

**Marin County Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program
Advisory Committee Meeting, February 27, 2007
Meeting Notes**

1. Check-In

Meeting notes from the February 13th Advisory Committee were approved by the Committee.

Craig Tackabery reported on his presentation to the County Board of Supervisors on February 20th. At the meeting, he discussed the completion of the preliminary data collection to compare to data after the NTPP is implemented. Craig also discussed the marketing and educational materials in development as part of the national effort as well as the Advisory Committee's progress.

2./3. Ranking Outcomes/ Project/Program Category Allocation Outcomes

Craig made some opening comments. The goal of the committee is to develop a list of infrastructure improvements and education and outreach programs. The basis for the process is the federal legislation. The committee used a needs based process, and applied a technical approach to the identified needs. The ranked lists of projects and programs are guides or tools to be used to develop a recommended list, they are not definitive, and are not based on a population formula. All project and program scopes and costs are preliminary. The final selection will be by the Board of Supervisors, and all infrastructure projects will require a commitment to maintain by the local jurisdiction. The Board's decision will be based on a recommendation by the Department of Public Works, and the recommendation will be a balance between Board of Supervisors priorities and Advisory Committee input. Leverage strategies will be pursued to implement projects and programs identified through the process that are not included in the final Board of Supervisors approved list. He made two observations about the ranked lists. With the limited funding available, there is not a wide geographic dispersion of infrastructure projects, and that looking at the maps, there are some obvious gaps in the system that are not filled.

Michael Jones reviewed the benchmarking process established by the committee and the amount of money allocated to each funding category. Coming into this meeting, the Project Team scored and ranked Program, Local/Feeder Project, Primary Projects and Planning Projects according to the criteria established by the Advisory Committee. Michael Jones led the Committee through an overview of programs/projects in these categories as well as Countywide Projects and what would be funded under the scoring criteria established by the Committee. Michael Jones also led the Committee through the scoring sheets a second time to make sure specific changes to lists and overall funding allocation changes were correctly captured.

Comments/Questions raised during the initial overview were as follows:

A. Countywide Projects

The Project Team specified that intersection improvements in the Countywide Projects are independent of intersection improvements specified in local/feeder and primary project corridor

improvements. Larger projects involving significant intersection modifications were rated as stand-alone projects.

The Project Team stated that on the Countywide list, the bullet items are only suggestions for facilities that can be implemented and that a solicitation and ranking process within the four countywide categories will determine what is ultimately constructed. The cost estimates will likely shift once project scopes are more defined

Eric Schatmeier asked if the steps/lanes/paths include right-of-way acquisition. The Project Team stated that these funds are just for construction and that most of these are already within the public right-of-way.

B. Programs

Two scenarios of scoring criteria were shared by the Project Team, the first was using the criteria established by the Advisory Committee, and the second used a different weighting with more emphasis on cost-benefit as the primary criteria for comparison purposes.

Many questions arose about the Bike Station, which is mentioned both under Programs and Countywide Projects. In Programs, this is the operating cost for a valet at the Station for three years. The Bike Station has no defined source of funding for ongoing operational costs once the Pilot concludes. Under Countywide Projects Bike Parking, those funds would be for the physical improvements required for the station.

Sean Co stated that Bike Station funding has been an issue regionally and that there is no dedicated source of funds.

Patrick Seidler asked why the Complete Streets program was ranked low. The Project Team stated that it didn't score well in the "program underway" criteria, nor did it have support from local agencies as currently suggested. The FHWA Engineer's Training program that scored higher than Complete Streets and which is being considered for funds includes some of these elements.

C. Primary Projects

Two scenarios of scoring criteria were shared by the Project Team, the first was using the criteria established by the Advisory Committee, and the second was another using cost-benefit as the primary criteria to show how rankings are affected by adjusting the weighting.

Deb Hubsmith suggested that the San Rafael transit improvement description change so it does not include real-time transit information and instead emphasizes safety improvements.

Deb Hubsmith stated that the Enfrente Road project has been funded and subsequently lost it in the past and does not want this to occur again. The Project Team agreed and stated that if it, or any other project, was languishing or abandoned, there are other projects in line to which the funds could be applied.

Sean Co asked if there is a process in place if projects are not implemented. The Project Team stated that other high ranked projects down the list would be funded.

Patrick Seidler noted that many north/south connections are included in funding list but east/west connections are absent.

Ron Bolds stated that San Anselmo/east/west projects are not at the top of the list.

D. Local/Feeder Projects

The Committee commented on the large cost of the East Francisco Boulevard project (\$4.2 million). The Committee decided to scale this back to planning/environmental for \$830k. Deb Hubsmith stated that the remaining portion of the East Francisco Boulevard project could be included in the 580/101 interchange project.

E. Planning

Ron Bolds stated that there is a lack of east/west projects, especially in the Ross Valley.

General Comments

Eric Schatmeier discussed his role with the TAM Board's subcommittee reviewing the NTPP Advisory Committee process. He stated that the TAM subcommittee has three recommendations:

1. Pedestrians should be represented in projects.
2. Steps, Lanes & Paths should be allotted more money
3. Geographic equity

After the Break and General Comments, the Committee reviewed the lists again and made recommendations for projects and funding levels for each category. These recommendations are described below:

A. Countywide Projects

The Advisory Committee approved the percent allocation of countywide projects into Signing/Striping, Intersection Improvements, Steps Lanes and Paths, and Bicycle Parking. The percents and total dollar amount are:

Program	Percent of Total	Cost
Signing/Striping	17	\$567,000
Intersection Improvements	13	\$420,000
Steps, Lanes & Paths	53	\$1,728,000
Bicycle Parking	17	\$564,750
Total	100	\$3,279,750

B. Programs

The Advisory Committee decreased the overall dollar amount allocated to programs from \$1.553 million to \$1.0 million. The Committee also decided to reduce funding to the Personal Travel Planning program to \$320k. The Committee recommended the twelve programs below.

- Bicycle Repair, Bicycle Education, Street Smarts, Personal Travel Planning, Health Promotion, Maps for Directional Signage, Riding with Youth Workshops, Share the Road Checkpoints, Seminars for Engineers, Booths at Events, Safety Campaign, Community maps.

C. Primary Projects

The Advisory Committee decreased the Cal Park tunnel project from \$1.25 million to \$1.08 million. The Advisory Committee also decreased the Puerto Suello-to-Transit Center Connector from \$1.2 million to \$600k, assuming that the remaining portion will be funded through a regional Safe Routes to Transit grant. The Committee also recommended the following ten projects:

- Cal Park Tunnel Pathway, Puerto Suello Hill Bikeway, Gate 6 Rd/Bridgeway Intersection, San Rafael Transit Center, Commuter Connection – Enfrente Road, Bridgeway-Ferry Path, Puerto Suello-Transit Station Connector, Mahon Cr Path-Transit Connector, Northgate Gap Closure, Los Ranchitos connector

D. Local/Feeder Projects

Ron Bolds discussed the Promenade project to be developed next year and wanting to connect this east/west project with others in the NTPP list.

Allan Bortel stated the importance of the Manzanita Path project

The Advisory Committee determined that they would use the criteria that they established at the previous meetings for determining the funding list for local/feeder projects. The Advisory Committee decided to drop the Francisco East project from \$5.2 million to \$830,000 and move this project to the Planning category and the Terra Linda Promenade from \$2.4 million to \$500,000, redefined as only providing bike and ped improvements along Freitas Pkwy between Del Ganado and Del Presidio. With these changes and the addition of \$387,000 reduction from Programs, the Advisory Committee recommended funding these six projects:

- County Health & Wellness Campus, Tennessee Valley Pathway, Terra Linda North San Rafael On-Street Bikeway Improvements, Medway Improvements, Doherty Drive Pathway, Manzanita Connector

E. Planning

The Advisory Committee decided that original projects 10 & 11 (Hub Improvements, Cross San Rafael Bikeway) are important east/west connections and should be funded. With remaining balances from other categories, there is room in the planning budget for these additions. The Advisory Committee recommended the following Planning projects.

- Central Marin Ferry Connection, Alto Tunnel, Hub Improvements, Cross San Rafael Bikeway

4. Community Presentation

Staff briefly described the planned agenda for the community presentation on March 12. There will be a presentation on the overall program first, followed by a series of stations, each focused on a particular category, at which participants can review maps and lists of projects and programs and provide comments.

5. Public Comment

None

6. Upcoming Meetings

The public presentation of the Advisory Committee's work is scheduled for March 12th, from 7 to 9pm at the San Rafael Community Center. The final Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for March 20th. The Board of Supervisors hearing is scheduled for April.