

TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Tollini called the regular meeting of the Tiburon Town Council to order at 7:30 p.m. on Wednesday, October 5, 2016, in Town Council Chambers, 1505 Tiburon Boulevard, Tiburon, California.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: Doyle, Fraser, Fredericks, O'Donnell, Tollini

PRESENT: EX OFFICIO: Town Manager
Chanis, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer
Barnes, Town Clerk Crane Iacopi

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Pamela McConnell-Douglas referenced the correspondence she had sent to the Council in the Digest, and asked if they had received it. She reviewed the information; her background and life in Marin; her education and experience as a paralegal and model. Nevertheless, she said she was unable to find work and asked why no one would give her a job. She spoke about the impact of this, on her human dignity. She asked the Council if it could help.

Ms. McConnell also said a number of individuals in town were harassing her. She said she could not understand this because all she sought was peace. Her husband, Steven Douglas, also spoke, and expressed his sentiment in one phrase, "Peace on Earth".

ACTION ITEMS

1. Update on Capital Project Planning Process – subcommittee recommendation on criteria for project ranking.

Town Manager Chanis said the Council had discussed the topic of capital project planning and prioritization at the Town Council/Staff Retreat on April 1, 2016, and again on July 20, 2016, when it appointed a subcommittee to develop criteria for project ranking. He said Mayor Tollini and Councilmember Fredericks were appointed to this committee.

The Town Manager said the subcommittee decided to use the County of Marin's criteria as a basis for its own recommendations. He also said staff had looked beyond Marin County for other CIP ranking methodologies, but believes the County's combines both simplicity and useful criteria that effectively differentiates between projects.

Town Manager Chanis said the questions for the Council, in reviewing the committee's recommendations, were: Are these the right criteria, the right weightings, and the right rankings. In his powerpoint presentation, Town Manager Chanis reviewed these three areas and asked for feedback. The subcommittee members also commented on the process and how they arrived at the findings.

Chanis said the County's methodology includes eight criteria, weighted, each of which can be scored between 1 and 5 or 6. He said the subcommittee developed eight criteria with rankings primarily between 0 and 4. He presented the following list, as Exhibit 1 to the staff report:

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)

Vice Mayor Fraser said it seemed like a lot of criteria to consider. Mayor Tollini said that the number of criteria did seem like a lot but after considering it, she said it was likely that staff would use the top four or five criteria to present project information to the Council, while the Council would most likely focus on the bottom three criteria (aesthetic benefit to residents, functional benefit to residents, and health and safety).

Vice Mayor Fraser commented that two criteria stood out for him – functionality and aesthetics – and he wondered how the Council could weigh these on behalf of the residents. He suggested that there be public outreach on these two points, especially as the Town’s demographic continues to change.

Mayor Tollini said the subcommittee hoped for public participation when they undertook this task.

Town Manager Chanis said that transparency is what this process is all about. He acknowledged that aesthetics are in the eye of the beholder, so it would warrant discussion, while function could be something as beneficial as properly maintained storm drains. Director of Public Works Barnes said another way to look at it might be to take into account how many people would be affected by a particular project.

Councilmember Fredericks said the Town’s “General Plan is our biggest, longest view of the Town of Tiburon.” Town Manager Chanis commented that the plan also “makes suggestions on things we should and should not do”. Fredericks said this would not preclude any discussion of projects the public is passionate about.

Town Manager Chanis said the prioritization process is a tool that gives us a framework, and should be treated as a guide rather than a hard and fast rule. Fredericks agreed that it is a wise way to do planning and also prepare for opportunities to present themselves.

On the subject of planning, Councilmember Fredericks asked whether there might be an opportunity to address Sea Level Rise or climate change within this framework. For instance, to take into account projects near the water that might be affected. Fredericks said it would show

the Town's readiness to incorporate this information into its criteria. She asked whether this had been addressed yet in the General Plan.

Town Manager Chanis said the County was taking the lead on a draft report on Sea Level Rise and was in the process of developing a predictive model.

Councilmember O'Donnell asked about the ranking of projects; for instance, could the Council decide to fund a project rated 2.5 versus a 4.5 project. Town Manager Chanis said, absolutely, Council had the discretion to do so. He reiterated that the prioritization process was meant to be used as a planning tool and as a guide; not to "box" in the Council, and to help balance resources with projects.

O'Donnell used an example of when the Town receives matching funds, and said that could be the trigger to move forward with a project. He said grants were often time sensitive. Fredericks concurred and agreed that would be the time to move a project up the ranking ladder.

Mayor Tollini talked about, as an example, whether the Town would spend a million dollars on a project ranked high in order to meet a "legal" criterion. Chanis said a good example of this was the need to upgrade the ferry landing to meet new accessibility standards. He said no one had this on their radar and yet, it just recently surfaced. But again, he said the prioritization process was the beginning, not the end of the discussion on capital projects.

Councilmember O'Donnell said he liked the criteria, and as presented, made perfect sense. He said the [1-4] ranking system was excellent, as well.

Vice Mayor Fraser said he was still thinking about the process. He said that projects arise, sometimes unexpectedly. The Yellow Bus Challenge is an example of this. He said they are still important projects.

Councilmember Doyle asked whether there was a computer program that might do all the calculations. But he said all the work that had been done on this program was great. He said a "common sense" approach was good but the Council needed something like this, as well.

Councilmember Fredericks said she was comfortable with the program but wanted the Council to go through a cycle of ranking. Mayor Tollini said that the Council should "play with it" to see if it works well and to make changes if it does not.

The Council went on to discuss the "weighting" of projects.

Fredericks wondered whether a project might be weighted on the basis that it meets a General Plan policy. After some discussion, Town Manager Chanis said a column might be added to the project list to reflect this, rather than using it as a ranking tool.

Fredericks also suggested that where legal mandates were concerned, a timeframe on how long the Town had to meet them might be useful in determining weight. Mayor Tollini cautioned that this weighting might change the scoring criteria; that it was a different concept if tied to timing.

Vice Mayor Fraser also said grant funding may not necessarily weight a project to a higher priority. He said there are still “nice to have” versus “need to have” projects, after all.

Councilmember Doyle commented that all the criteria seemed to be resident-based. He asked whether there might be criteria for projects that enhance the Town for non-residents, and residents.

Councilmember Fredericks suggested that this could be classified as an economic benefit to the Town, for instance. She said it might be added as a General Plan criterion as residents/local-serving commercial enterprises, or business enterprises.

Town Manager Chanis said the County uses the terms, “users” or “public”, rather than “residents”. But he said staff had not seen criteria and how to quantify these definitions.

In summing up the discussion, Director Barnes said he heard that Council wanted to add a column on the ranking sheets about whether the project complies with General Plan Policy and to add a criterion for commercial benefit. He said he heard that climate change criteria would be left off, for now.

Town Manager Chanis said he heard that there was general consensus to move forward and finalize the criteria and weighting, and to develop a project portfolio and project sheets to bring to the Council.

Chanis said that left the question of ranking and the best way to do it. He said there were several options--for staff/council to rank projects together, for staff to rank them, for staff to rank some and Council others, or perhaps other ideas.

He said typically the way these programs work is for staff and Council representatives to work together, for instance in a Council subcommittee, and then go to full Council with recommendations. He said he did not require an answer to this question tonight.

O'Donnell said to avoid a ranking bias, and because the Council is elected to be the overseers of this process, he would prefer to discuss the projects in an open forum, such as the Town Council/staff retreat, and following the retreat, rank projects with staff and a subcommittee. Councilmember Fredericks said that before Council can rank projects, it needs technical and cost information. The Town Manager said that's what the project sheets would be used for; that they provide a summary of this information.

Councilmember Fredericks said she also would prefer that staff rank projects and bring them to the Council for review. The Mayor said she thought the Council members should rank projects individually and then discuss them in an open meeting.

Councilmember O'Donnell asked where the projects would originate. Fredericks asked if this would be at the retreat, or before. Town Manager Chanis said it would be helpful to have them before the retreat. Vice Mayor Fraser suggested that the Council work on projects in January

and February, prior to the March retreat; and that these projects be brought to the retreat by the staff, already ranked.

Mayor Tollini said commencement of work on the project sheets should occur as soon as possible. Town Manager Chanis said staff could come back to Council with these in a couple of months, and then the retreat would be the culmination of the process.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Doyle said that there were signs denoting “public shore” in Tiburon but he wondered how to make it accessible to people. He said it was possible the Town already had beach and water access through public shore access. Town Manager Chanis said he would look into this further.

TOWN MANAGER REPORT

Town Manager Chanis said he would be out of the office on vacation from October 13 until October 24, 2016.

WEEKLY DIGESTS

- Town Council Weekly Digests – September 23 & 30, 2016

Received.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon, Mayor Tollini adjourned the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

_____/s/_____
ERIN TOLLINI, MAYOR

ATTEST:

_____/s/_____
DIANE CRANE IACOPI, TOWN CLERK