

I. Amending/Updating The Regional Bike Network (RBN) Project List

Staff introduced the topic of changing the criteria for project inclusion in the RBN because the CMAs have asked for “flexibility” in what they submit.

However, because MTC has already approved the network, the staff proposal for the next phase of project revision is, if jurisdictions wish to change the project descriptions, to have each jurisdiction keep an equivalent mileage and dollar amount.

Comment that this may penalize jurisdictions that have aggressively built out their bike networks

Staff noted that they have already made a big case to MTC management for the current allocations AND that MTC management is eager to build out the full network. Therefore MTC management does NOT want to institute a major revision/re-allocation of the network at this time.

The question was posed that, given the current allocations, did any jurisdiction have projects within the next four years? Discussion followed exploring the possibility of new projects that MAY come up in the next four years

Staff led further discussion of how cost/mileage calculations may occur and summarized the sense of the meeting thus: keep the cost allocations constant but allow jurisdictions to swap projects within those constraints

Request from Bay Trail to eliminate the reference to “spine and connectors”

Relative to revision of *criteria* for inclusion in the network, consensus was to put this off until the next RTP update.

Request each CMA for projections, cleared through local Bike Advisory Committees

Discussion of swapping projects

Staff summarized:

- need to make sure that swaps are reviewed locally and to ensure that previously approved projects are completed, especially if regional funds remain involved and if tied to STP CMAQ.
- Staff will summarize BAC comments and submit to MTC management

Discussion of Routine Accommodation checklist and issues involved in applying it to projects.

- RBWG members were requested to make suggestions on revising the checklist.
- Sonoma and BABC express a desire for routine accommodation to have more visibility and impact
- It was noted that CMA's need to maintain project checklists and make them available to local Advisory committees. CMA's are also responsible to have project sponsors respond to the checklist
- One suggestion for improvement of the checklist was to revise and rename it a "complete streets" checklist

STP/CMAQ/TE Call for Projects and ARRA-TE Backfill

Staff reported that the next STP/CMAQ call for projects is expected to coincide with the passage of a continuing resolution of the current transportation bill funding authorization, anticipated this fall.

Committee members reported on discussion of the matter at the Partnership Committee at which proposed future funding categories were discussed but not agreed upon due to lack of substantive financial information but which did discuss imposing geographic equity for bike/ped projects.

MTC Staff reported on proposed STP/CMAQ and ARRA-TE backfill for the Regional Bike Program:

- ARRA Backfill: \$8M
- STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 \$14M (fy '09-'10,'10-'11 and '11-'12)
- STP/CMAQ Cycle 2 \$21M (fy '12-'13,'13-'14 and '14-'15)

Regional Bike/Pedestrian Count Project

Staff reported on plan to conduct counts at 100 locations twice a year using a new standardized methodology. MTC would like to do this using a portion of the TDA-3 funds, pro-rated by jurisdiction.

Discussion of distribution of count locations

Discussion of potential to use CMAQ

Agreement that CMA's would review locations

Discussion of how data would be used – NOT for funding allocations

Suggestion made: to not only do *counts* but also gather additional information characterizing each count location such as associated land use character and evaluation of the bike facility