



Agenda Item No. _____

File Code No. 150.04

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

AGENDA DATE: August 4, 2009

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

FROM: Administration Division, Community Development Department

SUBJECT: Response To The Report Of The 2008-2009 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury Entitled "SBCAG - A Road Not Taken"

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council authorize the Mayor to send the attached letter as a response to the report of the 2008-2009 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury entitled "The Road Not Taken."

DISCUSSION:

California Penal Code Section 933.05 requires that the "governing body" of each public agency which is the subject of a report from the County Civil Grand Jury comment on those findings and recommendations contained in the report which are relevant to that particular public agency.

Attached is the proposed response to the Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury report concerning "SBCAG - A Road Not Taken." The recommended Council action would authorize the Mayor to send the letter to the Civil Grand Jury.

- ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Response to the Report of the 2008-2009 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury Entitled "SBCAG – A Road Not Taken"
 2. Report of the 2008-09 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury Entitled "SBCAG – A Road Not Taken"

SUBMITTED BY: Paul Casey, Community Development Director

APPROVED BY: City Administrator's Office



City of Santa Barbara
Office of the Mayor

ATTACHMENT

mblum@santabarbaraca.gov

www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov

August 5, 2009

Marty Blum
Mayor

City Hall
735 Anacapa Street
Santa Barbara, CA
93101-1990

Mailing Address:
P. O. Box 1990
Santa Barbara, CA
93102-1990

Tel: 805-564-5321
Fax: 805-564-5475

The Honorable Judge J. William McLafferty
Superior Court
1100 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 21107
Santa Barbara, CA 93121-1107

Dear Judge McLafferty:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the report of the 2008-09 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury entitled "SBCAG – A Road not Taken". This is an area of great interest to me personally and I think the Grand Jury did a very good job of highlighting appropriate concerns about regional planning in the County of Santa Barbara.

The following are my responses to the findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury:

Finding 1a: Santa Barbara County Association of Governments has authority to do regional land use planning through its Joint Powers Agreement.

Response – Agree

Finding 1b: The staff has developed recommendations for regional land use planning approved by Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Response – Agree

Finding 1c: The regional land use planning recommendations adopted by Santa Barbara County Association of Governments have not been implemented

Response – Partially agree. This finding may be a bit too broad for the point the Grand Jury is trying to make. A number of the reports make recommendations that are to be implemented at the local level, and a number of the local agencies have implemented recommendations from some of the studies referenced in the Grand Jury report.

As an example, the 2007 Regional Growth Forecast recommended phasing new commercial growth with residential development to minimize future impacts to the jobs/housing balance issues in the County. The City of Santa Barbara, since 1990, has had a commercial growth control ordinance called Measure E which restricts the amount of new commercial development in the City in favor of promoting additional housing development. The City has also participated



Please consider the environment before printing this letter.

in a number of regional task forces dealing with water quality, affordable housing, and other issues, which has been recommended in a number of reports.

Recommendation 1: That Santa Barbara County Association of Government and each respective jurisdiction implement already adopted recommendations that deal with regional land use planning

Response: I agree with this recommendation. The City of Santa Barbara's General Plan and past practices have always supported regional collaboration and planning. As the Grand Jury Report outlines, the issues of transportation, housing, and open space are regional issues, with regional concerns, that do not respect existing political boundaries. Collaborative and informed regional decision making is necessary and important, and the City of Santa Barbara will support such efforts as we have done in the past.

Finding 2: Santa Barbara County Association of Governments has not developed a fully integrated regional plan coordinating jobs, housing and transportation that includes all the County's jurisdictions.

Response – Agree

Recommendation 2: That the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments develop a fully integrated regional plan.

Response – Agree. I have spoken in favor of developing a fully integrated regional plan at SBCAG Board meetings in the past, and continue to think it is a good idea. Over the next few years, recently adopted State Legislation (SB 375) will require SBCAG to prepare such a plan. I believe such a plan will be beneficial for the County and will be supported by the City of Santa Barbara.

Finding 3: Santa Barbara County Association of Governments refused to apply for state funds for comprehensive regional planning

Response – Agree. As the City's representative to the Board, I spoke in support of applying for these funds. Although I missed the actual vote when the SBCAG Board voted to not apply for these funds, I am sorry the Board decided not to pursue the opportunity at that time.

The Honorable Judge J. William McLafferty
August 5, 2009
Page Two of Three

Recommendation 3: That Santa Barbara County Association of Governments aggressively pursue funding for comprehensive regional planning.

Response – Agree. SBCAG should pursue any and all opportunities to receive funding to support the development of a comprehensive regional plan.

Sincerely,

Marty Blum
Mayor

cc: City of Santa Barbara Councilmembers
Jim Armstrong, City Administrator
SBCAG Board Members

SBCAG - A Road Not Taken



SBCAG - A ROAD NOT TAKEN

**"If you don't know where you're going,
you might wind up someplace else."**

Yogi Berra

SUMMARY

Santa Barbara County is facing many critical challenges as it strives to maintain and improve the quality of life for all its residents. Air quality is threatened, open spaces are being challenged, agricultural land is in jeopardy and our roads are increasingly clogged. In addition, the County must face the reality of growth with a population shift to the north, parochialism significant enough to initiate a county-split referendum in 2006, a crisis in affordable housing, and a widening bifurcation of society based on wealth and age.

There is one organization in the County that has the ability to address these important issues and to develop viable solutions: the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). The SBCAG Board is comprised of 13 members including all five Santa Barbara County Supervisors and a mayor or council member from each of the County's eight cities. SBCAG was established "to examine common problems and suggest solutions."¹ The organization is designed to be a regional, multi-jurisdictional, forum for collaborative discussion and resolution of problems and issues.²

The 2008-2009 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury (Jury) conducted a review of SBCAG's regional approach to its many challenges. As a point of departure, the Jury reviewed a number of planning documents and reports issued by SBCAG from 1989 to the present. While these reports thoroughly addressed individual issues, they reflect a lack of cohesion across subject areas, jurisdictions, and time. In response to these anomalies, the Jury focused its attention on the SBCAG's approach to the overall issue of comprehensive regional planning, and in this regard identified four themes in the majority of reports approved by the SBCAG Board:

- 1) A recognition of the need to address countywide problems on a regional level
- 2) A lack of regional land use planning and coordination
- 3) A disproportionate emphasis on transportation
- 4) A reluctance on the part of the Board to address regional issues other than traffic

The State of California has offered "no strings attached" \$250,000 grants to counties willing to initiate regional approaches to solving regional problems. Of the 58 counties in the State, Santa Barbara is the only county that declined the offer and refused to participate.

¹ SBCAG *Regional Growth Forecast 2005-2040*

² Joint Powers Agreement for Santa Barbara County, 1966

SBCAG did make a significant foray into the regional planning arena with a 2004 study, *Taking Action Regionally, The Inter-Regional Partnership for Jobs, Housing, & Mobility*. This comprehensive report addressed the need to develop tools to analyze and deal with cross-jurisdictional challenges. The report clearly stated SBCAG's understanding of the importance of a broad-based approach:

Many of the issues that face local governments and the people they serve, such as: ...traffic, housing, air quality, and growth, extend beyond jurisdictional boundaries. SBCAG's primary purpose is to assist local governments in solving common problems and addressing public policy issues that are regional or multi-jurisdictional. SBCAG's broad responsibilities for planning and programming ensure that it can effectively establish or influence the policy-making process within the county.

The Grand Jury agrees. Regrettably, SBCAG essentially shelved the report and its recommendations. In contrast, San Luis Obispo County, geographically and culturally similar to Santa Barbara, was an early participant and recipient of State funds to develop a regional “plan”, completed in 2008.³ This collaborative effort among that county, its cities and citizens, is not so much a detailed document as it is a broad overview of their region and its possible future. Their approach, including public outreach, provides a basis for collaboration among the constituent members and a framework for future planning. These documents are not a threat to county or city members' autonomy in the planning arena, since their general plans continue to define the character of those jurisdictions within the overarching framework of this regional view. This Jury concluded that if other counties can overcome their internal resistance to collaborate and plan for housing their populations and protecting their natural resources, we can, and must, do the same.

BACKGROUND

Many would like Santa Barbara to remain as it was when they arrived, and there have been many efforts to achieve this. For example in 1989 the City of Santa Barbara passed Measure E which placed a limit on non-residential development and thereby limited job creation and the need for more housing. It resulted in limited success as the nature of work changed, while jobs continued to grow.

The pressures to develop housing to meet the needs of those who are employed here, versus the desire of those wishing to keep the County just as it was, have resulted in a morass of ineffective planning decisions. The 10 separate planning commissions that control all development in the County have created a patchwork quilt

“We have met the enemy, and he is us.”⁴

³ San Luis Obispo *Community 2050* Blueprint plan, Sept. 2008

⁴ SBCAG sponsored report, *Taking Action Regionally, The Inter-Regional Partnership for Jobs, Housing, & Mobility*, July 2004. (As used in the report the Walt Kelly quote from Pogo refers to Santa Barbara County)

of policies, ordinances, zoning regulations and enforcement procedures that lack cohesion, coordination, and create the potential for urban sprawl and its consequences.

Despite successful efforts to encourage carpooling and bus ridership, congestion continues to increase. The Jury found that there have been hundreds of dedicated individuals and numerous organizations and agencies which have proposed remedies to address this and other regional issues. Yet from these efforts there has been limited change.

Over the years the SBCAG Board has focused its attention on regional transportation issues, particularly capital roads projects, rather than integrating these with other important issues that impact transportation such as its relationship to jobs and housing. Land use planning is particularly important as it includes the concerns of open space, agriculture and the environment, in addition to jobs and housing issues. These remain unaddressed by SBCAG in any collaborative regional manner.

In 2004, SBCAG thoroughly studied⁵ the above problems and presented five key assumptions that communities and the entire region need to consider as they move toward the future:

- 1) *Whether we like it or not, the overall area's population is increasing through both net immigration and natural increase (births over deaths). There is no local mechanism that will halt the pressure for further internal and external growth from occurring.*
- 2) *No one city or region will be able to buffer itself from the impacts of continued development and redevelopment. Nor can we "build our way out of" these growth pressures.*
- 3) *Regional problems require regional solutions.*
- 4) *Meaningful change will require the development of interregional partnerships and alliances that heretofore have not been nurtured.*
- 5) *"Big Picture" policy changes will require a regional approach that can effectively exert political influence at the state-level through strategic cooperation at the local level.*

In other words, change is on the way, and the most satisfactory way to control it is through cooperative, inter-jurisdictional collaboration. SBCAG is the only entity in the county that has the authority and resources to address these issues in a comprehensive way.

⁵ SBCAG sponsored report, *Taking Action Regionally, The Inter-Regional Partnership for Jobs, Housing, & Mobility*, July 2004

METHODOLOGY

The Jury reviewed legislation that pertains to housing in California, including:

- 1934 – National Housing Act: Created the Federal Housing Administration (FHA)
- 1965 – Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (HUD)
- 1969 – State Housing Element Law, Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
- 2002 – AB 1493: California’s Vehicle Global Warming Law
- 2005 – Regional Blueprint Program
- 2006 – AB 32: Global Warming Solutions Act
- 2008 – SB 375: Transportation planning, travel demand models, sustainable communities strategy, environmental review

Documents reviewed included:

- California Health and Safety Code, Division 13, Part 1.5, State Housing Law
- Studies from the Urban Land Institute
- Publications from the California Department of Housing and Community Development
- SBCAG reports (see Appendix IV)
- Reports by the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara
- Reports by the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara
- Studies prepared by the Santa Barbara Region Economic Community Project
- The Central Coast Survey
- Previous Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury reports
- Community 2050 San Luis Obispo Blueprint, Sept. 2008

The Jury interviewed SBCAG Board members and staff, present and former members of the Santa Barbara County and City planning and housing staffs, architects, industry representatives, attorneys, representatives from non-profits, and advocates for and against the development of housing in the County.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Communities are not isolated but are interdependent within the region in terms of housing, transportation, jobs, shopping, recreation, health care, etc. Regional planning serves as a basis for county jurisdictions to work together to create a strategy that protects and enhances the communities and its residents. For instance, plans need to be developed to encourage the use of transit-oriented land use planning to facilitate walking, biking and transit ridership, thus meeting the State's mandate to reduce greenhouse gases.

California recently launched a program, with funding, to encourage counties to undertake such comprehensive regional planning. It was meant to develop a consensus between the public and regional leaders on a vision for the long-range development of their counties.

There was no mandate regarding housing, transportation patterns or environmental benchmarks. Recognizing this, SBCAG stated: “There is an overall **lack of ownership** (emphasis theirs) of the problem by the community at large. In spite of the existence of regional coordinating agencies, regional collaboration efforts across municipal and county lines have thus far been either non-existent or ineffective.”⁶ Nevertheless Santa Barbara County is the only county in the state that refused to participate.

The Grand Jury has reviewed the regional planning documents, which were developed by other counties and has found them to be useful and comprehensive. They not only set out land use plans, but more importantly offer all members of the community a chance to participate in shaping the future of their community.

Legislative Initiatives

For the past 75 years both the Federal and California governments have attempted to promote and encourage local jurisdictions to plan for their growing populations. Some legislation has provided incentives while others threatened punitive action for failure to comply. Recent significant legislation also addressed global warming, greenhouse gases and freeway congestion. This requires comprehensive planning, incorporating transportation with jobs and housing, while encouraging communities to develop their own solutions to these problems (see Appendix I). Embracing these State programs will increase the potential for transportation funds and access to State housing and other grant funds to bring about these needed changes. Santa Barbara County and its eight incorporated cities, which form SBCAG, have consistently resisted what has been perceived as State interference into local land use policies and decisions. Even voluntary State programs have been rejected by SBCAG, including one that offered \$250,000 in grant money to support comprehensive regional planning.

Jobs-Housing Imbalance

A major quality of life issue in the county is traffic congestion. The primary cause of this congestion is due to the imbalance between the locations of jobs and housing in the region. A widely used planning technique for local governments to gauge this imbalance is the ratio of jobs to housing in a given area (the jobs/housing imbalance). The ideal would be for jobs and available housing to be roughly equal, but achieving a balance goes well beyond trying to attain numerical equality. There is a qualitative aspect to this ratio, as the goal is to make housing suitable to the lifestyles and income levels of the workforce. In 2005, Santa Barbara County hosted roughly 188,000 jobs and had 138,000 housing units, for a 1.3 job/housing ratio.⁷ The ratios within the various jurisdictions in Santa Barbara County range from 0.69 to 2.08⁸ and directly impact regional travel patterns, work-trip lengths and congestion levels. For example, while Lompoc has a 1.0 ratio, many residents commute to jobs on the South Coast.⁹ It is apparent from the chart

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ SBCAG *Regional Growth Forecast 2000-2030*

⁸ SBCAG *Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Plan 2007-2014*

⁹ SBCAG *VISION2030:2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN*, September 2008

below that SBCAG projects jobs to increase faster than population in most areas, portending even greater imbalances.

Population and Employment – 2000 to 2030¹⁰

Sub-Region	Population		Percent Change	Jobs		Percent Change
	2000	2030		2000	2030	
South Coast	201,000	240,300	+20%	108,207	155,331	+44%
Santa Maria & Cuyama	118,200	177,800	+50%	41,508	60,927	+47%
Lompoc	58,300	75,200	+29%	20,202	28,283	+40%
Santa Ynez	21,800	27,400	+26%	8,528	12,249	+44%
County Total	399,300	521,700	+31%	180,445	258,820	+43%

Housing starts on the South Coast have been curtailed in large part due to the public pressure on appointed and elected officials. Various planning commissions have reduced the density of developments, thereby escalating housing costs, leaving urban areas underutilized and perpetuating urban sprawl. If the increase of jobs, population and commuting continues without establishing collaborative regional planning, the quality of life in the community of Santa Barbara as we know it will deteriorate, and it will continue to have the least affordable housing in the nation.¹¹

The Human Cost of Commuting

The principal impact felt by the residents of the County resulting from the job/housing imbalance is the continuing increase in traffic congestion. A common lament is that there are too many people in the area. The reality is that traffic congestion results from more workers commuting to their workplaces. Analysis of traffic statistics shows that commuting in the County increased 800% between the years of 1960 and 2000.¹² And yet the SBCAG Board continues to back away from addressing this congestion in a regional manner. It is estimated that more than 10,000 workers commute daily from residences in the North County to the South Coast. Between 1990 and 2000 the traffic from Ventura increased 61% and today it is estimated that there are 15,500 daily commuters from Ventura. Traffic from Ventura is projected to increase 51% during the next 20 years. Commuters from San Luis Obispo County has increased 36% during this same period and is expected to increase 74% during the next 20 years.

“A one-hour daily commute between Santa Maria and Santa Barbara equates to 500 hours of time spent in travel over a year’s time, which is 25% of a normal work year, and equivalent to 12.5 weeks of vacation.”

SBCAG’s *VISION2030: 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN*

¹⁰ 2002 UCSB Economic Outlook Project Report (Report totals)

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² SBCAG *VISION2030: 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN*, September 2008

The number of trips per household, minutes per trip, trip distances and vehicle miles traveled are all projected to increase significantly.¹³

SBCAG found that:

*Week to week and month to month, residents of Northern Santa Barbara County,(and) Santa Barbara South Coast... are confronted with more time-consuming commutes, as well as higher costs of home ownership and rental housing. The result is a shrinking middle class. Major employers close their doors and move away; service workers are forced to find housing in distant towns; people who can't afford to commute double up in a shrinking supply of homes, cottages and apartments. Health and safety organizations are increasingly challenged to hire and keep qualified personnel, jeopardizing health care services at the most basic level.*¹⁴

As an example, the Jury's investigation found that 35% of our safety officers do not live in the County. While the majority of out-of-County workers commute from Ventura and San Luis Obispo, some live as far away as San Bernardino and Fresno. As described in the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan,¹⁵ the Board has the responsibility to "...encourage local land use decisions that shape demand for transportation services."

The Board has concentrated on transportation issues including carpooling, express lanes, and the creation of regional bikeway networks. However, a major unaddressed task before SBCAG, and not to be understated, is the need for regional land use planning which would reduce urban sprawl and promote worker housing near job centers. If implemented, these improvements would, at the very least, work in conjunction with recent State laws requiring, among other things, the reduction in greenhouse gases

SBCAG

Board of Directors and Staff

SBCAG was established in 1966 under a Joint Powers Agreement executed by Santa Barbara County and each of its cities. SBCAG is an agency now governed by a 13-member Board of Directors consisting of all five county supervisors and one city council member from each of the other jurisdictions.

SBCAG currently operates with a budget in excess of \$33 million, including \$2.4 million for salaries and benefits, and is administered by a staff of 20 responsible to the Board of Directors. The majority of funds are used for capital transportation projects. Two professional standing committees, in turn, support this staff: the 11-member Technical

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ SBCAG sponsored report, *Taking Action Regionally, The Inter-Regional Partnership for Jobs, Housing, & Mobility, July 2004*

¹⁵ SBCAG VISION2030: 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN, September 2008

Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) and the 13-member Technical Transportation Advisory Committee (TTAC) (see Appendix II).

SBCAG’s annual 2008 Overall Work Program states: “Many of the issues that face local governments and the people they serve, such as traffic, housing, air quality, and growth, extend beyond jurisdictional boundaries...” It is clear from the partial list of its functional responsibilities (see Appendix III) and publications (see Appendix IV), that the organization has chosen to concentrate principally on capital projects related to transportation issues.

SBCAG Board and Staff Disconnect

The high quality of the numerous studies, reports and plans produced by the SBCAG staff with the support of the advisory committees is undeniable. These documents are routinely reviewed and approved by the Board. The documents feature a consistent theme – the need for a multi-jurisdictional focus on the issues facing the County. Nonetheless, the message of the need for collaboration on a regional basis appears to have been lost on the SBCAG Board.

“The South Coast is a geographic and economic region.... Its residents drink from the same water supply, breathe the same air, ride on the same highways, and do much of their shopping in the same stores... *It makes no sense for a region such as ours to adopt a piecemeal approach to the future.*” (emphasis theirs)

Impacts of Growth Study, 1974

The SBCAG staff is aware of the problems facing the County and has stated repeatedly “...regional problems require regional action”,¹⁶ yet the Board refuses to take on the responsibility for cooperative, collaborative planning. We are now behind every other county in the State in acquiring the technology and establishing the groundwork to address our problems collectively. The Jury confirmed this defensive approach by reviewing Board minutes and videos of Board meetings.

At its monthly meetings, members generally face an agenda laden with complex subjects, staff presentations, and background issues. Thirteen members with localized views respond individually to issues of growth, transportation, water, affordable housing, farm-worker housing, urban density, protection of open spaces, State intrusion on self-determination, etc. There is no existing, documented, overarching framework to guide or anchor the decision-making process. In its review of SBCAG meeting videos and minutes, the Jury confirmed reluctance on the part of the Board to adopt a collaborative approach to countywide problems. Rather than treating issues as opportunities for collective decision-making, the typical approach has been to frame them as threats to local autonomy, particularly if the State was involved. Every city, plus the unincorporated county, has its own General Plan which serves as the backdrop to the SBCAG’s deliberations. The staff has on more than one occasion proposed a regional planning approach to the Board. The Board has rejected it – repeatedly and emphatically.

¹⁶ Ibid.

CONCLUSION

Over the years efforts have been made by many in the community to tackle the problems of growth within our County. We want to maintain and enhance the beauty of Santa Barbara County. Change is inevitable, but change with proper planning can be used to improve what we all treasure.

If we are to have more effective livable communities, then jobs, housing, and transportation must be integrated into the planning process. If open space is to be preserved, it must be identified and prioritized. Housing must be planned so it does not encroach on productive agricultural land. Solutions will cross jurisdictional lines. Cooperation and collaboration among and between SBCAG Board members and their constituents can make this happen.

“...The absence of an area-wide policy is thus, itself a form of policy: if the jurisdictions of the regions do not form a common compact charting a common future, they will be left to mean-spirited squabbles in which each tries to gain at the expense of the others – and to the detriment of all.”

Impacts of Growth Study, 1974

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding 1a

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments has authority to do regional land use planning through its Joint Powers Agreement.

Finding 1b

The staff has developed recommendations for regional land use planning approved by Santa Barbara County Association of Governments.

Finding 1c

The regional land use planning recommendations adopted by Santa Barbara County Association of Governments have not been implemented.

Recommendation 1

That Santa Barbara County Association of Governments and each respective jurisdiction implement already adopted recommendations that deal with regional land use planning.

Finding 2

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments has not developed a fully integrated regional plan coordinating jobs, housing and transportation that includes all the County's jurisdictions.

Recommendation 2

That Santa Barbara County Association of Governments develop a fully integrated regional plan.

Finding 3

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments refused to apply for State funds for comprehensive regional planning.

Recommendation 3

That Santa Barbara County Association of Governments aggressively pursue funding for comprehensive regional planning.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSE

In accordance with *California Penal Code Section 933.05*, each agency and government body affected by or named in this report is requested to respond in writing to the findings and recommendations in a timely manner. The following are the affected agencies for this report, with the mandated response period for each:

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

First District Supervisor – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Second District Supervisor – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Third District Supervisor – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Fourth District Supervisor – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Fifth District Supervisor – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Buellton – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Carpinteria – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Goleta – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Guadalupe – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Lompoc – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Santa Barbara – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Santa Maria – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Mayor, City of Solvang – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3
Recommendations 1, 2, 3

APPENDIX I

Recent Legislation Regarding Planning Issues

1. California Regional Blueprint Planning Program¹⁷ – A grant program sponsored by the California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency to promote regional planning. The program was intended to foster a more efficient land use pattern that:
 - 1) *supports improved mobility and reduced dependency on single-occupant vehicle trips*
 - 2) *accommodates an adequate supply of housing for all incomes*
 - 3) *reduces impacts on valuable habitat, productive farmland, and air quality*
 - 4) *increases resource use efficiency*
 - 5) *results in safe and vibrant neighborhoods*

2. California Assembly Bill 32 – Global Warming Solutions Act: “Establishes first-in-the-world comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to achieve real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases (GHG).”¹⁸ This legislation requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to:
 - 1) Establish a statewide GHG emissions cap for 2020
 - 2) Adopt a plan by January 1, 2009 indicating how emission reductions will be achieved from significant GHG sources via regulations, market mechanisms and other actions
 - 3) Adopt a list of discrete, early action measures by July 1, 2007 that can be implemented before January 1, 2010 and adopt such measures

3. California Senate Bill 375 – SB 375 integrates the three major planning activities currently conducted by SBCAG, 1) Regional Growth Forecast, 2) Regional Transportation Plan, and 3) Regional Housing Needs Assessment. More importantly SB 375 provides the opportunity for Santa Barbara County and city planners to incorporate into the planning process (Housing Element) the means to provide for:
 - 1) Residential development near job cores and along transportation corridors and/or transit centers
 - 2) Integration of zoning for housing, commercial and industrial clusters as “villages”
 - 3) Maximization and encouragement of walking or cycling to work, and increasing housing density levels, for all income levels
 - 4) Reduction of commuter miles driven
 - 5) "Sustainable Communities Projects" with relaxed CEQA requirements

¹⁷ <http://calblueprint.dot.ca.gov/>

¹⁸ California Air Resources Board, Fact Sheet (<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/factsheets/ab32factsheet.pdf>)

APPENDIX II

SBCAG Advisory Committees

Technical Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) consists of 11 professional members:

- Eight members, one from each of the cities
- One member from the County
- One member representing the Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
- One SBCAG staff representative (Deputy Director, Planning)
- Selected ex-officio members

TPAC is SBCAG's regional planning advisory committee serving as a communication link between SBCAG and all planning agencies in the County.

Technical Transportation Advisory Committee (TTAC) consists of 13 professional members:

- Eight members, one from each of the cities
- One member from the County
- One member representing the Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
- One member representing the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD)
- One representative from CALtrans District V
- One SBCAG staff representative (Deputy Director, Planning)

TTAC serves as a communication link between SBCAG and all transportation agencies in the County. TTAC reviews and makes policy recommendations on fiscal matters, fund allocations, special studies, and planning documents for submittal to the SBCAG Board.

APPENDIX III

SBCAG "What We Do"¹⁹

- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA)
- Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)
- Local Transportation Authority (LTA)
- Congestion Management Agency (CMA)
- Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)
- Inter-Regional Partnership Project (IRPP)

¹⁹ <http://www.sbcag.org>

APPENDIX IV

Relevant SBCAG Regional Publications

- 1992 SBCAG Regional Housing Needs Study
- 1995 SBCAG Jobs/Housing Study
- Tri-County Socioeconomic Monitoring and Mitigation Program, June 2000
- 2002 SBCAG Regional Housing Needs for Santa Barbara County
- 2003 Congestion Management Plan, November 2003
- The Inter-Regional Partnership for Jobs, Housing, and Mobility, July 2004
- 2030 Travel Forecast for Santa Barbara County, September 2004
- 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), January 2006
- 2007 Federal Transportation Improvement Program, September 2006
- Regional Growth Forecast, 2005-2040, August 2007
- 2007 Travel Trends Report, December 2007
- SCAG Final Ventura/Santa Barbara Rail Study Report, March 2008
- 2008 Transit Needs Assessment, May 2008
- Final Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Plan 2007-2014, June 2008
- VISION2030: 2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN, September 20 2008

For a complete list of SBCAG publications go to the SBCAG Website at <http://www.sbcag.org>.