

EXPENDITURE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Draft Minutes – September 6, 2017

MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Debbie Alley
Sue Beittel
Lisel Blash
Allan Bortel
Monique Brown
Robert Burton
Bill Carney
V-Anne Chernock
Joy Dahlgren
Kevin Hagerty
Roberto Hernandez
Cynthia Murray
Mike Grant (Alternate
for Ken Lippi)
Vince O'Brien
Kate Powers
Peter Pelham
Paul Premo
Coy Smith
Scott Tye
Lynn Von der Werth
Joanne Webster

MEMBERS

ABSENT:

Javier Flores
Jon Horniek
Paul Roye

*Friendly reminder for members to brief alternates and alternates to brief members, as needed

STAFF

PRESENT:

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director
Bonnie Nelson, Facilitator
Molly Graham, Public Outreach Coordinator
Joanne O'Hehir, Coordinator

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began at 6:00 p.m. and Chair Chernock welcomed the committee members, each of whom provided a general introduction and overview of their interests and representative group. Members of the public also introduced themselves.

2. Previous Meeting Recap, Acceptance of the Minutes, Overview of Materials Requested, Response to Outstanding Questions

Chair Chernock announced that acceptance of the minutes would be deferred to the next meeting.

ED Steinhauser referred everyone to three handouts, general TAM announcements, that were distributed prior to the start of the meeting. The first was a flyer about the 6-month pilot Lyft program for first-and- last mile trip support (discount when using LYFT's rideshare option) called "GetSMART" which the executive director agreed to send to the group electronically and noted that it is on the TAM website as well. The second handout was a flyer about the September 9 "Drive Electric" event being held in the Bon Air Shopping Center. The final handout announced an informational open house on State Route 37, sponsored by Caltrans, on September 20 and being held at the Key Room at Homeward Bound in Novato.

3. Senate Bill 1 and Regional Measure 3 Update on Activity, TAM Staff

Executive Director Dianne Steinhauser provided background information on Senate Bill 1 (SB 1), an increase in gas taxes and vehicle registration fees, which will provide much needed funding, to both the state and local government, for road maintenance.

Regarding Regional Measure 3 (RM3), ED Steinhauser stated that a new project list is expected to be published by the Assembly for an upcoming vote later in the week and that she would forward it to the group once available. She reviewed the four projects recommended by TAM for this funding which include: Marin-Sonoma Narrows, Hwy 101 to I-580 Connector, SR37 Environmental Document, and the permanent transit center in San Rafael.

In response to questions regarding when this measure would be placed on the ballot and when it would be available for Marin's four projects if approved, ED Steinhauser said that timing of the ballot is still undetermined but would likely be either June or November of 2018. Regarding availability of the funds, she noted that toll collection would begin 6 months after the measure is approved by voters but that MTC would then go through a process to determine when to distribute the funds, noting bonding the revenue forward may be necessary, with allocations based on which projects were ready to accept the funding vs those that are still in development.

Regarding the renewal of TAM's sales tax, one participant commented that TAM could face the challenge of determining how much to allocate to these projects if they will also be receiving RM3 funding. Ms. Nelson reminded the group that none of these funding sources will pay for 100% of any of Marin's four projects included in RM3 but that RM3 funding is more likely to be allocated for a project if it has local money already allocated to it.

One commenter expressed concern about allocating sales tax money to a project in order to leverage outside funding, like RM3, in the event that the funding is not granted. ED Steinhauser said that strong funding plans are necessary when undertaking major infrastructure projects and that she felt confident that monies can be sourced to complete it. She added that

if the decision is made to renew the sales tax rather than renew and augment it, there will not be a large new revenue stream available for projects. As a result, the question is whether we want to place more emphasis on leveraging when it comes to new sales tax revenues. She noted that leveraging can be an incentive for partners to bring more money to the table.

A committee member stated that it is important to have “self-help county” status and local funds in hand in order to compete for funds.

4. Overview of Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District Transit Services – Denis Mulligan, General Manager

Ms. Nelson introduced Mr. Denis Mulligan, General Manager of the GGBH&T District who was presenting to the Committee at their request.

Mr. Mulligan provided a brief history of the District, and how increasing congestion which called for an expansion of the District to include not only the bridge but bus and ferry operations as well. He discussed the types of busses and ferries and services offered aboard these vehicles which help take traffic off the highway. He reviewed the District’s revenue sources and expense allocations, and he explained how the District uses technology, such as ticket vending machines and a moveable bridge barrier, to provide increased efficiency.

Mr. Mulligan stated that TAM provides \$85,000 per year to the Bridge District to help offset a portion of the ferry shuttle cost in the Sir Francis Drake Corridor especially, as directed by the 2004 Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan. He added that while regional bus service is eligible for Measure A funding, the Bridge District has not received any Measure A money for regional bus service. However, he asks the Committee members to remember his Agency when discussing the new expenditure plan as financial assistance may be needed in the future.

He reported that ferry ridership is at capacity and so he suggested that leveraging revenue from a new authorization could provide fifty percent of the purchase of a new ferry.

Responding to a question about current ferry capacity, Mr. Mulligan explained that the catamarans carry 400-450 while the larger ferries carry 725.

Mr. Mulligan was asked about the District’s strategic plan regarding climate change, sea level rise and funding sources. He stated that his bus fleet was converted to renewable diesel in 2016 and are looking for ways to do the same with the ferry fleet while new busses will be hybrids. He added that ferry ramps and gangways are scheduled to be replaced.

In response to a comment about busses not showing up in Mill Valley as per the schedule, Mr. Mulligan acknowledged that the problem existed in summer of 2016 but that the District has addressed that and has experienced only one missed bus trip since then.

One commenter talked about a “strange” traffic merge on the Waldo Grade since the implementation of the removeable median barrier as motorists must move over two lanes on the bridge approach. Mr. Mulligan explained that the new lane drop configuration was actually more standard, dropping lanes on the right side as happens on highways. The commenter

further mentioned that the painting of the bridge and the bridge cables seem to be behind schedule.

Mr. Mulligan stated that motorists have become accustomed to the merge which was a tradeoff to having a moveable barrier and there have been no accidents. As to the gentleman's second comment, Mr. Mulligan discussed the schedule for completing this work.

A committee member asked if the District could bridge the gap between the SMART train the ferry boats. Mr. Mulligan responded that a shuttle from San Rafael to Larkspur has just begun service and will continue until the SMART extension to Larkspur is built. He added that SMART's analysis in their environmental document anticipated that very few of their riders would go into San Francisco which Mr. Mulligan believes missed the mark.

In response to a question about the number of Larkspur ferry riders who come from outside of Marin, Mr. Mulligan said that it is a small number. He added that the majority of ridership is primarily from the Ross Valley and Terra Linda secondarily.

One member questioned the coordination of service between Golden Gate Transit and Marin Transit to avoid redundancies and to provide a seamless experience and Mr. Mulligan stated that his Agency coordinates closely with Marin Transit in both areas.

Responding to a question about reducing congestion by intercounty bus and ferry trips, Mr. Mulligan stated that discussions have been held on the topic but intercounty bus trips late-night are not cost efficient, similar to late-night ferry trips. However, the District would consider a pilot program of running a Vallejo to Larkspur ferry once SMART extends to Larkspur.

The final question for this item asked Mr. Mulligan to provide a summary of how much money the GGBHT District would ask for from a new sales tax, both on a one-time basis as well as over the life of the tax. Mr. Mulligan stated that his Agency would like to maintain the funding for the ferry shuttles and that he would ask for the flexibility for funding future regional bus service, of which both of these items are already in the current expenditure plan. In addition, the District would ask for a one-time \$15 million to cover one-half of the cost of a new ferry.

Ms. Nelson recognized the TAM Chair, Stephanie Moulton-Peters, who was in the audience.

5. Marin County Resiliency Programs – Bay Wave and C-Smart, Chris Choo

Executive Director Steinhauser introduced Ms. Chris Choo, Principal Planner for the County of Marin who introduced Mr. Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director of Public Works for the County of Marin, who was sitting in the audience.

Ms. Choo began her presentation by providing an overview of the recently completed Vulnerability Assessment and distributing a copy of the transportation section from that report. She noted that sea level rise scenarios were analyzed for all parts of the Bay shoreline in Marin County to better understand vulnerable areas and transportation outcomes as a result. Ten scenarios were analyzed at 10, 20 and 60 inches of sea level rise and included a 100-year storm in the scenarios. County staff collaborated with staff from the 11 Marin jurisdictions as well as special districts.

Ms. Choo then explained where the impacts of sea level rise would affect transportation including areas that currently flood during King tides, lands near the shoreline that are sinking currently, ten major roadways in Marin as well as busses, ferries, marinas, and bike paths. She added that emergency services including fire stations, the CHP in Corte Madera, and police and fire boats in southern Marin would also be affected.

Ms. Choo stated that she does not have a particular “ask” of the committee respective to the sales tax authorization but wanted to present the results of this study as a starting place to plan and adapt to this environmental event. She asked that the membership review the Assessment and to understand that sea level rise must be taken into consideration and integrated when undertaking any new projects or programs.

Mr. Alex Westhoff, of the County’s Community Development Agency spoke to the group about C-SMART, Collaboration: Sea-level Marin Adaptation Response Team, the counterpart to Bay Wave. He explained that BayWave is on the bay side of Marin while C-SMART, established in 2014, is on the ocean/pacific coast of Marin. He explained the five scenarios examined including 10-, 20-, 39- and 80-inch rises including annual, 20-year and 100-year storms. He reviewed 10 key vulnerabilities including beach erosion at Stinson Beach, Bolinas, and Tomales Bay. Regarding transportation vulnerabilities, he stated that approximately 20 miles of exposed roadways would be affected which could isolate some West Marin communities as alternate routes are nonexistent.

Mr. Westhoff discussed the Marin Ocean Coast Sea Level Rise Adaptation Report which is a non-regulatory document which offers a number of adaptation options suggested by local residents and technical experts who have been brought on board. He noted that the report is broken down into asset categories including parcels and buildings, transportation, utilities, and emergency services and then offers next steps to adapting to rise.

A member commented that the Model from the 2012 San Diego Plan was used by both Ms. Choo and Mr. Westhoff in their analysis and that a 5-ft. rise was anticipated. He questioned if and how often the model would be updated. Mr. Westhoff replied that the model will not be static and that he is working with the Coastal Commission to develop policy language as to when the model is updated.

In the interest of moving the agenda along in a timely manner, Chair Chernock asked if member questions could be forwarded, offline, to Ms. Choo and Mr. Westhoff for a response.

ED Steinhauser thanked one member, in particular, for requesting that this topic be agendaized and stated that she will be forwarding, to the membership, another report on governance in the Bay Area on sea-level rise issues, which is an important consideration for further implementation of adaptation strategies.

6. Breakout Groups – Discussion of the existing Measure A Expenditure Plan and potential changes or additions for a future Expenditure Plan

Ms. Nelson noted that, to date, the membership has heard from approximately 60 percent of

the speakers planned to come before the group, but she recognized, also, that the group is ready to be developing an expenditure plan. The first step in that development is for the members to break out into small groups to discuss categories for expenditures.

She reminded all to refer to the polling data and all the information received from the speakers throughout these meetings and asked that everyone keep in mind three factors:

- 1) Am I solving a real problem;
- 2) Can I garner a 2/3 vote; and
- 3) Can I avoid organized opposition.

She reviewed the handouts associated with this task which included a pie chart showing the categories covered in the current transportation sales tax measure's expenditure plan. She emphasized that this exercise will not focus on numbers, percentages, or dollars as those will be looked at in a future meeting. She clarified this exercise would focus on what categories should be included in and excluded from a future expenditure plan. She asked that groups get as specific as possible in discussing suggested categories. She reminded the group that categories should be flexible enough to span a 30-year tax but have enough specificity so that voters would understand what they are being asked to approve. While some example categories were provided as a starting point, Ms. Nelson stressed that groups can keep them or add and delete as they explore ideas and attempt to arrive at consensus.

Responding to a member's question whether groups should be thinking in terms of an extension of the existing tax or an augmentation of the existing tax, Ms. Nelson asked the group to begin by considering an extension of the existing ½-cent tax but then the group should consider what categories they would want to add if additional funding was available.

One commenter suggested that the group should consider what would occur if neither an extension or augmentation of the existing sales tax was sought and that this would create a baseline for consideration of the other two scenarios. He said this would be an easier "sell" to the average voter.

Ms. Nelson agreed with the comment and then asked everyone to go into their specific group, as indicated by the colored dot on each person's name tent, and proceed with the 30-minute exercise.

The groups re-assembled in the conference room at approximately 7:45 p.m.

One member asked for the dates of the October meetings and ED Steinhauser indicated that October 10 would be the first meeting with the second date yet to be determined.

The yellow team reported out:

Sea Level Rise and adaption should be factored into every category.

Transit: Marin Transit including high-volume corridor improvements; a new ferry boat, School busses and school-serving routes and general support of SMART

Streets, Roads, Paths: Major and Local streets and roads, including signalization

Safe Routes to Schools: Broaden the program to a new name "Safe routes and Connectivity"

so that education/encouragement can be broadened to other modes

Highways: West Marin, SR 37, 101/580 Direct Connector, MSN, ramp metering, and interchange improvements

Something else: Housing

A member of the yellow team added that he forgot to add ridesharing in the “Something else” category.

The red team reported out:

Transit: strongly supported category by the group, expand to include school bus service, rebuild the transit center, senior transit expansion, leverage more money for more transit

Streets Roads Paths: Not much support but do incorporate sea-level rise into infrastructure projects; questioned need for more money in this category if receiving SB1 funding

Safe Routes to Schools: strong support; Crossing Guards are critical; school congestion is a major issue

Highways: Supportive of MSN HOV Lane and recognition that MSN corridor is used for trucking/goods and services; recognition of SR 37 flooding and congestion; interchanges and local road improvements around interchanges; leverage dollars

Something else: support sea level rise projects; No more money for SMART, support for ferry shuttles and some money for new ferry

One member commented that he was glad to see support for transit by this team extended beyond Marin Transit.

The blue team reported out:

Transit: broad emphasis on congested corridors and core services that address commute issues; senior and rural transit not as major an emphasis

Streets Roads Paths: Emphasis on congestion relief on arterials and major roads for more efficiency; supportive of Complete Streets

Safe Routes to Schools: strong emphasis on crossing guards; focus on safety and reducing local congestion

Highways: emphasis on 101/580 connector to reduce congestion and MSN as well; not much support for SR 37 due to the many complex and costly issues including sea level rise; tangible success as with Gap Closure; leverage funding

Something else: Information technology on trips; micro transit – how to provide transit to the outside corridors without using large busses

A member of the team added that transit to schools was very important to this group as it adds so much to the congestion in those areas.

The green team reported out:

Transit: 55% was too much for this category as big busses and school busses will not be the vehicle of choice in the future; role of UBER and Lyft; autonomous futures; hubs and access to transit are important; support for \$15 million for Golden Gate Transit new ferry boat.

Streets Roads Paths: Smarter roadways in preparation for the future; Complete Streets but it

will not be supported if congestion reduction doesn't occur concurrently. Consider effect of sea level rise on local roads.

Safe Routes to Schools: Why aren't schools funding school bus service and crossing guards? School busses do reduce traffic; May prioritize Safe routes and pathways that could be affected by sea level rise. Loss of crossing guards is big issue; can we find a way to fund them?

Highways: Finish existing projects. One-time capital investments are better way to invest these funds than operating subsidy. Highways interfacing with local roads is important, such as interchange improvements.

Something else: what is role of autonomous vehicles? Remote work options; invite a Caltrans presentation on their work in Marin; How to address flooding? Flexibility important in a 30-year plan as things could look very different 30 years from now.

One member asked how flexibility in spending of revenues can be built in to an expenditure plan.

Ms. Nelson stated that it is balance of having enough flexibility to address emerging issues but enough specificity so that voters know that they will see results from their tax dollars. She cited the current expenditure plan and noted that some things are specific and others are eligible for funding.

A member asked how autonomous vehicles would be integrated into the transit system. ED Steinhauser suggested having a speaker at a future meeting explain how it is being implemented elsewhere.

A member asked and the executive director agreed to provide a link to the tape of the Innovation workshop where autonomous vehicles were discussed.

The Chair asked the group to consider a date for the second October meeting and the group agreed that October 23 would work.

Ms. Nelson noted that she found similarities among the four groups which she believes will give the committee a good foundation on which to build.

One member commented that the reporting out among the four groups referenced renewing but none talked about expansion of the sales tax. Ms. Nelson speculated that the groups identified categories that could fit into either scenario and that once this committee receives, in October, information about revenue projections, then decisions can be made regarding adding or dropping items from the list.

Ms. Weaver, the graphic illustrator, noted that as she walked amongst the groups during the breakout sessions, she was pleased to see different people talking each time she walked past their group. She commented, as well, that while there were questions regarding which box to place different ideas, the boxes are all interconnected.

One member stated that sea level rise is not an issue that is unique to Marin; rather it is a national issue and coordination should be in line with what the rest of the country is doing.

7. Request for Additional Material / Upcoming EPAC Activity

There were several additional information items referenced in the topics this evening.

8. Public Open Time

One member of the public said he thought the yellow bus program is important in the smaller communities but that Golden Gate is no long providing funds for the program, so he'd like to see how to funding could be restored. He suggested, also, asking the schools to move the start of classes forward by one hour to help morning congestion. He finalized his comments by stating that TAM needs to coordinate between the decision to place a sales tax on the ballot along with other measures that may come to the ballot as well.

9. Adjournment

Chair Chernock adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

TAM
Transportation Authority of Marin
EPAC 9-6-17

UPDATES
w/pt
37
RM3 possible vote Friday!
- Narrows
- S80 connector
- Hwy 37
- San Rafael
- renewable diesel
- hybrid buses
- plan to redo ramps

LEVERAGE
- multi COUNTY
- Bridge, bus, boat
- 20% of commute use transit
- COMFY ride!
- electronic toll reduce cost, congestion
- frictionless customer service
- moveable barrier
- suicide barrier
- NO MEASURE A \$!!
- Free Ferry SHUTTLE subsidized by TAM
- Please consider funding new Ferry Boat! (high speed) \$15mil

SEA LEVEL RISE
Bay wave
vulnerability assessment
transportation effects:
shoreline
101
580
37
SR transit center
Marinas
bike paths
SMART tracks
NEED to INTEGRATE into every other plan!

CSMART
Stinson Beach
Belinas - wharf road
Tomales
drinking water under roadway
ALTERNATE ROUTES DON'T EXIST!
"Flooding Triggers"
We know why, where, when, who... but HOW are we going to adapt?

BREAK OUTS
As we create a plan, ask....
- Are you solving a real problem?
- 2/3 vote?
- Avoid organized opposition?
- Sea level rise
- School buses
- High volume corridor - transit
- Grow SR25 + connectivity apply to other groups
- High priority hwy segment - add 37? West Marin to 115+ Interchanges
- HOUSING - can't solve transit prob w/o address employment + housing
- Ride sharing
- SMART - yes? no?
- Transit center
- Senior transit
- Crossing guards
- School congestion
- Ferry
- Complete streets
- Info technology
- Autonomous vehicles
- remote employment

Specificity
Flexibility - buses not the vehicle of the future
Creativity
Safety
Congestion
Leveraging

■ = new from last measure

Transportation Authority of Marin
Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee
September 6, 2017
© Eris Weaver 2017
www.erisweaver.info