

**From:** [George Relles](#)  
**To:** [Paula Perotte](#); [Stuart Kasdin](#); [James Kyriaco](#); [Jennifer Smith](#); [Luz Reyes-Martin](#); [Robert Nisbet](#)  
**Cc:** [City Clerk Group](#)  
**Subject:** Testimony from George Relles re Item C.3 on Goleta City Council January 20 Agenda regarding a proposed Transportation Commission  
**Date:** Monday, January 19, 2026 12:01:40 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.

TO: Mayor Perotte, Council Members, and City Manager Nisbet,  
I am writing regarding Item C.3 on your January 20, 2026 Meeting Agenda.

**In short, I am writing in support of Option 4 to establish a Public Transportation Commission**

My reasons include the fact that other municipalities have such a Transportation Commission, and that Goleta budget expenditures on transportation-related projects are the number one or two biggest items, from roads and bike lanes, to sidewalks, underpasses, etc. In addition, we benefit from and are impacted by considerable non-Goleta regional transportation resources such as Cal-Trans and MTD, and rail.

However, there are several additional reasons I support Option 4.

**There is a Pressing Need for Residents to Understand INTERRELATIONSHIPS Among Transportation Issues:** The main reason for establishing a Goleta Transportation Commission is because of the need for standing venue where residents can both learn about and provide input on transportation related issues as a whole, rather than piecemeal.

Currently, we can attend separate meetings or workshops just on roads, or just biking, or just safety or just MTD, or just rail. Frequent and impassioned public comments demonstrate the difficulty residents have in understanding how all such transportation-related elements are interrelated. This confusion was and still is evident regarding Project Connect, despite frequent educational and planning efforts.

**Commissions Provide a Greater Opportunity to Gain Resident Input:** As with other standing commissions, hearings are a two-way street. They provide a venue for residents to not only bring complaints, questions, and issues, but also to provide new and sometimes innovative ideas and solutions.

**Because It's Worth It:** No doubt, there's no free lunch. A new Transportation Commission will consume some staff and Council resources. However, the benefits will outweigh the required increased resources, just as we have seen with all our other commissions.

**Conclusion:** I have confidence that Council and Staff can and will create a Transportation Commission creatively and expertly to minimize the expenditure of resources, while maximizing its benefits.

Thank you for considering this request.



**From:** [Michael Iza](#)  
**To:** [Paula Perotte](#); [Stuart Kasdin](#); [Luz Reyes-Martin](#); [James Kyriaco](#); [Jennifer Smith](#); [City Clerk Group](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item C.3 – Transportation Advisory Structure Evaluation Report  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 20, 2026 3:22:55 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.

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

This comment is in reference to **Agenda Item C.3 – Transportation Advisory Structure Evaluation Report**, dated January 20, 2026.

Thank you for the thoughtful analysis in the staff report around capacity, efficiency, and public engagement.

After reviewing the report, I support the creation of a transportation advisory group, such as a commission or committee, provided it is intentionally designed to add value without becoming overly burdensome. Early public input and accountability can improve outcomes and help avoid late stage conflict, particularly for transportation projects that are highly visible and personal to residents. It can also provide a forum for public input on areas and projects where residents feel improvements and attention are needed.

To strike the right balance, I encourage a narrowly scoped, outcome focused model. An advisory group could focus on higher impact or potentially controversial projects, major policy documents such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and Vision Zero efforts, and grant related initiatives where public process is already expected, allowing for a more complete and integrated discussion of these priorities. Routine maintenance and formula driven projects could remain staff led.

A strictly advisory role, quarterly meetings, and clear criteria for what comes before the advisory group would help ensure meaningful public engagement while protecting staff capacity and project delivery.

Thank you for considering an approach that balances accountability, transparency, and practicality.

Respectfully,  
Michael Iza, a Goleta resident