

**From:** [Michael Iza](#)  
**To:** [Paula Perotte](#); [Stuart Kasdin](#); [James Kyriaco](#); [Luz Reyes-Martin](#); [Jennifer Smith](#); [City Clerk Group](#)  
**Subject:** Item C3 26-058 Development Impact Fees Prioritize roundabouts as part of vision zero  
**Date:** Monday, February 16, 2026 10:37:11 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am writing in support of staff's recommendation to incorporate modern roundabouts into our Vision Zero strategy.

Vision Zero is not a symbolic policy. It is a data-driven commitment to reduce severe and fatal collisions through roadway design. If we are serious about reducing deaths and life-altering injuries, we must be willing to implement countermeasures that are demonstrably effective.

Modern roundabouts are one of the most studied intersection treatments in transportation engineering. The Federal Highway Administration and Insurance Institute for Highway Safety consistently report:

- ~75% reduction in injury crashes
- ~90% reduction in fatal crashes
- Significant reductions in high-speed angle (T-bone) collisions

The reason is structural:

Roundabouts eliminate left-turn conflict points and force lower entry speeds. They convert high-severity right-angle crashes into lower-energy sideswipe or merging conflicts.

This is not theoretical. It is geometric physics.

In addition to safety benefits, roundabouts:

- Reduce vehicle delay compared to signalized intersections at many volumes
- Reduce idling and emissions
- Lower long-term maintenance costs (no signal equipment, less energy use)
- Improve traffic flow resilience during power outages

Community hesitation is understandable. Roundabouts represent change. But resistance to unfamiliar infrastructure cannot outweigh documented safety performance.

If we adopt Vision Zero while rejecting proven safety tools, we undermine the integrity of the program.

This decision is not about a preference, it is about measurable risk reduction.

I respectfully urge Council to support staff's recommendation and allow engineering best practices to guide intersection design where data supports it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warmest Regards,

Michael Iza

City of Goleta Resident



805.967.2500 | SBSCChamber.com  
Mailing Address: 5662 Calle Real #204, Goleta, CA 93117  
Visitor Center: 120 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

---

2/13/2026

Mayor Perotte and Goleta City Council  
City of Goleta  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, CA 93117

**RE: Proposed Development Impact Fee Increases**

Dear Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

The Chamber is very concerned about the scale of the proposed Development Impact Fee increases and what they will mean for housing in Goleta. Fees are projected to approach \$110,000 per unit (a 145% increase for single-family homes and a 120% increase for apartments). At a time when housing feasibility is already strained by increasing costs, uncertainty, and financing constraints, fee increases of this size can determine whether a housing project moves forward or not. We commend the City on its commitment to address the housing crisis and meet its RHNA goals. However, we are concerned that fee increases at this level are not consistent with those commitments.

We understand that the study identifies the maximum amount the City is allowed to charge, but would like to remind the Council that the City is not required to adopt the maximum. That is a policy choice. The proposal is based on maintaining current facility levels on a per-capita basis. In today's housing crisis, it is worth asking whether charging the full calculated amount to new housing is the correct approach.

For example, we are especially concerned about the bicycle and pedestrian fees, which are proposed to increase by roughly 480%. The study assumes that bike and pedestrian infrastructure should grow proportional to population growth. However, much of the existing network was built to improve safety, reduce emissions, and serve the broader community, including regional users. It is not clear that new housing alone should fully fund the continued expansion of the network.

The Chamber asks that the Council consider the following options before adopting these fee increases. Conduct a housing feasibility analysis, consider lower residential rates, and explore alternative funding sources. There must be alternatives that can allow Goleta to invest in infrastructure while also protecting housing feasibility.

Sincerely,

*Dustin Hoiseth*

Dustin Hoiseth  
Director of Economic Development  
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce

**From:** [Michael Messina](#)  
**To:** [Jennifer Smith](#); [City Clerk Group](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment in Support of Expanding Roundabouts in Our City  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 17, 2026 1:55:41 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please forward for Distribution to the City Council and Mayor.

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,

Per tonight's meeting, and Agenda Item #c3. As a resident and engaged citizen, I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed expansion of roundabouts throughout our city.

While roundabouts sometimes generate hesitation due to unfamiliarity, the evidence supporting their safety and performance is substantial. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (1), converting traditional signalized intersections to roundabouts has been shown to:

- Reduce injury crashes by approximately 75%
- Reduce fatal and severe injury crashes by up to 90%
- Reduce overall crashes by roughly 35%

*(1) Safety statistics cited herein are derived from research summarized by the Federal Highway Administration in National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 672, Roundabouts: An Informational Guide (2nd Ed., 2010), and associated U.S. before-and-after studies of intersections converted to modern roundabouts. Reported findings include approximately 35% reduction in total crashes, 76% reduction in injury crashes, and up to 90% reduction in fatal and incapacitating injury crashes. Similar findings have been summarized by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.\**

These outcomes stem from the geometry of roundabouts themselves. They eliminate high-speed right-angle and head-on collisions, which cause the most severe injuries, and slow vehicles to safer operating speeds (typically 15–25 mph). When collisions do occur, they are far less severe

Beyond safety, roundabouts improve operational efficiency:

- They reduce delay by allowing continuous movement rather than forcing drivers to wait at red lights during low cross-traffic periods. This not only offers aesthetic advantages but also reduces driver stress and provides economic benefits.
- They decrease idling time, lowering fuel consumption and emissions.
- They adapt dynamically to fluctuating traffic volumes because they are yield-controlled rather than timer-controlled.

From a fiscal standpoint for the City and Taxpayer, roundabouts represent long-term savings. Traditional signalized intersections require electrical service, signal heads, mast arms, controller cabinets, and ongoing maintenance and replacement. Roundabouts eliminate most of this infrastructure, reducing lifecycle costs and maintenance burdens on the city.

They also improve visual character, particularly in our scenic community with mountain backgrounds. By removing overhead signal arms, hanging lights, and bulky control cabinets, roundabouts reduce streetscape clutter. Landscaped central islands can enhance aesthetics and create a stronger sense of place rather than an industrialized intersection.

In addition to the data, I would like to offer personal observation and experience. I have spent many years traveling in foreign countries where roundabouts are common and integrated into everyday traffic systems. I have consistently been impressed by how effectively they keep traffic moving in areas that would otherwise experience significant congestion — congestion like what we routinely see in many U.S. cities. In those environments, roundabouts are not controversial; they are simply standard practice because they work.

I believe they are particularly advantageous in cities with populations like ours, where intersections frequently become bottlenecks during peak periods (coming to mind the intersection along Fairview/101). Roundabouts offer a practical way to improve throughput without expanding roadway footprints.

If there are remaining questions about their performance, I would respectfully encourage members of Council to visit comparable cities of similar size where roundabouts have been successfully implemented, particularly overseas, where they are commonplace, and lights are rare. Even within our broader community, there are examples where roundabouts have demonstrably reduced bottleneck gridlock and improved traffic flow. The evidence is not abstract — it is observable.

As our city plans for growth, mobility, safety, and long-term fiscal responsibility, expanding roundabouts where appropriate reflects a data-driven and forward-thinking approach.

I respectfully encourage the Council to support their continued implementation.

Sincerely,

Michael Messina

7920 Winchester Cir.

Goleta, CA 93117

City District #3