



COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

May 22, 2006

2:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Christine Culver	Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
Fabian Favila	City of Santa Rosa
Darren Heatherly	Citizen
Gary Helfrich	Sonoma County PRMD
Sue Kelly	City of Sebastopol
Frank Penry	City of Petaluma
Steve Schmitz	Sonoma County Transit
Bill Silva	City of Cotati
David Woltering	City of Cotati

SCTA Staff present: Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio, Lynne March, Janet Spilman, and Suzanne Wilford.

Introductions were made.

I. Consent Items – DISCUSSION/ACTION

A. Approval of minutes of May 9, 2006 meeting

The minutes were approved with the following correction: On page two, first paragraph “Frank Favilia...” should read “Fabian Favila.”

II. Action Item – DISCUSSION/ACTION

A. Recommendation to SCTA Board RE: Application for TDA3 Funding for *SCTA Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan* and Issuance of Request for Proposal/Scope of Work:

Steve Schmitz of Sonoma County Transit noted that, in general, the draft Request for Proposal was satisfactory; he noted some areas that need additional language in order to further clarify pedestrian issues, especially as compared to bicycle issues. Susan Kelly of the City of Sebastopol asked Mr. Schmitz to cite an example of his concern in the RFP. He referred to Task 4.0, which states the consultant will “recommend where bicycle and pedestrian counts would be valuable for planning and/or funding.” He inquired as to whether methodology needs to be included. Also, under Task 8.0 Deliverables #3: Mr. Schmitz wondered whether “projects and programs” refers to bicycles, or pedestrians, or both. Ms. Kelly felt that Task 4.0 asks that the consultant make recommendations; therefore, at that point, specific

issues could be addressed regarding the methodology for taking bicycle and pedestrian counts.

Janet Spilman of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) asked if there would be any objection to removing references to “pedestrian” under Task 4.0, and whether Task 8.0 should state that a “list of bicycle projects and programs are to be included...” Mr. Schmitz felt that the RFP needs to be more clear regarding pedestrian issues. Suzanne Wilford of the SCTA suggested that wording be added to the effect that pedestrian policies should be included, based on individual plan needs.

Christine Culver of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition expressed a need to include wording that would acknowledge the importance of the pedestrian component of the Plan; however, because it is being funded with bicycle transportation funding, the focus of the Plan is on bicycles. She felt that the wording should confirm the importance of the pedestrian element to the Plan. Mr. Schmitz confirmed to Ms. Culver that funding for the Plan comes from TDA Article 3, which can include pedestrian projects. In response to concerns expressed by Committee members that both bicycle and pedestrian projects and issues be addressed in the Plan, Mr. Schmidt voiced his concern that the budget will not allow for extensive study levels of pedestrian-related issues.

Ms. Spilman observed that the advantage of formulating a bicycle plan is that each jurisdiction already has one in place; from which a Countywide plan can be drawn up; whereas, a pedestrian plan would have to be drafted from the beginning as a completely new document. She suggested that Deliverable #3 item under Task 8.0 be worded to read “Lists of bicycle projects and programs are to be included, with descriptions, implementation...Pedestrian policies shall be included based on individual plan needs. Each plan will also include goals, objectives, and policies --- which may include some which are not mutual to all...” Mr. Schmitz then referred to Task 3.0, which refers to “bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs...” and noted that the language seems to imply the tasks outlined would apply to both bicycle and pedestrian issues and projects. He questioned whether the intent of the Plan is to undertake extensive inventory of pedestrian facilities as well as bicycle facilities.

Mr. Woltering responded that this could be worded to indicate that the focus of these tasks could apply to multi-use facilities, as an example, paths that are for both pedestrians and bicycles. Mr. Schmitz suggested adding wording to the effect that existing data and analyses could be incorporated into the Plan at the option of the individual jurisdiction. He expressed the need for the group to examine new pedestrian policies, or existing pedestrian policies, and compile these; but that it would not be feasible or practical to take this further in connection with new pedestrian projects. It was determined that this would apply to pre-existing pedestrian projects. Mr. Schmitz noted that no mandate exists to be eligible for funding for establishing a detailed pedestrian plan.

Ms. Spilman suggested adding language to read “inventory of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities will be provided by each jurisdiction when available.” Mr. Schmitz recommended adding further language indicating that it would be desirable to explore pedestrian policies and concepts in those plans that do not already have these. Ms. Spilman suggested that it might be more appropriate to have references

to policies included under a different section than Task 3.0. Ms. Kelly suggested this be included under Task 7.0.

Mr. Schmitz asked whether staff had contacted Marin County as to how their Plan was progressing, noting that the current County Plan is modeled after theirs. Ms. Spilman observed that there are jurisdictions in Marin that are more active than others in developing a bicycle and pedestrian pathway Plan. Ms. March noted that the Marin Plan is also the unincorporated County Plan.

Discussion followed regarding the number of meetings that are to be held for the different jurisdictions. It was suggested that 30 meetings could be conducted (for three meetings per jurisdiction). These would include public meetings and Committee meetings. Ms. Kelly suggested that some of these meetings could include more than one jurisdiction. Ms. Wilford suggested that each jurisdiction submit an estimate of the number of meetings they anticipate they will need. Language was then added to “provide an estimate of the number and type of meetings anticipated.”

Ms. Spilman confirmed changes to the RFP as follows: Under Task 3.0, remove references to “and pedestrian.” Wording is to be added to read, “The inventory of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities will be provided by each jurisdiction when available.” Under Task 4.0, references to “pedestrian” are to be removed. It was determined that the added wording “provide an estimate of the number and type of meetings anticipated” should be included under Item C, Proposal Requirements. Under Task 8.0, Deliverables #3, wording is to be added, after the second sentence, reading “pedestrian policy shall be included based on individual plan need.”

Mr. Schmitz identified missing data in the table provided under “B,” “Background,” which lists each jurisdiction, the year their bicycle plan was last adopted, and the year they plan to update their plan. Mr. Woltering noted that the City of Cotati plans to update their Plan in 2007, and that the plan was last adopted in 1999. Information from the City of Sonoma is forthcoming. Ms. Kelly thought that 1995 was the year the bicycle plan was adopted for the City of Sonoma.

Ms. Kelly made a motion to approve the RFP as amended by the discussion. Mr. Woltering seconded the motion. The amended RFP was approved unanimously.

TDA3 Funding:

Ms. Spilman reported that increased TDA3 funding is available this year. A formal request for the funding, approved by the Committee, must be submitted to the SCTA Board of Directors. The Committee will have to approve a program of projects. Ms. Spilman reminded Committee members that the City of Cloverdale’s \$60,000 striping project is still on the table. She reported that \$180,000 is available for planning and \$20,000 is available for GIS services.

Frank Penry of the City of Petaluma reported that Petaluma’s participation would depend upon Santa Rosa’s participation. He noted that they already have a bicycle plan, and that it will be part of the General Plan when this is updated. Ms. Spilman asked if Petaluma could contribute to the GIS project. Mr. Penry responded that they would not be opposed to contributing, and suggested that they could present their plan to the consultant to show the consultant what they have done.

Fabian Favila of the City of Santa Rosa announced that they would not be participating. He explained that they had budgeted for \$150,000 to do their own plan, and also have a grant application in to Caltrans for approximately \$140,000. The City is developing an updated Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan and bicycle plan.

Ms. Kelly inquired as to how this would proceed if there were not unanimous participation, and how the funding would be affected. She observed that it could not be a countywide plan if all jurisdictions; i.e., Santa Rosa and Petaluma, are not participating. Mr. Schmitz responded that these jurisdictions would still contribute, and that the plan would still represent the County.

Mr. Woltering voiced the importance of having a consistent format for the Countywide Plan wherein plans integrate and connect with each other. He expressed the need for the consultant to check in to help with integration. Mr. Favila reiterated that Santa Rosa is agreeable to contributing towards GIS software, and assured the Committee that the City will be very conscious of coordinating their efforts with the rest of the County. Ms. Kelly suggested adding wording in the RFP that would allude to two major jurisdictions who already have their own bicycle plans, and examine how their plans would be coordinated with the Countywide Plan.

Gary Helfrich of the Sonoma County Permit Resource Management Department expressed his concern regarding the integration of the GIS component.

Ms. Spilman noted that TDA3 is a funding source wherein funds that are not expended are returned to the pool. She noted that the Board would not approve an open-ended funding request; the Committee must determine a fixed amount to be requested. She said the Committee must decide, at this point, whether to move forward with a request of \$100,000 or less.

Mr. Woltering referred to Task 1.0 of the Request for Proposal, noting that it discusses working with the individual jurisdictions, to gather information that is available; to view it and incorporate it. He asked what assumption was made in connection with Santa Rosa and Petaluma, in terms of work effort; in terms of what would be available. Ms. Wilford responded that Santa Rosa's plan is completed; the concept was to determine what level effort could be provided to them, and if they wanted a more detailed pedestrian plan, how this would be incorporated into the Countywide plan. The level of effort would have been the same as that for other jurisdictions. Petaluma differed in that they had completed their update recently; therefore, this was mainly a matter of coordination with the rest of the County. She noted that Santa Rosa's contribution would be reduced to \$7,000.00. Petaluma's contribution would be reduced to \$2,000.00. These contributions are for the GIS software.

In response to a query by Mr. Schmitz, Ms. Spilman explained that the \$20,000.00 for GIS software costs represents licensing fees and the cost of the plotter.

Mr. Barney noted that staff would be providing data back with the entire Countywide GIS layer with all coordinated routes.

Following further discussion of the degree of involvement of Petaluma and Santa Rosa, Ms. Wilford reviewed options; one of these would be to attempt to draw up a Request for Proposal or a plan in the amount of \$110,000, with the understanding that Santa Rosa and Petaluma have separate plans; and if there is no response to the RFP, TDA3 funds would be reallocated.

After further discussion, Ms. Kelly observed that Sebastopol supports the project and is prepared to pay their share in it, but not to subsidize other jurisdictions. She also noted that the absence of two major jurisdictions does not reduce the cost of the project commensurately. Resulting discussion involved what would be equitable in terms of Santa Rosa and Petaluma's contribution to the Countywide Plan and GIS funding. Mr. Woltering observed that the issue is not as simple as using a percentage formula to determine the contribution amount for GIS funding, and that this would not be sufficient to cover those costs. Ms. Kelly noted that members of the Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee would be in attendance at public meetings. Darren Heatherly noted that Internet technology also allows people to "attend" public meetings online. Ms. Culver expressed her disappointment that Petaluma is not willing to invest in the Countywide plan.

Mr. Schmitz identified two outstanding issues; one is that in order to keep the GIS fixed cost of \$20,000.00 whole, this amount would need to be compensated for elsewhere if Petaluma does not contribute their percentage. Ms. Spilman noted that their cost would be \$2,400.00. Frank Penry of the City of Petaluma concurred. It was noted that bicycling and public input do not stop at city limits. The Committee agreed that public meetings would include many attendees from unincorporated areas of the County, from Santa Rosa, and from Petaluma. Mr. Helfrich voiced the need to identify what these public meeting costs would be, and the need for them to be shared by all jurisdictions equitably.

Mr. Penry raised the issue that the proposed funding could be invested in infrastructure/roads. Mr. Woltering agreed that the infrastructure is important, but expressed the need for a base plan, which would benefit everyone, and which should be county-wide, with each jurisdiction being represented, and contributing their share proportionately. Mr. Favila reiterated that Santa Rosa would be working in concert in this effort, and would be coordinating their work with the Countywide plan. Mr. Helfrich appealed for full participation by everyone. Mr. Favila agreed to have the City consultant coordinate with the County consultant.

Mr. Woltering observed that, given Santa Rosa's size and impact on the planning of other jurisdictions, a \$7,000.00 contribution would not be adequate.

Mr. Schmitz recommended that public input for Santa Rosa and Petaluma that comes up at future public meetings be forwarded to those jurisdictions.

Ms. Wilford noted that this is the first attempt by the SCTA and the Committee to develop a Countywide plan; and called on all jurisdictions to participate in future Plan updates. The decision at this time is whether to proceed as best as possible with 8 jurisdictions, with a proposed budget of \$110,000.00.

Mr. Schmitz made a motion to approve a request for funding in the amount of \$120,402.00, noting that Santa Rosa and Petaluma would not be participating in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. This amount would include contributions by jurisdictions in the amount of \$7,000.00 for the City of Santa Rosa, \$2,400.00 for the City of Petaluma (both towards GIS software), \$63,834.00 for the County of Sonoma, \$17,743.00 for the City of Rohnert Park, \$10,649.00 for the Town of Windsor, \$4,895.00 for the City of Healdsburg, \$4,111.00 for the City of Sonoma, \$3,445.00 for the City of Cloverdale, \$3,258.00 for the City of Sebastopol, and \$3,067 for the City of Cotati. This would allow for \$100,000.00 for the consultant and

for all jurisdictions participating in funding of the \$20,000.00 for GIS software. Ms. Kelly seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Adjourn/ACTION:

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nina Donofrio