

DRAFT – Includes Sean Charles Comments
Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group
Meeting summary 6-15-05

The meeting held at the Marin Humane Society conference room was convened at 3:42pm.

In Attendance: PAG members Mike Kerns, Cynthia Murray, Pat Eklund, Bernie Meyers, David Glass, Peter Breen, Mike Healy

Caltrans: Project Manager Ray Akkawi, Design Engineer Sean Charles, James Triantfyllou, Project Engineer, Bryan Walker.

Key Staff members attending included Suzanne Wilford, SCTA, and Craig Tackabery, TAM.

Approximately 15 other staff, consultants and members of the public were in attendance.

Agenda item #1: Project Update

Project Manager Ray Akkawi presented a brief project update and stated Caltrans' desire for internal circulation of the environmental document to begin Nov. 1, 2005. All needed reports are being finalized. The visual impact assessment is to be completed at the end of June 2005.

Caltrans is working with Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) and Sonoma County Transportation Agency (SCTA) on a Memorandum of Understanding for the project, which is currently in draft form. Map display events for the project will be held June 15, 2005 in Novato and June 16, 2005 in Petaluma.

Agenda item #2: Interchange evaluation report and discussion

A binder containing information on the access alternatives was given to PAG and staff, and Design Engineer Sean Charles presented the results of the evaluation of access alternatives for segment B of the MSN Project. The process, evaluations, findings, and sensitivity analysis were described, and the results of the analysis were described. (The content of the presentation is available in separate documents from this summary.)

PAG member Meyers asked if analysis matrix in use is the same (a standard) used by Caltrans for other projects. Sean Charles replied that basics of evaluation are the same but each project has different considerations. Various questions were asked about numeric rankings used in evaluation. Sean Charles explained how numeric scores were derived. PAG member Breen asked if PAG needed to have the level of detail being offered. Sean Charles suggested moving on to findings if PAG has faith in evaluation process that they had previously reviewed – PAG agreed. Further questions from the PAG were asked and answered to understand the results of analysis. Sean Charles stated that the four top interchange alternatives will be commented on at map displays and the process will continue into the environmental document phase, with preferred alternatives to be defined at the end of the process. PAG member Meyers asked if build out potential is factored into the selection of interchange alternatives. Sean Charles stated that analysis by consultant planners indicates no significant difference between the four top interchange alternatives in terms of growth inducement. Suzanne Wilford (SCTA) pointed out that adopted land use plans and travel models already conducted are used in environmental

document development so there should be no new documents or data employed to analyze growth inducement.

PAG Chair Cynthia Murray asked for walk through of Alt 12b which was provided by Sean Charles, detailing new access roads in the project for existing parcels that currently have driveway access from Highway 101. Sean Charles pointed out in answer to a question that there are no continuous access roads in any alternatives, as requested by the PAG earlier in design. PAG member Healy and Chair Murray pointed out need to consider access for local emergency responders in study of each alternative. Mr. Healy asked if purchasing certain isolated parcels at the end of cul de sacs may be more cost effective than providing access roads. Sean Charles stated that evaluation of that option will continue, but access roads/bike routes will also be used as utility corridors.

PAG members pointed out that the emergency responders in their communities need to have keys to the gates at Redwood Landfill. Sean Charles described various flooding, ROW and other issues in alternative 12b and responded to cost question by saying full cost analysis is not complete.

Chair Murray took questions from public on alternative 12b.

1. Are Indian tribes acquiring properties along project corridor? Consider limiting access if those acquisitions are happening. PAG responded that they were unaware of any current acquisition activities.
2. How would potential Scenic highway designation be impacted by aspects of this MSN project? Sean Charles stated scenic highway designation is not addressed, but the scenic nature of the project area is included in evaluation. Also, an aesthetics subcommittee is beginning to function and will look at scenic highway issues.
3. Where are the bikeways? Bikeways were pointed out on Alternative Mapping.
4. Will elevation of Pet River be impacted? No.

PM Akkawi offered for Sean Charles to discuss the sensitivity analysis summary.

Mr. Charles summarized a chart showing the same 4 alternatives as top ranked in the categories of access, Right of Way, environmental impact, and cost. The Sensitivity Analysis Summary shows that the criteria contained appropriate weighting. PM Akkawi asked for PAG members to approve carrying forward the 4 top ranked alternatives with no further study on other alternatives unless new information comes forward at a later time from the public. The PAG voted unanimously to carry forward only the 4 top alternatives.

Next PAG meeting

The next PAG meeting is scheduled for September 21, 2005, at a location to be determined in Novato. Chair Murray adjourned meeting at 5pm. **PLEASE NOTE THE DATE OF THE NEXT PAG MEETING HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 24, 2005 AT 4:00 PM AT THE PETALUMA COMMUNITY CENTER.**

Summary prepared by Barry Martin, CirclePoint
June 16, 2005