
PUBLIC WORKS OBJECTIVE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

STAKEHOLDER MEETING 1 (ENGINEERS) SUMMARY AND ACTION ITEMS

May 5, 2026
2:30 – 3:30 pm

Participants:	Bob Brown	Sustainable Community Planning
	Cecilia Kim	Opticos Design
	Anjulie Palta	Toole Design
	Amalia Leighton Cody	Toole Design
	Colin Roberts	Toole Design
	Rich Souza	CSWST2
	Robert Stevens	CSWST2
	Geoff Coleman	BKF
	Casey Talbot	Adobe Associates

The following comments were provided in response to the consultants' presentation of initial recommended street designs and minimum safety standards:

1. Main Street

- Would the proposed 10' travel lane width work with the Fire Code and with Marin Transit standards if bus service were to be provided?
- Would the on-street parking width or design shown comply with ADA parking standards?
- A question about application of PROWAG accessibility standards to private vs. public streets. It was noted that the current and intended County code requires public and private streets to be built to the same standards.

2. Residential Road

- Streets constructed with 7' parking lane widths result in complaints about sideswipes. It was noted that this standard is consistent with NACTO and used by Windsor.

- A 6' sidewalk is difficult to walk side-by-side and results in walking in the planting strip. Suggested reducing planting strip width by one foot and adding to the sidewalk width.
- Santa Rosa is looking at 34' street standards for residential areas; 30' was too narrow. Windsor uses 34' standard as well.

3. Alley

- Developers would seek to use this standard without sidewalks for lower density developments (e.g., small lot single family). It was noted that definitions will be incorporated that would not allow alleys or driveways to be used for through vehicular movements.

4. Collector

- Should consideration be given to flipping the bike lane and parking and/or allowing for a cycle track that's raised to the grade of the sidewalk? Developers like an on-street facility but Marin County cyclist community prefers off-street facilities. It was noted that the recommendations are consistent with the currently adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.
- Don't propose delineators which are expensive to maintain and a problem for street sweeping. Preference for concrete buffers or vegetated buffers.

5. Non-conforming Streets

- It was recommended that project frontages on existing non-conforming street design be allowed to extend existing improvements by require the full ROW dedication for upgraded standards. The County can always decline the dedication.

6. Minimum Safety Standards

- It was recommended that minimum safety standards for bike facilities just reference adopted state rules (not municipal code) that otherwise apply.
- It should be clearly stated what projects these minimum safety standards apply to. Not SB9 developments, etc.
- Should design speeds be related to minimum travel lane widths?
- How are Exemptions to Title 24 standards granted? By the BOS?
- In general (not necessarily related to safety standards):
 - Clearer direction on stormwater treatment and ADA requirements would help designers and County Staff
 - Guidance for intersection design should conform with ROW standards while still allowing flexibility

STAKEHOLDER MEETING 2 (DEVELOPER) SUMMARY AND ACTION ITEMS

May 6, 2026
1:00 – 2:00 pm

Participants:	Bob Brown	Sustainable Community Planning
	Cecilia Kim	Opticos Design
	Anjulie Palta	Toole Design
	Amalia Leighton Cody	Toole Design
	Colin Roberts	Toole Design
	Bruce Dorfman	Thompson-Dorfman
	Jay Luchetti	Thompson-Dorfman

The following comments were provided in response to the consultants' presentation of initial recommended street designs and minimum safety standards:

3. Main Street

- Should there be provisions of bioswales located in the portions of the parking lane?
- The minimum sidewalk width at 12' is very generous unless there is a high level of pedestrian activity, sidewalk dining, etc.
- These mixed use developments are likely to have buildings of 3+ stories. How would this cross section address the Fire Code's requirement for 26' travel lanes?
- Should sidewalk width be proportional to building heights?

4. Residential Road

- Recommended landscaping in bulb outs rather than continuous planting strips, although it was noted this would complicate drainage and tree health.
- Loch Lomond in San Rafael was offered as an example with head-in parking and no planter strip.



- A 5' sidewalk in residential areas is common, 6' is generous.
- Parking lanes are typically 8' wide.

3. Limited Residential

- Suggest 10' travel lanes, although some Fire agencies object to driving in the gutter pan.
- Suggest not showing continuous planter strip.
- Bioswales in the planting area next to a sidewalk would typically have to be bermed for safety, and the areas are usually too narrow to make it practical.

4. Alley

- The minimum width should be 24' (building face to building face) to allow for a true alley "feel" while still allowing vehicles to back up from garages.

5. Collector

- Would on-street parking be required if there was no adjacent development (thinking about a connector road to St. Vincent's developable area)?
- An 8' sidewalk is too wide.

6. Arterial (+alts), Industrial/Commercial

- No comments

7. Non-conforming Streets

- Developers primarily deal with new streets, but option 3 might be best (allow a continuation of the existing street design as above, but require ROW dedication)

8. Minimum Safety Standards

- Standards are good but they have to be practical for a project

STAKEHOLDER MEETING 3 (UTILITIES) SUMMARY AND ACTION ITEMS

May 6, 2026
2:30 – 3:30 pm

Participants:	Bob Brown	Sustainable Community Planning
	Cecilia Kim	Opticos Design
	Anjulie Palta	Toole Design
	Amalia Leighton Cody	Toole Design
	Colin Roberts	Toole Design
	Eric Anderson	Ross Valley Sanitary District
	Joseph Eischens	Marin Water
	Eric Miller	North Marin Water District
	Jasmin Diaz	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District
	Phil Benedetti	Ross Valley Sanitary District

No comments were provided in response to the consultants' presentation of initial recommended street designs and minimum safety standards.

However, participants discussed the following utility issues related to the street right-of-way:

5. Extent of repaving required for street trenching

- District representatives indicated that the cost of paving was greatly exceeding their budgets and attributed the increase in both asphalt costs and the extent of repaving necessary.
- It was recommended that the Uniform Construction Standards should be updated to be more specific on this issue, and it would be ideal if these were adopted by all Marin agencies for consistency.

6. Preference re: location of utilities

- Participants were asked if their preference was to locate new utilities in the street or in adjacent easements?
- There was agreement that it is easier to access utilities when located in the street. Roads need to be wider than 20' as a starting point to fit 10' min between edge of pipe to edge of pipe

- If a new street is being built, usually the developer works with utilities directly to confirm alignment and location.
- Biggest challenge occurs when going from one land use type to another (ie: residential with septic to commercial) that requires utility relocation.
- It was noted that about of third of utilities are on private properties without easements.