

**Marin County Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program
Advisory Committee Meeting, Dec 12 2006**

Meeting Notes

1. The NTPP and the Committee's Role

Ken Nordoff (chair) opened the meeting and everyone at the Advisory Committee table introduced themselves and the agency/group they represented. Ken asked the Committee if the notes from the last meeting's transcription style and distribution worked for the Committee. The Committee agreed and approved the notes style. The meeting order was shuffled slightly from the agenda to accommodate a presentation.

Craig Tackabery spoke briefly about the NTPP, the process, and a review of the Advisory Committee's role. There are four steps in the Advisory Committee process:

1. Solicitation of Ideas
2. Screening, Ranking, Categorization
3. Selection and Allocation by Category
4. Public Workshop to Share Results.

The Advisory Committee will determine the criteria for the initial screening of projects/programs and performance criteria for later ranking of projects/programs. This will be a technical process and the goal is for the methodology to be transparent. The results will be presented in a public workshop. The Board of Supervisors will make final project and program selections.

2. How the NTPP Came to Be (and how it came to Marin)

Deb Hubsmith, Advocacy Director for the Marin County Bicycle Coalition gave a Powerpoint presentation. The presentation included a history of NTPP and international best practices for bicycle facilities.

3. Selection of Screening Criteria

David Parisi, consultant to the County, explained the suggested initial screening criteria. There are over 200 projects/programs on the list and the Screening Process will be an initial process to remove any projects/programs that do not meet specific criteria. David's presentation included the initial screening criteria and asked the committee for others and for approval to proceed.

David shared a flow chart explaining the initial screening process. Committee members provided feedback and added a 7th screening criterion –that projects already fully funded by other sources be removed from the list. Projects that cannot be built and evaluated by 2010 are considered "planning projects." David is incorporating the screening criteria comments and will have an updated initial screening chart at the next advisory committee meeting.

Laura Thompson asked how dollars will be broken up into projects versus programs. David and Craig responded that this is not decided yet and that the screening process is either yes or no and then the projects/programs will be evaluated through performance criteria (see section 4). Determining percentages for each category will likely happen after the performance criteria evaluation.

Patrick Seidler asked about projects that may not meet official standards or demonstration projects and how they fit into the fund allocation. Craig stated that the Committee's role is to pick the project locations and that the Committee is not expected to determine engineering details of projects due to time constraints.

Dan Dawson stated that if projects/programs are eliminated during the screening process or performance criteria evaluation that there are other opportunities for funding outside of the NTPP.

A member of the public asked if projects that are already on existing plans, such as a General Plan, have more weight in the process. David responded saying that yes, this will likely help it in the evaluation process. This maybe part of the weighting strategy the committee determines for the performance criteria.

A member of the public asked if these projects/programs will focus on the latent demand or if it will focus on existing bicyclists/pedestrians. David responded that the NTPP and the projects/programs are targeted at both.

Rocky Birdsey asked if there would be a review of every project through the screening process because, if so, that would take a considerable amount of time. David said that this technical analysis based on the committee selected screening criteria will be done prior to the next meeting and a review of those projects and programs screened out will be provided at the meeting. It will be fairly easy to understand why they were screened without going through detailed individual clarifications.

David asked the committee if there were any additional items that could be added to the screening criteria. Dianne Steinhauser, of TAM, stated that if a project is funded in full through TAM that it can be removed from the list.

There was concurrence from the committee to use the screening criteria as amended.

4. Introduction to Performance and Ranking Criteria

David presented the suggested performance criteria for the projects/programs. These will be used after the screening criteria to score the projects/programs and determine their placement on the priority list. At the next meeting, weights of each performance criterion will be determined.

Joy Dahlgren asked if a decrease in vehicle usage will be part of the performance criteria and David responded that this would be included as part of 'ability to implement.' If a

project increases congestion or decreases air quality, it would likely negatively affect the project score.

Eric Schatmeier of TAM asked about the process for ranking programs because some of the suggested criteria do not apply to them, they only apply to projects. David stated that some of the criteria apply and that most likely, a subset of the project criteria will be used for the programs.

Deb asked what the process will be for determining what percentage of the funds will be applied to the five categories. David stated that this is the role of the Committee and it will likely be determined as the project/program list is narrowed and the demand is determined.

Patrick Seidler asked about expensive projects that affect many users. He raised concern that the more expensive projects would be negatively affected in the evaluation process due to high cost. David responded that in fact the projects that positively impact more people will benefit in the performance criteria process, and that this would outweigh/balance high costs. At the next meeting, David will bring examples to show how an evaluation process could work.

5. Major Projects Underway

Presentations on three large bicycle/pedestrian projects underway in Marin were provided at the meeting. The first presentation was by Dianne Steinhauser of TAM, and TAM consultant Connie Preston on the Puerto Suello Hill bicycle/pedestrian path. This path is being built as part of a Highway 101 Gap Closure project, and will be open to the public by the end of 2008 .

The second presentation was by Bill Whitney from the County of Marin on the Cal Park Hill Tunnel Rehab project. This project will connect San Rafael and Larkspur on an old railroad right-of-way. There will be a bicycle/pedestrian path and train tracks through the tunnel. It is estimated to be open to the public in fall 2008. Funds are coming from a variety of sources, but most is coming from Regional Measure 2 funds.

The third presentation was by Bill Whitney on the 101 Greenbrae Corridor Improvement project. The project will feature bicycle/pedestrian improvements near Highway 101 in conjunction with improvements to the highway and associated ramps. The project is at the study stage.

6. Workshop Debriefing/Projects and Programs Review

Dan reported to the Advisory Committee that 65 members of the public attended the workshop on November 29th. Many new ideas for projects were brainstormed by the public and included on the maps at the meeting. The workshop presentation by Dr. Andy Dannenberg is on the webpage.

Dan circulated the latest tables of proposed projects and programs. Each project has a unique ID number, however this number does not relate to any preference or order. It is simply to help identify projects on the maps.

Laura asked what Primary vs. Local means in the project table. Dan responded that the primary network includes the N/S Greenway as well as major bicycling corridors. Local means they are feeder facilities to the primary network.

A “U” on the project table means Unincorporated Marin.

Deb asked when we break out planning projects versus fully funded projects for implementation. Dan responded that this will happen through the screening process and projects that cannot be built in time will be moved to the planning list.

Ken asked about projects that are everywhere, for example bicycle parking projects or steps/paths projects. Dan responded that the County is collecting individual location suggestions for these projects and more specific cost details will need to be developed for each.

A public comment was made that Safe Routes to School projects are not on the list. Members of the Advisory Committee assured the member of the public that they are included and may be under a different name. The County interviewed all cities and TAM and their Safe Routes to School consultant in developing the list.

The final cut-off date for adding projects to the map/list is December 22nd, 2006.

Next meeting January 9, 2007 –likely agenda items include: a final project list, projects initially screened, examples of performance criteria rankings and criteria weighting.