bear the brunt of the effort to enlarge the freeway.

This roundabout will make it easier for the traffic to flow through the area while that construction is going on.....simply a convenient way to move traffic

When the freeway is completed the neighborhood will be left with an eyesore that will require upkeep, that will fall by the wayside, simply look at the Roundabout on Coast Village Road, all the foliage is dead.

Or, look at the bushes planted along Jameson on the freeway side, all dead. No plans were made to water or maintain them, this will be the outcome of the plantings.

Roundabouts are losing favor, they are dangerous to pedestrians and bicyclists, in fact a number of them are being removed from towns and cities.

I respectfully submit for your consideration..

Shelley Badat

From: SouthCentralCoast@Coastal
To: Qi_Isabel@Coastal
Subject: FW: Public Comment on April 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 11d - Appeal No. A-4-STB-20-0078 (County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department, Santa Barbara)
Date: Thursday, April 8, 2021 10:20:23 AM

Morning, this was in the SCC email

From: antiquepam@aol.com <antiquepam@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2021 11:13 AM
To: SouthCentralCoast@Coastal <SouthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Public Comment on April 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 11d - Appeal No. A-4-STB-20-0078 (County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department, Santa Barbara)

Dear Commissioners:

The approved roundabout is not consistent with the County's certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) related to minimizing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

A substantial issue exists, and many community members agree.

My sons are fifth-generation family members in this low-key neighborhood. We have many reasons to oppose this over-the-top roundabout, such as:

- Stop signs work.
- CHP data indicates the intersection is safe.
- A one-lane roundabout will be less safe for children, as well as other pedestrians, cyclists, and the handicapped who would be dangerously surrounded by vehicles.

Please support this appeal.

Sincerely,

PAMELA BOEHR
115 San Ysidro Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
(805) 969-4572

From: SouthCentralCoast@Coastal
To: Qi_Isabel@Coastal
Subject: FW: Public Comment on April 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 11c - Appeal No. A-4-STB-20-0079 (City of Santa Barbara Public Works Department and Santa Barbara County Public Works Department, Santa Barbara)
Date: Thursday, April 8, 2021 10:25:23 AM

In SCC email

From: Paulina Conn <pconnt43@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2021 1:51 PM
To: SouthCentralCoast@Coastal <SouthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Public Comment on April 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 11c - Appeal No. A-4-STB-20-0079 (City of Santa Barbara Public Works Department and Santa Barbara County Public Works Department, Santa Barbara)

April 7, 2021
California Coastal Commission

Item 11. b,c,d change of intersections from stop signs to round-about or in the case of Jameson Lane and San Ysidro Road a giant oval.

Please uphold the appeals and deny the round-about.

Please really uphold the appeal and deny the gigantic oval-about at Jameson Lane and San Ysidro Road. There will be deadly accidents where now there are none.

All round-about are dangerous for pedestrians. Drivers do not want to stop for pedestrians unless there is a STOP sign. Pedestrians, those with disabilities including folks in wheelchairs and children with bicycles who feel safer on sidewalks (walking) are really inconvenienced by these round-about. They have to walk out of the way because the Departments of Transportation do not put the sidewalk crossing directly through the round-about. Pedestrians have to walk out of their way to a straight section of road and then cross the street and HOPE the driver does not GUN their vehicle as they come out of the round-about onto the straight section of road. To not have an adequate number of stop signs in the correct places is particularly problematic when freeway on and off ramps are part of the configuration as is the case in these instances.

In Santa Barbara, at a brand new large, single lane round-about at Las Positas Rd. /Cliff Drive at Allen Road /Arroyo Burro Beach parking lot (within the Coastal Zone) a woman was severely injured and her dog killed because of a driver who did not stop.

At the San Ysidro Rd. / Jameson Lane intersection, children, families and tourists walk and bicycle to school and to and from the beach. There has to be direct, straight across the road access for pedestrians. That is provided now but will not be there with the giant oval-about in 11c on your agenda.

Please deny these round-about methods of directing vehicular traffic in these complex intersections

that encompass freeway ingress and egress. It is too dangerous for everyone but especially pedestrians and novice bicycle riders.

Thank you.

Paulina Conn
2612 Foothill Rd.
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

From: [Harry Rabin](#)
To: Phelps_Jacqueline@Coastal
Cc: Christensen_Deanna@Coastal; Qi_Isabel@Coastal
Subject: High Density housing and roundabouts in Montecito-Agenda for 4/14/21 coastal commission meeting. items 11B, 11C, 11D. OPPOSED
Date: Saturday, April 10, 2021 6:15:58 PM
Attachments: [Harry Sig Blue small.png](#)

I have to say as a resident of Montecito for over 25 years I am appalled by what is being considered for our area, specifically roundabouts and high density housing developments? Do any of you live in or near our community? The traffic is already ridiculous and what you are considering should not even be on the agenda.

What is needed is affordable housing and homeless housing in the County, those should be on your agenda as a priority. Montecito cannot tolerate or bare the weight of more housing, traffic and more construction, which has been all we have been living in for the past 10 years. The Rosewood/Miramar Hotel strike a memory chord here...

The idea of permitting either one, yet alone both of these into our area is:

1. An ill conceived plan
2. Would fail any EIS or CEQA requirements.
3. Plain and simple, the Coastal Commission doing the job it is suppose to do should not even be considering these abominations in our already high traffic and density, freeway shortcut thoroughfare. (Maybe they should have considered all the rush hour spill over onto coast village rd because they removed freeway on ramps.)

Myself, my wife and many many of my neighbours are opposed to either of these projects being permitted.

Best regards,



Harry Rabin
37 Humphrey Rd, Santa Barbara, CA 93108
Producer [On the Wave Productions](#)
Board of Directors [Reef Guardians](#)
Advisor/Documentarian [Whale Sanctuary Project](#)
Board Advisor [Heal the Ocean](#)
NOAA/CINMS Liaison [California Marine Sanctuary Foundation](#)
Media Producer at [Academy of Underwater Arts and sciences](#)

Cell +1 805 886 2204 | Direct +1 805 565 1663 | F +1 805 565 1978 | Skype: onthewavepro | onthewavepro@gmail.com
On the Wave USA LLC, 10 E. Yanonali Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 USA | web: onthewaveproductions.com

