



TOWN OF TIBURON
Tiburon Town Hall
1505 Tiburon Boulevard
Tiburon, CA 94920

TIBURON TOWN COUNCIL

October 5, 2016

Regular Meeting - 7:30 p.m

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Councilmember Doyle, Councilmember Fredericks, Councilmember O'Donnell, Vice Mayor Fraser, Mayor Tollini

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Persons wishing to address the Town Council on subjects not on the agenda may do so at this time. Please note however, that the Town Council is not able to undertake extended discussion or action on items not on the agenda. Matters requiring action will be referred to the appropriate Commission, Board, Committee or staff for consideration or placed on a future Town Council meeting agenda. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

AI-1. Update On Capital Project Planning Process

Subcommittee recommendation on criteria for project ranking.

Documents:

[AI-1 STAFF REPORT.PDF](#)

TOWN COUNCIL REPORTS

TOWN MANAGER REPORT

WEEKLY DIGESTS

ADJOURNMENT

GENERAL PUBLIC INFORMATION

ASSISTANCE FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Town Clerk at (415) 435-7377. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

Copies of all agenda reports and supporting data are available for viewing and inspection at Town Hall and at the Belvedere-Tiburon Library located adjacent to Town Hall. Agendas and minutes are posted on the Town's website, www.ci.tiburon.ca.us.

Upon request, the Town will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least 5 days before the meeting. Requests should be sent to the Office of the Town Clerk at the above address.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings provide the general public and interested parties an opportunity to provide testimony on these items. If you challenge any proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing(s) described later in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Town Council at, or prior to, the Public Hearing(s).

TIMING OF ITEMS ON AGENDA

While the Town Council attempts to hear all items in order as stated on the agenda, it reserves the right to take items out of order. No set times are assigned to items appearing on the Town Council agenda.



TOWN OF TIBURON
1505 Tiburon Boulevard
Tiburon, CA 94920

Town Council Meeting
October 5, 2016
Agenda Item:

AI-1

STAFF REPORT

To: Mayor and Members of the Town Council
From: Office of the Director of Public Works
Subject: Discussion of CIP Prioritization
Reviewed By: 

BACKGROUND

At the Town Council/Staff Retreat on April 1, 2016, staff presented a proposed framework for capital project planning that would provide for a systematic approach to the planning, budgeting and financing of capital projects. It consists of the following steps:

- Development of a Project Portfolio
- Ranking of projects within the portfolio based on a set of established criteria
- Approval of prioritized Project Portfolio and integration into annual budget process
- Review and adjustments to Project Portfolio on annual basis and/or as new projects are identified

Council indicated its interest in pursuing development of this planning process for its obvious benefit as a tool for budgeting, as well as to make the process more open and accountable. Council also supported the formation of a Council ad hoc committee to assist staff in developing this planning tool.

At the July 20, 2016 Council meeting, Council appointed Mayor Tollini and Councilmember Fredericks to serve on an ad hoc Committee to establish the criteria for ranking proposed projects.

Staff had previously reached out to other jurisdictions and asked if they had a prioritization methodology. The County has a prioritization methodology and seems to use their method with the greatest success. The County's methodology includes 8 criteria, weighted, each of which can be scored between 1 and 5 or 6.

San Rafael and Sausalito have methodologies based on the County's. San Rafael's is a simplified version of the County's method and includes no weighting. Staff's opinion is that it did not properly differentiate priorities. Sausalito indicated their methodology is not differentiating in a way that helps their Council.

Staff did look beyond Marin County for other CIP ranking methodologies, but believes the County's combines both simplicity and useful criteria that effectively differentiates between projects.

ANALYSIS

Staff met with the ad hoc Committee and presented the County's methodology as a draft. Criteria were changed, new weights were established and scoring changed to reflect the needs of the Town. Staff presented the new methodology back to the ad hoc Committee, and further refinements occurred via e-mail. This resulted in the proposed methodology detailed in **Exhibit 1**.

We have provided a blank scoring sheet template for Council review as **Exhibit 2**

Staff selected 24 projects for a trial run using the methodology and had scoring done by five staff members without consultation or descriptions of the projects. There was approximately 75% agreement on what projects belonged in the top third the middle third and the bottom third. Relying on the three staff members with the best knowledge of the Town and individual projects increased this slightly. We have provided a ranking sheet for these 24 projects showing the rank by the based on the average (mean) scores provided by staff. We have included the rank based on the median scores as well for comparison. Comparison of the mean rank and the median rank shows where there was some disagreement in the scoring. The summary data from staff's 'trial' run as **Exhibit 3**.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Town Council:

1. Receive the Staff Report
2. Discuss and finalize the ranking criteria
3. Direct Staff regarding next steps in this planning process

Exhibits: 1. CIP Ranking Criteria
 2. Blank Scoring sheet
 3. Staff trial run ranking of 24 projects

Prepared by: Patrick Barnes

Proposed Criteria Guide for CIP Rating
October 5, 2016

- a. Meets General Plan Policy (3)**
 0 – Meets no policies
 1 – Meets one policy
 2 – Meets two policies
 3 – Meets over two policies
- b. Required by Legal Mandate (3)**
 0 – No legal mandate
 1 – Yes, specific Mandate with a specified timeframe
 2 – Yes, more than 1 mandate with a specified timeframe
 3 – Yes, officially noted to be in violation of a Mandate
- c. Avoid Consequences of Deferred Maintenance (2)**
 0 – No additional cost or consequence of deferred maintenance
 1 – Will cost more to fix if delayed.
 2 – Problem within 5 years
 3 – Problem within 1 year
 4 – Problem current or imminent
- d. Dedicated or Non-GF source of funding available (1)**
 0 – Only funding is unallocated GF
 1 – Allocated GF available
 2 – Other Town Funding available
 3 – Federal Grant funding with match
 4 – Non Federal Grant Funded with match
 5 – Wholly grant funded
- e. Effect of Project on Operating Costs (Energy, Water, etc.) (1)**
 0 – No savings or increases operating costs
 1 – Small saving expected (less than 5% of project costs annually)
 2 – Yes, moderate saving expected (at least 5% of project costs annually)
 3 – Yes, significant saving expected (more than 10% of project costs annually)
- f. Removes/Reduces Threats to Health & Safety (4)**
 0 – Unlikely to be a danger
 1 – Problem within 10 years
 2 – Problem within 5 years
 3 – Problem within 1 or 2 years
 4 – Imminent danger
 5 – Is currently a threat to Health & Safety
- g. Large Functional Benefit to Residents (2)**
 0 – Minimal Functional Benefit
 1 - Few users – Minor Benefit to Residents
 2 – Moderate number of users – Benefit to Residents
 3 – Significant benefit to Residents
- h. Large Aesthetic Benefit to Residents (1)**
 0 – No aesthetic benefit
 1 – Minor aesthetic benefit
 2 – Some Aesthetic Benefit
 3 – Great Aesthetic Value but project purpose is not Aesthetics
 4 – Large aesthetic benefit; item's primary purpose is aesthetic (e.g. landmark building, sculpture)

Draft Project Scoring Template

October 5, 2016

| Score | Project | Funding | Project Cost | Unallocated General Fund | Meets General Plan Policy | Required by legal mandate | Avoid consequences of Deferred maintenance | Dedicated or Non-GF source of funding available | Effect of project on operating costs | Removes Threats to Health and safety | Large functional benefit to Town residents | Large aesthetic benefit to Town residents |
|-------|---|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 0 | Sidewalk Repairs Program (ADA) | Gas Tax/GF | 20,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Pot Hole Repair Program | Imp Fees/Gas Tax/GF | 45,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Open Space Management Program | Measure A Parks/GF | 53,000 | 25,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Storm Drain Improvements Program | GF | 250,000 | 250,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Ferry Terminal ADA upgrades | GF | 70,000 | 70,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Railroad Marsh Vegetation Removal | GF | 45,000 | 45,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Street Overlay/Rehab | Imp Fees/Gas Tax/GF | 1,500,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Elephant Rock Walkway Upgrade | GF | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Hawthorne Undergrounding-Resurfacing | Imp Fees/Gas Tax/GF | 470,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | PW Corporation Yard | GF | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | McKegney Green | Public (GF)/Private | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Mar West Roundabout/Signal | Imp Fees/Gas Tax/GF | 400,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Town Hall HVAC Replacement | GF | 290,000 | 290,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Hawthorne Undergrounding-General Benefit | GF | 900,000 | 900,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Traffic Calming Program | Imp Fees/Gas Tax/GF | 20,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Sidewalk Construction 1 (Mar West to Lyford) | Gas Tax/GF | 730,000 | 730,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Sidewalk Construction 2 (Gilmartin to San Rafael) | Gas Tax/GF | 700,000 | 700,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Lyford Parking Lot Stair Construction | Gas Tax/GF | 100,000 | 100,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Parking facility acquisition | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Residence parking pass program | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Relinquishment Cost Benefit/PSSR | | 133,000 | 133,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Hacienda Ridge Trail Access | GF | 125,000 | 125,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Kayak Put -In | GF | 500,000 | 500,000 | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 2020 Paradise Drive Retaining Wall Stabilization | Imp Fees/Gas Tax/GF | 140,000 | 140,000 | | | | | | | | |

Staff Ranking Summary Data

Exhibit # 3

Trial Run

October 5, 2016

| Project | Mean | Median |
|---|------|--------|
| Street Overlay/Rehab | 1 | 1 |
| Storm Drain Improvements Program | 2 | 3 |
| Pot Hole Repair Program | 3 | 2 |
| McKegney Green | 4 | 4 |
| Sidewalk Repairs Program (ADA) | 5 | 7 |
| Open Space Management Program | 6 | 6 |
| Ferry Terminal ADA upgrades | 7 | 5 |
| PW Corporation Yard | 8 | 10 |
| Traffic Calming Program | 9 | 13 |
| Elephant Rock Walkway Upgrade | 10 | 8 |
| Hawthorne Undergrounding-Resurfacing | 11 | 11 |
| Sidewalk Construction 2 (Gilmartin to San Rafael) | 12 | 16 |
| Railroad Marsh Vegetation Removal | 13 | 9 |
| 2020 Paradise Drive Retaining Wall Stabilization | 14 | 23 |
| Mar West Roundabout/Signal | 15 | 12 |
| Sidewalk Construction 1 (Mar West to Lyford) | 16 | 17 |
| Town Hall HVAC Replacement | 17 | 18 |
| Hawthorne Undergrounding-General Benefit | 18 | 19 |
| Hacienda Ridge Trail Access | 19 | 20 |
| Lyford Parking Lot Stair Construction | 20 | 21 |
| Kayak Put -In | 21 | 22 |
| Parking facility acquisition | 22 | 14 |
| Residence parking pass program | 23 | 15 |
| Relinquishment Cost Benefit/PSSR | 24 | 24 |