Chair Stephanie Moulton-Peters called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Chair’s Report (Discussion)

Chair Moulton-Peters indicated she had no report.

2. Commissioner Comments (Discussion)

There were none.

3. Executive Director’s Report (Discussion)

ED Steinhauser shared with the group photos of the recently completed successful Class 2 bike lane in the TAM-Almonte Shoreline area, which is nearing completion. She discussed the TAM Board’s agreement to advance the bike lane project ahead of the overall Caltrans pedestrian improvement project in the same corridor; and she noted there will be a celebration of the finished project in the near future.
Chair Moulton-Peters asked if the striping goes through the intersection at Shoreline, which Project Delivery Manager Dan Cherrier clarified that that striping at the turn in front of the gas station was difficult.

ED Steinhauser continued her report, discussing another Caltrans project, the Marin-Sonoma Narrows elevation of Highway 101, including a new bridge over San Antonio Creek, which will be finished in April and that there will be a celebratory event for this project. She mentioned as well the anticipated opening of 3rd lane eastbound on the Richmond-San Rafael bridge in late April and noted a South Bay newspaper article regarding another Bay Area bridge that is considering using part-time shoulder areas for traffic. ED Steinhauser mentioned TAM’s application for a planning grant to study “bus-on-shoulder” use in Marin County in the northern part where shoulders have been added as part of an overall systems evaluation of Highway 101; provision of electric vehicle charging stations at the County Civic Center campus and at various schools in the San Rafael school district; an upcoming report to the Executive Committees regarding electric vehicle infrastructure accomplishments and needs; and another report to be made this spring regarding funding constraints for crossing guards, employee/employer support programs like Lyft and bike-sharing.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked about funding for the 41 EV chargers the County applied for, and ED Steinhauser clarified that the County had applied and were receiving a PG&E grant, with TAM funds providing a match. Project Delivery Manager Nick Nguyen discussed the differences in structuring (ownership or leasing) the PG&E grant proposal, which could affect how the funds can be applied and where the additional TAM funding can be used to complete the request.

Commissioner Rice asked whether TAM knows the amount that the County will need to request from TAM, and Mr. Nguyen confirmed not yet. He cautioned, however, that an applicant to PG&E should not apply to TAM until they know what they need because using EV funds from TAM must be consistent with TAM’s funding conditions and limits. ED Steinhauser indicated she would like to come back to the Committee with additional information.

Chair Moulton-Peters pointed out that the cities currently do not have a coordinated approach to their own funding and acquisition of EV charging stations. Commissioner Rice discussed the site criteria and minimum number of chargers to be installed. ED Steinhauser commented as well on the cost of getting electrical service to the chargers.

Commissioner Rice expressed the need for the Board and Executive Committees to understand what TAM’s strategy should be for getting the needed EV infrastructure built out. ED Steinhauser questioned what (if any) role TAM will have for funding private commercial garages, chargers at workplace parking areas that may only be used by employees, or apartment complexes/private residential locations.

Commissioner Lucan asked if it would be helpful to appoint a small subcommittee to preliminarily consider the issues and potential solutions in advance of coming back to the Committee with an update. He indicated that Sonoma County did a local rebate program, and he also commented that historically these EV funds are not fully used which left him wondering if there were other ways to use them.

Commissioner Fredericks stated that another limiting factor is the required configuration of the chargers in parking lots and ADA access issues. ED Steinhauser agreed it has been an issue.

ED Steinhauser resumed her report, noting that the Miller Avenue Streetscape project has been named the 2018 Outstanding Local Street and Road Project Overall winner by the League of California Cities (for its full-depth paving reclamation); she also mentioned the upcoming fifth cycle of TAM’s Lifeline program – amount available for projects included in community-based transportation plans (the Canal neighborhood, Novato and Marin City), and types of eligible projects. She mentioned that the only lifeline funds that are being offered by MTC are transit
funds, and that transit operators in Marin are reluctant to swap funds. She concluded her report with a reminder of the April 2nd deadline for returning the annually-required Form 700.

4. Open Time for Public Expression

Cindy Winter commented that The Economist last week had a section on autonomous vehicles, which was well-reported and in-depth. She offered to share copies of the article. She also noted that April 2nd is a significant day because it is the first day that autonomous vehicles can move around without an engineer on board (but no paying customers are allowed yet), and it should be promoted as such in the media.

Ms. Winter also expressed concern about the need for more data reporting from ride-hail services such as Uber, Lyft, etc. and they should be required to pay taxes on the revenue they earn also. She thought it was time for local/regional governments to begin to push for better oversight and reporting.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked if ride-hail falls under any of TAM’s programs and does TAM track information associated with their services. ED Steinhauser noted there will be some information about Lyft service presented under Item #6, and she indicated there are some conclusions that can be drawn, but that data including personal data is not available.

5. Approval of Minutes from November 13, 2017 (Action)

Commissioner Rice moved to approve the minutes of November 13, 2017. Commissioner Lucan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

6. TAM Crossing Guard Program Location Recertification (Action)

ED Steinhauser noted that Project Delivery Manager Dan Cherrier and Consultant James O’Brien would be presenting the staff report on the Crossing Guard program which recommended the following actions to the full TAM Board:

1. Adopt the Ranked List of Crossing Guard Locations shown in Attachment A;
2. Adopt the funding level for the 2018/2019 school year to extend to Rank 58;
3. Support allocating $170,000 of Vehicle Registration Fee carryover to fund 18 locations from August to December should the Transportation Sales Tax Renewal be placed on the November 18 ballot.

Mr. O’Brien began the report with an overview of the 2017 ranking process that leads to the 2018-19 program approval. The ranking is a regular part of the Crossing Guard program, occurring every four years, last occurring in 2010 and 2014 he covered the program summary, the recertification process, data gathering and scoring, and the conclusions. He discussed the history of the program beginning in 2004, milestones, number of guards currently funded, the Expenditure Plan requirement for re-assessing the guards every four years, the master list of 150 guard locations prioritized by the MPWA (Marin Public Works Association) and the TAM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that approve the methods, scoring criteria, data-gathering, and scoring process; resulting in the ranked list included as an attachment at the end of the written report. He also discussed outreach to the schools, districts and cities affected by the scoring and ranking, i.e., those who have fallen below the funding threshold – notification that is given at the end of the school year and in the fall to ensure that parents and schools know the situation.
Mr. Cherrier reviewed the actions that the Committee is being asked to make, recommending that the TAM Board:

1.) Adopt the Ranked List of Crossing Guard Locations shown in Attachment A of the staff report; 2.) Adopt the funding level for the 2018/2019 school year to extend to Ranked position 58; and 3.) Support allocating $170,000 of Vehicle Registration Fee carryover to fund 18 locations (#59-#88) from August to December should the Transportation Sales Tax Renewal be placed on the November 18 ballot and approved. (He explained that otherwise the 30 locations would be cut in the beginning of the year, only to be reapproved and added back if the ballot measure is ultimately approved.)

Commissioner Rice asked for clarification on locations that are “self-funding” and how that is handled, which Mr. Cherrier explained. Mr. Cherrier commented on the impacts to the schools, the students, parents and districts for locations currently funded but whose schools drop below the threshold, and he noted that some of the schools or districts or jurisdictions might decide to fund their own guards. ED Steinhauser added information about the timeline for the Transportation Sales Tax Renewal process and voter approval, how it is overlapping the Crossing Guard location scoring, ranking and funding; which explains why staff is recommending the bridge funding to allow for a majority of the 30 locations currently funded for guards, but that will fall below the cutoff for next Fall, unless the Sales Tax Renewal is on the ballot and approved.

Chair Moulton-Peters requested that staff report to individual TAM Board members of crossing guard locations that may be affected.

Commissioner Furst asked about the option for a jurisdiction to use “volunteer” guards to cover some of their locations and how that would be handled; what the $5,000 fee covers and what the responsibilities would be for the jurisdiction. Mr. Cherrier discussed past research on the possibility and the plan established that allows a school district to provide a volunteer under their workmen’s compensation rules; who would then report to the contracted guard agency and would be treated just as any of the other guards with the exception of receiving a paycheck. This would be for a contracted period of one school year, even to the point of the district finding a replacement if their volunteer resigns.

Commissioner Lucan asked how the bridge funding for the early part of the next school year - pending the placement of the Sales Tax Measure on the ballot and pending its approval by the voters –will affect the message that is being given now to those who have fallen in the 58-88 ranking, which Mr. Cherrier discussed. He stated that the messaging would be, “Your crossing guard may not be here next year.” For those that fall below the threshold and for those that the schools do not plan to fund, the message will be, “Your crossing will not be here next year.”

Chair Moulton-Peters asked if the bridge funding will be applied when the Tax Measure is put on the ballot or only if approved on the ballot. Mr. Cherrier said when it is placed on the ballot.

There was discussion between the Committee and staff about the flexibility in Measure B funding that can help reconfigure some of the funding, as well as concerns that the exact costs for the Crossing Guard program is clarified for future funding needs and for the long-term viability of the program.

Commissioner Lucan recommended holding on to as many of the guards as possible going into the new school year through additional funding regardless of whether the Tax Measure is put on the ballot.

Commissioner Furst noted that public safety should be the highest priority for elected officials, and the crossing guard program qualifies as a safety issue. She said she would prefer to see full funding for the entire school year;
otherwise, at least for the first half. She suggested a back-up plan (Plan B) be developed so that the crossing guard program can continue to provide the needed services it does for as long as it can.

Commissioner Fredericks agreed to keep the program going as best as possible, and she would have no problem using Measure A funds as a matter of congestion relief – parents will not let their children walk to school unless it is safe, otherwise they will drive them, causing greater congestion.

Commissioner Rice echoed other comments regarding the importance of the program from a safety standpoint, as well as preferring to keep guards funded through the first part of the school year in hopes that the Sales Tax Renewal will pass on the ballot or the TAM budget can be reconfigured to ensure the program can continue at its current level. She cautioned, however, that she wants to be sure whatever and from wherever funds are “borrowed”, that they are reimbursed as promised. She also indicated she would like to see a greater analysis of where funds are being expended and a cost benefit analysis to see in which areas the need for guards is increasing vs. decreasing.

ED Steinhauser reported that the bridge funding is from funds that rolled over in the VRF program, and once used, could not be repaid.

Chair Moulton-Peters suggested greater correlation by schools would be helpful too, especially in comparing percentage of green trips per school.

Commissioner Furst moved to recommend the TAM Board approve the Crossing Guard Program Location Recertification, including 1) adoption of the Ranked List of Crossing Guard Locations shown in Attachment A; 2) adoption of the funding level for the 2018/2019 school year to extend to Ranked position 58; and 3) support for allocation of $170,000 of Vehicle Registration Fee carryover funds to cover otherwise cut locations (#59-#88) from August to December if the Transportation Sales Tax Renewal Measure is placed on the November 18 ballot and approved. Commissioner Lucan seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

7. Overview of Upcoming Innovation Workshop (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced Planning Manager Derek McGill to begin the presentation which asked the Committee to recommend to the full TAM Board to: 1) Receive presentation from Staff on content of TAM Second Annual Innovations Workshop - scheduled for Friday June 8th, 2018; 2) Approve not-to-exceed budget amount for the workshop; and 3) Comment and accept speaker listing to enable organization of the workshop to proceed.

Mr. McGill discussed the proposed date for the Workshop, Friday, June 8th, and the “not-to-exceed” budget of $25,000, supplemented by registration fee sponsorships. He then turned to Marnie Primmer from Connected Consulting for more information.

Ms. Primmer expressed appreciation for the invitation to work with TAM again, commenting on the success of the first Innovation Workshop and her excitement at the possibilities for this year’s Workshop, “Getting Ready for Green Transportation Innovation.” She commented on potential activities and presentations for this year’s program content, a possible keynote speaker, topics, exhibits and presentations, as well as panels,

Commissioner Fredericks indicated she was glad to see the first panel topic - “Building Innovation: How Incremental Changes Can Lead to Revolutionary Results” because it makes the future changes real.
Commissioner Furst said she thought topics were fabulous. Commissioner Lucan was pleased with the focus on autonomous vehicles. He added that he would like to see some focus next time around on waterways and high-speed ferries.

Commissioner Rice agreed, suggesting also a focus on public transportation overall. She also asked about who attended last year and the type of outreach planned for this year, to encourage as many as possible to attend and participate. Ms. Primmer responded that the earlier start this year should help with attendance, and she reviewed planned outreach efforts. Commissioner Rice also asked about outreach to students, which Ms. Primmer confirmed, noting the availability of a student discount.

In response to a question from the Committee, ED Steinhauser briefly discussed registration costs and sponsorships.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked about the purpose and goals for the event, which ED Steinhauser discussed. ED Steinhauser stated that last year’s workshop on “moving forward” was meant to be a board prospectus while this year’s theme will address what we can actually implement and how to do that here in Marin. Chair Moulton-Peters opened public comment on the item.

Cindy Winter indicated she attended last year and appreciated the subjects addressed. She expressed concern about bicyclist and pedestrian safety as well as apathy from those who don’t think the coming changes will affect them. Ms. Primmer stated optimistically that change will come, it’s only a matter of how soon.

Commissioner Furst moved to recommend to the full TAM Board the approval of a not-to-exceed budget amount of $25,000 for the workshop and accept the speaker list. Commissioner Lucan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

8. **N/S Greenway Gap Closure Project – Reaffirm Board Action that Requests the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Allocate Funding to SMART via TAM and other funding related Actions (Action)**

ED Steinhauser introduced the item with a brief review of the TAM Board’s action on February 12th, and she asked Principal Project Delivery Manager Bill Whitney to explain the action requested of the Committee to forward to the full Board:

1) Reaffirm a previous action to request MTC allocate $850,000 in Regional Measure 2 toll bridge funds for use by TAM to be directed to SMART for acquisition of land rights in preparation for a future project. Also confirm request to MTC for $500,000 in funds to complete design, right-of-way activities, and permits for the Northern Segment of the North/South Greenway in Larkspur, and request MTC to re-direct $2.9 mil in RM2 funds for the Multi-Use Pathway in San Rafael;

2) Incorporate additional requirement for both TAM and SMART to indemnify MTC with respect to early land acquisition, under an agreement by SMART and TAM that includes potential return of funding to MTC;

3) Adopt an MTC condition stating that any savings from the North-South Greenway project are to be applied to the permanent (not interim) relocation/facility for the San Rafael Transit Center;
4) Continue to work closely with funding partners, the City of San Rafael and the County of Marin, to close the $500,000 funding gap in the Multi-Use Path project. This gap is in addition to the $2.95M Regional Measure 2 mentioned in the staff report; and

5) Authorize the development and approval by TAM’s Executive Director an agreement with City of San Rafael to pass-through RM2 funds granted to TAM by MTC for the Multi-Use Pathway project in San Rafael.

Mr. Whitney noted that TAM is proceeding with an MOU between TAM and SMART regarding the projects. This has been previously authorized by the TAM Board.

Principal Project Delivery Manager Bill Whitney presented the staff report, reviewing the five separate actions that staff recommends the Committee affirm and forward to Board. He noted that action #5 had been done already by the Board at their special meeting on February 12th.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked for clarification on the second action, and ED Steinhauser explained it was intended to allow early acquisition of the land because they cleared the land. She acknowledged it was out of order but noted there is provision in CEQA law to allow it.

Regarding the $850,000 in RM2 funding to be used for acquisition of the land rights, Commissioner Furst asked about one of the lease-holders who had objected to the termination of his lease. Staff confirmed that it has since been resolved. Commissioner Furst also asked whether the MOU between the Golden Gate Bridge District, SMART, City of San Rafael and the County reduces the risk of any objections under the CEQA process. She wanted to be sure there was no risk to TAM in approving this action. ED Steinhauser said she believes it is safe.

Commissioner Furst moved to recommend the Board take the five actions as outlined in the staff report:

1) Reaffirm a previous action to request MTC allocate $850,000 in Regional Measure 2 toll bridge funds for use by TAM to be directed to SMART for acquisition of land rights in preparation for a future project. Also confirm request to MTC for $500,000 in funds to complete design, right, of way activities, and permits for the Northern Segment of the North/South Greenway in Larkspur, and request MTC to redirect $2.9 mil in RM2 funds for the Multi-Use Pathway in San Rafael.

2) Incorporate additional requirement for both TAM and SMART to indemnify MTC with respect to early land acquisition, under an agreement by SMART and TAM that includes potential return of funding to MTC.

3) Adopt an MTC condition stating that any savings from the North-South Greenway project are to be applied to the permanent (not interim) relocation/facility for the San Rafael Transit Center and

4) Continue to work closely with funding partners the City of San Rafael and the County of Marin to close the $500,000 funding gap in the Multi-Use Path project. This gap is in addition to the $2.95M Regional Measure 2 mentioned below.

5) Authorize the development and approval by TAM’s Executive Director an agreement with City of San Rafael to pass-through RM2 funds granted to TAM by MTC for the Multi-Use Pathway project in San Rafael.

Commissioner Lucan seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.
ED Steinhauser suggested the item be placed on the Consent Calendar for the next Board meeting. She also asked whether the Innovation Workshop should be listed as a Board item with opportunity for review and discussion. Chair Moulton-Peters agreed.

_The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m._