



BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
--

REGULAR MEETING
of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
of the
SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
A Public Agency
Tuesday, June 21, 2022
8:30 AM
John G. Britton Auditorium
550 Olive Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.
2. **ROLL CALL OF THE BOARD MEMBERS**
Chair Davis reported that all members were present.
3. **REPORT REGARDING THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA**
Lilly Gomez, Interim Clerk of the Board and Marketing and Community Relations Coordinator reported that the agenda was posted on Friday, June 17, 2022, at MTD's Administrative office, mailed and emailed to those on the agenda list, and posted on MTD's website.
4. **STATUS REPORT ON THE COVID-19 STATE OF EMERGENCY (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN - ATTACHMENTS)**
The Board reconsidered the circumstances of the COVID-19 State of Emergency.

Secretary Lemberger moved to approve staff's recommendation to continue to allow noticing and holding remote hearings, consistent with Government Code § 54953(e)(3). Director Perotte seconded the motion. Chair Davis held a roll call vote and the motion was approved unanimously.

CONSENT CALENDAR

5. **APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES - (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)**
The Board of Directors was asked to approve the draft minutes for the meeting of June 7, 2022.
6. **CASH REPORTS - (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)**
The Board of Directors was asked to review and approve the Cash Reports from May 28, 2022 through June 10, 2022.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
--

Vice Chair Tabor moved to approve the consent calendar. Director Sarkar seconded the motion. Chair Davis held a roll call vote and the consent calendar was approved unanimously.

THIS CONCLUDES THE CONSENT CALENDAR

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Dayton Kieswetter confirmed the Board of Directors received his follow up letter and Line 7 re-routing recommendations. Mr. Kieswetter also requested feedback from the Board on his proposal.

Chair Davis advised Mr. Kieswetter, public comment allows members of the public to share information to the Board of Directors but feedback is not provided and action is not taken.

Furthermore, Chair Davis recommended Mr. Kieswetter and General Manager Jerry Estrada schedule a meeting to further discuss. General Manager Estrada agreed.

8. RENEWAL OF FLOOD INSURANCE – (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)

Interim Human Resources Manager Rafael Cortez requested approval to renew Flood Insurance coverage with Wright National Flood Insurance Company through the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) effective July 10, 2022.

Director McQuary moved to approve renewal of Flood Insurance coverage with Wright National Flood Insurance Company through the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Director Sarkar seconded the motion. Chair Davis held a roll call vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

9. RENEWAL OF EXCESS WORKERS COMPENSATION INSURANCE – (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)

Interim Human Resources Manager Rafael Cortez requested approval to renew Excess Workers' Compensation insurance (EWC) with current coverage through Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management (PRISM) effective July 1, 2022 - July 1, 2023.

Vice Chair Tabor moved to approve renewal of Excess Workers' Compensation insurance (EWC) with Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management (PRISM). Director Perotte seconded the motion. Chair Davis held a roll call vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

10. ADVANCE AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE RENEWABLE DIESEL FUEL CONTRACTS – (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)

Purchasing Agent Valerie White requested the Board provide advance authority to the General Manager to enter into a renewable diesel fuel contract via the most advantageous priced option.

Director Sarkar moved to provide advance authority up to six months to the General Manager to enter into a renewable diesel fuel contract via the most advantageous priced option. Vice Chair Tabor seconded the motion. Chair Davis held a roll call vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the MTD Administrative Office at 805.963.3364 at least **48 hours in advance** of the meeting to allow time for MTD to attempt a reasonable accommodation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
--

11. CAPITAL PROJECTS UPDATE - (INFORMATIONAL)

Capital Projects Manager Ryan Gripp and Temporary Project Development Specialist Dave Rzepinski provided an update on MTD capital projects.

12. CAPITAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES - (INFORMATIONAL)

Grants & Compliance Manager Steve Maas, provided an update on upcoming formula and competitive capital funding opportunities.

13. GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT - (INFORMATIONAL)

General Manager Estrada provided an update on district activities.

14. OTHER BUSINESS AND REPORTS - (INFORMATIONAL)

Chair Davis requested two members of the Board volunteer to participate in an ad-hoc to replace the public member position in the Board of Directors. Director Perotte and Secretary Lemberger volunteered and will meet with General Manager Estrada to start process of assigning a new Board of Director member.

15. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION: REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS (GOVERNMENT CODE §54956.8) (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)

Property: 4678 Calle Real / 149 North San Antonio Road.

Agency Negotiators: General Manager Jerry Estrada; District Outside Counsel, Graham Lyons.

Negotiating Parties: Con/Am Group.

Under Negotiation: Price and terms of payment.

No public comments were made prior to recess. Chair Davis recessed to Closed Session at 10:25 AM.

The Board reconvened at 10:50 AM. Chair Davis reported that no action had been taken.

16. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR(S) (GOVERNMENT CODE § 54957.6) (ACTION MAY BE TAKEN)

Agency-designated representatives: MTD General Manager Estrada and Chief Operating Officer Mary Gregg.

Employee organization: International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union, Local 186.

Chair Davis reported that no action had been taken.

17. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Davis confirmed the tentative scheduled meeting to be held on July 5, 2022 is cancelled. Chair Davis adjourned the meeting at 10:52 AM.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the MTD Administrative Office at 805.963.3364 at least **48 hours in advance** of the meeting to allow time for MTD to attempt a reasonable accommodation.



Public Comment

Item #5 Attachments

06/21/2022 Board of Directors Meeting

June 3, 2022

To: The Members Of The Santa Barbra MTD Board Of Directors

Re: SBMTD route 7 buses traversing between Turnpike Rd and Patterson Ave

This is a follow up to my emailed letter addressed to the MTD Board of Directors dated November 18, 2021. If you did not receive this letter, or have not had an opportunity to read it, I have attached a copy. A copy of the follow up email correspondence with Mr. Estrada is also attached.

I'm contacting the Board as I believe the response I have received from Mr. Estrada, and Ms. Blackerby, pertaining to the Issues in my letter, has been superficial, inaccurate, self-serving, and completely void of any supporting statistics, documented research, analysis or written reports to support their claims that the current Turnpike to Patterson portion of route 7 is "essential and productive".

I'm trying to establish that running nearly empty 40', 10-ton, loud, dirty, aging diesel buses, 62 times a day, from 6 AM to 10 PM, up and down the residential neighborhood streets between Turnpike and Patterson as neither **essential, necessary, reasonable, or productive, - particularly when there is an alternate route that is far more suitable, and significantly more appropriate for buses of this size.**

These non-essential, nearly empty, behemoths (the largest and oldest in the fleet) are completely incongruous to these neighborhood streets.

See alternate route maps attached.

Mr. Estrada stated in his email of March 24th that "an analysis was conducted of boardings and alightings, ridership and average ridership along University Dr. and concluded that the routing was productive and essential". The actual analysis was not supplied, nor was it presented or referenced in Ms. Blackerby's route 7 report to the Board on March 15. I have asked 3 times for the actual supporting ridership/on-off statistics for this section of route 7. After much prodding by me, Mr. Estrada's responded on May 2 advising that he had requested staff to forward this information to me, but that it might take a "few weeks" to gather. That was over a month ago, and I have received or heard nothing. Why would it take a few weeks to gather ridership statistics that already exists in the "analysis" referenced by Mr. Estrada in his March 14 email to support the claim of "essential and productive"?

In that same email Mr. Estrada summarily dismissed the proposed alternate route based on warped logic, inaccurate unsupportable claims, half-truths, fact distortion, personal opinion, and a complete lack of knowledge of the area. The same type of unsupportable warped logic has been applied to **justify** the existing route. What is going on here? 'Sweep in under the carpet' and 'make it go away' seems to be the mantra.

I'm getting a palatable sense of dismissiveness, indifference, and condescension.

See emails attached.

My November 18, 2021 letter to the board was intercepted by Mr. Estrada, who phoned me several days later. After some discussion he advised that the matter would be properly researched during the upcoming route review process, starting in January 2022, and that staff would reach out to me at that time.

No one from MTD has ever "reached out to me"

He also advised that my letter would be forwarded to the Board, however, no reference to it has ever publicly been made by any board member, no public record seems to exist, no mention of it in any minutes or staff reports, up to and including Ms. Blackerby's Route 7 report to the Board on March 15, 2022.

Ms. Blackerby's route 7 verbal report to the board on March 15th was a vague, inaccurate 'white wash', completely lacking in substance. **Why wasn't my letter, and the "analysis" made part of that report?**

It appears to me that there is **no justifiable, essential or productive** reason why MTD is running, virtually empty, buses between Turnpike and Patterson, **particularly when a superior alternate route, that parallels the existing route, ½ mile to the north, is an obvious option.**

If the recent email survey disseminated to the public in late May is the "significant community outreach" Mr. Estrada referred to in his March 24 email, then why was there not single question pertaining to the issues at hand? The questionnaire made no mention of any of the points outline in my letter – WHY? How can the public respond to an issue if the issue isn't presented? It was relegated to an 'additional comments' section at the end of the questionnaire.

This would have been an excellent opportunity to get public feedback.

The local residents have never been surveyed, polled, or voted on their need or desire for bus service on our neighborhood streets. MTD has unilaterally made that decision, and justifies it by claiming that the bus service is "essential" – **essential to who?** This decision was probably made years ago, and based on demographics and residential geography that is no longer relevant. The roads in this single-family residential neighborhood subdivision were never intended or designed for full size city buses.

University Dr. has a posted weight limit of 7 tons yet MTD runs 40', 10-ton nearly empty buses up and down the street 63 times a day under the pretext that busses are "essential", and therefore MTD does not have to abide by this regulation. The **insignificant** number of 'boards & alights' achieved by 63 daily buses should be proof enough that busses are not essential or productive through this residential neighborhood.

The appraiser, on a recent refinance appraisal of my home, advised that appraisals on University Dr. tend to be lowered by the presence of 10-ton buses, every 15 minutes, 16 hours a day as they are regarded as a significant nascence, and a viewed as a negative by most potential buyers, particularly families with younger children. The entire University Dr vicinity is desirable to younger families due to its ½ mile proximity to Foothill Elementary School.

My original letter of November 18, 2021 contained many suggestions and requests, in addition to the suggested alternate route, of which all but a few have been completely ignored.

In conclusion I would ask four things of the board:

- 1) Arrange an on-location meeting consisting of myself, a Board member(s) best suited to assess this situation, Mr. Estrada, and Ms. Blackerby to traverse both the current and suggested alternate route. I believe this is necessary, and should have been done during the route review, in order to fully understand the geography, neighborhood demographics, and the specific MTD bus issues as they relate to this neighborhood. A written & verbal report to the board as to the observations.
- 2) Approve and conduct a **timely**, un-biased survey of the local residents to obtain their input on the need or desire for MTD buses on their local neighborhood roads. Obtain local input as to bus size, noise, frequency, hours of operation etc., as well as the proposed alternate route.
- 3) Demonstrate, through documentable research and analysis, that MTD's buses are "essential", "necessary" and "productive" to the riding public on this section of route 7. Also demonstrate why the suggested alternate route should not be implemented.
- 4) Review and advise on the other suggestions and/or requests, outlined in my original letter, that have never been responded to.

Please advise.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Respectfully,



Dayton T. Kieswetter

On Mar 18, 2022, at 12:30 PM, dtkjr@aol.com wrote:

Dear Mr. Estrada:

On December 3, 2021 we spoke by phone, in response to my Nov 18, 2021 letter to the Board regarding my concerns and issues with bus traffic between Turnpike and Patterson. It was my understanding that a detailed review/analysis would be conducted during the upcoming route review process.

Ms. Blackerby's verbal report to the board on March 15, 2022 regarding Rt. 7, and in particular the section between Turnpike and Patterson, was striking in its complete absence of any detail, supporting statistics, accuracy and scope. Not a single specific issue in my letter was discussed. She did not address the very low ridership, very low on/off usage, Bus frequency & hours, noise, unjustified bus size, proximity to single family homes, and danger to bike riders and pedestrian. She did not discuss any of the various basic suggestions I made, up to and including re-routing the buses along Cathedral oaks – not the freeway as she stated. She suggested my concerns were based solely on my not wanting buses on University Dr. Wrong, I fully support public busses. I don't support the misuse of public assets by operating busses where they're not justified, needed, wanted, or dangerous. I would have expected an analysis similar to the one presented regarding the minor change to Rt. 17.

Ms. Blackerby stated that the on/off statistics and overall ridership of this section were "higher than expected" – what does this mean? She claimed to have "reached out to the neighborhood" – beyond the contact I initiated in July 2021 I'm unaware of anyone else being consulted on this issue. She also claimed I suggested routing the buses onto the freeway between Turnpike a Patterson thus bypassing a large residential area – this is false – I made no such suggestion. My suggestions would not bypass anything of significance but actually offers a superior route. She also made the assumption that because this section of Rt. 7 consists of an "aging population" this somehow justifies bus service. Look at the ridership statistic they do not support this claim. The ridership statistics speak for themselves. Her report seemed to be nothing more than lip service - an embarrassing disservice to me, the Board, and the public. I would have expected better from SBMTD.

I also found it curious that I was not supplied the Zoom login protocols, as part of the Board packet, thus preventing me from addressing the board directly regarding Ms. Blackerby's report. All previous Board packets included this login info. I could only watch on YouTube.

I would like to ask that an in-depth analysis be performed. The issues and concerns I have presented are real and needs SBMTD's full attention.

I have attached my original letter to the Board from Nov 18, 2021. Please re-read and note my suggestions.

Please advise.

Thank you

Dayton T. Kieswetter
805 708 4059

Alert: This mail originated outside MTD. Use caution when clicking on links or opening attachments. Be aware that hackers and password thieves can easily mimic trusted sources.

Alert: This mail originated outside MTD. Use caution when clicking on links or opening attachments. Be aware that hackers and password thieves can easily mimic trusted sources.

From: JESTRADA@sbmtd.gov,

To: dtkjr@aol.com,

Subject: RE: MTD Bus Issues between Turnpike Rd. and Patterson Ave.

Date: Thu, Mar 24, 2022 3:19 pm

Attachments:

Mr. Kieswetter,

Concerning your experience attempting to participate in the last board meeting via Zoom. Our Clerk of the Board has assured me that an email containing a link to MTD's Board Packet including Zoom login protocols was sent to you Friday, March 11. She has informed me that she tested the login information prior to the meeting and that everything appeared to be working as expected.

As for your request that MTD conduct a more extensive assessment of your recommendation that the Line 7 be rerouted off University Drive to Cathedral Oaks, I respectfully disagree with that course of action. I am satisfied that the current routing is safe, efficient and productive.

MTD staff has taken the following steps to consider your point of view on this matter:

- Planning and Operations management have traversed the route and observed buses operating through the neighborhood and did not note any irregularities or areas of concern
- An analysis was conducted of boarding's and alighting's, ridership and average ridership along University Drive and concluded that the routing was productive and essential.
- Staff has verified that numerous transit routes within the South Coast traverse single-family neighborhoods safely and have done so for many years.
- As for safety or speeds, staff analyzed travel speeds along this portion of Line 7 and is satisfied that MTD's buses are being operated safely. MTD's bus operators are held to a very high standard and are trained and monitored on how to interact with cyclists and pedestrians.
- As for your proposed alternative routing of Cathedral Oaks, our concern is that it is not easily reached by the people who live in the University Drive neighborhood. Population density is much lower in the Cathedral Oaks section between Patterson and Turnpike. Additionally, MTD's experience with Line 10, which traveled along this stretch of Cathedral Oaks, supports the position that there is greater demand for bus service along University Drive.
- As for the bus size, MTD feels it is justified based on the route ridership. The noise will be reduced considerably as our fleet becomes newer, cleaner, and eventually, electric.

I realize that this decision is not the outcome you sought, as a courtesy to you, I asked Ms. Blackerby to include your recommendation within our staff report to draw attention to the request. To date, I am not aware of any other individuals recommending the rerouting of the Line 7 as you suggest. At the board meeting of March 15, staff officially presented annual service levels that are typically implemented in August. MTD is planning significant outreach efforts to the community regarding its proposals for the aforementioned August changes and long-term recommendations related to our Short Range Transit Plan. I recommend you participate in the community input process as I feel it would be beneficial to everyone within the bus riding community to be aware of your suggestion so that their feedback could be considered as well.

It is certainly your right to express your disagreement with this decision directly to the MTD Board of Directors at any of our board meetings under public comment. If you prefer to do so in writing as well, please submit your letter to the Clerk of the Board and will be shared with the board members.

April 1, 2022

Dear Mr. Estrada:

Thank you for your March 24th email reply.

I'm sure you have a lot on your plate right now, but please hear me out.

Let me respond to your staff's assessment, as you reported in the above noted email.

1) Ridership, boarding's, and alighting's on University Dr, as well as the entire route between Turnpike & Patterson:

Based on the MTD's own ridership/on-off statistics, supplied to me for 2019, (which have been noticeably missing from any of your staff's current assessments), on-offs and ridership on University Dr. was negligible at best, and would hardly qualify as "productive and essential". I suspect the current actual statistics are even lower.

In addition, based on my own observations over past 6 months (post pandemic), watching literally hundreds of buses go by, at all hours, the ridership/on-off numbers are anemic. It's rare that I see more than 4 people on any bus, and a large percentage of buses go by virtually empty.

Observing the two stops viable from my home (Ribera & University and Patterson & University) the average number of people getting on and off, on any given day, can be counted on one hand, and appear to be mostly one-time, non-repeat, non-resident riders.

The buses are neither productive, and certainly not essential on University Dr.

Please supply current SBMTD ridership statistics between Turnpike and Patterson, and specifically University Dr.

2) University Dr. profile as compared to route 7 as a whole.

Please see Rt. 7 Map Attached – route marked in red is recommended re-route

The **only** truly residential streets on route 7 are University Dr. and N. San Marcos. La Colina Rd., which might be considered quasi residential, has Bishop High School, Hope elementary, a church, and the County Education Dept offices. University Dr., on the other hand, is the only street that is made up of 100% 3–4-bedroom single-family stand-alone homes. All other streets on Rt. 7 are heavily traveled commercial streets, with more commercial properties than residential.

To suggest that the "population density is much lower in the Cathedral Oaks section between Patterson & Turnpike" as a reason not to consider re-routing the buses is ludicrous. This re-route mirrors **exactly** the profile of the rest the route 7 - it has SBCC Wake Center, 4 churches, 2 community centers, Tuckers Grove Park, Foothill Elementary, and several large condo and housing tracks, all currently unserved by MTD. University Dr is the complete exception.

The suggestion that by re-routing the buses onto Cathedral Oaks would somehow limit the residents of University Dr access to bus service is also ludicrous. University Dr residents essentially don't use the bus. All the homes on University Dr. have 2 and 3 car garages so I think it's safe to assume they are not using, or have a need for public transportation.

Cathedral oaks runs parallel to University and is only 4/10th of a mile north of University. It easily services the same University Dr vicinity, and is actually closer to the more populated area between Cathedral Oaks and University.

To compare the section of route 10, between Turnpike and Patterson, to the entire Rt. 10, and claim this "supports the position that there is greater demand for bus service along University Dr is a self-serving distorted conclusion.

3) Posted Road Weight Limit and Bus Size

University Dr. is posted at each end as having a 7 ton road weight limit, which the current buses significantly exceed. It's my understanding that MTD is entailed to disregard this weight limit if there is overwhelming and justifiable need for bus service. This need clearly does not exist University Dr.

You stated that regarding bus size "MTD feels it is justified based on the route ridership". Without trying to be a 'smart alec', a 16-passenger van could handle route 7 ridership.

In closing I have a few questions:

- 1) Inasmuch as I never received any acknowledgement from the board, as to the receipt of my Nov 18, 2021 letter, address to the board, please confirm that they received it, and it was entered into the record?
- 2) Was any type written report created by Planning and Operations supporting their claims as to not observeing "any irregularities or areas of concern"?
What was the date and time of day they "traversed" this neighborhood.?
- 3) What are the "numerous transit routes (streets) that traverse single family neighborhoods" within the SBMTD system, **that have the same residential profile as University Dr.- 100% single family 3 and 4 bedroom stand-alone homes?.** Do any of them have a weight limit?
- 4) Please supply current ridership statistics for route 7, and specifically University Dr.

Please advise

Thank You
Respectfully,
Dayton T Kieswetter

DAYTON T. KIESWETTER
5192 UNIVERSITY DR.
SANTA BARBARA CA. 93111
805 708 4059 Phone or Txt
dtkjr@aol.com

November 18, 2021

To: Members Of The Santa Barbara MTD Board Of Directors,

My name is Dayton Kieswetter. I am a home owner at 5192 University Dr., Santa Barbara.

Bus issues I am addressing:

The low passenger usage, and negative impact MTD buses are having on the single family residential neighborhoods of University Dr. and North San Marcos Rd.

University Dr. & N. San Marcos Rd. are located between Patterson Ave. & Turnpike Rd. - a very small part of MTD Rt. 7 & booster Rt. 2420/2464

MTD bus traffic on University Dr & N. San Marcos Rd..

There are currently **52 (26 inbound, 26 outbound) full size, aging diesel buses daily** that traverse this 100% residential neighborhood M-F. These buses are 40 Feet long, weight over 10 tons, and seat approximately 40 passengers. The weekend schedule is reduced to about ½ this.

They **start at 6:30 AM and end at 10:30 PM M-F – 16 hours.** About 1 every 15 minutes

They are sparsely used and virtually empty most of the time as they traverse University Dr. & N. San Marcos.

University Dr Profile:

The sections of University Dr. & N. San Marcos Rd. in question lie **between Turnpike Rd. and Patterson Ave.** They are typical quiet 2 lane residential Rds. totaling about 1 ½ miles in length.

University Dr. specifically, is a 100% single family residential neighborhood made up **entirely** of 70, 3 & 4 bedroom, well cared for, predominantly owner occupied, single family homes. There are no commercial properties, office building, businesses, churches, apartment buildings, condominiums, PUD's, multiple dwelling units etc., anywhere in the vicinity. Foothill elementary school is located 1/2 mile north at the corner of Cathedral Oaks Rd & Ribera Rd.

All the homes front on University Dr. with their respective living & sleeping quarters only 35 to 40 Ft. from the road.

The posted speed limit is 25 MPH. There are 4 stop signs and 3 bus stops - each direction.

There are no designated bike lanes as the road is too narrow.

The street is posted, at both ends, as having a 7 ton (14,000 Lbs.) maximum weight limit.

There is, effectively, only 1 MTD bus stop that is unique to University Dr.- University & Ribera.

University Dr. is heavily used by bicyclists, (it has access to the Bike Path), dog walkers, recreational walkers, homeowners, and young children going to and from Foothill Elementary School.

This is not the kind of neighborhood you would expect to see full size, 10 ton, commercial diesel buses, 52 times a day from 6:30 AM to 10:30 PM - 16 hours.

Specific Issues:

1) The sparsely used buses are intimidating, threatening, and overpower this 2 lane residential neighborhood by their sheer size, frequency, momentum, and weight.

2) **The buses exceed the 7 ton road weight limit by at least 3 tons.** Not sure why MTD gets a free pass on this as the need for buses on this section of route 7 is virtually nil.

- 3) The buses create a dangerous environment for bicyclists, school children, and pedestrians.
- 4) **There are no designated bike lanes** exacerbating the danger to bicyclists.
- 5) The buses create an excessive amount of noise when accelerating, decelerating, downshifting, and air braking. **There are 4 stop signs, and 3 bus stops (each direction) on this 2/3 mile stretch of road, each triggering this crescendo of noise right at our doorsteps and into our living rooms – 52 times a day from 6:30 AM to 10:30 PM.. Keep in mind that the fronts of our homes are only 30-40 feet from the road.**
- 6) Any conversation happening on the sidewalk has to stop when a bus goes by, and plug your ears if air brake blast happens.
- 7) Many of the buses depart and approach stop signs and **bus stops** by rapid acceleration, only to downshift/decelerate, and hit the air brakes as they approach the next stop sign or bus stop.
- 8) Having my own radar gun, many of the buses manage to quickly accelerate and reach, and in some cases surpass, the 25 MPH speed limit in a matter of yards.
- 9) Black exhaust soot needs to be washed off the front exterior windows, door sills, and plants every 2 to 3 months.
- 10) **The buses are negatively affecting property values.** The appraiser, on my recent refinance, advised that the buses are a deterrent to prospective buyers, and is reflected in the appraised value.
- 11) Considering the extremely low ridership on this section of route 7, the bus frequency, weight, size and noise suggests an excessive overreach on the part MTD, **at the expense of the residents of University Dr & N. San Marcos Rd.**

Are buses warranted on University Dr and San Marcos Rd. at all?:

In mid-July of this year, I invited to my home, and met with, two MTD management members, Hilary Blackerby & Bill Morris to observe and discuss the above issues. Although the meeting was professional, right from the 'get go' my concerns seemed to fall on 'deaf ears'. The discussion was more about defending and justifying the route, bus size/weight, lack of passengers, bus frequency, and noise than acknowledging that any problem may exist. Ignore the facts and maintain the status quo seemed to be the end game.

In subsequent emails, Hilary was able to supply me with 2019 (per-pandemic) ridership statistics for University Dr. and N. San Marcos Rd. for the purpose of determining the justification for the size and frequency of the buses.

As is supported by **my own observations** (both per-pandemic and over the past few months), bus usage on University Dr. is minimal.

The buses that I observe, passing my home, rarely have more than 4 observable passengers, with the majority of buses having only 1 or 2. A surprising number appear to be completely empty. These are full size 40 passenger 10 ton buses.

Based on the MTD statistics supplied, and **my own observations**, very few of the passengers have actually boarded or alighted on University Dr. - they are merely thru passengers.

As an avid road cyclist I traverse University Dr and N. San Marcos Rd.. 4 or 5 times a week - it's rare that I see anyone waiting at any of the bus stops.

Based on the University Dr. ridership statistics, and again my own observations, there is little to justify large 40', 10 ton diesel buses servicing University Dr. 52 times a day. There is little to justify buses at all.

It would seem that the entire 1 ½ mile section of route 7, between Turnpike Rd. and Patterson Ave (which includes University Dr. and N. San Marcos Rd.), is being used more to facilitate the moving of buses between Santa Barbara and Goleta than actually meeting customer demand. Bus productivity, efficiency, and utilization are not being used effectively, or in the best interest of tax payers, the riding public, or University Dr. residents.

Recommendations to be considered:

1) Actions that could be implemented immediately:

- 1) Instruct the drivers to respect our neighborhood, slow down, avoid activating the air brake pressure

release, accelerate/decelerate slowly, and don't engine blast, or release the air brake when passing or adjacent to bicyclists and/or pedestrians.

- 2) Use cleaner, quieter, smaller busses that are more appropriate for this neighborhood, passenger usage, and road weight limits.
- 3) Reduce the hours and frequency to be in line with actual usage

2) Initiate an Alternate Rt.:

This proposed alternate route offers a better choice to riders, and is a more efficient use of buses. It's a natural and superior alternative to the existing route – a win, win

Buses headed west (outbound) would turn right onto Turnpike Rd at Calle Real and Turnpike, instead of continuing straight on Calle Real toward University Dr. They would then head north to Cathedral Oaks Rd. (about 1 mile), turn left and head west on Cathedral Oaks, (about 1 mile) to Patterson Ave., turn left onto Patterson Ave. and head south and reconnect with route 7 as it currently exists. Reverse this headed East/Inbound.

Turnpike Rd., Cathedral Oaks Rd., and Patterson Ave are all wide roads suited for large commercial buses, **(there is no weight limit)** with very few residential properties adjacent to, or fronting the road. The speed limit is 35 to 40 MPH. There are 3 stop lights and no stop signs.

Turnpike Rd., Cathedral Oak Rd, and Patterson Ave. are currently not significantly serviced by MTD.. This would add about 2 miles to the route. All but 2 of the existing bus stops could be serviced by this route. Keep booster route 2420 as is - it serves a different purpose and is only 2 trips per day.

Turnpike Rd., between Calle Real and Cathedral Oaks Rd., has a number of public entities currently not serviced by MTD - SBCC Wake Campus, 4 Churches, a community center, and homes that do not front on Turnpike Rd..

Cathedral oaks, between Turnpike Rd. and Patterson Ave, has Tuckers Grove Park, 2 churches, a community center, Foothill Elementary School, and 2 PUD/Condo complexes set well back off the road.

Patterson Ave. has 'The Tree Farm' - very large PUD, set back off the road - no road noise.

These roads are already traveled by trucks and other commercial vehicles but are not serviced by MTD. This seems like a natural fit for bus service.

3) Reduce the frequency and bus size as noted above:

Revert to the Saturday schedule all week, and use smaller and quieter buses

4) Split the route:

Run 2/3 of the buses along the alternate route proposed above, and the remaining 1/3 along the existing route, but again with smaller more appropriate buses.

I invite any member of the Board and/or Management to my home to observe and discuss the situation. I would also suggest driving the **entire** route between Turnpike Rd. and Patterson Ave., as well as the recommend alternate route to get a better understanding of the situation.

Thank you for your attention and consideration into this matter.
I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,



Dayton T. Kieswetter