



## General Public Comment Received

| Name of Sender  | Distributed prior to hearing | Distributed after the hearing |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Frank Peters    | X                            |                               |
| Sunita Beall    | X                            |                               |
| Sunita Beall    | X                            |                               |
| Molly Pearson   | X                            |                               |
| Steve Fort      | X                            |                               |
| Melville Sahyun | X                            |                               |
| Frank Ortiz     | X                            |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |
|                 |                              |                               |

**From:** [Frank Peters](#)  
**To:** [SSAC Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on State Street promenade: Bikes on State  
**Date:** Thursday, March 9, 2023 2:16:32 PM

---

You don't often get email from fxpeters@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL**

Dear SSAC:

Throughout the pandemic I have made a hobby of photographing bicyclists on the State Street promenade. The linked YouTube video provides a collection of the photography and I would like to provide it as public comment.

In the video you will note those associated with undesirable bicycling behavior, but you will also see a cross-section of the community bicycling on the promenade for a variety of reasons. While there are a few bad apples out there, they represent a minority of the promenade's bicyclists.

Please share this link.

Bikes on State: <https://youtu.be/8IXMoUav4bI>

Frank Peters  
[@bikingbreathing](#)  
(805) 318-0808

**From:** [Sunita Beall](#)  
**To:** [Randy Rowse](#); [Alejandra Gutierrez](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [Jason Harris](#); [Lindsey Drewes](#); [Community Development PC Secretary](#); [SSAC Secretary](#); [Hilda Maldonado](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Paseo Nuevo Mall / city workforce housing  
**Date:** Sunday, April 16, 2023 7:51:32 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [sunita.beall@gmail.com](mailto:sunita.beall@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL**

On Jan 16, 2023, at 12:15 PM, Sunita Beall <[sunita.beall@gmail.com](mailto:sunita.beall@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Mayor Rowse, Superintendent Maldonado, city council members, and city planners,

As a member of the community, I have been following the discussion in regard to the sale of Paseo Nuevo Mall closely. I have visited this community since 1991, when my husband began his graduate studies at UCSB, and we moved here in 1999. Having grown up in the Bay Area with some very pedestrian friendly, outdoor malls I found that Paseo Nuevo never seemed to become the vibrant center of downtown that it should have been even when retail shopping was at its peak.

As always, I have felt that downtown has often been out of alignment with the greater Santa Barbara community around it. Many of the landlords are at fault for this but until the pandemic there seems to have been a great deal of passivity on the city planning and leadership side.

During the pandemic I became very involved in speaking to the SB Unified School Board. While I initially was promoting the return to school, from a medical standpoint, I soon began to become involved in issues such as literacy and funding for vulnerable students. My children have grown up and are mostly independent, and now I have more time for becoming involved in the community. I have begun to speak out on issues that are vital to our community. As a resident of 22+ years who has worked and raised children here, I also feel that I am representative of a significant sector of the community- adults who use community services and amenities and also intend to stay in the community for the long term. I hope that my children not only can return but want to return. My husband and I are homeowners with a significant but not overwhelming mortgage. I

am a physician who was in private practice but I am now employed by UCSB and my husband has owned a privately held software company in town for 19 years with 15-20 employees.

One of the issues that I am promoting with the school board is the idea of workforce housing for teachers. This may not be part of the usual governance on the SB USD but this has to be on their radar, in order to retain quality teaching and administrative staff. But workforce housing is no doubt an issue for every city agency.

In listening to this discussion in regard to Paseo Nuevo, as well as many others, the common thread is that the SB community needs to revitalize downtown for its residents, not just tourists, retain young people who grew up here and are part of the essential infrastructure but cannot afford their first home or rentals, and create a vibrant community hub.

If Paseo Nuevo has a lease issue and is going to be sold in what appears to be a fire sale, consider this:

1. Purchasing the property, and turning the site into a combination of essential city workforce housing (teachers/ police, firefighters and other emergency staff, city staff) and also set up this site to be dynamic and interactive with State Street.
2. A good workforce housing program would not be intended for permanent housing, but to give owners an opportunity to save and build equity for their next house or retirement, wherever they choose to live.
3. The city has been struggling with the site of the Farmers' Market. Have the Farmers' Market held there, and any other family friendly events. The first floor could be city friendly retail, such as exercise, food shops, maybe even some city businesses.
4. Have not just the city and state fund this endeavor, but the community. I would give money to this project. And let's talk about the elephant in the room, the unincorporated areas of Montecito, Hope Ranch, etc. They benefit greatly from city services, especially the schools, are not required to provide workforce housing in their

areas, and they should be on the hook for all this, in some way.

5.

Who better to have in the center of our city than our central workforce?

I look forward to hearing your thoughts in this matter.

Sincerely,

Sunita Beall

**From:** [Sunita Beall](#)  
**To:** [SupervisorWilliams@countyofsb.org](mailto:SupervisorWilliams@countyofsb.org); [lcapps@countyofsb.org](mailto:lcapps@countyofsb.org); [jhartmann@countyofsb.org](mailto:jhartmann@countyofsb.org); [Nelson@bos.countyofsb.org](mailto:Nelson@bos.countyofsb.org); [steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org](mailto:steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org); [Randy Rowse](#); [Alejandra Gutierrez](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [Jason Harris](#); [Lindsey Drewes](#); [Community Development PC Secretary](#); [SSAC Secretary](#); [Hilda Maldonado](#); [wsims-moten@sbunified.org](mailto:wsims-moten@sbunified.org); [droybal@goleta.k12.ca.us](mailto:droybal@goleta.k12.ca.us); [mayer@psych.ucsb.edu](mailto:mayer@psych.ucsb.edu); [pperotte@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:pperotte@cityofgoleta.org); [HousingElement@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:HousingElement@cityofgoleta.org)  
**Subject:** Housing element / workforce housing  
**Date:** Sunday, April 16, 2023 8:18:00 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [sunita.beall@gmail.com](mailto:sunita.beall@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL**

Dear SB county, SB city and Goleta city officials,

My name is Sunita Beall and I am a community member.

We need more workforce housing. This housing would be for people and families who already commute to Santa Barbara because they cannot afford to live here. Supporting workforce housing has so many dividends as it improves quality of life for workers and their families, retains employees for the long term due to the benefits of living in this beautiful county, improves everyone's quality of life by taking cars off the roads, and most importantly confers value to workers who are often undervalued in our community.

I do not know the actual number of people who are commuting or are struggling to save their bills or pay for their future needs. I know that when the pandemic ended the apartment eviction protection ended 20% of the help requests were from city employees. So I suspect that the number is closer to 30% or above. Do you have that data?

Many recently **approved** projects with higher density have some percentage of affordable units, anywhere from 17% to 20% of the total units. Heritage Ridge, which the SB Housing Authority developed with the Towbes Group, is 31% affordable. 400 W Carrillo St and 116 E Cota St, developed by the SB Housing Authority, is 100% affordable. Some of the newer housing **proposals** with higher density have 11-19% affordable units, probably close to the minimum, but is less than what our workforce needs. There are also approved and planned projects that have 0% affordable units, because they are not asking for increased density.

In the Santa Clara unified school district teacher workforce housing has been built that allows newly hired teachers to live in subsidized housing for ten years or less, allowing them to save. My understanding is that the Goleta Valley Unified does own a parcel, but does not know how to develop that parcel, and they are thinking of selling the land. We will always need teachers, why not help develop this parcel? In building **teacher specific housing**, there is an opportunity to partner with philanthropic organizations as well as the Housing Trust to create some very unique workforce housing.

When the city and county become involved in housing projects, the number of affordable units increases. Not only do we have the Santa Barbara Housing Authority, but we also have the Housing Trust Fund of Santa Barbara County. Between these two agencies the city and county can negotiate financing with developers to increase the percentage of affordable units in any project, as well as partner in some more innovative,

My other points are in regard to specific locations mentioned in the housing element and the number of units being constructed.

The Miramar is proposing to build 20 units on 1 acre. 14 of those are affordable or moderate. 6 are market rate. The Miramar has 147 employees. 14 employee units, 9%.

The Biltmore is proposing 40 units on 2 acres, 27 of which will be affordable. The Biltmore, when it was open, had 425 employees and the San Ysidro Ranch has 62 employees. 487 employees, 27 employee units, 5%

The Bacara is also proposing employee housing. They employ 110 employees. They are also proposing to build employee housing.

What is wrong with this picture? They are adding the bare minimum of employee housing. They remainder will be market rate apartments, which in those locations will no doubt be **well above** market rate. These will be either short term or long term rentals, and will add handsomely to their profits. Why are these units not **100% affordable**? Whom are they trying to help? Themselves? This allows them to build additional revenue-producing hotels rooms under the guise of altruism. I am sure they will be able to deduct these “costs” from their revenues for tax purposes.

The second issue is that there are so many more middle and low income employees that serve the Montecito area. Just at the two school districts alone there are roughly 80 employees in the low to median income range, but if we are going to add fire district, hospitality, retail, leisure club, maintenance and personal employees, the number is much higher. Again, 41 affordable units is not even close to what is needed in that area. Additional parcels need to be offered and considered.

I feel the same about UCSB and Cottage Health, the largest employers in Santa Barbara county. UCSB has 735 units proposed, 435 or 62% of which are median income units, and this sounds respectable. The median compensation there is \$80,000 thousand which is comparable to the Santa Barbara median income. UCSB employs roughly **6,600** people. How many of the **3,300** employees at the median or below need workforce housing? Adding 435 median income units begins to sound like a very small number, when you look at the larger picture. I have no idea what those numbers are at Cottage Health, do you?

So supervisors and city council members, I task you to find out, for each of your areas, by the

numbers, where median to low income people are being employed, who is employing them, and how much housing is needed for them. This is the **roadmap** to creating **necessary** housing that is **equitably** located across the county. And I am asking employers, as well as the community, via the housing authorities , to contribute to financing these projects, so that we can work with developers to build to meet our workforce housing needs.

Thank you for your attention,

Sunita Beall



**From:** [molly\\_pearson](#)  
**To:** [SSAC Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback - public comment regarding February 16 2023 SSAC Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 2, 2023 9:48:59 AM

---

You don't often get email from mollypearson99@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL**

Hello State Street Advisory Committee members,

I attended the February 16 meeting but unfortunately could not stay until the end, when public comment was received. Here are a few points from my perspective as a 35 year resident of Santa Barbara who likely shares with you a love of State Street as a landmark of the community and regularly rides both e-bikes and traditional bikes on State Street and all over the city for transportation, recreation, and exercise.

- What is the planning/legal process to convert a street to something else (e.g., some of the non-transportation uses that are being considered such as restaurant seating, concerts, play areas, park-like setting)? I asked this question at one of the workshops, and city planning staff said that a couple of directions/options were being researched. Will the SSAC weigh in on this aspect?

- I would appreciate hearing from City transportation staff regarding some of the proposals that are being considered for bikes in particular. They and many other cities have done so much research and have implemented infrastructure changes that make bike travel much more safe and convenient on city streets.

- Over the last 3 years I have logged more than 4,000 miles on my e-bike commuting to and from work, meetings, the gym, and events. Unfortunately, the interim configuration on State Street has made it less safe for commuting, and I generally use other streets if I really need to get somewhere on time. Please use this committee to suggest changes to the current interim setup, to find out what works and what doesn't to direct bicycle traffic better in the interim. It has been a free-for-all for much too long.

- E-bikes and traditional bikes can be very safe and efficient forms of transportation if infrastructure is designed and used safely and effectively. E-bikes are getting a lot of negative comments in this process at least partly due to the lack of effective infrastructure for their use in the interim setup on State Street. Also, many under-18 riders do not wear helmets or do not latch them. Can the City increase enforcement of this requirement? Word gets around quickly, and I believe some strategic enforcement (similar to the City's enforcement of pedestrian traffic safety) would go a long way.

- The SSAC and the public should be informed about what the "interim operations" committee is doing in the interim, and what is being implemented for existing conditions. Will that be an agenda item at the next SSAC meeting, or how else can a member of the public find out what is being done related to existing conditions?

I'm very interested in the future of bikes on State Street, and I want to make sure the city is addressing the issues related to conflicts between bikes and pedestrians that are occurring in this interim period, and not carrying those problems and negative comments over into the

future plans for State Street.

Thank you for your consideration,

Molly Pearson

## Greta Walters

---

**From:** Steve Fort <stevefort1313@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 16, 2023 7:43 AM  
**To:** SSAC Secretary

You don't often get email from stevefort1313@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL**

I want to express that the bike mess on State needs to get under control. Everyone has had enough of adults (and kids) riding their bikes with no respect for anyone. It has become very tiring, unsafe, and disheartening. The bike mess needs to end as soon as possible. The City bends over backwards for bike coalitions, and these groups seemingly do nothing to address the safety issue their constituents rub in the face of the public every time they race down State and run through traffic lights. I don't know anybody who isn't frustrated with the lack of enforcement.

I 100% support cars coming back with normal bike lanes as opposed to a giveaway to bike dominance like it is now.

Sincerely,  
Steve Fort  
816 Grove Lane

**From:** [Irene & Mel](#)  
**To:** [SSAC Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** State Street Advisory Committee meetings, May 2023  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 17, 2023 9:17:23 PM

---

You don't often get email from sahyun@infionline.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL**

I am not able to attend the May 22 and 24 meetings of the Committee but would like the following comments read into the record of the appropriate meeting. I did attend and address the April meeting of the Committee.

I find the two principal options for State Street, namely (1) a return to vehicular traffic for the entire length of the street, and (2) a refinement of the existing experimental State Street Promenade, both unattractive. There is, however, at least one other option. That option is two mini-promenades, one in the Nightlife Zone from (more-or-less) Gutierrez to Ortega Sts., and a second one in the Arts Zone, from Figueroa to Sola Sts. In between (Ortega to Figueroa Sts.) vehicular access to local businesses and public transportation would be enabled; adequate provision could be made for bicycles, especially if this were a parklet-free zone.

I find this proposal attractive for two primary reasons:

(1) As our consultants reported at the last meeting, the experience in other cities has been that short (less than half-mile) pedestrian zones have tended to be successful, while longer promenades have not been.

(2) The two sections of State St. that I am suggesting for mini-promenades are culturally distinct, attracting different clienteles, and peaking in activity at different times. There is no reason for them to communicate.

Please bring my comments to the attention of the Committee as appropriate, and keep me informed of future opportunities for resident input.

Melville R. V. Sahyun

102 E.Pueblo St.

Santa Barbara

(651)927-9686

**From:** [Frank Ortiz](#)  
**To:** [SSAC Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** Open State Street  
**Date:** Sunday, May 21, 2023 3:21:38 PM

---

[You don't often get email from go\_gamma@mac.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

EXTERNAL

For the City Council's Consideration,

The Pandemic Emergency is over.  
The need for additional outdoor dining has passed.  
The restaurants have the indoor dining they previously had.  
The Parklets are an eyesore and the road closure is not needed.  
It's time to open State Street again.  
We need the route for not only car traffic but parades and other events.

Thanks you,

Frank Ortiz  
Lifelong resident of Santa Barbara