

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA  
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION**

123 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, California 93101  
(805) 568-3000



**SCOTT D. MCGOLPIN**  
Director

November 5, 2020

Re: San Ysidro Roundabout Coastal Development Permit Application 19CDP-00000-00098  
To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors:

Chair Hart and Board Members,

We are writing you as applicants on the Coastal Development Permit Application for the San Ysidro Roundabout (19CDP-00000-00098). Although this project achieves improvements for the public specified by the Montecito Community Plan, County Board Policies, the Local Coastal Plan Amendment, mitigation for the 101HOV project specified in its Environmental Impact Report, and is critical to the effective circulation of regional traffic, it was subject to review by the Montecito Board of Architectural Review and Montecito Planning Commission (MPC) as part of the permitting process. The process followed, hearings and deliberation, and conditions placed on the project by the MPC were in some ways more typical of conditions for private development rather than projects built for public use by local and state agencies. Public Works requests your board consider some changes to these conditions to meet the intent of the conditions while recognizing the implementing agencies (the County, Caltrans, and SBCAG) are public, and building these projects for the public good. Specifically, where the MPC conditions conflict with standards of practice for engineering, design, County and State policies, safety, financial agreement, traffic circulation, traffic control, and coordination, the department recommends the changes below for the benefit of the public. Recommended changes fall into two general categories and are described further below: 1) those that clarify the conditions for implementation and 2) those that reconcile the intent of the conditions with standards of practice for public projects.

**Changes Recommended by Public Works**

Condition numbers below refer to conditions for the Development Plan. However the comments and requested changes apply to the parallel conditions in the Coastal Development Permit as well.

Of the twenty nine project conditions, Public works requests changes to the following five:

- 19. Per LU-M-2.1.1, and VIS M 1-3, the highest area(s) of the roundabout, including the plantings, shall not significantly reduce the present view corridors, ~~shown in the photographs at the June 3, 2020 May 20, 2020 hearing,~~ of San Ysidro Road looking North (of the Santa Ynez Mountains) and South (of the Pacific Ocean).**

The recommended change to include 'significantly' allows for installation of traffic safety devices and barriers to meet engineering design standards. It also gives the Montecito Board of Architectural Review (MBAR), the body responsible for the aesthetics of the project, flexibility to inform the project and create the most context-sensitive project. The condition as written conflicts with the design developed by the Design Working Group, comprised of MBAR and MPC members with knowledge of the community desires. Adding 'significantly' would give them flexibility to increase the views in the corridor while still meeting

AA/EEO Employer

other goals expressed by the community in over 30 outreach meetings of creating a neighborhood feel and screening with mature, robust vegetation.

The change to remove the photograph references is because their depiction doesn't correspond to what is seen at the intersection with the naked eye. The intent would remain the same by removing this language, as it will still require preserving the corridor views to the extent feasible. In addition, this recommendation is consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act analysis performed on the project.

**21. Per LU-M-2.3, the ~~two~~ existing utility poles on North Jameson (immediately ~~East and~~ West of San Ysidro Road) shall be removed and the utilities undergrounded if feasible.**

This recommended change would clarify the condition, as there is no pole immediately east of the project. So although the condition is acceptable, it would be more clear to remove a reference to a pole that is not there. Adding "if feasible" simply acknowledges the fact that these are Edison-owned facilities, not County or State owned. The County does not have authority to force Edison to underground, and Edison may have limitations based on the nature of their facilities that precludes them from undergrounding. While it appears this condition is feasible despite adding significant cost to the project, until the design and implementation is complete it would be more conservative to allow flexibility for implementation.

**22. Per CIRC-M.1.1 and 3.7, any road signage shall be "Old Santa Barbara Style" wooden signs with white lettering and a brown background like the existing signage in the community ~~where~~ feasible (e.g., the street signs of North Jameson and San Ysidro Roads).**

While it was made clear at the hearings that California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices will govern the material, type, and location of signs, there could be opportunities to use signs of the type specified above for road name signs on the County roads. This recommended change would clarify which signs would and would not fall in this category. Traffic Control device standards are extremely regimented and any variance from material types for these signs would not be recommended by Public Works or the State, and could result in liability issues.

**23. Per CIRC.M.1.1 and M-3.6, the establishment period for all plants shall be at least five (5) years. Additionally ~~the County Public Works~~ (or its successor(s) in interest) shall enter into a long-term, renewable, maintenance agreement, with ~~the State covering adequate funding for the~~ irrigation and maintenance of the landscape. ~~This agreement shall be recorded and for an initial term as long as the longest maintenance agreement presently in force in Santa Barbara County. This agreement will assign responsibilities to each party for these items as agreed upon by both parties.~~**

The recommended changes would address the initial maintenance period, as well as future ongoing maintenance, in a manner consistent with how public agencies agree on maintenance for projects that cross agency lines. Throughout the County where there is shared maintenance on State facilities, including all the other 101HOV parallel projects in development, maintenance is covered through a Freeway Maintenance Agreement (FMA). This agreement explicitly states which party is responsible for what items of work and where. The agreement is adopted by your Board on behalf of the County, which is why 'Public Works' is recommended to be changed to "the County".

Changes to remove 'adequate funding' are recommended because it is subjective and because it binds the Board to commit future funds beyond the approved budget cycle. The mechanism to have dedicated funding for these types of items that is committed for the long term is Community Service Areas (CSA), such as CSA-3 and CSA-11. These have long term, secure budgeted funding for specific locations and scopes.

AA/EEO Employer

Other Transportation funding is subject to annual budgeting availability and prioritization. The rest of the strike out and replace is to clarify that the agreement will be similar to FMAs elsewhere.

**25. Per GOAL F-M-2 and Policy F-M-2.3, all of the plants for landscaping shall be fire-resistant, desirable plants listed at the Montecito Fire Protection District's web site [https://www.montecitofire.com/fire-prevention; last visited May 26, 2020] or approved by the MFPD. Additionally, none of them shall be on its list of undesirable plants.**

The recommended changes would clarify and allow flexibility to complete the project in keeping with the recommended plant palates from the Design Working Group, comprised of members of the MBAR and MPC while meeting the intent of being fire-resistant and approved by Montecito Fire Protection District. In working with the district, the designed team learned that some reasons plants may be on the undesirable list are for circumstances that don't apply to this project. Likewise, some plants may not be on the desirable list because it is an illustrative list, not an all-encompassing list of desired plants. This can easily be resolved by ensuring MFPD reviews and approves the planting plan.

Thank you for your consideration of these changes. They are consistent with concerns Staff raised during the 25 hours of hearings on this project at the Montecito Planning Commission. Although the project could still be built without modifying the conditions, these changes would help ensure good stewardship of public facilities and funds, reduce liability, increase safety, improve the ability to build and plant the project envisioned by the MBAR and MPC Design Working Group, and will work towards creating the best project for the traveling public while bringing back the neighborhood feel of this gateway to Montecito.

Sincerely,



Chris Sneddon  
Deputy Director  
Transportation Division

Cc:

Mona Miyasato, County Executive Officer  
Scott McGolpin, PE, Santa Barbara County Public Works Director  
Fred Luna, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments  
Dave Emerson, Caltrans Corridor Manager  
Joe Arnold, Caltrans Lead Engineer  
Donna Senauer, Montecito Planning Commission, Chair

AA/EEO Employer