

**Marin County Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program
Advisory Committee Meeting, Jan 30 2007
Meeting Notes**

1. Check-In

Dan Dawson asked the committee if there were any questions regarding the January 30th Advisory Committee notes. Nancy Weninger stated that the notes suggested Central Marin Ferry Connector did not have a preferred alternative when the study conducted by Larkspur did recommend the railroad alignment. The project team responded that a more comprehensive study of the area by TAM is underway, and a preferred alternative for the CMFC has not been determined, and that the January 9th notes would be made more explicit.

2. Screening Outcomes

Dan Dawson explained where the Committee is in the process on the flow chart. The flow chart now shows what has been accomplished and what is left to finish. The most recent lists and maps were handed out to committee members. Committee members were asked if they had questions/comments about the lists and whether or not they were satisfied with the screening process. Comments are described below.

Deb Hubsmith commented on the countywide projects list, stating that the location lists associated with projects like bike parking, directional signage, and stenciling are suggested examples of candidates for countywide projects from MCBC's perspective. Deb requested clarification that a complete list of all of the individual projects in a countywide project list do not need to be developed for the project to be funded. The project team stated that a process would take place, using the ranking criteria once fund allocations occur to determine what projects in each countywide project category would be implemented. Ken Nordoff (chair) reiterated that the specific projects listed under the countywide projects are example projects and that as part of the selection process for countywide projects the actual list of projects could include projects not specifically identified already.

Patrick Seidler stated that the Merrydale overcrossing is an existing bicycle facility and to add it to the map. He requested that project #2006 show an alternative alignment along Las Gallinas in addition to Northgate Drive around the mall.

Dianne Steinhauser raised questions about two projects, #2001 Grand Ave bridge and #2015 Mahon Creek Connector. She said that she supplied additional information but that they are both off of the project lists. #2001 is pending more information about the implementation schedule and may be returned to the LOCAL project list if the concerns over the proposed timeline are addressed. #2015 will be added back to the PRIMARY list, with alternative for an undercrossing removed from the project description. Several questions arose about Steps, Lanes and Paths. These projects are both on the local list and countywide list. After much discussion, the consensus of the group was to have

steps, lanes and path projects stand on their own, and striping/signage projects would become a separate countywide project. For steps, lanes, and paths, there would be two potential projects: one would be on the countywide list and the other would be on the planning list. Projects that are sufficiently analyzed/scoped would be assigned to the respective countywide project bucket, while less vetted ideas would go in the appropriate planning category bucket.

Dianne Steinhauser said that #300 Marin-Sonoma Narrows can be removed from planning projects because it will be funded from other sources.

Laura Thompson asked that ‘marsh’ be removed from #400 and that feasibility for this project has occurred, and to instead note that environmental review and a traffic study are necessary.

Sean Co asked if the programs included operation costs. The project team stated that operation costs are only included through the NTPP tenure (2010).

Deb Hubsmith asked that program RES-6 – Model Policies toolkit- not be redirected because TAM is not implementing all of the programs elements, such as circulating it to towns/cities and getting approval from city councils. Dianne Steinhauser agreed that this is not part of the toolkit scope and wants the toolkit to be a resource for cities/towns. Michael Jones stated that some of the suggested elements could be included in the bike/ped plan updates.

With these minor changes, the committee accepted the balance of the screened project lists as final.

3. Primary Network Projects and Feeder/Local Network Projects Ranking Criteria, Weighting Exercise, and Scoring of Criteria

David Parisi shared the edits to the Primary and Feeder/Local ranking criteria requested last meeting. Craig introduced the federal legislation as a guide to the program’s purpose, and suggested its use as a guide on how weight the ranking criteria. The committee then individually weighted the ranking criteria. Results were input into an Excel spreadsheet. The Committee had an open discussion about weights and the min/max weights input by individuals. The Committee adopted the average weights of the committee members for the ranking criteria weights. Ranking and weights are below:

Impact in Achieving Modal Shift	26
Completes Transportation Network	28
Improves Safety	11
Ability and Timeliness of Implementation	12
Unique Opportunities	12
Benefit-to-Cost Determination	11
Total	100

The team stated that the above weights can be reviewed to see if they make logical sense after each potential project list is ranked.

5. Ranking Criteria for Countywide Projects, Programs, Planning Projects

Committee members handed in their ranking criteria weights for the other categories. These will be shared, discussed and finalized at the next Advisory Committee Meeting.

6. Benchmarking

Bonnie Nelson spoke about dividing up the funds among the different pie pieces. She handed out a benchmarking memo that includes proposed fund allocations for other Pilot communities. 20% of the NTPP funds are already allocated to administrative costs (5%) and federal obligations (15%). The rest is for dividing between project and programs. Marin County has an advantage because there is already an implemented Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program. Sheboygan, another NTPP location, is investing heavily into SR2S. Of the remaining 80% of funds, Bonnie gave an approximate break up based on other community's approaches of 60-70% allocation to projects and 10-20% to programs. Some Committee members provided feedback that this was too high a percent for programs. Bonnie tasked the Committee with thinking about how they would allocate the pie and to bring their input to the next meeting. She reiterated that this is a values approach to the pie slices, based on Committee members feelings about which categories will achieve the program goals. Craig commented that this is being approached for two sides, this side is a values based approach, and then we will approach it from the project list side. The ranked lists will show what can be accomplished within each slice at a specified funding level. The Committee will then revisit the pie slice percentages to see if the total package makes logical sense.

7. Wrap-Up/Next Steps

Craig went over the schedule in the packet. He noted that the public presentation to the community on the Advisory Committee draft recommendations is scheduled for the evening of March 12, and that a final Advisory Committee meeting was added on March 20. Nancy indicated she had a conflict on March 12, but felt that the meeting should be held to keep the program on schedule. The Committee accepted the updated schedule.