

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

June 14, 2006
2:00 PM



ROOM 324A, RUG ROOM
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Al Boro, Vice-Chair, City of San Rafael
Peter Breen, Town of San Anselmo
Alice Fredericks, Town of Tiburon
Steve Kinsey, Chair, Transportation Authority of Marin
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commissioner Members Absent: Joan Lundstrom, City of Larkspur
Lew Tremaine, Town of Fairfax

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director
David Chan, Programming Manager
Denise Merleno, Recording Secretary

Staff Members Absent: Dianne Steinhauser, TAM Executive Director

Other Commissioners Present: Carol Dillon-Knutson, City of Novato
Barbara Heller, Alternate, City of San Rafael

Chair Steve Kinsey called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Chair's Report

Chair Kinsey began the meeting by stating that he is a member of the Greenbrae Corridor Subcommittee which met earlier this week and the issue of expanding the analysis to the 101/580 interchange was raised. It was agreed that the information discussed might be relevant, but it is understood that the subcommittee is not thinking of expanding the project. While the RFP allows the project study area to extend beyond what was originally defined, Chair Kinsey clarified that there should be no implication that there is an additional project involved.

Chair Kinsey cited the article in the June 14 issue of the Marin Independent Journal regarding the branding of our new transit system.

2. Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Boro stated that, from a discussion he had with his city manager, there is a forced march taking place with the Transit District, that they're going to be "on their own", and he believes that a

discussion needs to take place before this occurs. Further, he stated that his city is not interested in going into the transit business, and then, ultimately, have the responsibility of funding it.

Commissioner Murray said that, as a member of all the organizations involved in this discussion, she is not aware of any plan indicating that the decision has been made.

Commissioner Kinsey reiterated that the transit district has a five-year agreement with Golden Gate to provide services, is committed to that agreement, and that there is no plan to separate itself from that. He added that ADA accessibility at bus stops is a big issue and there needs to be a collaborative effort to solve it. As to the issue of staffing, he said that the decision was made to hire a full-time transit manager, and that the county has budgeted for the hiring of other personnel as well. However, the transit manager is the only position currently in an active recruitment process. He concluded the item by saying that there are many issues we need to discuss, and the best way to approach this is by inviting MCTD to this forum to talk with us regarding our concerns and to answer questions we may have on the issue.

3. Executive Director's Report

In Dianne Steinhauser's absence, Craig Tackabery introduced David Chan, TAM's new programming manager whose first day with TAM was Monday, June 12. He was employed, previously, for 11 years by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

4. Approval of Minutes from May 10, 2006 Meeting

The minutes from May 10, 2006 were approved without revision.

5. 101 Corridor Projects Update (Discussion)

Connie Preston, of Vali Cooper updated the group on the 101 Corridor Projects. She began by stating that the work on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. as part of Segment 2 – the Corte Madera Creek segment – is in its final stages. There is some paving that needs to be fixed on the main line and that work should be completed by the end of June and striping can be done two weeks after that. All work is scheduled for completion by mid-July. In Segment 3, Central San Rafael, work is in progress. There have been no major problems to date and all work is on schedule. Caltrans produced a website for this project, and TAM's website will contain a link to it in the next day or two. Caltrans is writing a weekly report summarizing work for the upcoming week and it will outline all the upcoming detours and lane closures. This report will be sent to property owners and appropriate agencies as well as posted on the website.

Commissioner Murray commented that she spoke with Mike Ghilotti who has been working with a Caltrans employee to conduct value engineering on the interim bridges.

Ms. Preston confirmed that Caltrans is looking at a proposal to change the way the 101/580 flyover is constructed which would result in faster completion at a reduced cost. She added that she hopes to have more information on this matter next month.

Ms. Preston stated that, regarding Segment 4, the 95% submittal for the multi-use path has been sent to CalTrans. The final drawings are still being worked on and comments from Caltrans are being

incorporated for submission by the end of June. Construction is tentatively scheduled for January 2007.

Chair Kinsey asked Ms. Preston to explain the connection between the Bike/ped facility and the need for an agreement to go out to bid. She responded by saying that TAM has a cooperative agreement with CalTrans which will be in the June 22 board packet, but a condition of that agreement is that a maintenance agreement be in place by the time construction begins.

Chair Kinsey closed this item by saying that the Gap Closure Committee met today and is looking at a number of details that could improve the aesthetics along East Francisco Blvd., such as tearing down some nearby cyclone fencing. Lastly, they are looking at the possibility of improving the northbound merge from 580 to 101.

6. Bike/Pedestrian Path Maintenance (Action)

Mr. Tackabery stated that this item was discussed at the last meeting of this committee but that this report flushes out some of the items.

The first policy item for consideration is whether the Alta contract should be amended to include a detailed inventory of what is needed to maintain the existing paths, funds needed for resurfacing, and the condition of the bridges. Alta has estimated this to be approximately \$25,000.

The second policy item is whether this committee would recommend amending the budget to include funds for an adopt-a-path coordinator for one year. Carryover funds exist for next year.

The third policy item identifies that this funding, approximately \$100,000, is not available in year 2. One of the options is to ask the cities and the county to increase their contributions.

The fourth policy item involves TAM taking over the programming of TDA funds and asks the committee to consider a policy to encourage major maintenance projects to be funded "off the top."

The fifth policy item asks if the committee would like TAM staff to pursue flexibility with the regional bike funds we receive from MTC.

The last policy asks the committee to consider whether it would like an element of the Strategic Plan to address that interest may be used for up to a 50% match for local jurisdictions for Bike/ped path maintenance. This would be for projects along the North/South Greenway funded, fully or in part, by Measure A funds. Because the interest amount will fluctuate there will never be a set dollar amount that is available for cities to rely upon.

Chair Kinsey opened up the item for discussion.

Commissioner Murray asked the group to remember that once TAM learns that an unsafe situation exists, it becomes TAM's responsibility to ensure that the situation is remedied. Further, she stated that costs for items such as landscaping, and the type of construction materials used, need to be taken into consideration when funding maintenance.

Commissioner Fredericks suggested that this process is moving too quickly to allow for city managers to provide input. She added that a process needs to be formalized for cities to apply for the pool of funds that is accumulated from the interest.

Carol Dillon-Knutson agreed with Commissioner Murray regarding the issue of liability falling to the city for poorly-maintained paths. She concluded by saying that she would like employees of the cities' public works departments to provide guidance on this issue.

Commissioner Kinsey responded that Ms. Steinhauser has met with DPW staff on this but would advise her that committee members want additional collaboration to create a level of comfort for all parties.

In response to a question from Commissioner Breen, Chair Kinsey responded that this discussion item applies only to the paths along the Greenway. He stated, further, that in looking at Bike/ped issues, there are existing facilities and new facilities on the Greenway. Also, there will be new facilities that are constructed as part of major roads or as part of local infrastructure. These are decisions that individual cities will make. The policy inventories the Greenway, but in terms of eligibility for recouping costs down the road, if Measure A funds are used to construct bike facilities, then cities are eligible to ask for up to 50% of maintenance costs for that segment of the path, if the money is available.

Commissioner Boro suggested that this item be examined further so that the end result is not one where we have beautiful looking paths but not so beautiful roads. Commissioner Murray added that Measure A money will last for a specific period of time and that TAM will have to continue to shoulder the responsibility for maintenance after that money is gone.

In response to a question posed by Commissioner Breen, Mr. Tackabery responded that the \$25,000 increase in the Alta Contract covers the cost of the assessment of the north/south greenway.

Chair Kinsey opened the discussion to the public, and Eric Andersen of the Marin County Bike Coalition said that his discussions with Ms. Steinhauser have centered, for the most part, on the North/South Greenway and future challenges that could arise with this specific facility. He recommended that TAM allows the 50% match for any project funded/built by TAM rather than just Measure A funds; otherwise the only project it will apply to is the one in San Rafael.

Barbara Heller of the City of San Rafael asked if each of the bike/ped pathways is available to pedestrians. She suggested that pedestrians will not use the paths when they're placed in the streets. Commissioner Kinsey confirmed that the Greenway is a bike/ped path and has been designed for both types of users.

Andy Preston of the City of San Rafael stated that he would like to see city public works directors involved in the design of future paths. Additionally, he said that the City of San Rafael has a volunteer coordinator and that he would use that volunteer to help solicit other volunteers to help maintain the pathways rather than have TAM hire additional staff. Lastly, he suggested that he believed it is not allowable to do routine maintenance using Measure A local funds.

Commissioner Kinsey summarized this item by acknowledging that, while this group was not able to resolve the issues raised during this meeting, it was prepared to recommend that the interest earned on the account from the strategy be reserved and available for Greenway routine maintenance on a shared basis in an amount of up to 50%. Commissioner Murray motioned for approval and Commissioner Breen seconded the motion.

7. Measure A Allocation Process (Discussion)

Trudy Presser reported that TAM is on schedule to adopt its Strategic Plan and after which it will proceed with allocations from the Measure A fund. The process will begin in June and the first allocation will be to the Marin County Transit District (MCTD) for the 2006-07 fiscal year with additional allocations scheduled for the coming months. She explained that there are two types of allocations.

The first is an allocation that is done for TAM administered activities – expenses, TAM administered contracts and funding agreements. This would be covered under the budget adoption process taking place at the TAM meeting of June 22, 2006.

The second process would cover allocations to other jurisdictions. It will be an individual process whereby a resolution would need to be adopted by the board to allocate the funds to these jurisdictions. An allocation request form would be submitted, and TAM would pass a resolution to allocate the funds. A funding agreement would be issued to the jurisdiction, and the Executive Director would have the authority to execute the agreement.

Commissioner Murray suggested that, in the interest of fairness, this process be formalized with deadlines so that all applications are looked at in context. Additionally, she suggested that this process be conducted no more than twice a year in order to utilize staff time in the most efficient manner. Responding to a question from Commissioner Murray about the presence of a carryover provision in case the jurisdiction doesn't use all its funds, Ms. Presser said that jurisdictions must agree to expend the funds it receives. Mr. Tackabery added that TAM will be made aware if monies aren't being used through the reporting that jurisdictions are required to submit to TAM.

8. Strategy 4, Crossing Guard Program – Implementation Policies

Commissioner Kinsey reported that this item was carried forward from the May meeting. He pointed out that the final paragraph in the report answers the question that was raised last month and states that "...the proposed contractor would be will be recruiting crossing guard staff from existing crossing guard volunteers and employees."

9. Open Time for Public Expression

There was no further public comment.

Chair Kinsey adjourned the Executive TAM meeting a 3:35p.m.