



MEETING OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
TAM

THURSDAY, MAY 25<sup>TH</sup>, 2006  
7:30 PM

ROOM 330  
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER  
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

**MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present: Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Al Boro, Vice Chair, City of San Rafael  
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisor  
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council  
Peter Breen, San Anselmo City Council  
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council  
Carole Dillon-Knutson, Novato City Council  
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council  
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council  
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council  
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax City Council

Members Absent: Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Jeanne Barr, Ross Town Council  
Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council

Staff Members Present: Dianne Steinhauser, TAM Executive Director  
Craig Tackabery, Marin DPW Assistant Director  
Art Brook, Marin DPW Transportation Engineer  
Tho Do, Marin DPW Associate Civil Engineer  
Jessica Woods, TAM Recording Secretary

*Chair Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.*

**1. Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan Public Hearing**

Chair Kinsey summarized the staff report and noted that TAM will conduct a public hearing and receive input on the Draft Strategic Plan. Also, additional written comments can be provided up until June 16, 2006. TAM staff intends to bring the final Strategic Plan to the Board for approval at the June 22, 2006 TAM meeting.

The item was opened to public input.

Deb Hubsmith, representing, MCBC, discussed the issue of pathway maintenance, which is an eligible expenditure under the Expenditure Plan for Strategy 3. She talked about the need to address this in the Strategic Plan because there is a Countywide Facility called the "North/South Greenway." SMART is including portions of the North/South Greenway maintenance in their plans, but there is no entity that has been established to maintain portions of the North/South Greenway that are not in the SMART

corridor, which is from San Rafael south. They heard that the recommendation is for local cities that are along the North/South Greenway to pick up the cost for maintenance of those facilities and they do not feel this is an appropriate solution. By asking the local cities to pick up the cost for multi jurisdictional facilities, what could happen is that those facilities could never get built because those cities would not have that money in their General Fund. She added that because the North/South Greenway has Countywide benefit they feel that this should be taken off the top of Strategy 3, so they can spread out the risk and also create a countywide benefit. This will be cheaper in the long run and create an overall benefit for the County. She further asked that maintenance of the North/South Greenway be included as part of Strategy 3.

David Schonbrunn, representing, TRANSDEF, discussed provisions for debt service and it seemed that the notion that a specific percentage is set aside for the Gap Closure project should also include the debt service to serve that project. In the reserve policy, he believed it has become a belt and suspenders kind of reserve that is overly conservative. He agreed with the need to protect ongoing programs, but if there were a fluctuation in sales tax, it would make more sense to simply defer projects. Roughly 30% of sales tax revenues are going to capital projects, local streets and roads. If there were a problem with sales tax, even though the Strategic Plan is based on the low revenue model, projects could simply be deferred. He further urged TAM to see if this is being overly conservative and whether it would make more sense to defer projects.

Rich Myhere, San Rafael resident, read the article in the IJ about the HOT lanes and attended the MTC workshop on the General Plan 2020. At that meeting there were a series of informational boards and one discussed the HOT lanes and many people present were so dissatisfied with those choices that they created a fourth choice of abandoning this idea forever, which was the winner that night. It seemed that MTC did push through and include that in the broader Bay Area wide plan. He did vote for Measure A and he would have never supported Measure A if he felt public monies would be used to build what he sees as a private express lane for the well to do at the expense of normal folks and tourists. He further urged TAM to delete the line item about \$850,000 in the budget for a study of the HOT Lane.

Nancy Weninger, Larkspur resident, supported the completion of the North/South Greenway, which she uses often. Also, TAM should allocate money for the maintenance of this regional facility. Larkspur has the worse roads in Marin County and even with Measure A, road maintenance is under funded. Not to take responsibility would place a burden on the small towns, particularly in Larkspur. She is concerned that the Central Marin Ferry connection project that will connect Larkspur Trail to the Cal Park Tunnel might not be built because an entity would not take on maintenance of that structure. She further believed it would be great if TAM stepped up and took responsibility for maintenance issues of this regional facility.

Cindy Winter, Greenbrae resident, supported the North/South Greenway. She suggested that dividing the responsibility for maintenance among various municipalities would increase the County's exposure to legal liability. She believed that if one entity could take responsibly for maintenance, it would be wonderful, in order for those to have a central point to contact and to keep it simple.

Marcus Vyvyan, San Anselmo resident, commutes to Mill Valley on a bicycle. He believed the County was getting involved and started allocating capital resources to develop multi-modal facilities and the Greenway is one of those facilities. Also, a lot of this greenway will not be built until an agency picks up the maintenance cost, and he believed Measure A is the appropriate source of funding.

TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
TAM  
May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Greg Caper, Corte Madera resident, stated that Marin County is a tremendous resource and he enjoyed cycling and being outdoors he believed the Greenway is another asset that they must develop, protect and maintain and urged TAM to think in those terms.

Allen Nichel, Sausalito resident, urged Measure A funds to be used for the North/South Greenway.

Lionel Gambill, Novato resident, submitted written comments to the Board and stated that HOT and HOV lanes share one deeply flawed assumption: namely that travel demand is inelastic and nothing is further from the truth. Travel demand is highly sensitive to travel time and now it is showing a sensitivity to fuel cost. The more miles built, the more solo drivers and the less carpooling. HOV, or HOT lanes, are self-limiting. He believed social equity is a real issue. He asked if Marin really wanted or needed Lexus Lanes. Benefits are much more favorable to high-income users. The goal was to reduce traffic, but congestion on the freeways has stayed the same or worsened, and wondered who has benefited.

Mark Birnbaum, Novato resident, urged TAM to allocate TAM money for the North/South Greenway.

Patricia Gallery, Fairfax resident, pointed out that people are program served. Those that only have bicycles for transportation do not have a luxury to not take a car. This is a matter of safe transportation to those that have no choice. Some cases it is a matter of necessity. She further urged TAM to support the Greenway and use Strategy 3 funds for the Greenway and thanked TAM for all their efforts.

Jonathan Toste, San Rafael resident, supported the work that TAM has done and wanted to make it very clear how important the maintenance money is for the bicycle trail. The maintenance is critical and funds must be allocated. They need to have a bike system in this County that is equal to Davis and Santa Barbara.

Raoul Wertz, Mill Valley resident, supported TAM's efforts and urged TAM to use Measure A funds for the Greenway maintenance. He agreed with the idea of centralizing the maintenance.

Joe Preis, Mill Valley resident, commutes from Mill Valley to San Francisco everyday and hoped to commute to San Rafael with a safer and easier pathway to ride. He would love to see Marin upstage San Francisco and make it nice to ride around Town.

Rocky Birdsey, representing, MCIL, discussed the pathway in Sausalito where there is a jurisdictional issue. He has been working with both departments, but hoped to see a streamlined process for the North/South Greenway. He believed it would be beneficial if funds could be allocated. He is extremely concerned about transit, so whatever the bond is, if allocated to each strategy, transit will be paying 55% of the interest on the projects. He hoped more of the debt service could be allocated to capital improvement projects and to keep the reserve as low as possible.

Jonathan Leone, Sausalito Planning Commissioner, pointed out that Sausalito upgraded a portion of the bicycle lanes in the last few years, but more must be upgraded for bicycle safety. He further stated that whether funds are allocated for maintenance or for upgrade of the bike pathway, it would greatly improve the safety and draw the marginal rider back on to the bike path, so he encouraged TAM to allocate funds to upgrade both the pedestrian and bike lane pathway.

Eugene Walden, Sleepy Hollow resident, discussed Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and asked TAM to consider developing a long-term plan for Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, which is an important regional road. He further added that Marin County is developing long-term plans for its transportation and infrastructure.

The public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey announced that staff would respond to these comments along with any others received in writing at the next TAM meeting scheduled for June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2006.

## **2. Chair Reports**

Chair Kinsey stated that as representative of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission he participated in a workshop related to transit efficiency and effectiveness. There is a very clear concern they have as a Commission about regional investment in transit and the high cost associated with meeting the transit demands, specifically between the last RTP and this RTP. There was over \$8 billion in increases regionally in the operating cost related to transit this far exceeded the increased revenues. Also, there has been a significant reduction of transportation ridership in the Bay Area, so the consequence is that the cost effectiveness of the investment is being reduced. They clearly want to see a multi-modal future and MTC discussed a range of ways to look at performance standards, consolidation, funding sources, and incentives to encourage improved deficiencies. Also, they benefited from conversations with general managers from SamTrans, AC Transit and Muni to help understand the challenges facing transit. He added that it is such a significant portion of the Bay Areas investment that they must look closely how they are using those dollars. There were no specific actions taken at the workshop, but it was agreed to work closely with operators to better understand the choices they have moving forward. Also, they addressed the recognition that the State's infrastructure bond that includes a significant amount of money for transportation in a variety of ways that would create a one time windfall for transit, specifically for transit capital. This did not touch on other items that the Executive Director will refer to, but as it relates to capital investments for transit, the thinking is that with such a significant amount of money coming into the region, what should be considered for those dollars? Do they want to distribute them on the current formulas and allow each existing agency to make their own decision; do they want to make investments in social equity around transportation in areas where transit dependent populations live; do they want to address vehicle shortfalls for replacement of fleets; transit expansion projects; TOD programs; or do they want to continue to link investments in the region to land use patterns. He further encouraged the Commission to think about ADA related investments that will be needed in all transit systems, so this is a discussion occurring at the region and he would keep TAM informed.

Chair Kinsey indicated that he has not heard from any Commissions that are interested in serving on the Ad Hoc Committee related to the County's Nonmotorized Transportation planning process, so he encouraged any Commissioners that are interested in looking at the County's Nonmotorized program to participate from a TAM perspective. He further added that within the next month they must establish that committee.

Commissioner Swanson asked the Chair if the \$8 billion increase is due to existing service; function of new services; or a combination. Chair Kinsey believed it is a combination. The sum total of the transit investments is for the 25-year period of the RTP, which would include expanded service expectations as well as existing. They did not break that down as to what percentage of operating cost increased.

Commissioner Swanson stated that if in fact that goes to fund additional transit capacity, then it brings with it operating requirements that must be met, which exacerbates the problem. He further believed a priority is to rehabilitate or re-capitalize the current situation enable them to operate more efficiently and effectively and to relieve some of the pressure of increasing the operating support.

Commissioner Breen discussed the bond measure and it seems in his view that money is needed on the streets. He believed they must have all their wagons at the starting line ready to drop proposals because that money will go fast. Chair Kinsey responded that he is very thankful and appreciative of the Executive Director's involvement with the CMA Directors and with her experience with MTC and Caltrans to encourage the whole region to develop the competitive corridor plans rather than planning against each other.

### **3. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda**

Commissioner McGlashan noted that Muir Woods Shuttle launches the day after tomorrow and runs every half hour from 9:30am to 7:00pm in and out of Muir Woods on weekends and holidays and encouraged visitors and friends to use that service.

### **4. Accept Oversight Committee's Annual Report**

Lori Lopin, Chair, Oversight Committee, provided an independent review of TAM's Measure A expenditures for TAM's consideration. She further stated that there are vacancies on the committee and encouraged TAM to fill those vacancies.

Commissioner Lundstrom asked the Chair of the Oversight Committee when the first independent audit of the books would occur. Committee Member Logan responded that the actual audit already occurred in the last few months.

Chair Kinsey thanked Committee Member Lopin on behalf of TAM and noted that TAM is very appreciative for all the Committee's efforts.

Commissioner McGlashan indicated that the environmental organizations have provided recommendations for the vacancy as the alternate for this Committee, but direction was given to staff to try and use that spot for an underserved community representative that could articulate environmental justice issues. He wondered if this Board could reconsider that prior guidance to staff and consider changing its direction. Chair Kinsey suggested discussing that matter as part of the consent agenda, which will be discussed shortly. Commissioner McGlashan agreed.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner McGlashan moved and Commissioner Breen seconded, to accept the Annual Report from the Oversight Committee. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.**

### **5. Executive Director's Report**

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, provided TAM with an Executive Director's Report for their review that included the following:

- Federal – House of Representatives is considering the first version of the Fiscal Year 2006/07 Appropriation Bill.
- State
  - Infrastructure Bonds
    - Formula Funds
    - Other Bond Sources

- May Revise of the State Budget
- Regional
  - MTC STA Policy
  - MTC FasTrak Strategic Plan
- Local
  - Doyle Drive – South Access to Golden Gate Bridge/Doyle Drive
- Run-Down of Infrastructure Bond Proposals
  - SB 1266
  - SB 1689
  - AB 140
  - AB 127
  - AB 142
  - AB 1039
  - AB 1467
  - AB 143
  - SCA 7
- Transportation, Air Quality and Security Bonds
  - Transportation - \$17.25 billion
  - Air Quality - \$1.2 billion
  - Security & Disaster Preparedness - \$1.525 billion
  - Housing - \$2.85 billion
  - Smart Growth - \$1.15 billion
  - Flood Protection
  - Education
    - K-12 Facilities \$7.329 billion
    - Higher Education - \$3.087 billion
  - Elements of SB 1266 Bond Package
    - Funding Categories
    - SB 1266 Infrastructure Bond Summer - Estimated Funding for San Francisco Bay Area
    - Bay Area Share of SB 1266 Local Street & Road Funds
    - Bay Area's Share of Transit Funding in Proposition 1B

Commissioner Dillon-Knutson asked staff if the proposal for Marin to pay for Doyle Drive died. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that there is no firm proposal on the table at this time. However, San Francisco Transportation Authority received a special earmark of funds to study congestion of all entrances and exits in San Francisco. The study will look controlling congestion by charging tolls at certain times of the day, and Doyle Drive is included.

Executive Director Steinhauser then introduced Denise Merleno the new Executive Assistance Clerk to the TAM Board. TAM welcomed Executive Assistant Clerk Merleno to TAM.

## **6. Commissioner Report**

### **a. Executive Committee**

Chair Kinsey reported that the Executive Committee minutes are provided in the packet. He pointed out that the Committee spent a significant time talking about the Countywide Planning Adhoc Committee, which is Item 9, and they reviewed the work plan that is also part of the agenda tonight.

**b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Groups**

Commissioner Murray announced that a ribbon cutting for the overcrossing will occur on June 1st at the Redwood Landfill at 1:00pm. She added that it is a great accomplishment to have this safety project completed at a cost of at least \$10 million, fully funded by the private sector. She further stated that the County was the local agency required by Caltrans; it is a three-party agreement, and is a great benefit to the community.

**c. SMART**

Vice Chair Boro reported that Blue Ribbon Committee was appointed and they gave their report to the Board. They looked at the existing expenditures and reviewed the current price increase of about 14% attributed to cost of materials, steel, concrete and some inflation factors. Next month the Board will receive the Expenditure Plan and projected income and look at adoption in June or July. They also received a presentation on the Railroad Square project that Commissioner McGlashan participated in.

Commissioner McGlashan noted his excitement and there was a unanimous decision from the Selection Committee, including two members of the Santa Rosa City Council, to work very closely with a development team led by Creative Housing Associates to develop the 5.5-acre site in Railroad Square in Santa Rosa. He believed this is a dream come true for good TOD projects. It could end up achieving a LEED platinum neighborhood design certification from the US Green Building Council. It includes retail; commercial; over 100 units of housing; affordable housing; bicycle parking; no wasted land on car parking; solar, rainwater cisterns for reuse, and passive airflow methodologies for heating, ventilation and air conditioning. The project is incredibly sensitive to adjacent neighborhoods and architectural features of that area. He noted that many buildings around the Railroad Square have old stonework, and that they took that into consideration and worked incredibly closely with local neighborhoods. He is very proud of the SMART Board in setting out what many thought was an impossible set of criteria.

**7. Consent Calendar**

- a. Approval of TAM Minutes of April 27, 2006. Recommendation: Approve.
- b. FY 2005/06 Budget Adjustment. Recommendations: Acknowledge and approve the revised FY 2005/06 Budget of revenue and expenditure levels of FY 2005/06.
- c. Addendum to Agreement with County of Marin for Cal Park Tunnel Project. Recommendation: Approve the first amendment to Agreement No. A-FY05/06-008 (FA) between TAM and the County of Marin.
- d. Special Liability Insurance Program Coverage with Driver Alliant Insurance Services, Inc. Recommendation: Authorize the Executive Director to execute all required documents with Driver Alliant Insurance Services, Inc. to provide Special Liability Insurance Program (SLIP) coverage, decline to purchase terrorism coverage, and acknowledge that the company is not licensed in California.
- e. Committee Appointments – Citizen Oversight Committee. Recommendation: Accept the resignation of Jim Leland; continue to actively solicit nominations for the TAC and OC and fill any remaining vacancies at future meetings when applications are received from nominating organizations.
- f. IT Service Contract Approval. Recommendation: Approve hiring SPTJ Computer Network Design, Implementation and Support, and authorize Tam's Executive Director to execute a contract for IT support services with SPTJ Computer Network Design, Implementation and Support for a three-year amount not to exceed \$100,000, with the first year not to exceed \$40,000.

Chair Kinsey announced that Consent Calendar Item 7e would be removed for further discussion.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner McGlashan moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded, to adopt the Consent Calendar, with Item 7e removed for further discussion. Motion carried unanimously by the Commission.**

### **Consent Calendar Item 7e**

Chair Kinsey noted that the recommendation is simply to acknowledge that they have vacancies and they want to continue to pursue positions to be filled as well as accept the resignation of Commissioner Leland at this time.

Executive Director Steinhauser explained that a year ago in June of 2005 staff was directed to consider for the environmental positions two aspects of environmental involvement, one traditional environmental advocacy; and the second is in the area of environmental justice. She indicated that they have two members that served in the position one from each element. The environmental justice member resigned, and since that the staff received a recommendation from the Grass Routes Leadership Network for Raphael to fill that position. He is very active with respect to these issues and wished to be considered for the vacant position. Also, there are two vacancies in Northern Marin.

Commissioner McGlashan knows Raphael and believed Raphael would fill that role very well. Commissioner Murray stated that as a representative of North Marin, they would be delighted if Bernie Myers would fill either of those spots. She directed staff to contact Mr. Myers to know which seat he would fill.

The item was opened to public input.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, supported Bernie Meyers being appointed. She noted that environmental communities have gone through the process of discussing Bernie Myers as an alternate. The Sierra Club and MCL have accepted Mr. Meyers as the alternate for the environmental community. Also, if Mr. Myers is willing to take the North Marin position he should be contacted in that regard. She believed Mr. Myers would be an outstanding person to take on this position.

The public input was closed

Executive Director Steinhauser has not received a final application from Raphael, but this would come back to TAM next month for action.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion

**Commissioner McGlashan moved and Commissioner Swanson seconded, to adopt the recommendation included in the Consent packet to accept Commissioner Leland's resignation and continue to seek to fill the position. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.**

## 8. Caltrans Report

Jit Pahdher, Caltrans representative, stated that construction on Central San Rafael has started and the project is moving forward.

In regard to the Corte Madera Creek area, they are looking at opening the HOV at the end of June. The Sir Francis Drake/Highway 101 project is also moving forward and that should be completed in the next couple of weeks.

In regard to the last segment of Puerto Suello Hill, TAM's consultants are working very hard. They delivered 95% of the plan and specs.

Commissioner McGlashan discussed a SHOPP project in regard to the E. Blithedale exit ramp and asked if there is a risk of increases in construction costs waiting to submit projects to CTC for approval until the November meeting and risk of breaking ground next March. Representative Pandher responded that he did not see any risk. There is a lot of drainage and tree removal issues, so they do not want to take that risk getting into the fall or rainy season, so they hope to start in April. They want to start and finish the work during one construction season and not have the risk of prolonged construction. He further noted that they would break ground next spring.

Chair Kinsey noted that in addition to the Highway 101 work, Caltrans is doing some emergency repair work in the near future on Highway 101 south of Stinson Beach. Representative Pandher responded that they are working on a proposal for that area and hope to start work, but headquarters objected to their proposal. Chair Kinsey discussed Devil's slide and indicated that Caltrans agreed to have their reader board message signs include "*businesses open.*" That is real progress and asked that they pay close attention to the precedent in San Mateo when this issue comes in Marin County.

## 9. Countywide Planning Adhoc Committee

Commissioner McGlashan summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM consider the recommendation from the Special Committee as outlined in the attached report. As well, consider the concerns and recommendations from the Executive Committee, as outlined. Also, recommend appropriate structure for future activity.

Chair Kinsey acknowledged Planner Kristin Drumm present this evening who helped with the Ad Hoc Committee and he noted his appreciation in that regard.

Executive Director Steinhauser noted that staff received a letter from the Sierra Club and Marin Environmental Housing Dialogue related to this issue. She welcomed an opportunity to review these elements in a more formal structure but at this time there is a lot on TAM's plate and it would be very difficult for her staff to have any type of a role in exploring issues that are not already part of the 200 item work plan that is part of the Commission's packet to be discussed later in the agenda.

Commissioner Tremaine noted his disappointment with the Executive Committee's recommendation. He understands the concern about impacting staff, but a great deal of wisdom that went into having the Congestion Management Agency and the Countywide Planning Agency work as the same unit. He added that land use planning and transportation planning should walk hand in hand. He believed if this recommendation moves forward, and the Countywide Planning Agency is sent off on its own, TAM will never get it back. He felt it could be managed and should not be separated. He added that TAM staff's legitimate concerns about being overburdened could be respected and managed by a group of TAM

members. He felt the countywide issues would only come forward in an annual report. He is concerned about the direction this is headed and noted his disappointment and believed it is a huge mistake.

Commissioner Lundstrom attended several previous iterations and the planning part was always done by planning staff. In this case, the proposal would operate under the umbrella of the Transportation Authority as a unified agency with two staff individuals. She is concerned about the Countywide Plan and its elements and the burden upon local planning staff. She added that the existing population centers are in the 11 cities and to gather information for any kind of evaluation they must go to the cities. She further stated that her concern is that to do anything meaningful, the burden is on local City staff and time equals money.

Commissioner McGlashan stated that one reason the Ad Hoc Committee recommended this structure was to avoid the concern that Commissioner Lundstrom just discussed, which was to not burden TAM staff with responsibility of running this Committee. The idea is that it would be a burden for a few of the Commissioners fired up about this idea along with Kristin Drumm and Alex Hinds who wanted to step in and staff it for them. The whole point was to conduct the Committee in a similar fashion to the old Countywide Planning Agency structure that was used by this Board. Another advantage of using the Committee structure is they would not add on planning discussions late at night. Their thought was to get those interested in discussing these issues supported by planning staff, so the Agency was not burdened, it would come back to the full Board rarely. Also, the other advantage was a notion of the "coalition of the willing", not to burden individuals on this Board who are already focused on other issues. He then added that Commissioner Lundstrom made a great point, and there would no doubt be some tasks for local planning staff. They did look at using the planners directors as a key venue that was ultimately rejected. Every time the County updates its General Plan it harvests the kind of information that is needed for this Committee from City staff. He did not believe the three meetings would rely on a huge bulk of new information. He then wanted TAM to compare the cost of the time burden on planning staff both at the County and all other cities with the price of missed funding opportunities and lack of regional coordination.

Commissioner Fredericks participated in this Committee because she desired collaboration within the jurisdictions. She did not think there is lack of collaboration between jurisdictions, just that it is not as visible. They provide services through the JPA's, Marin Planning Directors' meeting, and Marin Managers' meetings. There are face-to-face collaborations among jurisdictions. Issues are raised and brought back to the individual cities. She found it very attractive that having gotten information from staff they would then have some venue on occasion to discuss the information. Her issue was that the proposed Committee seemed too broad and they would deal with issues that they had no particular consensus data on, and she thought would be difficult very difficult to recruit the electives to participate. The kind of information harvesting that was being discussed in the beginning is much more extensive than currently required by the County, and if it is not required it will not show up and then they will have these incomplete discussions. When the Countywide Planning Agency was in existence it did have a set of very hard to refuse incentives, such as eligibilities for funding, and this is not being proposed at this stage. Also, she felt it is extremely pessimistic to think that in the course of doing business with TAM that there is no land use/transportation linkage planning happening at all. It is just not to the extent that people with vision are very happy about. There is a difference between the City and Town's General Plans and the vision of the County Plan, which is build out. The cities are not going to have the time or resources to cover build out scenarios and collaborate. She appreciated the idea of this venue, but wished it would focus on issues of TAM that include land use and transportation linkage to some extent and allow it to grow from that point.

Commissioner Belser also participated on the Committee and agreed with Commissioner Fredericks that TAM is not totally divorced from land use. She felt in trying to make it palatable in using a "*coalition of the willing*," which the Committee was, it loses value to the degree they do not have full representation. She believed time is not as valuably spent. The idea is not necessarily dead, and she appreciated the land use considerations, but the report mentioned that they were not focused enough, purpose and it must be very focused. She noted that Sausalito has the smallest planning staff, but she believed there are several favorable concepts, but it needs further refinement. She further believed this venue could be used for that purpose on occasion.

Commissioner Breen believed they have a child that did not have a home. He added that the concept is good, but the purpose is not clear. Is it a discussion group? If so, then to what agency should it go. If it is a group that has some kind of authority or provides clear recommendations they must make that clear, but that requires full representation. He did not believe they could move forward with the "*Committee of the willing*." This requires more discussion and maybe there are too many people and too many pieces.

The item was opened to public input.

Marge Macrajs, representing Sierra Club, supported the idea of establishing a Countywide Planning entity that would be able to start dealing with the need for collaborative planning. They did participate in meetings that Commissioner McGlashan convened and thanked him for his efforts. The problems that the Sierra Club views as such are not going to go away. There are alternative means of addressing these problems, but they are planning issues that need careful consideration. They are issues that will take participation from all jurisdictions, not just the County. The Countywide Plan indicated potential for \$10 million more square feet of commercial/industrial development. Impacts on housing and transportation services are tremendous and the environmental impact report will provide more information. They felt it is really important to give planning the kind of attention that it needs and involve all jurisdictions in trying to address the environmental, housing and transportation issues. The Sierra Club supports what the Special Committee recommended for TAM to recommend that another entity take up this responsibility. They urge TAM's attention to these issues because they should all have the opportunity to help solve these problems together.

Dave Curry, representing Housing Council, stated that housing needs collaborations among other jurisdictions. This is the Countywide Planning Agency that became the Congestion Management Agency, and they cannot have just one specific measure as the metric to review. They must also review effects on water and employees. At this point, it must be a discussion group, because they do not have a clear commission. Three individuals cannot birth this full form. He recommended a re-creation of some of the inner connectiveness that happened with the first Countywide Plan. He did not believe it could be administered; it must be from the "*coalition of the willing*." He agreed with the Sierra Club and Marin Environmental Housing Dialogue that they should start somewhere. He hoped it could be within this group, and not necessarily a full appointed Committee, but a discussion group to carry this forward.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, thanked Commissioner McGlashan as well who took a leadership role along with Commissioner Adams. She explained that public involvement was great from all the different groups. The public asked that the elected officials take this on. There is a void taking place in the County because there is no place where the public can get together and talk about this issue. The Community Development Agency is willing to take this on. This is one way to be able to work with community development on some of these issues to receive grant funding. It is not a good idea to leave this with the TAM Board. She further recommended giving it a try.

TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
TAM  
May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Sue Vital, representing, League of Women Voters, attended most of the meetings and the ideas that she received from email were very close to what Marin Environmental Housing Dialogue and Sierra Club provided. This is a County where they have more common values and they can work along and make miracles in regard to the three-corridor plan. This is a chance to build further. They need regular meetings or workshops to get the community groups and planning staff together. She desired opportunities to explore new ideas and explore easy to cooperate and coordinate projects. They further noted that the League would discuss this matter further.

Roger Roberts, representing, Marin Conservation League, participated in several meetings and stated that they are all in one boat together and they must be headed in the same direction in terms of dealing with land use and transportation and other countywide issues. There is no good place where these items can be discussed together. The whole purpose in trying to revise this concept was to create an entity where there can be some collaborative thinking. MCL believed this is a timely matter and an item TAM should support. If TAM did not know how to organize or structure it, then he recommended that TAM review the model of Napa County because they have been very successful in collaborative planning, developing regional collaborative decision making, and gathering funds from other sources to move forward.

Novato resident appreciated the work of TAM in regard to the outreach and the information on the website is wonderful and really focused. He felt this organization is really working and has a clear vision. He agreed that land use issues are related, but he is worried that more would be placed on TAM and TAM already has a tremendous workload. Also, TAM has done a very good job in moving forward, so possibly using that as a model rather than making TAM grow into something that it is not.

The public input was closed.

Commissioner Breen asked Commissioner McGlashan the reaction and suggestions from the City Manager and County Administrator. Commissioner McGlashan responded that he had not received any direct feedback. Executive Director Steinhauer indicated that there was no comment that she received, but there was discussion at the meeting about the difficulty in the managers being able to manage all their work and a specific request to reduce the number of meetings of MCCMC.

Commissioner Gill asked to attend the managers meeting to talk about MCCMC and she received a list of about 10 complaints, so the managers believe that it is too much work.

Vice Chair Boro discussed at the Executive Committee that he did not support the goals regarding housing being a countywide solution. Planning is done through the community. He appreciated the tone of the letter from the Marin Environmental Housing Dialogue. He stated that housing issues become very controversial. The point of view about collaborative planning on housing he did not see from a San Rafael point of view. Each must find out how to achieve the goal from the State. A special meeting of TAM, separate from TAM business, once or twice a year to discuss land use/ transportation issues might make sense with the planners present. He did not know of any City that is interested in pursuing this at this time due to resources, and the fact that all issues are local. To collaborate to solve the housing problem he did not see it working in San Rafael. This is a good body and a good cross-section of the County, and if there is forum to start once a year to have separate meetings to discuss these issues, he could support it, but there are several agendas being put under different prescription.

Commissioner Lundstrom recommended developing a plan over the fall that is specific because several towns are built out. She desired a specific plan to be developed that might move forward to have identifiable outcomes under the Planning Departments.

Chair Kinsey stated that there seems to be a consensus that there are issues that would be of interest, but there is concern about staff time and resources available. He thanked all who participated in this process and appreciated the Community Development Agency's willingness to support this for a year without seeking additional resources from other agencies. He added that TAM is not ready to take this on, or to accept the offer from the Community Development Agency. He did believe the suggestions heard from Commissioner Lundstrom and Vice Chair Boro would be welcomed by those ready to move forward even today. He then asked that TAM send a letter to the Community Development Agency thanking them for their assistance, thanking those on the Ad Hoc Committee as well who participated and making it clear that if the Community Development Agency wanted to work with the cities and their planning directors and city managers to put together a special meeting, that TAM would host at some later time during this fiscal year, with support from Community Development staff.

Commissioner Fredericks recommended that they keep on the calendar that TAM has a workshop planned in early fall.

Chair Kinsey added that they do have the TPLUS program that did make some acknowledgement that there is a relationship between transportation and land use. Also, they have the TLC and HIP programs with open invitations and opportunities for cities and towns to participate.

#### **10. Addendum to Professional Services Agreement with Nolte Associates**

Chair Kinsey summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM approve Addendum 3 of the Nolte Contract for additional services in the amount of \$807,400, for work indicated on Exhibit A to the Addendum.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Swanson moved and Commissioner Gill seconded, to approve Addendum 3 of the Nolte Contract for additional services in the amount of \$807,400, for work indicated on Exhibit A to the Addendum. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.**

Chair Kinsey acknowledged that staff is prepared to go out for an RFQ for oversight work, which is appropriate, and that will occur during the course of the next fiscal year.

#### **11. Draft 2006/07 Work Plan**

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM approve the Fiscal Year 2006/07 Workplan, recognizing that implementation is dependent on the adoption of the TAM FY 2006/07 Budget. Also, that TAM Board recognizes that the plan will receive minor adjustments authorized by the Executive Director during the course of the year.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Commissioner Swanson discussed page 68 and expressed concern for the terminology used. Executive Director Steinhauser agreed to use more appropriate terminology.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Fredericks moved and Commissioner Dillon-Knutson seconded, to approve the Fiscal Year 2006/07 Workplan, recognizing that implementation is dependent on the adoption of the TAM FY 2006/07 Budget. Also, that TAM Board recognizes that the plan will receive minor adjustments authorized by the Executive Director during the course of the year. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.**

## 12. Draft 2006/07 Budgets

Chair Kinsey summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM provide comments on the preliminary proposed FY 2006/07 and suggest any changes. He also directed staff to schedule a public hearing for June 22, 2006, and to post the Proposed FY 2006/07 budget on the TAM website at least 30 days prior to the public hearing.

Executive Director Steinhauser noted that there are funds for a follow up to a regional HOT occupancy toll lane study that is being carried out by MTC. It may be appropriate with respect to MTC findings to look at occupancy tolling options to look at the possibility of that as a feasible revenue source for future improvements for the entire length of Highway 101. There is a revenue source available that is a Federal earmark that TAM received this year, which is \$850,000. This study would not cost \$850,000, and it is shaping what MTC may be proposing for Marin and Sonoma County. Again, this is looking at the entire length of HOV system from the Golden Gate Bridge to Windsor. The HOV lane segments in Marin County are utilized at 35%. There is capacity within those occupancy vehicle lanes that could use a congestion pricing toll lane. MTC adopted a HOT lane network as part of their regional transportation plan in 2004 and this corridor was one of the HOT lane segments adopted, so this funding is reserved to consider whether or not to investigate this further. She recommended changing the language to specifically state, "*\$150,000 for follow up evaluation to MTC's high occupancy toll lane study.*"

Vice Chair Boro has staff if MTC conducted the study. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that they are engaged in the study currently and Phase 1 will be completed in September. Phase 1 will look at the HOT lane work around the Bay Area. Phase 2 will be through next winter, looking at a couple of segments of high occupancy toll lanes and actual details for implementation, monitoring, and enforcement. Vice Chair Boro asked staff to frame a one-page summary of what MTC will do and how this will compliment that approach. Executive Director Steinhauser agreed.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff if there are any rules attached to the \$850,000 in the Federal earmark. Also, if they did not spend the full amount of \$150,000 for the toll lane study can the funds be used for other items. Executive Director Steinhauser responded in the affirmative. She added that the funds would be left up to Marin and Sonoma County to decide how to divide up. This is available for support for the environmental document or design in the corridor. This is an eligible element since it will look at critical features to the public approval of the project, which is how to fund it. There are no restrictions and it can be used on any eligible feature of that \$450 million project.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff about changing the language and reducing the amount to \$150,000 where would the other portion of that earmark go? He recommended calling it "*earmark contingency.*" Executive Director Steinhauser noted that it is reserved for support for the environmental and project approval process that will transpire over the next two years and staff could list that as two distinct pieces, for ongoing support of Caltrans and coordination with Sonoma County, and for the follow up study.

Chair Kinsey noted that currently it is showing up as a surplus number at the bottom in the balance, and recommended on page 82 calling it out as a reserve for that segment.

Commissioner Breen reminded TAM that the early warning system should not be the front page of the IJ. He believed it is a good example of working with the public and community so they understand what we are working on. Chair Kinsey indicated that staff recognizes that there was some draft information that was conveyed.

Commissioner Tremaine is not sure what other items this money might be eligible for and would rather create a fund to maintain the bikeway. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that the money comes out of a Federal earmark for the Marin Sonoma Narrows. The project has \$120 million in secured funding. It is a \$450,000 million project at this time, and is increasing. Money could be used for any feature of that project.

Commissioner Murray stated that HOT lanes have been studied and she supported going ahead. It gives the pros and cons to help them understand what they can and cannot do. \$150,000 seems expensive. She understands that part of what they were going to do is looking at expanding the corridor. They must have it done in segments to know what might be accessible from a funding and public standpoint. The project is \$450 million, but at \$650 million with the right-of-way. They have an unbelievable difference between what we have and what we need to get this moving forward. Safety improvements, such as the Redwood Landfill are important because safety will only get worse.

The item was opened to public input.

David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, discussed trying to make the Strategic Plan conform to the budget, in particular having to do with administration costs. Measure A had a 5% cap on administration and it showed up just under \$1 million a year. In the budget, salaries and benefits are listed at \$1.3 million, so there is mismatch. There is a relevant issue of Measure A duties versus other administration. He asked how those would correspond, and will Measure A remain under 5%. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that the salary and benefits indicated in the budget are roughly 5% of both Measure A funds as well as other sources. The \$1.3 million is combination of the 5% of the Measure A funds as well as other funds that go under salaries and benefits, which include city/county contributions and planning money from MTC. All of that builds into their salaries and benefits including the RM2 toll funds. They are still locked at the 5% for Measure A, and they are gradually trying to have staff on board to do regular ongoing activity and reduce the need for consultants for ongoing activity.

Chair Kinsey stated that the portion of their compensation for their workforce associated with Measure A is evaluated and audited each year under their responsibilities under Measure A.

Commissioner McGlashan considered that staff bring the budget back with a subtotal of salaries and benefits specifically for Measure A activities as a sub set of Item 1001, so no one is confused.

The public input was closed.

Vice Chair Boro discussed professional services for the next year and under contract they might need a public information officer to do outreach in order to help get the word out to the press and board. He recommended possibly \$25,000 to spend as needed. Also, there is \$35,000 for State legislative assistance. In Item 13 there is a lot of activity and dollars, so they should have a person working on these dollars full-time. He asked staff to have an idea of the needs at State and Federal level and the type of help needed, and bring that information back at the next meeting.

Chair Kinsey stated that these are all preliminary comments being provided. He directed staff to put it on the website and schedule a public hearing for June 22<sup>nd</sup> 2006.

### **13 Federal and State Legislative Platform**

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM approve the Legislative Program as outlined in the staff report.

Chair Kinsey recommended including in the motion the tracking of the issues related to public transit account spillover activity.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Swanson moved and Commissioner Murray seconded, to approve the Legislative Program as outlined in the staff report, including the tracking of the issues related to the public transit account spillover activity.**

The item was opened to public input.

Rocky Birdsey, representing, MCIL, thanked TAM staff and the Board for the spillover support. They support CSA 7. In regard to AB 343, half is spillover protection. If spillover is loaned to the General Fund it must be paid back within three years and is also important in the same context. AB 244 they support because it has really great language that they recommended to be incorporated into SB 1611 as follows: *"eligible projects include, but are not limited to, roadway operations and improvements, public transit capital improvements and operations, and bicycle/pedestrian safety projects and programs."*

The public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey noted that specific legislative actions would be tracked.

**Motion carried unanimously by TAM.**

### **14. Addendum to Agreement with Local Government Services, LGS, for hiring of staff**

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

**Commissioner Tremaine moved and Commissioner Breen seconded, to approve the LGS amendment. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.**

Chair Kinsey thanked staff for the quick turnaround

### **15. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda - None**

*By Order of Chair Kinsey, the TAM meeting adjourned at 10:25pm.*