



# ASSOCIATED TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS

100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4, Santa Barbara, CA 93110 • (805) 687-4418 • FAX (805) 682-8509

Since 1978

Richard L. Pool, P.E.  
Scott A. Schell, AICP, PTP

May 7, 2018

17097L02

Steve Fort  
SEPPS  
1625 State Street, Suite 1  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

## ***TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION ASSESSMENT FOR THE MTD CALLE REAL RESIDENTIAL PROJECT – COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA***

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) has prepared the following traffic and circulation assessment for the MTD Calle Real Residential Project (the "Project"), located on the north side of Calle Real in the Goleta area of Santa Barbara County. The purpose of traffic and circulation assessment is to provide information to assist the design team in developing an access and circulation plan for the development, determine appropriate frontage improvements along Calle Real, and provide traffic information which can be used for the Project EIR.

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Project site is located on the north side of Calle Real between San Antonio Road on the east and Dexter Drive on the west. Figure 1 (attached) presents the location of the Project site within the Goleta area. The site consists of four parcels totaling 18.93 acres and is currently vacant. MTD is proposing to develop a medium-density residential development with up to 233 multi-family units.



## EXISTING CONDITIONS

### Street Network

As shown in Figure 1, the Project site is served by a network of highways, arterial roadways, and collector streets. The following text briefly describes the major components of the study-area street network.

**U.S. 101**, located south of the project site, is a multi-lane interstate freeway serving the Pacific Coast. U.S. 101 is the principal route between the Goleta area and the adjacent cities of Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, and Ventura to the south; and Goleta, Buellton and Santa Maria to the north. Primary access to U.S. 101 is provided via the Turnpike Road interchange to the west; and the northbound on- and off-ramps at El Sueno Road and the SR 154 interchange to the east.

**Turnpike Road**, located west of the project site, is a 4-lane arterial road north and south of U.S. 101. Turnpike Road is classified as a P-2 arterial road by the County.

**Calle Real**, located along the Project's southern frontage, is a 2-lane arterial frontage that parallels the north side of U.S. 101 within the study area. Calle Real is classified as a P-2 arterial road by the County. Access to the project site may be provided via a roadway connection to Calle Real.

### Existing Roadway Operations

Existing average daily traffic (ADT) volumes were obtained for Turnpike Road and Calle Real from the traffic study completed for the 4791 Calle Real Mixed-Use Project. The Existing ADT volumes for the study-area roadway segments are shown on Table 1. The operational characteristics of the study-area roadways were analyzed based on the County's engineering roadway design capacities (a summary of the roadway capacities is attached). Table 1 shows the acceptable capacity ratings and Existing ADT volumes for the study-area roadways.

**Table 1**  
**Existing Roadway Operations**

Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Number of Lanes	Acceptable Capacity	Existing ADT
Calle Real e/o Turnpike Road	P-2	2 Lanes	14,300	7,500
Calle Real e/o El Sueno Road	P-2	2 Lanes	14,300	9,700
Turnpike Road n/o Calle Real	P-2	4 Lanes	34,000	9,900
Turnpike Road s/o Calle Real	P-2	4 Lanes	34,000	21,500

The data presented in Table 1 show that the study-area roadway segments currently carry traffic volumes within their acceptable capacity ratings.

### Existing Intersection Operations

Because traffic flow on urban arterials is most constrained at intersections, detailed traffic flow analyses focus on the operating conditions of critical intersections during peak travel periods. "Levels of Service" (LOS) A through F are used to rate intersection operations, with LOS A indicating free flow operations and LOS F indicating congested operations (more complete definitions of levels of service are included in the Technical Appendix). The County considers LOS C as the minimum acceptable operating standard for intersections in the Goleta area.

Existing peak hour traffic volumes and LOS for the study-area intersections were obtained from the traffic study completed for the 4791 Calle Real Mixed-Use Project and the EIR completed for the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Update. Table 2 presents the existing intersection LOS for the AM and PM peak hour periods.

**Table 2**  
**Existing Intersection Operations**

Intersection	Control	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak hour	
		V/C-Delay	LOS	V/C-Delay	LOS
Calle Real/Turnpike Road	Signal	0.477	LOS A	0.591	LOS A
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Turnpike Road	Signal	0.636	LOS B	0.692	LOS B
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Road	Signal	0.688	LOS B	0.711	LOS C
Hollister Avenue/Turnpike Road	Signal	0.580	LOS A	0.649	LOS B
Calle Real/El Sueno Road/US 101 NB(a)	Stop Signs	16.7 Sec	LOS C	15.6	LOS C
V/C = Volume-to-Capacity Ratio					
(a) Stop Sign controlled intersection, level of service based on average seconds of delay.					

The data presented in Table 2 show that the study-area intersections currently operate acceptably at LOS C or better.



**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The Santa Barbara County traffic impact thresholds were used to assess impacts for the Project. The thresholds are listed below.

- A. The Project will result in a significant impact on transportation and circulation if proposed Project traffic increases the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio at local intersections by the values provided in the following table:

<b>Significant Changes in Levels of Service</b>	
<b>Intersection Level of Service (Including Project)</b>	<b>Increase in V/C or Trips Greater Than</b>
LOS A	0.20
LOS B	0.15
LOS C	0.10
LOS D	15 Trips
LOS E	10 Trips
LOS F	5 Trips

- B. The Project's access to a major road or arterial road would require access that would create an unsafe situation, a new traffic signal, or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.
- C. The Project would add traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, road-side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) that would become a potential safety problem with the addition of Project traffic.
- D. Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection's capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable levels of service, but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D (V/C 0.80) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of 0.03 for an intersection which would operate from 0.80 to 0.85, a change of 0.02 for an intersection which would operate from 0.86 to 0.90 and a change of 0.01 for an intersection which would operate greater than 0.90 (LOS E or worse).

## PROJECT-SPECIFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

### Project Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates were calculated for the Project using rates presented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual<sup>1</sup> for Multi-Family Housing (Low Rise – Land Use Code #220). Table 3 presents the trip generation forecasts for the Project.

**Table 3**  
**Trip Generation - Housing Opportunity Site 1**

Land Use	Size	ADT		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips (In/Out)	Rate	Trips (In/Out)
MFDU	233 Units	7.32	1,706	0.46	107 (27/80)	0.62	130 (82/48)

The data presented in Table 3 show that the Project is forecast to generate 1,706 average daily trips, 107 AM peak hour trips, and 130 PM peak hour trips.

### Project-Specific Roadway Impacts

The Project is forecast to add 1,706 ADT to the surrounding street network. Table 4 assesses the Project's potential impacts to the study-area roadway segments based on County thresholds.

**Table 4**  
**Potential Roadway Impacts**

Roadway Segment	Existing ADT	Existing + Project ADT	Acceptable Capacity	Impact?
Calle Real e/o Turnpike Road	7,500	8,286	14,300	NO
Calle Real e/o El Sueno Road	9,700	10,638	14,300	NO
Turnpike Road n/o Calle Real	9,900	9,985	34,000	NO
Turnpike Road s/o Calle Real	21,500	22,097	34,000	NO

<sup>1</sup> Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 10th Edition, 2017.

The data presented in Table 4 show that the study-area roadway segments carry volumes well within the County's acceptable capacity threshold. The average daily traffic generated by the Project would not cause the roadway segments to exceed their acceptable capacities, and would therefore not generate project-specific roadway impacts based on County thresholds of significance.

### Project-Specific Intersection Impacts

The Project is forecast to generate 107 AM peak hour trips and 127 PM peak hour trips. Tables 5 and 6 assess the potential impacts of the Project to the key intersections in the study area.

**Table 5**  
**Potential Project-Specific Intersection Impacts – AM Peak Hour**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		
	Existing LOS	Project-Added Trips	Potential Impact?
Calle Real/Turnpike Rd	LOS A	48 PHT	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	39 PHT	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	18 PHT	No
Hollister Ave/Turnpike Rd	LOS A	11 PHT	No
Calle Real/El Sueno-US 101 NB Ramps	LOS C	59 PHT	No

**Table 6**  
**Potential Project-Specific Intersection Impacts – PM Peak Hour**

Intersection	PM Peak Hour		
	Existing LOS	Project-Added Trips	Potential Impact?
Calle Real/Turnpike Rd	LOS A	59 PHT	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	46 PHT	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS C	34 PHT	No
Hollister Ave/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	13 PHT	No
Calle Real/El Sueno-US 101 NB Ramps	LOS C	71 PHT	No

The data presented in Tables 5 and 6 show that development of the Project would not generate significant project-specific impacts to the key intersections in the vicinity of the site. It is noted that the U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Road intersection is approaching LOS D operations during the AM peak hour period (AM LOS = 0.76 V/C). Development of the Project would add 18 peak hour trips to this intersection during the AM peak hour period,



which would increase the V/C ratio by approximately 0.01 or less. The addition of Project traffic would therefore not generate a significant project-specific impact based on County thresholds.

## **CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS**

### **Cumulative Traffic Volume Forecasts**

Cumulative traffic and level of service forecasts for study-area roadways and intersections were obtained from the traffic study completed for the 4791 Calle Real Mixed-Use Project and the EIR completed for the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Update. These forecasts are presented in the following sections.

### **Cumulative Roadway Impacts**

The Project is forecast to add 1,706 ADT to the surrounding street network. Table 7 assesses the Project's potential impacts to the study-area roadway segments under cumulative conditions.

**Table 7**  
**Potential Cumulative Roadway Impacts**

<b>Roadway Segment</b>	<b>Existing ADT</b>	<b>Existing + Project ADT</b>	<b>Acceptable Capacity</b>	<b>Impact?</b>
Calle Real e/o Turnpike Road	8,550	9,318	14,300	NO
Calle Real e/o El Sueno Road	10,670	11,608	14,300	NO
Turnpike Road n/o Calle Real	11,870	11,955	34,000	NO
Turnpike Road s/o Calle Real	22,800	23,397	34,000	NO

### **Cumulative Intersection Impacts**

The Project is forecast to generate 107 AM peak hour trips and 130 PM peak hour trips. Tables 8 and 9 assess the potential impacts of the Project to the key intersections in the study area under cumulative conditions.

**Table 8**  
**Potential Cumulative Intersection Impacts – AM Peak Hour**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		
	Existing LOS	Project-Added Trips	Potential Impact?
Calle Real/Turnpike Rd	LOS A	48 PHT	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	39 PHT	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	<b>LOS D</b>	18 PHT	No
Hollister Ave/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	11 PHT	No
Calle Real/El Sueno-US 101 NB Ramps	LOS C	59 PHT	No

**Table 9**  
**Potential Cumulative Intersection Impacts – PM Peak Hour**

Intersection	PM Peak Hour		
	Existing LOS	Project-Added Trips	Potential Impact?
Calle Real/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	59 PHT	No
U.S. 101 NB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	46 PHT	No
U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Rd	LOS C	34 PHT	No
Hollister Ave/Turnpike Rd	LOS B	13 PHT	No
Calle Real/El Sueno-US 101 NB Ramps	LOS C	71 PHT	No

The data presented in Tables 8 and 9 show that development of the Project would not generate significant cumulative impacts to the key study-area intersections. It is noted that the U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Turnpike Road intersection is forecast to operate in the LOS D range during the AM peak hour period with cumulative traffic volumes. Development of the Project would add 18 peak hour trips to this location during the AM peak hour period, which would increase the V/C ratio by approximately 0.01 or less. The addition of Project traffic would therefore not generate a significant cumulative impact based on County thresholds (V/C increase of 0.03 required for cumulative impact).

## **SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION**

The following section reviews the site access and circulation improvements that would be required for the Project. These improvements were developed based on input provided by County staff (Mr. Will Robertson, Transportation Planning Supervisor).



### **Vehicular Site Access**

County staff indicated that vehicular access to the site should be taken from San Antonio Road on the east and possibly from the Dexter Drive cul de sac on the west. A secondary access connection to Calle Real near the middle of the site could also be considered. Given the existing traffic volumes in the study-area and the level of traffic generated by the Project, it is not likely that traffic signal warrants would be met at the Calle Real/San Antonio, or Calle Real/Dexter Drive intersections.



*Calle Real Sidewalk at Maravilla*

### **Calle Real Frontage Improvements**

The Calle Real frontage along the Project site is currently unimproved (no curb, gutter or sidewalk is provided). The County would require full frontage improvements along Calle Real to construct a standard curb, gutter, and a minimum 5-foot sidewalk. A larger meandering sidewalk/parkway configuration, similar the one that was constructed in front of the Maravilla Senior Living development located on Calle Real west of Patterson Avenue, could be considered for the Calle Real frontage, but would be subject to a long-term maintenance agreement with the County. It

appears that sufficient right-of-way is currently provided along Calle Real to accommodate these improvements without additional right-of-way dedications.

### **San Antonio Road Frontage Improvements**

The San Antonio Road frontage along the Project site has been improved with curb, gutter and a 4-foot sidewalk. The east side of the roadway adjacent to the County buildings is unimproved. The roadway width varies from 31 to 32 feet between Calle Real and Granada Place (the entrance to the Forte Ranch condominium development), and on-street parking is allowed on the west side of the roadway. The roadway width will accommodate parking on one side and two travel lanes.



*San Antonio Road Frontage*

### **Calle Real Widening**

The section of Calle Real located on the western side of the Project site transitions from a 5-lane roadway (two eastbound lanes, a center turn lane, and two westbound through lanes) to a two-lane roadway with one eastbound lane and one westbound lane. The two-lane roadway section continues easterly to the intersection with SR 154, with left-turn lanes provided at major intersections. County staff indicated that Calle Real would not need to be widened to provide the 5-lane section adjacent to the site but would need to provide eastbound left-turn lanes at any site access connection that was provided. The existing on-street bike lanes would also need to be maintained.



*Calle Real Transition*

### **Undergrounded Utilities & Street Lights**

County staff indicated that the utilities present along the Calle Real frontage would need to be undergrounded as part of the Project in accordance with current County policies. In addition, new street lights would be required on the Calle Real and San Antonio Road frontages.

### **On-site Circulation**

County staff indicated that the internal roadways for the Project site should be designed to accommodate on-street parking on both sides of the street with a minimum width of 36 feet. Internal street intersections would need to be designed to County standards with appropriate approach angles. The on-site circulation design should be multi-modal and accommodate pedestrians and bicycles as well as vehicles. The internal street system would be constructed as private streets maintained by the development.

### **Transit**

The Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) provides local bus service for the region. The nearest bus stops to the Project site are located on Calle Real at the San Antonio intersection adjacent to the Project site and just east of the Calle Real/Turnpike Road intersection. The existing bus stops are served by MTD Line 7, which provides transit





service to/from downtown Santa Barbara to the Old Town Goleta. Data published on the MTD website indicate that in March 2018, Line 7 carried an average of 16.5 passengers per operating hour, which is slightly lower than the system-wide average. The data also shows that the route experienced 1 "at capacity" load and 0 "too full to board" loads during the month of March 2018 (MTD data is attached for reference). A bus stop for the Coastal Express is also provided near the Project site on Camino del Remedio. The Coastal Express provides transit service to/from Ventura to Goleta and UCSB.

Census data collected in 2010 show that 5% of commuters in the Goleta area utilize public transportation (census data contained in the Technical Appendix for reference). For a project the size of the MTD Calle Real Residential Project (233 units), there would be approximately 4-6 new transit users that would commute during the peak hour periods (7-9 AM/4-6 PM). There are currently 17 busses that serve the Project area during the peak hour periods, thus the Project would add less than 1 rider per bus. The new bus riders generated by the Project would therefore not measurably impact the operations of the transit routes that serve the site.

### **Traffic Fees**

The County of Santa Barbara has established a set of transportation impact mitigation fees to collect funds to implement long-term improvements for the Goleta planning area (traffic impact fees attached for reference). The transportation fee for a Condominium development is estimated at \$7,864 per unit. The Public Works Transportation fee amounts are calculated based on the Peak Hour Trips (PHT).

This concludes ATE's traffic and circulation assessment for the MTD Calle Real Residential Project. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you with the Project.

Associated Transportation Engineers



Scott A. Schell, AICP, PTP  
Principal Transportation Planner

SAS/DLD

Attachments





### STANDARD ENGINEERING ROADWAY DESIGN CAPACITIES

Roadway Type	# Lanes	LOS A		LOS B		LOS C		LOS D		LOS E	
		Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Arterial	2 Lanes	8,100	12,000	9,400	14,000	10,800	16,000	12,100	18,000	13,500	20,000
Arterial	4 Lanes	16,100	23,900	18,900	27,900	21,600	31,900	24,300	35,900	27,000	39,900
Major	2 Lanes	6,500	9,600	7,500	11,200	8,600	12,800	9,700	14,400	10,800	16,000
Major	4 Lanes	12,900	19,200	15,100	22,300	17,200	25,500	19,400	28,700	21,600	31,900
Collector	2 Lanes	4,600	7,100	5,400	8,200	6,200	9,400	6,900	10,600	7,700	11,800

The roadway capacities listed above are "rule of thumb." Some factors which affect these capacities are intersections (numbers and configuration), degrees of access control, roadway grades, design geometries (horizontal and vertical alignment standards), sight distance, level of truck and bus traffic and level of pedestrian and bicycle traffic.



**County of Santa Barbara**  
**Development Impact Mitigation Fee Summary Sheet**  
**Goleta Planning Area**  
**Revised Fees for FY 2017-2018**

Fee Program	Single Family Dwelling Fee	Dwelling Other Than Single Family Fee	Retail Commercial Fee (per 1,000 sf) <sup>1</sup>	Non-Retail Commercial Fee (per 1,000 sf) <sup>1</sup>	Fee Determination By	Fee Collection By	Fee Due To Be Paid At <sup>2</sup>	Ordinance Effective Date
Parks								
• Quimby	\$12,156	n/a	n/a	n/a	Parks Dept.	Parks Dept.	TM/TPM	12/20/1998
• Dev. Mitigation	\$11,860	see Note 3	see C&I	see C&I	Parks Dept.	Parks Dept.	FI	7/1/2006
• Commercial & Industrial (C&I)	n/a	n/a	\$1,932	\$2,722	Parks Dept.	Parks Dept.	FI	7/1/2006
Transportation <sup>4</sup>	\$15,345	see attached	see attached	see attached	Public Works	P&D	FI	7/1/2006
Fire	\$590/1,000 sf	\$750/1,000sf	\$770	see Note 5	Fire Dept.	Fire Dept.	FI	12/20/2014
Library	\$489	\$362	\$169	\$239	P&D	P&D	FI	7/1/2006
Public Administration	\$2,087	\$1,546	\$729	\$1,029	P&D	P&D	FI	7/1/2006
Sheriff	\$559	\$412	\$388	\$550	P&D	P&D	FI	7/1/2006

**Notes:**

1. Planning & Development will determine project size in order to calculate the fees.
2. TM/TPM: Tract Map/Tentative Parcel Map (fees payable prior to Land Use Permit for TM and prior to map recordation for TPM)  
FI: Final Inspection (fees payable on or before final building permit inspection)  
MC or LUP: Map Clearance or Land Use Permit (fee payable prior to map recordation or Land Use Permit if no map recordation)
3. Parks Development Mitigation Fees for other than single family dwellings are as follows (per unit):
  - Duplex Units \$ 10,200
  - Second Units (Attached)\* \$ 4,265
  - Second Units (Detached)\* \$ 4,265
  - Apartments\*\* \$ 8,409
  - Mobile Homes\* \$ 7,700

\* Indicates full fee. Board adopted Beneficial Project Credit: 60% credit for second unit attached; 40% credit for second unit detached; 60% credit for mobile home.  
\*\* Indicates full apartment fee. Beneficial projects must meet certain density requirements to qualify for upfront fee credits.
4. Public Works Transportation fee amounts are calculated based on Peak Hour Trips (PHT). Contact Public Works staff (805-739-8785) for estimate of PHT.
5. Fire charges \$940/1,000 sf for Office, \$710/1,000 sf for Industrial, \$520/1,000 sf for Warehouse/Distribution, and \$350/1,000 sf for Agricultural buildings.



## Transportation Impact Mitigation Fees for the Goleta Planning Area (effective July 1, 2017)

<b>Residential</b>		
Single Family Detached	\$15,345	per unit
Residential Second Unit	\$7,864	per unit
Apartment	\$9,421	per unit
Condominium	\$7,864	per unit
Mobile Home	\$8,203	per unit
Retirement Community	\$4,104	per unit
Elderly Housing-Detached	\$3,494	per unit
Elderly Housing-Attached	\$1,520	per unit
Congregate Care Facility	\$2,581	per unit
<b>Industrial</b>		
Light Industrial	\$14,891	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Industrial Park	\$13,977	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Manufacturing	\$11,245	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Heavy Industrial	\$10,330	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Warehousing	\$7,746	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Rental Self-Storage	\$457	per vault
<b>Commercial</b>		
Building Material-Lumber Store	\$52,175	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Garden Center (Nursery)	\$49,075	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Discount Membership Store	\$37,529	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Hardware-Paint Store	\$43,653	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Free-Standing Discount Superstore	\$37,723	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Auto Care Center	\$29,674	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Furniture Store	\$6,498	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Shopping Center 50,000 Sq Ft or less	\$80,787	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Shopping Center 50,001-100,000 Sq Ft	\$62,791	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Shopping Center 100,001-200,000 Sq Ft	\$51,837	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Shopping Center 200,001-300,000 Sq Ft	\$42,117	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Shopping Center 300,001 Sq Ft or more	\$35,036	per 1,000 Sq Ft
<b>Markets</b>		
24 Hr Convenience Store	\$375,515	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Convenience Store (Other)	\$241,607	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Supermarket	\$101,431	per 1,000 Sq Ft
<b>Institutional</b>		
Community Recreational Facility	\$6,648	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Private School K-12	\$3,038	per student
Church	\$2,506	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Day Care Center	\$685	per child
Nursing Home	\$1,216	per bed
<b>Office</b>		
Medical-Dental Office	\$55,609	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Single Tenant Office Bldg	\$26,134	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Office Park	\$22,792	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Corporate Headquarters Bldg	\$21,118	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Business Park	\$19,600	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Research & Development	\$16,409	per 1,000 Sq Ft
General Office 50,000 Sq Ft or less	\$34,032	per 1,000 Sq Ft
General Office 50,001-100,000 Sq Ft	\$28,410	per 1,000 Sq Ft
General Office 100,001-200,000 Sq Ft	\$23,700	per 1,000 Sq Ft
<b>Restaurants</b>		
Fast Food with Drive Through	\$257,897	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Fast Food w/o Drive Through	\$201,434	per 1,000 Sq Ft
High Turn-Over (Sit Down)	\$100,386	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Quality	\$75,005	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Delicatessen	\$61,007	per 1,000 Sq Ft
<b>Miscellaneous Land Uses</b>		
Hotel	\$8,899	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Motel	\$6,857	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Service Station	\$106,185	per fueling pump
Service Station with Conv Market	\$89,448	per fueling pump
Bank/Savings & Loan + Drive-in	\$624,106	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Bank/Savings & Loan, Walk-in	\$400,788	per 1,000 Sq Ft
Auto Dealership	\$42,541	per 1,000 Sq Ft

The information in this brochure is intended as a courtesy to the developer to estimate transportation impact fees for new development. Public Works Transportation Staff shall calculate the actual fee, in accordance with ordinance no. 4270 and the most current version of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, prior to payment.

The Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee is based on the increase in traffic (peak hour trips) resulting from new buildings, building additions or changes in land use. Projects that increase traffic by less than one peak hour trip are exempt from the fee. Increased traffic generated by a project is quantified by using data such as land use, floor area and/or number of dwelling units and then referencing it to technical traffic generation data provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual and other applicable sources. "Credit" is given for existing traffic generated at a particular site.



## System Ridership Report: March 2018

System-wide ridership decreased 7.6%, or more than 43,000 passengers, for the month of March as compared to March 2017. MTD provided one less service day this March. Schools had the same number of service days this March as compared to March 2017. UCSB ridership increased 3.5% and SBCC ridership decreased 12.1%.

**Table A: Ridership Trends by Fare Component**

Fare Categories	Month			Fiscal Year to Date		
	Mar-18	Mar-17	%Change	Jul 17 - Mar 18	Jul 16 - Mar 17	%Change
General Fare	63,113	73,681	-14.3%	645,792	685,027	-5.7%
Transfers	42,704	43,632	-2.1%	397,556	386,534	2.9%
Full Fare Prepaid <sup>(1)</sup>	72,419	79,086	-8.4%	697,940	727,873	-4.1%
Santa Barbara City College	63,491	72,268	-12.1%	512,887	567,484	-9.6%
Senior & Disabled Prepaid <sup>(2)</sup>	58,621	60,033	-2.4%	513,906	495,309	3.8%
Shuttle (DWE & Seaside)	11,971	15,724	-23.9%	157,239	166,667	-5.7%
UC Santa Barbara	138,160	133,512	3.5%	977,403	917,979	6.5%
Student Prepaid <sup>(3)</sup>	41,126	50,293	-18.2%	401,429	442,011	-9.2%
Free	9,827	11,103	-11.5%	100,178	95,270	5.2%
My Ride	5,272	7,713	-31.6%	59,870	70,552	-15.1%
Senior	13,240	15,632	-15.3%	128,068	142,186	-9.9%
Persons with Disabilities	3,295	3,401	-3.1%	25,832	28,295	-8.7%
Tokens	2,113	2,634	-19.8%	17,865	19,245	-7.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>525,352</b>	<b>568,712</b>	<b>-7.6%</b>	<b>4,635,965</b>	<b>4,744,432</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>

(1) Includes adult 10-Ride and Unlimited 30-Day Passport use.

(2) Includes seniors' and persons with disabilities' 10-Ride and Unlimited 30-Day Passport use.

(3) Includes student 10-Ride and Unlimited 30-Day Passport use.

**Table B: Revenue Hours and Revenue Miles**

Metrics	Month			Fiscal Year to Date		
	Mar-18	Mar-17	%Change	Jul 17 - Mar 18	Jul 16 - Mar 17	%Change
Passengers	525,352	568,712	-7.6%	4,635,965	4,744,432	-2.3%
Revenue Hours	19,037	19,110	-0.4%	162,526	161,721	0.5%
Passengers per Rev Hour	27.60	29.76	-7.3%	28.52	29.34	-2.8%
Miles	229,041	234,664	-2.4%	1,954,824	1,967,432	-0.6%
Passengers per Mile	2.29	2.42	-5.4%	2.37	2.41	-1.7%

\*SOURCE: MTD PASSDAT PROGRAM, MTD TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING SECTION



**Table C: March 2018 System Ridership**

LINE	Month			Fiscal Year to Date		
	Mar-18	Mar-17	%Change	Jul 17 - Mar 18	Jul 16 - Mar 17	%Change
1 West Santa Barbara	26,876	28,219	-4.8%	245,846	253,649	-3.1%
2 East Santa Barbara	40,955	45,019	-9.0%	383,663	386,959	-0.9%
3 Oak Park	16,153	17,225	-6.2%	147,361	146,240	0.8%
4 Mesa/SBCC	11,338	11,045	2.7%	96,123	92,733	3.7%
5 Mesa / La Cumbre	10,120	12,110	-16.4%	94,836	104,639	-9.4%
6 Goleta	49,270	49,874	-1.2%	427,017	434,583	-1.7%
7 County Health / Fairview	21,810	22,138	-1.5%	203,609	174,042	17.0%
8 County Health	-	-	0.0%	-	13,743	-100.0%
9 Calle Real / Old Town Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	-	4,257	-100.0%
10 Cathedral Oaks	1,292	1,813	-28.7%	13,060	15,869	-17.7%
11 UCSB	84,702	86,608	-2.2%	719,661	705,203	2.1%
12x Goleta Express	15,150	17,429	-13.1%	144,681	164,217	-11.9%
14 Montecito	5,420	7,697	-29.6%	55,303	63,185	-12.5%
15x SBCC / UCSB Express	20,329	23,963	-15.2%	172,130	195,666	-12.0%
16 City College Shuttle	9,537	9,703	-1.7%	68,306	73,772	-7.4%
17 Lower West / SBCC	13,188	13,072	0.9%	112,678	116,158	-3.0%
20 Carpinteria	20,894	24,635	-15.2%	197,990	214,058	-7.5%
21x Carpinteria Express	5,345	7,668	-30.3%	52,805	63,348	-16.6%
23 Winchester Canyon	3,992	4,568	-12.6%	35,885	44,203	-18.8%
24x UCSB Express	41,798	50,545	-17.3%	390,258	434,833	-10.3%
25 Elwood	5,339	5,436	-1.8%	47,252	43,628	8.3%
27 Isla Vista Shuttle	30,333	29,917	1.4%	216,739	206,162	5.1%
28 UCSB Shuttle	42,319	39,191	8.0%	305,783	261,948	16.7%
36 Seaside Shuttle	4,073	5,202	-21.7%	41,125	46,709	-12.0%
37 Crosstown Shuttle	7,338	7,502	-2.2%	70,596	64,790	9.0%
Booster Services	18,732	23,954	-21.8%	157,161	179,741	-12.6%
<b>System Subtotal</b>	<b>506,303</b>	<b>544,533</b>	<b>-7.0%</b>	<b>4,399,868</b>	<b>4,504,335</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>
<b>Downtown Waterfront Shuttles</b>						
30 Downtown Shuttle	16,145	20,133	-19.8%	192,447	214,709	-10.4%
31 East Beach Waterfront Shuttle	1,765	2,836	-37.8%	27,558	30,428	-9.4%
32 West Beach Waterfront Shuttle	1,138	1,210	-6.0%	16,091	13,234	21.6%
<b>Unknown/Miscellaneous</b>			0.0%	-	-	0.0%
<b>System Total</b>	<b>525,351</b>	<b>568,712</b>	<b>-7.6%</b>	<b>4,635,964</b>	<b>4,762,706</b>	<b>-2.7%</b>
<b>Related Routes</b>						
20, 21x Carpinteria	26,239	32,303	-18.8%	250,795	277,406	-9.6%
1, 2, 37 East/West & Crosstown	75,169	80,740	-6.9%	700,105	705,398	-0.8%
4, 5, 15x, 16, 17 Mesa Lines	64,512	69,893	-7.7%	544,073	582,968	-6.7%
7, 8, 9 Calle Real	21,810	22,138	-1.5%	203,609	192,042	6.0%
6, 11 State/Hollister	133,972	136,482	-1.8%	1,146,678	1,139,786	0.6%

\*SOURCE: MTD PASSDAT PROGRAM, MTD TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING SECTION

TABLE C NOTES - PERIOD OVER PERIOD COMPARISON EXCEPTIONS: SYSTEM CHANGES AND ENHANCEMENTS OCCUR THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. THESE AFFECT THE QUALITY OF CONCLUSIONS DRAWN WHEN COMPARING RIDERSHIP PERIOD OVER PERIOD FOR THOSE LINES THAT ARE MODIFIED.



**Table D: March 2018 - Passengers per Hour**

LINE	Month			Fiscal Year to Date		
	Mar-18	Mar-17	%Change	Jul 17 - Mar 18	Jul 16 - Mar 17	%Change
1 West Santa Barbara	28.0	27.6	1.6%	29.3	29.1	0.9%
2 East Santa Barbara	27.3	27.6	-1.1%	29.3	28.0	4.8%
3 Oak Park	19.4	20.1	-3.8%	20.7	19.5	6.1%
4 Mesa/SBCC	28.1	26.8	4.8%	27.7	26.6	4.1%
5 Mesa / La Cumbre	16.7	19.8	-15.6%	18.2	19.9	-8.6%
6 Goleta	28.2	30.8	-8.4%	28.7	31.1	-7.7%
7 Calle Real / Fairview	16.5	16.4	0.7%	17.9	17.4	2.9%
8 Calle Real / Turnpike	-	-	0.0%	-	26.0	-100.0%
9 Calle Real / Old Town Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	-	11.7	-100.0%
10 Cathedral Oaks	8.5	11.5	-25.5%	10.2	13.0	-21.6%
11 UCSB	32.2	33.8	-4.9%	31.7	31.5	0.6%
12x Goleta Express	24.1	28.4	-15.3%	26.5	30.6	-13.3%
14 Montecito	12.2	17.1	-28.7%	15.1	16.7	-9.2%
15x SBCC / UCSB Express	32.1	35.2	-8.8%	32.2	36.6	-11.9%
16 City College Shuttle	35.0	33.7	4.1%	36.4	37.5	-2.8%
17 Lower West / SBCC	46.6	45.0	3.4%	46.5	47.7	-2.6%
20 Carpinteria	16.9	20.6	-17.9%	19.6	20.4	-3.6%
21x Carpinteria Express	14.7	23.1	-36.6%	18.2	22.3	-18.3%
23 Winchester Canyon	19.6	22.0	-11.0%	20.2	22.2	-9.0%
24x UCSB Express	39.7	46.3	-14.2%	42.6	46.8	-9.0%
25 Elwood	22.8	26.4	-13.9%	23.9	26.4	-9.8%
27 Isla Vista Shuttle	48.4	46.2	4.6%	44.5	42.0	5.9%
28 UCSB Shuttle	63.1	65.5	-3.7%	59.4	62.6	-5.1%
36 Seaside Shuttle	11.1	14.0	-20.8%	13.5	14.7	-8.2%
37 Crosstown Shuttle	13.6	13.3	2.3%	15.6	14.1	10.2%
Booster Services	72.1	87.0	-17.1%	79.8	87.4	-8.6%
<b>System Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>-6.7%</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>
<b>Downtown Waterfront Shuttles</b>						
30 Downtown Shuttle	20.0	24.4	-18.0%	24.3	25.6	-5.1%
31 East Beach Waterfront Shuttle	10.4	17.2	-39.1%	14.9	16.2	-8.2%
32 West Beach Waterfront Shuttle	13.7	15.1	-9.2%	18.4	15.1	21.3%
<b>System Total</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>-7.3%</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>29.3</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>

<b>Related Routes</b>						
20, 21x Carpinteria	16.4	21.2	-22.4%	19.3	20.8	-7.0%
1, 2, 37 East/West & Crosstown	25.1	25.1	-0.1%	26.9	26.0	3.6%
4, 5, 15x, 16, 17 Mesa Lines	29.3	30.6	-4.1%	29.7	31.5	-5.8%
7, 8, 9 Calle Real/Fairview	16.5	16.4	0.7%	17.9	17.6	1.5%
6, 11 State/Hollister	30.6	32.6	-6.3%	30.5	31.3	-2.7%

\*SOURCE: GFI GENFARE, MTD TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING SECTION

**Table E: March 2018 – ‘At Capacity’ Loads Indicated**

Classified as a 30-foot vehicle with 10 or more standees, or a 40-foot vehicle with 20 or more standees.

LINE	Month			Fiscal Year to Date		
	Mar-18	Mar-17	%Change	Jul 17 - Mar 18	Jul 16 - Mar 17	%Change
1 West Santa Barbara	9	5	80.0%	50	21	138.1%
2 East Santa Barbara	18	5	260.0%	97	47	106.4%
3 Oak Park	1	7	-85.7%	7	22	-68.2%
4 Mesa/SBCC	1	-	100.0%	10	7	42.9%
5 Mesa / La Cumbre	3	3	0.0%	27	29	-6.9%
6 Goleta	13	9	44.4%	167	204	-18.1%
7 Calle Real / Fairview	1	1	0.0%	14	15	-6.7%
8 Calle Real / Turnpike	-	-	0.0%	-	1	-100.0%
9 Calle Real / Old Town Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
10 Cathedral Oaks	-	-	0.0%	2	7	-71.4%
11 UCSB	28	26	7.7%	276	247	11.7%
12x Goleta Express	3	1	200.0%	75	41	82.9%
14 Montecito	1	1	0.0%	12	6	100.0%
15x SBCC / UCSB Express	11	15	-26.7%	79	141	-44.0%
16 City College Shuttle	8	1	100.0%	24	18	33.3%
17 Lower West / SBCC	1	2	-50.0%	12	23	-47.8%
20 Carpinteria	3	-	100.0%	30	22	36.4%
21x Carpinteria Express	1	-	100.0%	5	9	-44.4%
23 Winchester Canyon	-	-	0.0%	4	6	-33.3%
24x UCSB Express	21	36	-41.7%	278	339	-18.0%
25 Elwood	-	-	0.0%	6	6	0.0%
27 Isla Vista Shuttle	5	8	-37.5%	239	80	198.8%
28 UCSB Shuttle	32	32	0.0%	182	159	14.5%
36 Seaside Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	1	5	-80.0%
37 Crosstown Shuttle	-	1	-100.0%	5	8	-37.5%
Booster Services	5	18	-72.2%	104	156	-33.3%
<b>System Subtotal</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>-3.5%</b>	<b>1,706</b>	<b>1,619</b>	<b>5.4%</b>
<b>Downtown Waterfront Shuttles</b>						
30 Downtown Shuttle	-	22	-100.0%	91	113	-19.5%
31 East Beach Waterfront Shuttle	1	2	-50.0%	8	9	-11.1%
32 West Beach Waterfront Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	1	-	100.0%
<b>Unknown</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>System Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>-14.9%</b>	<b>1,806</b>	<b>1,764</b>	<b>2.4%</b>

\*SOURCE: GFI GENFARE, MTD TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING SECTION



**Table F: March 2018 – ‘Too Full to Board’ Loads Indicated**

Passengers were refused service because a vehicle was too full to safely board additional riders.

LINE	Month			Fiscal Year to Date		
	Mar-18	Mar-17	%Change	Jul 17 - Mar 18	Jul 16 - Mar 17	%Change
1 West Santa Barbara	5	1	100.0%	11	8	37.5%
2 East Santa Barbara	2	9	100.0%	24	19	26.3%
3 Oak Park	-	-	0.0%	-	7	-100.0%
4 Mesa/SBCC	-	-	0.0%	-	1	-100.0%
5 Mesa / La Cumbre	-	4	-100.0%	13	6	116.7%
6 Goleta	-	8	-100.0%	55	80	-31.3%
7 Calle Real / Fairview	-	-	0.0%	5	2	150.0%
8 Calle Real / Turnpike	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
9 Calle Real / Old Town Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
10 Cathedral Oaks	-	-	0.0%	1	2	-50.0%
11 UCSB	92	35	162.9%	569	327	74.0%
12x Goleta Express	1	1	0.0%	41	30	36.7%
14 Montecito	-	-	0.0%	2	3	-33.3%
15x SBCC / UCSB Express	4	10	-60.0%	40	101	-60.4%
16 City College Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	5	6	-16.7%
17 Lower West / SBCC	-	-	0.0%	1	6	-83.3%
20 Carpinteria	-	-	0.0%	1	5	-80.0%
21x Carpinteria Express	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%
23 Winchester Canyon	-	1	-100.0%	11	8	37.5%
24x UCSB Express	32	40	-20.0%	342	459	-25.5%
25 Elwood	-	-	100.0%	3	4	-25.0%
27 Isla Vista Shuttle	34	29	17.2%	271	297	-8.8%
28 UCSB Shuttle	81	85	-4.7%	511	524	-2.5%
36 Seaside Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	-	12	-100.0%
37 Crosstown Shuttle	-	2	-100.0%	1	10	-90.0%
Booster Services	6	13	-53.8%	88	82	7.3%
<b>System Subtotal</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>1,995</b>	<b>1,999</b>	<b>-0.2%</b>
<b>Downtown Waterfront Shuttles</b>						
30 Downtown Shuttle	2	39	-94.9%	362	516	-29.8%
31 East Beach Waterfront Shuttle	2	5	-60.0%	5	41	-87.8%
32 West Beach Waterfront Shuttle	-	-	0.0%	7	2	250.0%
<b>Unknown</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
<b>System Total</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>-7.4%</b>	<b>2,369</b>	<b>2,609</b>	<b>-9.2%</b>

\*SOURCE: GFI GENFARE, MTD TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING SECTION