

**Marin County Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program
Advisory Committee Meeting, February 13, 2007
Meeting Notes**

1. Check-In

Dan Dawson noted that the community presentation has been confirmed for Monday, March 12. The final Advisory Committee meeting is set for Tuesday, March 20.

2. Weighting Exercise Outcomes

David Parisi gave a summary of the weighting exercise for Primary and Local/Feeder Network projects that was done at the January 30th meeting. The group then went through the exercise for the remaining categories of Countywide, Planning, and Programs.

Nancy Weninger commented that the same criteria should be used for Planning projects as for Primary / Local projects.

Rocky Birdsey suggested for Planning Projects, Ranking Criteria 2D (Existing Parallel routes...), that the presence of on-street parking should be added to as a factor. The group agreed to add language of “high on-street parking turnover” to Planning Projects criteria 2D.

Rocky Birdsey also asked to make sure pedestrian projects are included and considered.

Ken Kochevar commented that he would like to see some weight taken off collisions and more added to observations

Deb Hubsmith commented that public support should not be measured through the maps and dots from the public workshop.

Suzanne Bourguignon asked that walking/bicycling to transit is added to the list of programs.

Rocky Birdsey asked how support of agencies to manage programs is gauged. The project team responded that the success of programs elsewhere helps to evaluate how a program is best managed and by whom.

Allen Bortel asked if Caltrans has a local office and if costs for Caltrans contacts come from the NTPP administrative fund or out of specific project costs. The project team responded by stating it depends on the project but that for the Pilot, there are no charges from Caltrans.

A member of the Advisory Committee asked if the initial screening sorted out most of the projects needing large Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The project team stated yes, they went to the Planning Projects list and most of the projects on the Primary and Local/Feeder Network lists would be eligible for a negative declaration/FONSI or categorically exempt.

Because of the environmental process, anything requiring an EIR/EIS would push the project schedule out beyond the horizon date of the Pilot.

3. Why Does it Take So Long and Why Does it Cost So Much?

Jeff Martin gave an overview of the project implementation process and trends in construction costs.

A committee member asked if there are other federally funded projects in Marin. The project team responded that yes, there are many, for example the CalPark tunnel has federal funds.

4. Break

5. Benchmarking

Michael Jones gave an overview of the benchmarking process and the memo discussed at the previous meeting. Committee members assigned percentage-of-funding scores to the categories which were then tabulated on a spreadsheet to see the collective outcome.

Countywide Project fact sheets were distributed. In the Countywide category, there are four projects. These four are listed on the project list and other potential projects that would fall into one of these blanket projects are shown underneath in italics. Listed are examples of project locations, not an all-inclusive list of potential improvement locations, nor will every location listed be improved with a project. Projects within these four categories will be ranked at a later date, after solicitation for additional ideas has been done.

A committee member stated that these projects need to be ADA accessible.

Dianne Steinhauser stated that Countywide projects could be used to provide geographic equity for communities that did not get large projects funded by trying to secure other sources.

Steps, Lanes & Paths projects identified in the Local/Feeder Network list are for engineering plans since they have already undergone a detailed planning study. Patrick Seidler stated that this would eliminate Tam Valley and Sausalito because they need planning done first. The team responded that this is why those areas are included on the Planning project list.

6. Scoring Outcomes

This item was held over to the next meeting.

7. Public Comment:

Deb Hubsmith stated that this is also a leveraging opportunity for more funds later and that this is also a planning process for the entire system and other opportunities.

The project team responded that an overview of leveraging will be provided at the meeting.

8. Wrap-Up/Next Steps

There was discussion of a need for more time for committee discussion before the March 12 community presentation. The Committee decided to meet from 12-5 on February 27 to allow more time.