

## CHAPTER 7.0 TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT (TE)

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

#### General Plan Law Requirements [GP]

The Transportation Element, also known in state law as the Circulation Element, guides the continued development and improvement of the transportation system to support land uses planned in the Land Use Element. State planning law requires:

...a circulation element consisting of the general location for proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element plan.

#### Transportation Element Policies

TE 1:	Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
TE 2:	Transportation Demand Management
TE 3:	Streets and Highways Plan and Standards
TE 4:	Target Level of Service Standards
TE 5:	Planned Street and Road Improvements
TE 6:	Street Design and Streetscape Character
TE 7:	Public Transit (Bus Transportation)
TE 8:	Rail Transportation
TE 9:	Parking
TE 10:	Pedestrian Circulation
TE 11:	Bikeways Plan
TE 12:	Transportation Systems Management
TE 13:	Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
TE 14:	Financing Transportation Improvements
TE 15:	Regional Transportation

The State General Plan Guidelines recommend that the circulation policies and plans should: integrate the transportation and circulation system with planned land uses; promote the safe and efficient transport of goods and the safe and effective mobility of all segments of the population; make efficient use of existing transportation facilities; and protect environmental quality and promote the wise and equitable use of economic and natural resources.

#### Coastal Act Requirements [CP]

Generally, only short segments of Goleta's arterial street system and U.S. Highway 101 (US-101) and State Route 217 (SR-217) traverse areas within the California Coastal Zone. Provisions of the Coastal Act promote maintenance and enhancement of public coastal access by automobile and transit. New development is required to avoid overwhelming the local circulation system so as to allow ease of public access. New or expanded public roadways must be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by planned new development. Where existing or planned transportation infrastructure can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, priority shall be given to coastal-dependent land uses so that they are not precluded.

#### Existing Transportation System and Conditions: 2005 [GP]

##### Regional Setting

Goleta is situated on the south coast of Santa Barbara County along the US-101 and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridors, which traverse the city from east to west and divide it into northern and southern sections. The City has little or no control over regional traffic that passes through Goleta on US-101 or on SR-217, which connects southward to the University of

California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) campus and the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Congestion on these routes in the future will continue to affect traffic conditions on the city's street network. Even if the City limited future development within its boundaries entirely, traffic congestion would continue to increase as a result of growth in surrounding areas and particularly at UCSB, which is adjacent to the city's southern boundary. At the same time, alternatives to automobile travel are limited within Goleta and the urbanized south coast area.

### **Existing Street and Highway System**

Goleta's arterial network includes two continuous east-west arterials that generally parallel the US-101 corridor: Hollister Avenue south of the freeway and Cathedral Oaks Road to the north. All major north-south arterials in the city have interchanges with US-101: Patterson Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Los Carneros Road, and Storke-Glen Annie Road. Goleta experiences significant traffic volumes and congestion, and these issues rank high among the concerns of residents. As traffic congestion increases, it can frustrate drivers, waste fuel, contribute to pollution, and reduce productivity and recreational time. Because the area is largely developed and nearly built out, the components of the city's future road system are already in place, except for a limited number of new links proposed in this plan. A major emphasis in the future will be on achieving more efficient utilization of the existing street network.



*Fairview/U.S. Highway 101 Overpass Traffic*

Traffic conditions are greatly influenced by the limited number of north-south crossings of US-101 and the lack of a street grid system. These constraints reduce the connectivity of the street system and contribute to congestion on the cross routes at their freeway ramps and at their intersections with east-west arterials such as Hollister Avenue. Limited capacity on US-101, which consists of two travel lanes each direction west of Fairview Avenue and three travel lanes east to Santa Barbara, can result in pressure on the only two continuous parallel routes—Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road—as drivers seek alternate routes during periods of severe travel delay on US-101.

### **Transit Services**

The Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) provides public bus transit services in Goleta and the south coast area. As of 2005, the structure of the governing board of MTD did not provide for representation by Goleta. While Goleta's low-density suburban residential development pattern presents a challenge to transit providers, the concentration of larger-scale employers and commercial services, particularly along the Hollister Corridor and at the UCSB campus, offers opportunities for bus transit to play a larger role in the future. Additional constraints are caused by limited funding to support public bus transportation services. As of 2005, several providers offered express commuter service to Goleta from Ventura County in the south and from the Santa Ynez Valley, Lompoc, and Santa Maria in the north. Despite an

extensive route network within the Goleta area, for many potential users the bus transit system was not competitive in 2005 with the automobile in terms of convenience and accessibility.

### **Passenger Rail Services**

As of 2005, passenger rail service in Goleta was limited to Amtrak and state-supported service in a corridor extending from San Diego to San Luis Obispo. These services use the UPRR tracks, which are parallel and adjacent to US-101. The only terminal facilities in Goleta consist of a passenger platform at La Patera Lane. Although the possibility of instituting commuter rail service along the UPRR corridor between Goleta and Ventura County has been discussed by regional organizations, no commitments or actions have been made as of 2005, and the feasibility of such service and its potential role in reducing congestion on US-101 remain unproven.

### **Existing and Forecasted Future Travel Conditions**

The Goleta Travel Model, a detailed transportation model encompassing 162 traffic analysis zones and 29 land-use variables within the city and surrounding portions of the Goleta Valley, was developed for the General Plan by PTV America based on VISUM model software. The model calibration is documented in a report by PTV America titled "City of Goleta 2005 Transportation Model Calibration Report," dated September 2005. The model is a single-mode, PM peak-period model that addresses auto travel. The Goleta Travel Model was employed by Dowling Associates to forecast and evaluate future traffic conditions resulting from the Land Use Plan set forth in the Land Use Element. The modeling tested several transportation system alternatives to evaluate the effectiveness of various improvements in maintaining acceptable levels of service (LOS) on city roadways. In addition, the transportation consequences of several land use alternatives were evaluated. The modeling of various general plan scenarios is documented in a report by Dowling Associates, Inc., titled "City of Goleta General Plan Traffic Forecast Report."

Figure 7-1 shows existing 2005 PM peak hour traffic volumes and forecasted future traffic volumes with full build-out, consistent with the land use plan, on selected intersections and roadways on the city's street network. The data indicate that increases in traffic volumes of 25 percent or more can be expected on some segments of the street system.

Table 7-1 shows the projected PM peak hour LOS at each intersection evaluated in the traffic model under three scenarios: the existing condition as of 2005, buildout under the land use plan assuming no improvements to the transportation system, and buildout assuming improvements consistent with the transportation plan. The data show that three City intersections were deficient (LOS less than C) in 2005. The number of deficient intersections would increase to 17 if growth were to continue in accordance with the proposed land use plan without any improvement to the transportation system. The number of deficient



***U.S. Highway 101***

**TABLE 7-1  
EXISTING AND PROJECTED FUTURE LOS AT SELECTED INTERSECTIONS**

Map ID	Intersection Location	Base Year 2005		Planned Land Use/No Transportation Improvements		Planned Land Use/Planned Transportation Improvements	
		V/C Delay	LOS	V/C Delay	LOS	V/C Delay	LOS
		1	Hollister Ave./Calle Real	13.9s	B	18.7s	C
2	Hollister Ave./Entrance Rd.	0.43	A	0.48	A	0.46	A
3	Hollister Ave./Canon Green Dr.	19.3s	C	72.3s	F	0.55	A
4	Hollister Ave./Pacific Oaks Rd.	0.55	A	0.82	D	0.74	C
5	Hollister Ave./Market Place Dr.	0.57	A	0.55	A	0.52	A
6	Hollister Ave./Storke Rd.	0.77	C	0.94	E	0.89	D
7	Storke Rd./Market Place Dr.	0.56	A	0.67	B	0.70	B
8	Storke Rd./Phelps Rd.	0.42	A	0.52	A	0.59	A
9	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Glen Annie Rd.	0.62	B	0.69	B	0.66	B
10	Glen Annie Rd./Del Norte Dr.	9.5s	A	9.9s	A	9.7s	A
11	Glen Annie Rd./US-101 NB Ramp	0.65	B	0.77	C	0.72	C
12	Storke Rd./US-101 SB Ramp	0.51	A	0.63	B	0.53	A
13	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Alameda Ave.	0.46	A	0.50	A	0.45	A
14	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Los Carneros Rd.	19.8s	C	37.0s	E	0.64	B
15	Los Carneros Rd./Calle Real	18.8s	C	34.3s	D	0.65	B
16	Los Carneros Rd./US-101 NB Ramp	0.56	A	0.62	B	0.60	A
17	Los Carneros Rd./US-101 SB Ramp	0.71	C	0.87	D	0.56	A
18	Los Carneros Rd./Calle Koral Rd.	0.70	B	0.76	C	0.73	C
19	Los Carneros Rd./Castilian Dr.	0.64	B	0.74	C	0.73	C
20	Los Carneros Rd./Hollister Ave.	0.69	B	0.89	D	0.78	C
22	Los Carneros Way/Hollister Ave.	0.46	A	0.58	A	0.46	A
23	Hollister Ave./Aero Camino Rd.	0.51	A	0.61	A	0.56	A
24	Hollister Ave./La Patera Ln.	0.60	A	0.62	B	0.73	C
25	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Fairview Ave.	0.52	A	0.57	A	0.57	A
26	Fairview Ave./Stow Canyon Rd.	70.3s	F	> 50s	F	0.61	B
27	Fairview Ave./Encina Ln.	0.46	A	0.52	A	0.52	A
28	Fairview Ave./Calle Real	0.81	D	0.96	E	0.80	C
29	Fairview Ave./US-101 NB Ramp	0.77	C	0.97	E	0.75	C
30	Hollister Ave./Fairview Ave.	0.68	B	0.83	D	0.78	C
31	Hollister Ave./Pine Ave.	0.65	B	0.76	C	0.62	B
32	Hollister Ave./Rutherford St.	0.50	A	0.71	C	0.62	B
33	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Cambridge Dr.	0.31	A	0.36	A	0.36	A
35	Calle Real/Kellogg Ave.	0.38	A	0.42	A	0.43	A
36	Hollister Ave./Kellogg Ave.	0.71	C	0.95	E	0.74	C
37	Hollister Ave./SR-217 SB Ramp	0.79	C	0.99	E	19.5s	C
38	Hollister Ave./SR-217 NB Ramp	0.68	B	0.73	C	3.9s	A
42	Patterson Ave./US-101 NB Ramp	0.72	C	0.87	D	0.77	C
43	Patterson Ave./US-101 SB Ramp	0.89	D	1.09	F	0.75	C
44	Patterson Ave./Overpass Rd.	0.56	A	0.61	A	0.61	B
45	Hollister Ave./Patterson Ave.	0.79	C	0.86	D	0.74	C
51	Fairview Ave./US-101 SB Ramp	0.62	B	0.83	D	0.71	C
54	Hollister Ave./US-101 NB Ramp	8.5s	A	8.5s	A	n/a	n/a
55	Ellwood Station Rd./Calle Real	8.4s	A	13.3s	B	0.64	B
56	Hollister Ave./US-101 SB Ramp	11.6s	B	14.6s	B	0.43	A
57	Winchester Canyon Rd./Calle Real	9.0s	A	10.7s	B	11.3s	B
58	Fairview Ave./Ekwill St.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.0s	C
59	Fairview Ave./Fowler St.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.2s	A
60	Ekwill St./Pine St.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.2s	A
61	Ekwill St./Kellogg Ave.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13.7s	B
65	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Hollister Ave.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.44	A
67	Cathedral Oaks Rd./Calle Real	10.8s	B	11.1s	B	0.44	A
68	La Patera Ln./Calle Real	n/a	n/a	18.4s	C	0.79	C
69	La Patera Ln./Cathedral Oaks Rd.	n/a	n/a	12.6s	B	12.2s	B
70	Hollister Ave./Ellwood Station Rd.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.71	C

NOTE: Data are expressed at volume/capacity ratios (v/c) for signalized intersections and as seconds of delay (s) for unsignalized intersections during the PM peak hour period.  
LOS = Level of Service      V/C = Volume-to-Capacity Ratio

intersections is reduced to one with the implementation of the proposed transportation improvements identified in this plan.

Table 7-2 identifies existing and projected average daily traffic volumes on various roadway segments associated with the proposed land use plan. The data show that three street segments were deficient in 2005. The number of deficient segments is expected to remain at three if growth were to continue in accordance with the proposed land use plan without any improvement to the transportation system. All deficient roadway segments would operate at acceptable service levels with implementation of the proposed transportation improvements identified in this plan.

### **Transportation Issues and Needs**

As a result of the transportation modeling and community input at numerous public workshop meetings, the following transportation issues and needs were identified:

1. A need for more north-south crossings of US-101 to relieve congestion on cross-routes with interchanges.
2. A need to reconstruct an obsolete and/or deteriorated freeway interchange.
3. A need for major operational improvements to improve traffic flow and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians on Hollister Avenue in the Old Town area.
4. A need to reduce congestion on Hollister Avenue in Old Town by creating an alternative route to divert trips via Ekwil Street and Fowler Street to South Kellogg Avenue and the SR-217 interchange.
5. Concerns regarding deterioration in LOS at several key intersections, and the need for reasonable alternatives to reduce intersection congestion.
6. Concerns about improving safety, for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians, at a number of locations within the city.
7. A concern that future transportation improvements be consistent with the existing and desired character of the community.
8. A need for convenient and accessible transit alternatives for commuters.
9. Concerns regarding substantial growth anticipated at UCSB and the university's participation in mitigating the traffic impacts on Goleta's street network.
10. Concerns regarding adequate maintenance and repair of streets in the future.
11. A key issue or concern is uncertainty regarding adequacy of funding sources to meet some transportation needs.

**TABLE 7-2  
EXISTING AND PROJECTED ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY EVALUATIONS**

Segment Location	Base Year 2005			Planned Land Use/ No Transportation Improvements			Planned Land Use/ Planned Transportation Improvements		
	Count ADT	Capacity at LOS C	Deficient Yes/No	Model ADT	Capacity at LOS C	Deficient Yes/No	Model ADT	Capacity at LOS C	Deficient Yes/No
Hollister west of Patterson	17,800	34,000	No	23,500	34,000	No	21,700	34,000	No
Hollister west of Fairview	21,700	34,000	No	24,900	34,000	No	22,900	34,000	No
Hollister east of Los Carneros	15,700	34,000	No	19,400	34,000	No	18,900	34,000	No
Hollister east of Storke	20,300	34,000	No	28,200	34,000	No	25,300	34,000	No
Hollister east of US-101 Interchange	6,500	14,300	No	7,100	14,300	No	5,400	14,300	No
Cathedral Oaks east of Fairview	9,500	30,100	No	11,000	30,100	No	11,000	30,100	No
Cathedral Oaks east of Los Carneros	9,200	14,300	No	10,500	14,300	No	10,200	14,300	No
Cathedral Oaks west of Glen Annie	9,700	14,300	No	11,000	14,300	No	11,500	14,300	No
Cathedral Oaks north of US-101 Interchange	2,000	14,300	No	2,500	14,300	No	2,300	14,300	No
Calle Real east of Los Carneros	8,000	14,300	No	11,400	14,300	No	11,900	14,300	No
Calle Real west of Glen Annie	9,100	30,100	No	9,100	30,100	No	11,900	30,100	No
Glen Annie north of US-101 Interchange	8,500	34,000	No	11,400	34,000	No	10,900	34,000	No
Storke south of US-101 Interchange	40,000	34,000	Yes	50,200	34,000	Yes	45,700	47,000	No*
Storke south of Whittier	15,800	14,300	Yes	18,300	14,300	Yes	17,700	34,000	No*
Los Carneros north of US-101 Interchange	12,200	34,000	No	17,200	34,000	No	14,900	34,000	No
Los Carneros south of US-101 Interchange	20,800	34,000	No	27,200	34,000	No	24,700	34,000	No
Los Carneros south of Hollister	20,500	14,300	Yes	25,400	14,300	Yes	23,600	34,000	No*
Fairview north of Calle Real	14,700	34,000	No	18,000	34,000	No	18,000	34,000	No
Fairview south of US-101 Interchange	25,000	34,000	No	31,300	34,000	No	30,200	34,000	No
Patterson south of US-101 Interchange	25,100	34,000	No	25,700	34,000	No	26,500	34,000	No

\* Lane Capacity Improvement Location  
ADT = Average Daily Traffic  
LOS = Level of Service

## 7.2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND GOALS [GP/CP]

The purpose of the Transportation Element is to set forth the plan for a safe, efficient, and adequate transportation system for Goleta. To meet this purpose, the Transportation Element addresses the general transportation and circulation improvements needed to provide adequate capacity for future land uses as well as to resolve existing deficiencies. This element contains goals and policies to improve overall circulation in Goleta and ensure that future development is supported by appropriate transportation facilities. For vehicular transportation, the city's roadway network is classified in a hierarchical system based upon intended function and anticipated traffic levels, and appropriate design standards are specified for each type of roadway. Acceptable levels of service are established to determine when capacity improvements are necessary. Because local circulation is closely linked with the regional system, the element supports regional programs to alleviate traffic congestion and construct capacity improvements. Alternative transportation modes are also identified in this element to reduce dependency on the automobile and improve environmental quality.

The following guiding principles and goals, which are not in order of priority, provide the foundation for the Transportation Element. All policies set forth in subsequent sections of this element have been established to conform to the guiding principles and goals, and future actions of the City following adoption of the plan are required to be consistent.

1. Plan and provide transportation facilities and services in a manner that reinforces, rather than detracts from, the character of the community and its quality of life.
2. Ensure that transportation improvements are provided on a timely basis to support new development without reducing the LOS to unacceptable levels.
3. Create and maintain a cost-effective and efficient transportation network that meets the mobility needs of all users.
4. Provide a transportation system that increases choice for intra-city and regional travelers and limits or reduces congestion on city roads.
5. Create a convenient, safe, and well-maintained street network.
6. Create and maintain a balanced and diversified transportation system with choice of modes, including expanded bus transit, rail, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, to manage congestion and improve mobility.
7. Improve connectivity between the various travel modes, including auto, bus, rail, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
8. Lessen future increases in individual auto travel, particularly during peak commute periods, by enabling mixed-use development, maintaining jobs-housing balance, and designating lands for higher density residential use in the Hollister Transit Corridor.
9. Guide future transportation investments in a manner that will increase safety, improve traffic flows, and reduce congestion on local roadways.

## 7.3 COASTAL ACT POLICIES [CP]

The Coastal Act policies set forth below are adopted as policies of this plan for those areas of Goleta within the California Coastal Zone. The numbers refer to sections of the California Public Resources Code. The Transportation Element maps show the location of the Coastal Zone boundary.

- 30252** The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation resources by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.
- 30254** New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the Coastal Zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal-dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.

## 7.4 CITY POLICIES

### Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System [GP/CP]

**Objectives:** *To create and maintain a balanced and integrated transportation system to support the mobility needs of Goleta's residents and workforce, with choice of bus transit, bicycle, and pedestrian as well as private automobile modes. To reduce the percentage of peak-hour person-trips that are made by automobile and provide the facilities that will enable diversion of trips from automobiles to other modes. To develop, maintain, and operate a balanced, safe, and efficient multimodal transportation system to serve all persons, special-needs populations, and activities in the community.*

- TE 1.1 Alternative Modes. [GP/CP]** The City's intent shall be to achieve a realistic and cost-effective balance between travel modes, including bikeways, pedestrian circulation, and bus transit. The City shall encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, such as bus transit, bicycling, and walking, which have the additional beneficial effect of reducing consumption of non-renewable energy sources.
- TE 1.2 Transportation and Land Use. [GP/CP]** The design of the City's transportation infrastructure and services, and investments in future improvements, shall be supportive of the land use plan set forth in the Land Use Element and responsive to the transportation impacts of development located in nearby areas outside the city boundary. The design of and improvements to Goleta's transportation system should accommodate not only existing conditions, but also projected growth based on the



Land Use Element of this plan and planned growth in adjacent jurisdictions, including UCSB, the County, and the City of Santa Barbara.

- TE 1.3 Improved Connectivity in Street, Pedestrian, and Bikeway Systems. [GP/CP]** In developing the future transportation system, the City will place priority on creating one or more additional non-interchange crossings of US-101 to connect the community from north to south. The intent shall be to facilitate cross-town traffic, improve bicycle and pedestrian flow and safety, and to relieve traffic congestion on cross-routes with freeway interchanges.
- TE 1.4 Multi-Use Street System. [GP/CP]** The City shall emphasize geometric configurations for street and intersections that will readily accommodate transit vehicles and other travel modes as well as to improve traffic flows and turning movements for automobiles. These actions shall be balanced with safety considerations and the value the community places on not widening roads and intersections to the extent that roadways would be inconsistent with desired community character.
- TE 1.5 Multimodal Transportation Center. [GP]** The City supports consideration of a multimodal transportation center in the city to facilitate interconnection and transfers between express bus routes, automobile, bicycle and pedestrian circulation, and potentially commuter and other passenger rail services. While a proposed area in the vicinity of the current Amtrak terminal should be studied, alternative sites should also be explored; the ultimate location will depend on the results of such study.
- TE 1.6 Development Review. [GP/CP]** As a condition of approval of new non-residential projects, the City may require developers to provide improvements that will reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Preferential parking spaces for carpools.
  - Bicycle storage, parking spaces, and shower facilities for employees.
  - Bus turnouts and shelters at bus stops.
  - Other improvements as may be appropriate to the site.

## **Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management [GP]**

***Objective:*** To attempt to influence individual travel behavior, particularly by workers at larger-scale employers, to lower future increases in peak-hour commute trips and other trips by persons in single-occupant vehicles.

- TE 2.1 Reduction/Shifting of Peak-Hour Vehicle Trips. [GP]** The City supports efforts to limit traffic congestion through reducing low-occupancy auto trips and shifting peak-hour vehicle trips to off-peak hours. Possible means for accomplishing this include the following:
- Increased telecommuting.
  - Establishment of flexible work schedules.

- c. Provision of incentives for carpooling.
- d. Provision of vanpools.
- e. Car sharing/ride sharing.
- f. Guaranteed ride home programs.
- g. Safe routes to school programs.
- h. Provision of pedestrian amenities.
- i. Provision of bicycle facilities and amenities.
- j. Bus pass programs for employees.
- k. Public information and promotion of ridesharing.

**TE 2.2 Land Use Strategies to Reduce Automobile Travel Demand. [GP]** The City supports the following land use strategies, as provided in the Land Use and Housing Elements, which may enable greater reliance by commuters, shoppers, and others, on alternative modes of travel:

- a. Live-work development, wherein residential units in some areas may be designed to include work spaces for the residents.
- b. Mixed-use development on individual sites, whereby residential and non-residential uses are permitted in an integrated development project on a single site.
- c. Mixed-use development within particular subareas of the city, whereby varying uses on separate parcels are located in close proximity to one another so as to enable walking and bicycling between residences, workplaces, and shopping areas. These sub-areas include, but are not limited to: Old Town, the Hollister Corridor, and the Calle Real-Fairview Avenue areas.
- d. The provision of onsite commercial services for employees in new non-residential development, such as but not limited to cafeterias, childcare, financial services, convenience retail services, concierge services, and others as appropriate.
- e. The provision of onsite or nearby employee housing within business parks, office and institutional uses, and other employment concentrations as appropriate, to encourage walking to work.

**TE 2.3 Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes. [GP]** The City encourages investment in alternative modes of travel that will make those modes more competitive with auto travel in terms of convenience, accessibility, costs, and safety. These may include, but are not limited to, improvements in the bus transit system, the bikeway system, pedestrian circulation



**Old Town MTD Bus Stop**

system, and potentially commuter rail services, if the region should determine to pursue this option.

- TE 2.4 Employer-Based or Project-Based Transportation Management Plans. [GP]** When appropriate, the City may as a condition of approval require proposed larger-sized non-residential developments with 100 or more employees to prepare and adopt a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and to maintain a designated Transportation Manager. The TMP shall establish quantified objectives for trip reduction and shall identify the specific measures that will be employed to accomplish trip reduction, including but not limited to the measures identified in TE 2.1. The Transportation Manager shall work with Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' (SBCAG) Traffic Solutions (the county's rideshare organization) and the City in developing, implementing, and monitoring the TDM measures and shall provide an annual report to the City on the status and effectiveness of the measures.
- TE 2.5 City of Goleta TDM Program. [GP]** The City shall establish a program that will provide measures or incentives to encourage reduction in vehicle trips, including commute trips, by its employees. These measures may include but are not limited to the actions identified in TE 2.1.
- TE 2.6 Reduction of School-Related Automobile Traffic. [GP]** The City encourages public and private schools to adopt TDM Plans and to implement trip reduction programs to reduce congestion on streets near schools caused by commuting students and staff. Potential measures include funding for safe routes to schools, encouraging MTD and other transit providers to offer free or reduced-cost bus passes for students and employees, increased funding of school buses, and others as appropriate.

### **Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards [GP/CP]**

***Objective:*** *To provide a street network, including appropriate provisions for bicycles and pedestrians, that is adequate to support the mobility needs of city residents and businesses.*

- TE 3.1 Overall Street Plan. [GP/CP]** Figure 7-2 shows the traffic circulation plan for Goleta. The map classifies the city's street system by function and identifies major intersections that either have or may require signalization in the future. Future street improvements shall be consistent with the functional classifications designated in Figure 7-2.
- TE 3.2 Freeways. [GP/CP]** US-101 and SR-217 are designated as freeways for their entire length in Goleta, as shown in Figure 7-2. The rights-of-way for these routes are controlled and managed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The following policies and standards shall apply to roads designated as freeways:
- a. **Definition/function.** A freeway is a four- or six-lane divided highway with full control of access by grade-separated interchanges at intersections. Freeways serve as the principal routes for the inter- and intrastate system of highways, carrying large volumes of high-speed traffic between regions, cities, major traffic generators, and points of interest. As the highest level of road facility, freeways are designed and managed to provide maximum service and safety for through traffic.

- b. Design Standards. The following standards shall apply:
  - 1) The number of travel lanes may vary from two to three in each direction.
  - 2) Auxiliary lanes may be provided to allow easy access from one interchange to the next without the need for local traffic to merge into through-travel lanes.
  - 3) Interchanges shall provide for grade separation with cross-routes; priority in signalization at the intersection of ramps with the cross-route should be given to flow of traffic on the freeway.
- c. Additional Travel Lanes. One additional travel lane in each direction from Fairview Avenue west to the planned new interchange at Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Avenue may be provided in the future to create six travel lanes along the entire length of US-101 within Goleta.
- d. Interchange Improvements. Appropriate operational improvements may be provided at interchanges to assure maintenance of LOS standards and safety.
- e. Landscaping. Freeway medians and rights-of-way shall be appropriately landscaped. The City supports landscaping improvements that will upgrade the visual quality of the freeway corridors.
- f. Viewsheds. Improvements to the freeway system shall be provided in a way that will maintain existing views of the ocean and mountains to the greatest extent feasible.
- g. Noise Buffers. Where warranted, noise buffers may be provided along the US-101 right-of-way to mitigate noise impacts on adjacent residential uses or other noise-sensitive land uses.

**TE 3.3 Principal Arterials. [GP/CP]**  
 Routes designated as *principal arterials* are shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards shall apply to these streets:



**Principal Arterial—Los Carneros Overpass**

- a. Definition/Function: *Principal arterials* are continuous routes that carry through traffic between various neighborhoods and communities, frequently providing access to major traffic generators such as shopping areas, employment centers, recreational areas, higher-density residential areas, and places of assembly. Driveway access, especially for residential uses, to a principal arterial is generally discouraged or kept to a minimum in order to facilitate traffic flows.
- b. Access to Abutting Properties. Although established patterns of development in Goleta have created driveways along most arterial segments, access to abutting properties shall be managed to maximize safety and functionality for through traffic, including but not limited to the following characteristics:

- 1) Driveways shall have sufficient width to minimize conflicts between through traffic and turning movements.
- 2) Driveways shall adhere to safe sight-distance requirements to the extent feasible.
- 3) New development abutting principal and minor arterials shall accommodate safe ingress and egress without necessitating backing movements into the arterial.
- 4) Where feasible, sharing driveways with adjoining properties is encouraged, with provision of reciprocal access easements.

Where street standards cannot be fully met and access from the arterial must be approved due to the absence of any other feasible and practicable alternative, development intensity may be reduced on the site to lessen or avoid potential traffic safety hazards and vehicular conflicts.

c. Design Standards. The following standards shall apply:

- 1) A principal arterial may be a divided or an undivided multi-lane street, with or without center median.
- 2) The maximum number of through-travel lanes shall be two lanes in each direction except for street segments between US-101 and Hollister Avenue, where the maximum number of lanes shall be three lanes in each direction.
- 3) Lane widths and intersection geometrics shall be adequate to accommodate transit vehicles and large trucks.
- 4) Intersections of arterials with cross-routes are provided at grade, although partial control of access may occur at some locations. Intersection controls shall give priority to traffic flow on the arterial rather than the cross-route.
- 5) Principal arterials shall include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.
- 6) At a minimum, principal arterials shall include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Principal arterials may include landscaped medians and/or landscaped strips between curb and sidewalk.
- 7) Parking may be provided in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street. (Amended by Reso. 19-01, 1/15/19)

**TE 3.4 Minor Arterials. [GP]** Routes designated as *minor arterials* are shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards apply to these streets:

- a. Definition/Function: Minor arterials serve as a secondary type of arterial street carrying local through traffic within communities, frequently providing access to shopping areas, employment centers, recreational areas, residential areas, and places of assembly. A minor arterial may connect different neighborhood areas within the city.
- b. Design Standards: The following standards shall apply:
  - 1) A minor arterial may be a divided or an undivided multi-lane street, with or without center median.

- 2) The number of through-travel lanes is usually one lane in each direction, although two lanes may be provided on particular segments, when warranted by traffic volumes.
- 3) Lane widths and intersection geometrics shall be adequate to accommodate transit vehicles and large trucks.
- 4) Intersections of arterials with cross-routes are provided at grade, although partial control of access may occur at some locations. Intersection controls shall give priority to traffic flow on the minor arterial rather than the cross-route, except where the cross-route is a major arterial.
- 5) Minor arterials shall include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.
- 6) At a minimum, minor arterials shall include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Minor arterials may include landscaped medians and/or landscaped strips between curb and sidewalk.
- 7) Parking may be required in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street. (Amended by Reso. 19-01, 1/15/19)

**TE 3.5 Major Collectors. [GP/CP]** Routes designated as *major collectors* are shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards apply to these streets:

- a. Definition/Function: Major collectors function to collect traffic from local streets and to carry that traffic to principal or minor arterials. Collectors may also link two arterials as well as collecting traffic from local streets and abutting driveways. Collectors are designed to provide access to local streets within residential and commercial areas or to connect streets of higher classifications to permit adequate traffic circulation.
- b. Design Standards: The following standards shall apply:
  - 1) Collectors shall generally not exceed two travel lanes (one lane in each direction) and shall generally be undivided streets.
  - 2) Collectors generally should not form a continuous system, so that they cannot easily be used as substitutes for arterials.
  - 3) Intersections of collectors with cross-routes are provided at grade. Intersection controls shall give priority to traffic flow on the arterial rather than the collector.
  - 4) Collectors shall include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.
  - 5) At a minimum, collectors shall include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Collectors may include landscaped strips between curb and sidewalk.
  - 6) Parking may be required in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street. (Amended by Reso. 19-01, 1/15/19)

**TE 3.6 Local Streets. [GP/CP]** All streets not specifically designated in another category shall be classified as local streets as shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards apply to local streets:



**Local Street**

- a. **Definition/Function.** A local street provides access to abutting individual properties and links such properties and their uses to a collector or arterial. City street standards shall ensure that local streets provide access to abutting properties and should include a variety of designs and spacing, depending on access needs. Local streets are intended to serve only adjacent uses and are intended to protect residents from the impacts of through traffic.
- b. **Design Standards.** The following standards shall apply:
  - 1) Local streets shall be designed in a manner consistent with the character of the adjacent neighborhood and uses and any physical and environmental constraints.
  - 2) In appropriate segments, full urban street standards shall be required, including curb, gutter, and sidewalks on both sides of the street. Bicycle lanes should be provided if the street is designated as a Class 2 bicycle route in the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan.
  - 3) Local street standards should encourage residential access points to be located on the least traveled street wherever there is an option.
  - 4) Parking may be required in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street.
- c. **Other.** New multi-family residential and commercial development should not have primary access on local streets, except where there is no feasible alternative.
- d. **Traffic Calming.** The City shall emphasize the use of local streets for local access and residential traffic in order to minimize traffic noise, congestion, and other hazards to residential uses and pedestrians. Through traffic may be discouraged by a variety of methods, such as installation of traffic calming devices or setting lower speed limits, provided there is involvement and support from the immediate neighborhood. *(Amended by Reso. 19-01, 1/15/19)*

**TE 3.7 Guidelines for Geometric Cross Sections. [GP/CP]** The following guidelines shall apply to determinations of appropriate cross sections for particular street segments:

- a. Travel lanes should have a typical width of 12 feet.
- b. Turn lanes have a typical width of 11 feet.
- c. The typical width for on-street parking is 8 feet.
- d. Center medians, where required, typically have widths of 14 feet.



- e. The typical width for a bike lane is 5 feet.
  - f. The typical width for a sidewalk is 6 feet in residential areas, with a greater width in commercial areas.
  - g. The typical width of a parkway or planting strip between curb and sidewalk is 6 feet.
- TE 3.8 Truck Routes. [GP]** Primary truck routes shall be limited to freeways and major and minor arterials within the city. The City may designate or prohibit use of particular streets by any commercial vehicle exceeding a maximum gross weight. However, any street so restricted may continue to be used by such vehicles for pickups and deliveries of goods, merchandise, or construction materials to any building or site located on the restricted route.
- TE 3.9 Right-of-Way Dedications and Improvements. [GP/CP]** Existing and future rights-of-way may vary along different segments of individual streets within a single functional classification, based upon the existing patterns of development along the various segments. The appropriate street cross section, frontage improvements, and right-of-way dedications shall be established by the City Engineer when imposing conditions of approval for development applications on abutting parcels. Dedications of right-of-way may be greater in locations where it is appropriate to secure space for utilities, street appurtenances, transit facilities, and landscaped areas.

#### Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards [GP]

**Objectives:** *To maintain an adequate LOS on the city street system, including at intersections, to provide for the mobility needs of the community. To avoid further degradation of service levels at intersections where existing service levels do not meet target standards.*

**TE 4.1 General Level of Service Standard. [GP]** A traffic LOS standard C shall apply citywide to major arterials, minor arterials, and collector roadways and signalized and unsignalized intersections, except as provided in TE 4.2. The standard shall apply to daily traffic volumes and both AM and PM peak hours for intersections, and to average daily traffic volumes (ADT) for roadway segments. Table 7-3 provides descriptions of the LOS categories.

**TE 4.2 Modified Level of Service Standard for Specific Intersections at Planned Capacity. [GP]** Any intersection or arterial link that is developed to the maximum permitted number of lanes (see Policy TE 3 and TE 6.5) shall be considered to be at “planned capacity,” and the forecasted volume to capacity ratio with all planned transportation improvements, as shown in Table 7-1, shall be the applicable LOS standard. As of 2005, the



**Storke and Hollister Intersection at the Camino Real Marketplace**



Storke-Hollister intersection was the only intersection in the city at “planned capacity,” and the applicable volume to capacity standard is 0.89.

**TABLE 7-3  
LEVEL OF SERVICE AND V/C RATIO DESCRIPTIONS**

LOS	Description of Operation	V/C Ratio
A	Describes primarily free-flow conditions at average travel speeds. Vehicles are seldom impeded in their ability to maneuver in the traffic stream. Delay at intersections is minimal.	< 0.60
B	Represents reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds. The ability to maneuver in the traffic stream is slightly restricted and delays are not bothersome.	0.61 – 0.70
C	Represents stable operations; however, ability to change lanes and maneuver may be more restricted than LOS B and long queues are experienced at intersections.	0.71 – 0.80
D	Congestion occurs, and a small change in volumes increases delays substantially.	0.81 – 0.90
E	Severe congestion occurs with extensive delays, and low travel speeds occur.	0.91 – 1.00
F	Characterizes arterial flow at extremely low speeds, and intersection congestion occurs with high delays and extensive queuing.	> 1.00

Note: LOS is commonly used as a qualitative description of intersection operation and is based on the capacity of the intersection and the volume of traffic using the intersection. Intersection capacity analysis evaluates the operation of an intersection using a range of LOS from LOS A (free-flow conditions) to LOS F (severely congested conditions) based on corresponding Volume/Capacity (V/C) ratios shown in the table.

- TE 4.3 Deficiency Correction Plans. [GP]** When the LOS for any intersection or arterial link at planned capacity falls below base year standards which are expressed in Table 7-1, the City shall require a Deficiency Plan to be prepared prior to approving any development that would further lower the LOS. The Deficiency Plan shall consider alternative transportation improvements, including alternative modes. Any improvements established in the adopted Deficiency Plan may be provided as mitigation by new development or included in the impact fee system. The Deficiency Plan shall be prepared by the City or at the City’s direction within 90 days of publication of a City-approved traffic report indicating degradation of service below base year standards which are expressed in Table 7-1. *(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08)*
- TE 4.4 Level of Service Analysis Methodology. [GP]** The City Engineer shall develop appropriate standards and methods for determining the LOS at intersections and road links, including unsignalized intersections. These methods may include the Intersection Capacity Utilization and the Caltrans Highway Capacity Manual methodologies, or other appropriate methods.
- TE 4.5 Traffic Improvement Master Plan. [GP]** The City shall prepare and maintain a master plan for street system improvements necessary to accommodate future growth allowed by the Land Use Element and to maintain acceptable levels of service. The initial plan shall include the major improvements specified in Policy TE 5, as well as any additional improvements determined to be appropriate.
- TE 4.6 LOS Effects of Future Land Use Plan Amendments. [GP]** Any amendment to the Land Use Element that would increase impacts on arterials and intersections at ultimate capacity shall include the development and implementation of transportation measures that would not reduce the LOS (increase the traffic volume to roadway capacity [v/c] ratio) of these facilities.

**Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements [GP/CP]**

**Objective:** *To identify and describe the major future improvements to the street and highway system that will be needed to accommodate the forecasted future traffic volumes, based upon the Land Use Plan, at acceptable levels of service.*

- TE 5.1 General. [GP/CP]** Proposed major street and highway improvements are shown in Figure 7-3 and Table 7-4. Major proposed improvements are deemed necessary to maintain the City's LOS standards as set forth in this plan. Additional recommended improvements may be appropriate in the long term and are desirable to enhance Goleta's circulation system, but are not necessary to maintain LOS standards. Specific improvements will be implemented as conditions require and funding is available. The design of specific improvement projects will be determined as each project is implemented.
- TE 5.2 Replacement of the Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Interchange. [GP/CP]** The major planned projects include replacement of the Cathedral Oaks/Hollister interchange with US-101 due to deterioration of the existing overpass structure caused by reactive aggregates in the original construction. The new interchange will be relocated slightly to the east to align directly with Cathedral Oaks Road and Hollister Avenue. The new overpass structure shall include provisions for bicycles and pedestrians.
- TE 5.3 Ekwil–Fowler–South Kellogg Improvements. [GP/CP]** This planned major project includes construction of new segments of Ekwil Street and Fowler Street to connect these streets in a direct alignment with Fairview Avenue and with a southern extension of South Kellogg Avenue, which extends north to Hollister Avenue at its interchange with SR-217. The intent of this project is to more efficiently collect existing and future traffic from the southern portion of the Old Town area and from the Santa Barbara Airport, and to divert a portion of trips having origins or destinations in this area away from a congested segment of Hollister Avenue in Old Town between Fairview Avenue and SR-217. Related purposes of this project are to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians along Hollister Avenue in Old Town and to help facilitate revitalization efforts in the Goleta Old Town Redevelopment Project Area.
- TE 5.4 Hollister Avenue (Old Town) Redesign Improvements. [GP]** This major project is intended to provide substantial operational improvements along Hollister Avenue in the central Old Town area between Fairview Avenue and the SR 217 interchange. The purposes include improvement of traffic flow, improved facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, and improved safety at intersections. A related intent is to help facilitate revitalization efforts in the Goleta Old town Redevelopment Project Area.
- TE 5.5 New US-101 Freeway Crossings. [GP]** Two planned major projects are new grade-separated freeway crossings without interchanges at US-101, to link northern and southern portions of Goleta. The planned new crossings are intended to connect Calle Real with Hollister Avenue, generally at Ellwood Station Road in western Goleta and at La Patera Road in the central Hollister area. The effect of these projects is to create alternative routes that will divert vehicle trips away from existing heavily used cross-routes with freeway interchanges. The purpose is to reduce congestion and improve LOS on these routes, particularly at the freeway ramps and

**TABLE 7-4  
MAJOR PLANNED STREET AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

Map No. (Figure 7-3)	Name of Improvement	Sources of Funding			
		City Impact Fees	RDA	State and Federal	Other*
1	Replace Cathedral Oaks/Hollister interchange	X		X	X
2	Ekwill–Fowler–South Kellogg improvements	X	X	X	X
3	Hollister Avenue/Old Town redesign improvements	X	X	X	X
4	New vehicular crossing at US-101 and Ellwood Station Road	X		X	X
5	New vehicular crossing at US-101 and La Patera Road	X		X	X
6	Street frontage improvements (w. Hollister, s. Fairview)	X		X	X
7	Phelps Road connector	X		X	X
8	Reconstruct Los Carneros overpass	X		X	X
9	Overpass Road extension to Hollister Avenue	X	X		X
10	Improvements at various key intersections to improve LOS	X	X	X	X
11	Add lane in each direction on US-101 West of Fairview Avenue	X		X	X
12	Storke Road Capacity Improvements—Storke Road from Hollister Avenue to US-101 (widening and/or lane reconfiguration)	X		X	X
13	Storke Road Capacity Improvements—Storke Road south of Whittier Drive to the southern city limit	X		X	X
14	Los Carneros Road Capacity Improvements—Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue to the southern City limit	X		X	X

\* Includes, but not limited to, Measure D funds, traffic mitigation funds from other jurisdictions, and City general funds

at the intersections with Hollister Avenue and Calle Real. These projects will assist with congestion relief on two cross routes, Storke Road and Los Carneros Road, which provide access to and from UCSB, and will help mitigate future increases in traffic associated with development in Goleta and growth at the university. The precise alignments and design of the new freeway crossings will be determined by specific studies in the future.

**TE 5.6 Extension of Overpass Road. [GP]** The Overpass Road Extension Project is designed to connect the existing Overpass Road with Hollister Avenue at a new signalized intersection. The primary purpose of this major project is to accommodate traffic generated by planned residential development along the route extension. The project will also help reduce congestion at the Overpass Road/Patterson Avenue and

- the Patterson Avenue/Hollister Avenue intersections by diverting some westbound vehicle trips to the new route. This project is also located within the Goleta Old Town Redevelopment Project Area.
- TE 5.7 Connection of Phelps Road. [GP/CP]** This planned project will provide a connection between the present eastern terminus of Phelps Road and Los Carneros Road to the east, aligning with the intersection of Mesa Road and Los Carneros Road. The purpose of this project is to improve LOS on Hollister Avenue, Storke Road, Los Carneros Road, and El Colegio Road by enabling traffic between western Goleta and UCSB to utilize a direct alternative route to these roads. This project will also assist with reducing future congestion at the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection.
- TE 5.8 Reconstruction of Los Carneros Bridge Over the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks. [GP]** The major planned projects include replacement of the Los Carneros Road bridge over the UPRR tracks, which is needed due to deterioration of the existing bridge structure caused by reactive aggregates in the original construction. The new bridge structure shall include provisions for improved level-of-service at the Los Carneros/US-101 southbound ramp intersection and the accommodation of bicycles and pedestrians.
- TE 5.9 Street Frontage Improvements. [GP/CP]** These projects are intended to provide substantial operational improvements along South Fairview Avenue and the western segment of Hollister Avenue. The purposes include improvement of traffic flow, better facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, and increased safety at intersections. A particular intent for the South Fairview Avenue improvement is to help accommodate future increases in auto travel associated with terminal expansion and growth in scheduled air carrier services at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.
- TE 5.10 Major Intersection Improvements. [GP/CP]** Improvements may be made to key intersections identified in Figure 7-3 to increase capacity and improve LOS when warranted as a result of future increases in traffic. Such improvements may include installation of controls such as stop signs or traffic signals, changes in signal timing, addition of through-travel lanes and/or dedicated turn lanes (except where limited by TE 6.5), construction of islands and/or other improvements for pedestrians, and other improvements as determined to be appropriate. Maintaining pedestrian safety and compatibility of the scale of improvements with neighborhood character shall be primary considerations in determining the appropriate improvements at individual intersections.
- TE 5.11 Additional Lanes on US-101 West of Fairview Avenue. [GP/CP]** This major project, identified as #11 in Figure 7-3, includes the addition of one travel lane in each direction on US-101 from Fairview Avenue west to the new interchange at Cathedral Oaks Road/Hollister Avenue. This improvement will reduce constraints created by high traffic volumes on US-101 and allow diversions of traffic from city streets to the freeway, thereby contributing to improved LOS on local streets.
- TE 5.12 Storke Road Capacity Improvements—Hollister to US-101. [GP]** This project, identified as #12 in Figure 7-3, includes the addition of up to one lane in each direction on Storke Road from Hollister Avenue to US-101. This would be accomplished by widening the roadway and/or reconfiguring the existing turn lane.

- TE 5.13 Storke Road Capacity Improvements—Whittier to Southern City Limits.** [GP/CP] This project, identified as #13 in Figure 7-3, includes the addition of up to one lane in each direction on Storke Road south of Whittier Drive to the southern city limit. This would be accomplished by widening the roadway and/or reconfiguring the existing travel lanes.
- TE 5.14 Los Carneros Road Capacity Improvements.** [GP] This project, identified as #14 in Figure 7-3, includes the addition of one lane in each direction on Los Carneros south of Hollister Avenue to the southern City limit.
- TE 5.15 Other Improvements.** [GP] In addition to the major street improvement projects described herein, additional minor improvements to the City's street network may be undertaken in the future to respond to changing traffic conditions.
- TE 5.16 Traffic Monitoring.** [GP] The City shall periodically monitor traffic conditions over time on an as-needed basis. Based on such evaluations, the City shall identify any additional traffic improvements to achieve the target LOS, reduce congestion, and address safety concerns.
- TE 5.17 Periodic Update of Major Improvements.** [GP] As conditions change, planned major roadway improvements may be identified through the annual General Plan Review and status report process required by California Government Code Section 65500. Amendment of the General Plan shall be required for any substantial change to the major projects identified in this policy.
- TE 5.18 Timing of Roadway Improvements.** [GP] Roadway improvements shall be periodically prioritized to be correlated with impacts caused by new development, to reflect the degree of need for mitigation, and to reflect future changes in congestion and/or LOS. The timing of construction of planned major improvements will also be affected by the availability of funding.

#### **Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character [GP]**

***Objectives:*** *To ensure that the standards used for the design and development of new roadways and improvements to existing roadways reflect and support the character of adjacent development. To create streetscapes that will enhance neighborhood quality.*

- TE 6.1 Overall Factors to Guide Development of Street Standards.** [GP] The following guidelines shall be used to develop specific standards for streets and roadways within the city:
- a. The city street system shall be planned, designed, and developed to support the safe and efficient movement of people, goods, and services.
  - b. Standards shall assure that the street system is developed in a manner consistent with adjacent planned land use and neighborhood quality and character.
  - c. Standards shall minimize conflicts between through traffic and local traffic.
  - d. Standards shall be consistent with physical and environmental limitations of the area traversed by a street and the designated function of the street.

- e. Standards shall reflect a reasonable balance between initial expense and long-term operations and maintenance costs.

**TE 6.2 Component Features Included in Street Standards.** [GP] The City Engineer will develop specific geometric and other design standards for street infrastructure that will safely accommodate facilities and services that include but are not limited to those listed below:

- a. A number of travel lanes consistent with neighborhood character, the functional classification of the roadway, and forecasted traffic volumes.
- b. Accommodation of emergency and service vehicles, including garbage collection and recycling services.
- c. Sidewalks or other facilities for pedestrians.
- d. Bicycle lanes or other appropriate facilities for bicycles, where shown on the Bikeways Plan Map.
- e. On-street parking in appropriate locations.
- f. Public transportation facilities such as bus turnouts and shelters.
- g. Drainage improvements and other utilities.
- h. Landscaping, landscaped medians, planting strips, and street trees.
- i. Street lighting consistent with neighborhood character and safety considerations.
- j. Provisions for mail boxes.
- k. Informational and traffic control signs.



*Intersection of Fairview and Calle Real*

The appropriate width of the rights-of-way for individual street segments will be based upon the existing conditions and constraints along each segment (see also TE 3.9).

**TE 6.3 Drainage.** [GP] New transportation facilities should be designed in a manner that minimizes impacts on natural drainage patterns and protects water quality while accommodating transportation needs.

**TE 6.4 Streetscape Amenities.** [GP] Street design standards should incorporate appropriate pedestrian and neighborhood-enhancing elements in roadway design based on the density of development and the type of roadway. These elements may include wider sidewalks, separated sidewalks, planting strips, landscaped medians, benches, street trees, and pedestrian-oriented streetlights.

- TE 6.5 Limitation on Expansion of Intersections. [GP]** No city intersection, excluding freeway ramps and the Storke/Hollister intersection, shall exceed a total of seven lanes on any leg including through-travel lanes and turn lanes, even if this requirement reduces the LOS below the target LOS set forth in Subpolicies TE 4.1 and TE 4.2. (Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08)
- TE 6.6 Street Trees and Landscaping Guidelines. [GP]** The City shall develop a street tree guide for selecting appropriate tree species for landscaped and median strips, sidewalks, and other landscaped right-of-way areas.
- TE 6.7 Widths of Paved Surfaces. [GP]** New rights of way and access easements should be paved to the smallest dimension necessary to accommodate their designed function (including emergency access) and to maintain the character of the neighborhood.
- TE 6.8 Street Lighting. [GP]** Street lighting shall be provided in keeping with neighborhood character and consistent with the policies of the Conservation Element, based upon the following criteria:
- Enhancement of pedestrian and vehicular safety.
  - Existing and projected traffic volumes.
  - Location of school or transit stops.
  - Proximity to higher-intensity land uses.
  - Proximity to nearest intersection.
  - Proximity to residences.
  - Other relevant state, federal, local, or utility design requirements.

### Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation) [GP/CP]

**Objectives:** *To support the efforts by MTD and other transit providers to sustain and expand the bus transit system to serve the needs of local and regional commuters, the transit-dependent population, and other users in a convenient, reliable, and efficient manner. To increase bus ridership levels in order to reduce peak-period automobile trips on area roadways.*

- TE 7.1 Transit Network. [GP/CP]** The existing (2005) bus route network is shown in Figure 7-4, along with certain proposed future facility improvements. The City supports efforts by MTD and other transit providers to develop and maintain convenient, efficient, and reliable bus transit services in the city and in the Goleta Valley area.
- TE 7.2 Linkage between Transit Services and Land Use. [GP/CP]** The City shall work with MTD and



**Bus Transit**

other transit providers to ensure that local transit routes within the city offer convenient, reliable, and efficient service to meet the needs of the following uses:

- a. Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital and nearby medical facilities.
- b. Schools, (especially high schools and middle schools), but also including day care and after-school programs.
- c. UCSB.
- d. Local public services, including City Hall and the Goleta Public Library.
- e. Retail commercial centers, including the Hollister Corridor and the Calle Real commercial areas.
- f. Employment centers along the central Hollister Corridor area.
- g. Existing and planned higher density residential areas near the Hollister Corridor.
- h. Community, recreation, and cultural centers.
- i. Larger community parks, particularly those with sports fields, and open space areas.

**TE 7.3 Intermodal Transportation Center/Bus Transfer Areas. [GP]** Figure 7-4 identifies areas where transit routes converge and where there are significant opportunities for transfer from one route to another. Two bus transfer locations are identified: (1) Hollister Avenue in Old Town and (2) adjacent to the Camino Real Marketplace. The City, MTD, and other transit providers should identify and plan for facilities in these areas to facilitate and accommodate such transfers. In addition to these designated areas the City shall also consider potential opportunities for park-and-ride facilities, especially any opportunities that offer shared parking facilities with other uses. The public transportation plan map in Figure 7-4 also designates a generalized location for an intermodal transportation center near the existing Amtrak station. The purpose of the transportation center would be to provide a convenient and safe hub for transfers between bus, shuttle, train, automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian modes. The specific site selected for a transportation center should allow convenient and safe drop-off and pick-up areas without adversely affecting surrounding traffic flows.

**TE 7.4 Regional and Express Commuter Bus Service. [GP]** Express routes, which are generally long-haul routes with segments on US-101 and SR-217 and fewer stops than other types of routes, are designed to serve longer-distance commuters to employment centers. Existing regional and express/commuter bus routes as of 2005 are shown in Figure 7-4. The City supports efforts by providers to expand routes to better serve employment centers in the city and to increase the frequency of service along existing regional express and commuter bus routes linking employment centers in the Goleta and UCSB areas with Ventura County, Santa Barbara, the Buellton–Santa Ynez Valley area, and the Lompoc and Santa Maria areas. Regional commuter service routes are operated by Clean Air Express, VISTA, and MTD.

**TE 7.5 Local Commuter Bus Service. [GP]** These routes tend to traverse intermediate distances, have more bus stops and greater frequency of service, and connect local residential areas with large-scale employment centers such as UCSB and the mid-Hollister corridor. Existing local commute bus routes are shown in Figure 7-4. The



City supports efforts by MTD and other transit providers to improve local commute service by appropriate adjustments to routing, scheduling, and frequency of service.

- TE 7.6 Other Local Bus Service. [GP]** Local bus routes generally traverse shorter distances and are characterized by more closely spaced and frequent stops than express and commute-oriented routes. Local routes generally serve trips to non-workplace destinations throughout the day, as well as serving some commuters. Existing local bus service routes as of 2005 are shown in Figure 7-4.
- TE 7.7 Shuttle Bus Service. [GP]** Shuttle routes, which may employ smaller transit vehicles, generally serve a limited area with frequent headways, and generally are appropriate within and/or between high-intensity commercial areas and large employment centers, such as UCSB. The locations of existing fixed-route shuttle bus services as of 2005 are shown in Figure 7-4. The City supports expansions of shuttle services when such expansions are shown to satisfy a significant unmet need and when they are cost effective.
- TE 7.8 Hollister Avenue Transit Corridor. [GP]** Hollister Avenue from the eastern city boundary west to Pacific Oaks Road is designated as the Hollister Avenue Transit Corridor. The public transportation map in Figure 7-4 illustrates that the highest concentration of transit routes and greatest frequency of service occur in this area. The land areas along this corridor include existing and planned future retail commercial and employment centers as well as higher-density housing. These higher-intensity uses are transit oriented; the City supports efforts by MTD and other providers to expand express and local bus services along this corridor as ridership levels warrant.
- TE 7.9 Paratransit Services. [GP]** The City encourages the development and/or maintenance of a full array of on-demand public transportation services to serve the Goleta area. Such services could include Easy-Lift, dial-a-ride, fixed-route van service, and taxi cab services to meet the needs of persons with special requirements and neighborhoods that do not produce sufficient transit ridership levels to warrant scheduled bus route services.
- TE 7.10 UCSB Bus Service Programs. [GP]** The City encourages programs by UCSB to promote bus use by students, faculty, and staff. These efforts should include free or discounted monthly bus passes, funding of shuttle bus services, funding of express bus services, automobile sharing, ridesharing, appropriate pricing of on-campus parking, parking management policies, and other activities.
- TE 7.11 Other Bus Transportation Providers. [GP]** The City supports efforts to provide scheduled bus service to particular external destinations, such as the Santa Barbara Airbus to Los Angeles International Airport and the shuttle buses operated by the Chumash Casino to carry employees and customers to its facility in Santa Ynez. Scheduled or demand-responsive bus or van service by large employers (such as UCSB and Raytheon) for their workers is encouraged.
- TE 7.12 Transit Amenities in New Development. [GP/CP]** The City shall require new or substantially renovated development to incorporate appropriate measures to facilitate transit use, such as integrating bus stop design with the design of the development. Bus turnouts, comfortable and attractive all-weather shelters, lighting,

benches, secure bicycle parking, and other appropriate amenities shall be incorporated into development, when appropriate, along Hollister Avenue and along other bus routes within the city. Existing facilities that are inadequate or deteriorated shall be improved or upgraded where appropriate and feasible.

- TE 7.13 Assessments of Transit Needs. [GP]** The City encourages continuous efforts to monitor, evaluate, and adjust bus services to respond to changing conditions in order to meet, in a cost-effective manner, the transit needs of specific population groups, including but not limited to commuters, elderly persons, students and youth, persons with disabilities, persons with limited economic means, residents of specific neighborhoods, and employers.

### **Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation [GP]**

***Objective:*** To accommodate commuter-oriented rail passenger service along the UPRR corridor that would serve employment centers in Goleta and UCSB, in the event that the region determines to pursue this option to accommodate long-distance work trips between Ventura County and Goleta.

- TE 8.1 Commuter Rail Service. [GP]** If the region should determine that it is cost effective to implement commuter rail service along the UPRR corridor, the City shall consider new facilities, such as (but not limited to) track sidings or a turnaround, as may be appropriate to accommodate the service. Any improvements should be limited to areas within the existing railroad right-of-way to the extent feasible.
- TE 8.2 Rail Terminal. [GP]** Figure 7-4 identifies the location of the existing Amtrak terminal as of 2005. The City, in cooperation with Amtrak and any future commuter rail service provider, should actively explore and promote the development of an expanded multimodal transportation center that includes a rail station in the city as referenced in TE 7.3. As of 2005, facilities were limited to a passenger platform. The City supports regional funding and construction of a terminal facility that includes a building with an indoor waiting area, ticketing, information kiosks, restrooms, and other appropriate amenities; parking; and drop-off and pick-up areas. Small-scale ancillary commercial services, such as a small restaurant, may also be permitted as integral to the terminal facility.
- TE 8.3 Coordination of Bus Service with Commuter Rail. [GP]** If the region should determine to implement commuter rail service along the UPRR corridor, the City encourages MTD, private providers, and/or employers to consider scheduled and/or demand-responsive shuttle bus service between the train station and local employment centers, including but not limited to UCSB.
- TE 8.4 Linkage of Land Use With Potential Commuter Rail. [GP]** The land-use plan map designates land areas along and near the railroad corridor in the mid-Hollister area for business park and medium-density multi-family residential development. It is the intent that these higher-intensity uses support and not prevent potential passenger rail service as well as support existing and potential expanded bus commute services along the Hollister Corridor.

**TE 8.5 Amtrak and Caltrans-Supported Passenger Rail Services. [GP]**

The City encourages that existing Amtrak services and Caltrans-supported passenger rail services be maintained, with expansion or increased frequency of service when warranted by ridership levels.



**Union Pacific Railroad**

**TE 8.6 Rail Freight Transportation. [GP]**

The existing rail line accommodates both freight and Amtrak passenger services. It is the intent of this plan that any future improvements for expanded passenger services provide for safe joint use of the facilities in a manner that will not interfere with rail freight operations.

**TE 8.7 Retention of Railroad Right-of-Way. [GP]** In the event that any portion of the existing railroad right-of-way is proposed to be abandoned by UPRR in the future, the City supports efforts to secure an ownership interest by a regional or local entity. The intent shall be to reserve the right-of-way for future use, including but not limited to commuter rail service, park-and-ride lots, or other appropriate transportation facilities.

**Policy TE 9: Parking [GP/CP]**

**Objectives:** *To ensure that an adequate amount of parking is provided to accommodate the needs of existing, new, and expanded development, with convenient accessibility and attention to good design. To assure that on- and off-street parking is responsive to the varying and unique needs of individual commercial areas and residential neighborhoods.*

**TE 9.1 Off-Street Parking. [GP/CP]** The primary source of parking supply for new development of all types of uses within the city shall be off-street parking spaces that are provided on site within the development.

**TE 9.2 Adequacy of Parking Supply in Proposed Development. [GP/CP]** The City shall require all proposed new development and changes/intensifications in use of existing nonresidential structures to provide a sufficient number of off-street parking spaces to accommodate the parking demand generated by the proposed use(s), and to avoid spillover of parking onto neighboring properties and streets.

**TE 9.3 Parking in Residential Neighborhoods. [GP/CP]** Any proposed new or expanded use in residential areas shall provide adequate onsite parking to support the use. Adequate parking shall be provided to minimize the need for parking in public rights-of-way and to avoid spillover of parking onto adjacent uses and into other areas. The existing supply of on-street parking spaces shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Off-street parking for proposed new single-family dwellings in all residential use categories shall be provided in enclosed garages. Driveway aprons in

single-family residential neighborhoods shall have sufficient widths and depths to allow parking of two standard-sized vehicles in front of the garage.

**TE 9.4 Parking within Commercial and Industrial Areas. [GP/CP]** The following standards shall apply to parking within nonresidential areas:

- a. An adequate number and appropriate type of parking spaces shall be provided on site for new development or changes of use in commercial, business park, and other industrial areas.
- b. Supplemental satellite parking facilities are encouraged for large employers to prevent spillover parking into neighboring areas.
- c. In determining the adequacy of proposed parking for new or substantially modified development, the City may consider proximity to transit facilities and the provisions of a TMP where it is demonstrated that the plan's measures will sufficiently reduce the demand for onsite parking.
- d. Conditions of approval for large nonresidential projects may include a requirement to prepare a TMP that includes monitoring of parking lot utilization and measures that will be implemented if the event that the supply of onsite parking spaces is inadequate.
- e. Provision of large amounts of excess parking is discouraged, except that surplus landscaped areas may be identified and reserved for future expansion of parking areas if warranted by future conditions.
- f. Compact parking spaces and 90-degree parking stalls are discouraged in parking lots serving high-turnover uses, such as (but not limited to) retail commercial centers.

**TE 9.5 Parking Lot Design. [GP]** Design standards applicable to retail, commercial, business parks, and parking lots are set forth in the Visual and Historic Resources Element Subpolicies VH 4.5, 4.7, and 4.11. In addition, the following standards and criteria shall apply to parking lots of three or more spaces:

- a. Parking lot design shall provide that all individual spaces are clearly delineated and have easy ingress and egress by vehicles.
- b. Proposals that include compact parking spaces shall be subject to discretionary approval by the City, and the number of compact parking spaces shall not exceed 20 percent of the total; parking spaces for oversized vehicles shall be included when appropriate.
- c. Access driveways and aisles shall have adequate geometrics, and the layout shall be clear, functional, and well organized.
- d. Pedestrian walkways between the parking area and the street, main entrance, and transit stops should be protected by landscaped or other buffers to the extent feasible.
- e. The visual impact of large expanses of parking lots shall be reduced by appropriate response to the design standards set forth in the Visual and Historic Resources Element's Policy VH 4.

- TE 9.6 Old Town Parking. [GP]** The following criteria and standards shall apply to parking in the Goleta Old Town area:
- a. As part of the Old Town Redevelopment program, the City and RDA shall develop a parking plan that supports the goals of the *Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan*.
  - b. Where practical and feasible, on-street parking shall be used to create a buffer between pedestrians and vehicle traffic, reduce the speed of traffic, and provide for needed short-term parking.
  - c. The City may consider establishing a program whereby new development could be allowed to pay a fee in lieu of providing all or a portion of the required onsite parking. Such fee receipts, supplemented if appropriate with RDA funding, shall be used exclusively to acquire land and/or construct or improve one or more off-street parking facilities.
  - d. Any proposed parking structures shall be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of size, bulk, scale, and design. Commercial space shall be incorporated in the structure along the street and sidewalk frontage.
- TE 9.7 Shared (Joint Use) Parking. [GP/CP]** The City's new Zoning Code shall include provisions to allow consideration and approval of proposals for shared parking for multiple uses on a single site and/or adjacent sites where some proposed uses have peak demand in the daytime while the peak demand for other uses is in the nighttime hours. The intent shall be to promote efficient use of parking areas and to reduce the amount of paved or impervious surfaces.

#### **Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation [GP]**

**Objective:** *To encourage increased walking for recreational and other purposes by developing an interconnected, safe, convenient, and visually attractive pedestrian circulation system.*

- TE 10.1 Pedestrian System Map. [GP]** Figure 7-5 depicts the various locations that are planned to serve as pedestrian pathways, including sidewalks within public street rights-of-way, trails, parks, open spaces, and beaches. The map identifies locations of proposed improvements to the pedestrian circulation system, particularly where there are missing links in the existing system as of 2005.
- TE 10.2 Master Plan for Pedestrian Facilities. [GP]** The City shall develop a Master Plan for Pedestrian Circulation to provide an integrated network of sidewalks and trails to link residential neighborhoods, commercial areas, community facilities, and other forms of transportation. This plan should outline priorities to provide and maintain a continuous improved surface of sidewalks for pedestrians that meets ADA requirements for accessibility and includes construction of new sidewalks and repair of deteriorated sidewalks, and minimizes conflicts with utilities and other transportation modes. Where feasible, sidewalks should be constructed on both sides of the street. The plan shall emphasize achieving the maximum separation of pedestrian facilities from traffic.
- TE 10.3 Design Criteria for Pedestrian Facilities. [GP]** The City shall establish guidelines for pedestrian walkways, including but not limited to widths and other geometrics,

street corners, types of materials, street crossings, and other features as appropriate. Such standards may be included in the Master Plan for Pedestrian Circulation.

**TE 10.4 Pedestrian Facilities in New Development. [GP]** Proposals for new development or substantial alterations of existing development shall be required to include pedestrian linkages and standard frontage improvements. These improvements may include construction of sidewalks and other pedestrian paths, provision of benches, public art, informational signage, appropriate landscaping, and lighting. In planning new subdivisions or large-scale development, pedestrian connections should be provided through subdivisions and cul-de-sacs to interconnect with adjacent areas. Dedications of public access easements shall be required where appropriate.

**TE 10.5 Pedestrian Safety. [GP]** The City shall consider measures to improve pedestrian safety, including but not limited to the following:

- a. Heightened visibility for crosswalks.
- b. Traffic controls.
- c. Expanded enforcement of pedestrian right-of-way laws.
- d. Adjustments to signal timing.
- e. Appropriate signage for pedestrians and motorists.
- f. Prevention of obstruction of pedestrian circulation by temporary advertising signs, merchandise displays, and other types of obstacles.
- g. Improved lighting at intersections and at other locations along the pedestrian circulation network.
- h. Incorporation of appropriate pedestrian safety measures, such as islands, in intersection designs.
- i. Cooperation with school districts to create safe routes to school through provision of crossing guards, sidewalks, curb extensions to reduce crossing length, high-visibility crosswalk markings, signage, trails, separated pathways, or other appropriate means.



*Existing Sidewalk*

**TE 10.6 Study of Grade-Separated Pedestrian Crossing of US-101 in Old Town. [GP]** The City shall, in cooperation with Caltrans and other appropriate agencies, undertake a study of the feasibility of constructing a grade-separated crossing of US-101 in the Old Town area to serve pedestrians and bicyclists. The study shall evaluate potential alignments, right-of-way requirements, design alternatives, construction costs, and potential funding sources.



## Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan [GP]

**Objective:** To encourage increased bicycle use for commuting and recreational purposes by developing an interconnected circulation system for bicycles that is safe, convenient, and within a visually attractive environment.

**TE 11.1 Bikeways Plan Map. [GP]** Figure 7-6 identifies the locations of planned Class I, II, and III dedicated bike paths and local streets that are intended to serve as bike routes. The bikeways plan is intended to establish a safe, interconnected system of bikeways that is linked to walkways and trails to meet existing and anticipated mobility needs of residents for nonmotorized transportation. The plan includes links with existing and proposed bicycle routes in adjacent jurisdictions to interconnect with the regional system of facilities.

**TE 11.2 Bicycle Transportation Plan. [GP]** The City shall periodically prepare and adopt a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that addresses the required elements set forth in Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code. This plan is required for submittal of grant funding applications. Among the subjects to be included in the BTP are the following:

- a. Estimates of the number of existing and future bicycle commuters in the area.
- b. A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways, including Class I, II, and III bikeways.
- c. A map showing the existing and proposed land use pattern and its correlation with the bikeways.
- d. A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities, such as parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.
- e. A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes, such as but not limited to bicycle parking at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, park-and-ride lots, and trailheads at open space preserves.
- f. A description of how the BTP has been coordinated and is consistent with other regional transportation plans, including the bicycle transportation plans of other jurisdictions and UCSB.
- g. A description of the projects proposed in the plan and listing of their priorities for implementation.



**Hollister Avenue Through Old Town—Location for Proposed Class II Bikeway**

- h. Identification of estimated costs and financial needs for all projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters.

The BTP shall be regularly reviewed and updated to respond to changing conditions and needs. Any future changes shall be incorporated into the map in Figure 7-6 during periodic updates or amendments to the General Plan.

- TE 11.3 Design Guidelines. [GP]** The City shall formulate design guidelines that establish standards for construction and maintenance of bikeways. Bikeways should be constructed on both sides of the street and incorporated into roadway and bridge projects located along planned bicycle routes. Where space allows, Class I bicycle lanes shall be the development priority over Class II and III lanes. Existing bike lanes shall not be removed to add traffic lanes unless bike lanes of the same or higher classification will be replaced as part of the roadway improvements.
- TE 11.4 Facilities in New Development. [GP]** Bicycle facilities such as lockers, secure enclosed parking, and lighting shall be incorporated into the design of all new development to encourage bicycle travel and facilitate and encourage bicycle commuting. Showers and changing rooms should be incorporated into the design of all new development where feasible. Transportation improvements necessitated by new development should provide onsite connections to existing and proposed bikeways.
- TE 11.5 Bicyclist Safety. [GP]** The City supports programs to increase public awareness of bicycle safety. The City should work with SBCAG Traffic Solutions and other appropriate regional entities to provide information to motorists and bicyclists regarding maps of bike path locations, safe routes, and increased signage to alert others of the presence of bicycles. Amenities along bikeways such as directional signage, water fountains, bike parking, and lighting should be appropriately placed to allow adequate passage. The City should work with Caltrans to reduce barriers to US-101 crossings. In addition, the City encourages bicyclists to take responsibility for their own safety by such measures as bicycle lights and wearing light and/or reflective clothing.

### **Policy TE 12: Transportation Systems Management [GP]**

**Objective:** *To establish operational controls that will manage the street network in a manner that will efficiently and safely utilize the existing limited capacity consistent with protection of the surrounding neighborhood.*

- TE 12.1 General. [GP]** The City shall pursue actions that will maximize the function, efficiency, and safety of the local street circulation system while minimizing environmental impacts by observing the following general guidelines:
- a. Control the location and spacing of driveways and the design of parking lots to avoid traffic and pedestrian conflicts and confusing circulation patterns (especially along designated arterials).
  - b. Discourage commercial and through traffic on local access streets.
  - c. Designate special routes for through truck traffic and for transport of hazardous materials.



- d. Encourage through-trip travel only on designated arterials.
- e. Place high priority on the access needs of public safety vehicles, especially in emergency situations.

**TE 12.2 Efficient Utilization of Transportation Facilities. [GP]** As a nearly built-out city, most of the major elements of Goleta's transportation system are already in place. Consequently, a necessary priority in the future will be on making relatively minor improvements designed to achieve modest increases in capacity and to maximize efficient utilization of existing transportation facilities. These operational and safety improvements may include the following:

- a. Intersection improvements, such as construction of turn lanes and installation of traffic controls.
- b. Adjustments of signal timing to improve traffic flows, including installation of coordinated signal systems on arterials.
- c. Provision of continuous dual left-turn lanes.
- d. Reconfiguration of street geometrics.
- e. Provision of landscaped center medians.
- f. Improved sidewalks and street crossings for pedestrians.
- g. Use of roundabouts or traffic circles instead of other intersection controls.
- h. Other transportation systems management measures as may be appropriate.

**TE 12.3 Neighborhood Traffic Management. [GP]** It is the intent of the City to protect residential neighborhoods from the effects of traffic from outside the neighborhood. Neighborhood Traffic Management Programs (NTMPs) may be developed to respond to problems or issues in a consistent and methodical approach. Generally the purpose of NTMPs is to reduce vehicle speeds where appropriate and to control traffic volumes on local streets. Each NTMP shall be a two-phase program, with the first phase involving education and neighborhood participation to determine whether there is support for potential measures to manage neighborhood traffic. The second phase shall involve, where appropriate and cost effective, installation of restrictive physical devices to manage traffic and improve safety. Neighborhood residents and businesses should be invited to participate in the program so that they can evaluate the benefits and tradeoffs of various measures and be involved in the decision-making process. Generally passive traffic management measures should be evaluated for effectiveness prior to considering installation of restrictive measures.

**TE 12.4 Street Maintenance and Pavement Management Program. [GP]** Street maintenance and safety improvements on Goleta's existing roadways shall be a priority. The City's Pavement Management System, which models future changes in the condition of paved street surfaces, shall be used to identify and prioritize street maintenance, rehabilitation, and repair projects for inclusion in the City's capital improvements program.

**TE 12.5 Intelligent Transportation Systems. [GP]** The City shall work with appropriate agencies to implement "Intelligent Transportation Systems" when appropriate. These measures may include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Variable message signs and real-time traffic monitoring video cameras along US-101.
- b. Real-time transit kiosks and information displays at major transit stops.
- c. Web-based trip planners to assist public transit users in transit trip planning.

### **Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development [GP]**

**Objective:** *To ensure that new development is supported by adequate capacities in transportation systems, including city streets and roads, without reducing the quality of services to existing residents, commuters, and other users of the city street system.*

- TE 13.1 Traffic Studies for Development Proposals. [GP]** Future development in Goleta will cause added burdens on the transportation system. Traffic analyses and reports shall be required for development proposals which the City Engineer and Planning Director determine may have effects on the local street system, including but not limited to possible degradation of service levels, potential creation of safety hazards, potential adverse effects on local neighborhood streets, or other substantial transportation concerns. When required by the City, traffic studies shall be performed by a qualified transportation engineer under a contract with the City. The costs of the traffic study, including costs of City staff time, shall be the responsibility of the project applicant.
- TE 13.2 Content of Traffic Studies. [GP]** The City shall develop technical standards for the preparation of traffic studies for development projects and for the content of traffic study reports.
- TE 13.3 Maintenance of LOS Standards. [GP]** New development shall only be allowed when and where such development can be adequately (as defined by the LOS standards in Policy TE 4) served by existing and/or planned transportation facilities. Transportation facilities are considered adequate if, at the time of development:
- a. Existing transportation facilities serving the development, including those to be constructed by the developer as part of the project, will result in meeting the adopted LOS standards set in Policy TE 4; or
  - b. A binding financial commitment and agreement is in place to complete the necessary transportation system improvements (except for the planned new grade-separated freeway crossings), or to implement other strategies which will mitigate the project-specific impacts to an acceptable level, within 6 or fewer years; and
  - c. Any additional offsite traffic mitigation measures are incorporated into the impact fee system for addressing cumulative transportation impacts of future development.
- TE 13.4 Options If Traffic Mitigations Are Not Fully Funded. [GP]** If the transportation capital improvements needed to maintain adopted transportation LOS standards are not able to be funded, then the City shall take one or more of the following four actions:

- a. Phase or delay development until such time that adequate fiscal resources can be provided to build the necessary facilities transportation improvements (or to include them in the impact fee system).
- b. Require the developer to construct the necessary transportation system improvements, with a reimbursement agreement that uses future payments of impact fees by other projects.
- c. Reduce the scope of the development to reduce the traffic generation below the thresholds set in Policy TE 4.
- d. Require the developer to identify alternative strategies, such as transit improvements, improving signalization, improving other streets, adding pedestrian or bicycle improvements, etc., to mitigate potential traffic impacts.

**TE 13.5 Developer-Constructed Transportation Improvements. [GP]** Developers shall be required to construct transportation improvements along their property frontages in accordance with City standards. The Developer shall be required to provide all necessary access and circulation facilities within the property; such facilities shall be designed to meet City standards.

#### **Policy TE 14: Financing Transportation Improvements [GP]**

**Objective:** *To ensure that there is adequate funding for construction of transportation facilities that are needed to support new development and address existing deficiencies to achieve the targeted level of service.*

**TE 14.1 Traffic Impact Fees. [GP]** The City shall adopt a citywide traffic impact fee in accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill 1600 to fund transportation improvements to mitigate the traffic impacts of new development. The impact fee study shall identify and be based on the estimated costs of construction of all transportation system improvements needed to ensure adequate levels of service system wide. Each new development project shall be charged a fee that represents its proportionate share of potential need for and impacts on the facilities included in the fee system. The impact fee system may incorporate improvements made and fees collected by the City since its incorporation in 2002.

**TE 14.2 Capital Facility Plan. [GP]** The City shall prepare a capital facility plan that includes those facilities that are necessary and appropriate to maintain acceptable LOS levels on the transportation network. The costs of the facilities shall be the basis for the impact fee system.

**TE 14.3 Mitigation Payments by UCSB. [GP]** A mitigation agreement between UCSB and the City should be developed and adopted to provide for monetary contributions by UCSB for its "fair share" of the costs of road improvements needed to serve planned future university projects. The agreement shall address transportation impacts created by projects to be undertaken pursuant to any future amendments or revisions to the university's Long-Range Development Plan.

**TE 14.4 Mitigation Fees by Projects in the City of Santa Barbara. [GP]** A mitigation agreement between the City of Santa Barbara and the City of Goleta should be developed and adopted to provide for monetary contributions by the City of Santa

Barbara for its “fair share” of the costs of any road improvements in Goleta needed to serve planned future airport projects, including projects located on airport property north of Hollister Avenue. (See related LU 12 3.)

- TE 14.5 Mitigation Fees by Projects in the County of Santa Barbara. [GP]** A mitigation agreement between the County and the City should be developed and adopted to provide for transfer of traffic impact fees collected by the County for projects that have traffic impacts on city streets and roads. The agreement should be applicable to projects located within Isla Vista, portions of the eastern Goleta Valley, and other areas where traffic impacts are likely to affect city streets and/or intersections. (See related LU 12 7.)
- TE 14.6 State and Federal Funding. [GP]** The City shall seek transportation funds from state and federal sources to fund transportation needs. The City should support state funding to maintain the condition and adequate levels of service on state freeways and routes serving the city.
- TE 14.7 Local Transportation Tax Measure. [GP]** The City may use its discretionary portion of the Measure D special sales tax revenues to assist, where appropriate, the funding of improvement projects identified in this plan. The amount of funding from this source shall be based on the share of cost attributed to existing rather than new development. This funding shall not be used to subsidize and/or reduce the transportation improvement cost attributable to future development.
- TE 14.8 Redevelopment Funding. [GP]** Tax increment revenue bonds issued by the RDA may be used to assist the funding for construction of transportation improvements located within the boundaries of the Goleta Old Town Project Area.
- TE 14.9 Other Financing Mechanisms. [GP]** The City may consider other mechanisms to finance transportation improvements, including but not limited to issuance of General Obligation Bonds and creation of various types of special benefit assessment districts, such as Mello-Roos districts, to provide financing for transportation improvements that will be owned by the City or other appropriate public entity.

### **Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation [GP]**

***Objective:*** *Participate in developing regional transportation solutions to expand choices for local citizens, make the highway system more efficient, improve regional bus service, consider potential commuter rail service, and create an interconnected system of bicycle routes and trails.*

- TE 15.1 Intercity Travel. [GP]** The City shall coordinate with and participate in partnerships with Santa Barbara County, the City of Santa Barbara, Caltrans, MTD, SBCAG, UCSB, and other agencies to provide adequate facilities for commuter travel, including auto, bus, and rail systems, to serve intercity travel demand. Joint efforts may include transportation improvements outside Goleta that serve intercity travel, such as freeway improvements, park-and-ride lots, express commuter bus services, and demand-management measures to reduce intercity vehicular travel.
- TE 15.2 Linkages. [GP]** In developing street standards under this goal, the City and neighboring jurisdictions should work together to develop standards and

designations that are consistent. This effort should include developing appropriate links between pedestrian and bicycle routes.

- TE 15.3 Critical Transportation Facilities. [GP]** Critical transportation facilities for emergency vehicle access and emergency evacuation shall be maintained and improved as a priority need. Critical transportation facilities include US-101 and SR-217, major east-west arterials including Cathedral Oaks Road and Hollister Avenue, and major north-south arterials that connect portions of the city on either side of US-101. Due to the potential for structural failure of some facilities in a seismic emergency, alternative routes and procedures for their use during emergency events shall be identified.
- TE 15.4 Shared Transportation Facilities. [GP]** The City of Goleta shall work with the City of Santa Barbara and the County of Santa Barbara to maintain adequate service levels at shared streets and intersections. Shared facilities include but are not limited to segments of Hollister Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Storke Road, Cathedral Oaks Road, Patterson Avenue, and others.
- TE 15.5 Regional Transportation Planning. [GP]** The City of Goleta shall actively participate with other jurisdictions in Santa Barbara County and the south coast area in planning to improve local and regional transportation systems and choice, particularly where such partnerships will increase the likelihood of obtaining funding. These jurisdictions include Caltrans, SBCAG, MTD, UCSB, Cities of Santa Barbara and Carpinteria, the Santa Barbara County Congestion Management Agency, and others. These efforts may include:
- a. Improved US-101, including extension of three lanes to the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks interchange.
  - b. Freeway interchange improvements.
  - c. Improvements to regional arterial routes, particularly routes parallel to US-101 such as Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road.
  - d. Routes that provide access to UCSB and Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.
  - e. Improved and expanded regional and local bus service for commuters.
  - f. Creation of a Transportation Center in Goleta to improve connectivity of various modes and bus routes.
  - g. Study potential for commuter rail on the UPRR tracks between Goleta and Ventura County.
- TE 15.6 Regional Transportation Funding. [GP]** The City shall support a regional funding approach to pay for improvements to the regional highway and bus transit systems.
- TE 15.7 Traffic Mitigation Agreements. [GP]** The City shall use any available method including participation in the review of environmental impact reports of development proposals outside the City to ensure that the impacts of development in the area on the City's transportation system are fully mitigated by the agencies approving such developments. The City should develop interlocal agreements with neighboring jurisdictions and Caltrans that require development to mitigate significant impacts that development generates on the transportation system, including state routes.

## 7.5 IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS [GP]

**TE-IA-1 Traffic Impact Fee Program.** The City will prepare a citywide traffic impact fee study and adopt a traffic impact fee ordinance in accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill 1600. The fees shall be used to fund transportation improvements that mitigate the traffic impacts of new development allowed by this plan. The impact fee study shall identify and be based on the estimated costs of construction of all transportation system improvements needed to ensure adequate levels of service system wide. Each new development project shall be charged a fee that represents its proportionate share of potential need for and impacts on the facilities included in the fee system.

Time period: 2006 to 2008

Responsible parties: Administrative Services Department, Community Services Department, City Council

**TE-IA-2 Capital Improvements Program and Budget.** The City shall prepare and maintain a Capital Improvement Program that includes a list of all transportation-related capital projects needed to implement the General Plan during the planning period and the anticipated costs and funding sources for each project. The annual budget should include the appropriations for those projects authorized to be initiated in the next fiscal year. The Capital Improvement Program should be updated annually along with anticipated funding capacities as part of the annual budget process.

Time period: Annually

Responsible parties: Community Services Department, Administrative Services Department, Planning Commission, City Council

**TE-IA-3 Street Design Standards.** The City will prepare a street design manual that sets forth standards for design of street facilities, including travel lanes, on-street parking, center medians, landscape strips, sidewalks, bikeways, bus turnouts, bus shelters, street trees, and other facilities located within street rights-of-way. The standards shall include dimensional requirements for the various facilities.

Time period: 2007 to 2008

Responsible parties: Community Services Department

**TE-IA-4 Neighborhood Traffic Management Program.** Neighborhood Traffic Management Programs (NTMPs) may be developed to reduce vehicle speeds where appropriate and to control traffic volumes on local streets. Each NTMP should be a two-phase program, with the first phase involving education and neighborhood participation to determine whether there is support for potential measures to manage neighborhood traffic. The second phase may involve, where appropriate and cost effective, installation of restrictive physical devices to manage traffic and improve safety. Generally passive traffic management measures should be evaluated for effectiveness prior to considering installation of restrictive measures.

Time period: Ongoing, as requested

Responsible parties: Community Services Department, neighborhood residents, City Council

**TE-IA-5 Parking In-Lieu Fee Program for Old Town.** The City will consider establishing regulations in the new zoning code that allow all or a portion of the onsite parking requirement for development within the Old Town area to be satisfied by the payment of an in-lieu fee. Fee receipts, supplemented if appropriate with RDA funding, shall be used exclusively to acquire land and/or construct or improve one or more off-street parking facilities.

Time period: 2006 to 2007 (adopt new zoning code)

Responsible parties: Planning and Environmental Services (zoning code), Redevelopment and Neighborhood Services Department (implementation of parking project)

**TE-IA-6 Bicycle Transportation Plan.** The City shall periodically prepare and adopt a BTP that addresses the required elements set forth in Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code; such a plan is required for submittal of grant funding applications.

Time period: Ongoing

Responsible parties: Community Services Department, City Council

**TE-IA-7 Update of the CEQA Thresholds Manual.** The City's CEQA Thresholds Manual shall be revised to incorporate standards consistent with the policies and standards set forth in the Transportation Element.

Time period: 2010

Responsible parties: Planning and Environmental Services, Community Services Department (*Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08*)

*This page intentionally left blank*