

**Marin County Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program  
Advisory Committee Meeting, November 14, 2006**

**Meeting Notes**

**1. Telling our Stories**

Craig Tackabery gave some opening remarks, and then the group gave self-introductions.

**2. What is the NTPP?**

Craig Tackabery gave a presentation introducing the NTPP, that included the history and background of the program, the relationship to the national program effort, program evaluation requirements, and other concurrent efforts in Marin County such as the Bike Plan updates

Ken Kochevar (FHWA) commented that he hosts conference calls with those involved in the Pilot in California, including Craig and Dan from the County and Caltrans staff. Ken emphasized that program funding requirements are very important, ensuring that the funds are all obligated on time. The hope is that the Pilot Program will have positive results, which will lead to follow up programs and additional funding in future federal transportation bills.

Craig mentioned a kickoff meeting in December of 2005 between all the Pilot communities. For Marin – Craig, Supervisors McGlashan and Kinsey, and Deb Hubsmith. Because of Deb's extensive history with this effort at the national level, all the Pilot communities agreed that Deb should be involved with the program as a resource for all the communities.

Joy Dahlgren commented that the program seems geared toward mode shift, but what about mobility? Craig responded that data collection requirements call for before and after measurements on mode shift. How do you measure mobility? It is a challenge to measure accurately because of the number of variables but the survey questions are structured to limit as many of those as possible.

Eric Schatmeier (TAM) asked how does the Final Report deadline fit with the 2010 survey? Craig responded that there will be a post-survey supplement to the final report

**3. In the Beginning**

Dan Dawson gave a presentation on the local NTPP efforts and roles of the Advisory Committee. This committee serves under the Department of Public Works (not Board of Supervisors). The term of commitment is expected to be wrapped up by Spring, when a final list of projects will be forwarded to the BOS for approval. Because the focus is on transportation mode shift, the western part of the county is not included in the NTPP – focus is on the eastern, urban core of the county.

Nancy Weninger asked that for multi-jurisdictional projects, who will be the lead agency? Craig responded that County Public Works will administer funds, but actual implementation may be done by others. Some smaller projects may be combined and done at a county level – e.g. signing and striping. It may not be efficient for small jurisdictions to go after small projects on their own where staffing limitations or economies of scale make countywide efforts more realistic and efficient.

Rocky Birdsey commented that the pedestrian component is often lacking in Bike/Ped Plans. For example, sidewalk gaps are often overlooked as projects. Dan responded that he agreed, small pedestrian projects may not appear in adopted plans but could certainly be considered for this program, provided the criteria are met.

Patrick Seidler commented that for unincorporated area outreach, he suggests approaching the Supervisors and their staff for project ideas. Craig responded that we already have briefed the Supervisors and will continue that outreach through the process

Craig made a comment on strategy. He noted that obviously not all desired projects can be funded with the \$20 million available, and that we will look for opportunities to use other funding, TAM funding, and looking ahead to the federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization which will start to occur before Pilot program is finished.

Nancy commented that Craig keeps mentioning \$20 million, but the funding was for \$25 million. What happened to other \$5 mil? Craig responded that 15% is taken off the top because of Federal funding rules, then some money goes to National Program coordination, survey research contract, the NTPP consultant, etc. Expect to have about \$20 million for project/program implementation.

Ken Kochevar commented that we should consider NEPA early on. FHWA has different tiers of review in NEPA. e.g. signage and striping would have less review than other projects.

It was asked what do educational components entail? Craig responded that these could include bike safety classes, rodeos, etc. It's more than just media or outreach.

Nancy commented that bike parking should be one of the encouragement programs

Eric Schatmeier (TAM) asked if there is a specific mode split target? Craig responded no. This is a Pilot program, so part of the purpose is to see what happens if you make these improvements. Eric followed that he asked because some of these improvements may take awhile to catch on. Craig said we had noticed that Portland has good data on long term trends, and it may be necessary to extrapolate some of that data given the short timeframe between project construction in 2009 and the post-survey in 2010.

Patrick Seidler asked how to handle Countywide approach to bike parking, signing, striping? Dan responded that we will look at Countywide package for these types of improvements

Diane Steinhauser asked if the committee has a role in the Public Workshop? Dan responded yes, we want the AC to participate, and that you can assist at stations.

John Nemeth (SMART) had a comment on Cost/Benefit. Cost is easy to quantify, what about benefit? Dan said that in developing the methodology, we'll need to be as quantitative as possible.

Laura Thompson asked if the money disappears in 2010 if not spent? Ken Kochevar said the money needs to be programmed by 2010 but there are three additional years before it must be spent.

#### **4. Communication**

Michael Jones from Alta gave a presentation of the website and communication plan, including sample slides showing the selected website layout.

Nancy Weninger commented that it doesn't just read like a website for the NTPP, but also as a page to encourage walking and biking. She mentioned that Marin DHS has proposed a similar site GOMARIN, and suggested staff make sure we are not overlapping with their effort.

Craig mentioned the Profile section of the site. Want to focus on regular people doing regular things by walking and biking. Perhaps the advisory committee could suggest people they know to put on the profile.

Ken Kochevar reminded us to not forget American with Disabilities Act (ADA) – Section 508 compliance for visually impaired. There is software you can run the website through to test whether it is compliant.

## **5. Break**

## **6. Projects and Program Ideas**

Craig led a discussion of the projects and programs currently underway, derived from existing plans, the Countywide Plan Updates, and a series of interviews with local agency staff. A preliminary project list was distributed to the Committee. A list of programs was also discussed.

Diane Steinhauser mentioned that stairway projects have frequently come up as a priority, but these are difficult to implement due to ADA

Deb Hubsmith, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, mentioned that there are lots of other projects and processes going on in the County, such as CalPark, Lincoln Hill, Central Marin Ferry Connection (CMFC) – and the top priority list must include those existing efforts.

Diane Steinhauser mentioned a funding shortfall possible with the Lincoln Hill project – could this process be flexible to cover funding shortfalls in some of these other major projects?

Celia Graterol asked about the small details – what about maintenance which is lacking in many existing facilities? Dan responded that maintenance is not an eligible expense for this program.

Ken Nordhoff.(chair) said that as part of this process, we need to make it clear to the committee and the public what the funding does not cover.

Laura Thompson asked about possibly having a tiered approach to project selection. Maybe an A or B list. Something that would allow us to look at these large projects that are going out to bid, see if there are funding shortfalls.

Rocky Birdsey mentioned that CalPark is a vital project to the network, and we should be creative with our use of Federal funding.

Nancy Weninger commented that we shouldn't penalize projects that have been ongoing and pre-date this process, they should be included.

Patrick Seidler noted the Lincoln Hill, CalPark, and CMFC are three critical projects to the network.

Deb Hubsmith mentioned that there are lots of Safe Routes to Schools projects funding opportunities, with the current round of funding available now and subsequent expected funding.

Celia Graterol mentioned Bellam/I-580 as a priority location. Craig pointed to where it was on the project list.

Patrick suggested we add a Complete Streets campaign program, this would be a coordinating effort for cities and County.

## **7. Community Workshop**

Michael Jones discussed the format of the community workshop, the current flyer was passed around.

Ken Nordhoff (chair) asked if the public will see the draft project list at the meeting, and cautioned that we don't want to set expectations too high.

Laura Thompson suggested that we make sure our comment cards for different stations are all in the same format, so we get the same types of input/comment.

Ken Kochevar asked how we are advertising the meeting. Craig responded that there is a distribution list from the County, and we will try to get an article in the Marin IJ.

Diane Steinhauser asked about the ability to extend projects beyond 2009, and make forecasts or projections for the post-survey.

Ken Kochevar cautioned to not use too many forecasts or projections. He said we should stick with the legislative intent, which is to see what we can build by 2009, then measure the use by 2010.

Diane Steinhauser followed that she hopes to see the program continue for another phase.

Ken Nordhoff (chair) suggested that we have the project ranking criteria to review for the next Advisory Committee meeting.

Hamid Shamshapour commented that we should be cautious in sharing the draft project list with the public, that we should not deviate from the legislative intent (i.e. should not extend projects beyond 2009), and that for the most bang for buck we should look at local connections to schools which are small projects that connect a network.

Patrick Seidler said he would like to see the legislation, and the Supervisors' direction, so that people can understand what the legislative intent is.

Deb Hubsmith suggested that we have a copy of the legislation available at the public meeting.

The committee was asked who could make the Public Workshop, and most raised their hands that they will attend.

## **8. Administrative Items**

Next Advisory Committee dates: December 12, January 30, February 13, and February 22 are set as the Advisory Committee dates.

## **9. Public Comment**

MCBC representative said this was a historic moment to be kicking off the Pilot project. He mentioned that the 2 most important county projects -- Lincoln Hill and Calpark are mostly funded, that topography is very important in this county, and that the Alto tunnel is the next step to creating a greenway all the way from Sausalito to San Rafael. He said we need to look at mode shift.