

# **TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN**

## **MEASURE A – TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX**

### **STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE (SPU)**

**2016**

**Chair:**

Stephanie Moulton-Peters - Mill Valley City Council

**Vice Chair:**

Judy Arnold - Marin County Board of Supervisors

**Commissioners:**

Damon Connolly – Marin County Board of Supervisors

Sandra Donnell - Belvedere City Council

Alice Fredericks – Tiburon Town Council

Diane Furst - Corte Madera Town Council

Daniel Hillmer - Larkspur City Council

Steve Kinsey – Marin County Board of Supervisors

P. Beach Kuhl - Ross Town Council

Eric Lucan - Novato City Council

Tom McInerney – San Anselmo Town Council

Gary Phillips – San Rafael City Council

John Reed - Fairfax Town Council

Katie Rice - Marin County Board of Supervisors

Kathrin Sears - Marin County Board of Supervisors

Tom Theodores – Sausalito City Council

**Executive Director:**

Dianne Steinhauser

[www.tam.ca.gov](http://www.tam.ca.gov)

**TAM Board Alternates:**

James Campbell – Belvedere City Council  
Carla Condon – Corte Madera Town Council  
Kate Colin – San Rafael City Council  
Pat Eklund – Novato City Council  
Renee Goddard – Fairfax Town Council  
Kevin Haroff – Larkspur City Council  
Sashi McEntee – Mill Valley City Council  
Ford Greene – San Anselmo Town Council  
Elizabeth Brekhus – Ross Town Council  
Erin Tollini – Tiburon Town Council  
Herb Weiner – Sausalito City Council

**Citizens’ Oversight Committee (COC ) Members**

Allan Bortel - Marin County Paratransit Coordinating Council  
Robert Burton - Southern Marin Planning Area  
V-Anne Chernock – Northern Marin Planning Area  
Joy Dahlgren – Central Marin Planning Area  
Pamela Gach – League of Women Voters  
Vacant – Environmental Organizations  
Vince O’Brien – Bicyclists and Pedestrians Groups  
Peter Pelham – Major Marin Employers  
Paul Premo - Taxpayer Groups  
Paul Roye - Ross Valley Planning Area  
Scott Tye - West Marin Planning Area  
Kathleen Helmer – School Districts

**COC Alternates**

Jayni Allsep – Southern Marin Planning Area  
Rocky Birdsey - Marin County Paratransit Coordinating Council  
Monique Broussard – Major Marin Employers  
Kay Noguchi – League of Women Voters  
Nancy Okada - Environmental Organizations

## Table of Contents

<b>LIST OF ATTACHMENTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
A. THE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN.....	12
B. OVERVIEW OF THE STRATEGIES .....	12
1. <i>Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit</i> .....	14
2. <i>Strategy 2: US 101 HOV Gap Closure</i> .....	14
3. <i>Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure</i> .....	15
4. <i>Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools</i> .....	15
C. STRATEGIC PLAN PURPOSE & GUIDING PRINCIPLES .....	16
<b>II. POLICY ELEMENTS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
A. SEPARATION OF STRATEGIES & SUB-STRATEGIES POLICY .....	19
B. RESERVE POLICY .....	20
C. DEBT POLICY .....	21
D. INVESTMENT POLICY .....	22
E. FUND SWAP POLICY .....	22
F. COMPLIANCE AUDIT POLICY.....	23
G. STRATEGIC PLAN AMENDMENT POLICY.....	24
<b>III. REVENUES &amp; EXPENDITURES.....</b>	<b>26</b>
A. SALES TAX REVENUE FORECAST METHODOLOGY .....	26
B. OFF-THE-TOP EXPENDITURE ASSUMPTIONS / DEBT CAPACITY .....	26
C. REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN .....	27
1. <i>Revenue Available for Programming</i> .....	27
2. <i>Revenue &amp; Expenditure Plan by Strategy/Sub-Strategy</i> .....	27
3. <i>Fund Leveraging</i> .....	28
D. PROGRAMMING METHODOLOGY & ASSUMPTIONS FOR STRATEGIES .....	29
1. <i>Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit</i> .....	29
2. <i>Strategy 2: US 101 HOV Gap Closure</i> .....	31
3. <i>Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure</i> .....	32
4. <i>Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools</i> .....	37
<b>IV. IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES.....</b>	<b>43</b>
A. CLAIMANT POLICIES .....	43
1. <i>Eligibility for Funding</i> .....	43
2. <i>Application Process</i> .....	43
3. <i>Allocation and Disbursement of Funds</i> .....	44
4. <i>Monitoring and Reporting Requirements</i> .....	45
5. <i>Eligible and Ineligible Costs</i> .....	45
6. <i>Other</i> .....	46
<b>V. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>47</b>

## **List of Attachments**

**Attachment 1 – Sales Tax Revenues and Assignment to Strategies**

**Attachment 2 – Sales Tax Programming Summary**

**Attachment 3-1 – Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit Revenues and Expenditures**

**Attachment 3-2 – Strategy 2: Highway 101 Gap Closure Revenues and Expenditures**

**Attachment 3-3 – Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure Revenues and Expenditures**

**Attachment 3-4 – Strategy 4: School-Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools Revenues and Expenditures**

## **List of Appendices**

### **1. Local Transportation Infrastructure, Major Roads & Related Infrastructure**

- a. Candidate Projects
- b. Funding Allocations by Planning Area
- c. Project Prioritization Criteria for Major Roads
- d. Major Roadway Projects Data Table

### **2. Local Transportation Infrastructure– Funding Allocations by Community**

### **3. Safer Access to Schools**

- a. Crossing Guard Location Evaluation Criteria
- b. Summary Data, Crossing Guard Survey
- c. Crossing Guard Requests (Phase 1 and 2)
- d. Safe Pathway Selection Process and Selected Projects for FY 07/08 and 09/10
  - i. Call for Projects
  - ii. Summary of Project Descriptions
  - iii. Scoring Summary for Projects Selected

### **4. Implementation and Claimant Forms**

- a. Sample Application – Major Roads
- b. Sample Funding Agreement – Local Roads
  - i. Exhibit A – Conditions on Sub-Strategy 3.2
  - ii. Exhibit B – Sample Allocation Request Form
  - iii. Exhibit C – Sample Annual Report Form

### **5. Project Fact Sheets (various projects)**

### **6. Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan**

### **7. Marin County Transit District Short-Range Transit Plan**

### **8. Comments and Responses on 2016 Draft Strategic Plan**

## Glossary

- Allocation** An action by the TAM Board making funds available. After funds are programmed in the Strategic Plan, the TAM Board can make individual allocations to projects and programs. Following the allocation action, TAM enters into a funding agreement with the sponsor. The sponsor can then spend the funds.
- Authority** Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) – the agency created for the purpose of administering the ½-cent sales tax for transportation in Marin County. The TAM Board includes representatives from each city and town in Marin County, plus the five members of the Board of Supervisors. The Authority also functions as the Congestion Management Agency for Marin County.
- Citizens' Oversight Committee** A 12-member committee of TAM consisting of 5 representatives selected from the five planning areas and 7 representing diverse interest groups in Marin County. Reports directly to the public on all issues related to the Expenditure Plan and use of the ½-cent transportation sales tax.
- Claimant** A project or program sponsor who is due to receive funding under one of the four Strategies established in the Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Measure Expenditure Plan.
- Expenditure Plan** The Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Measure Expenditure Plan, which is the plan for spending the ½-cent transportation sales tax funds.
- Hwy 101 Gap Closure Project** The Gap Closure Project includes the completion of the HOV lane on Highway 101 through San Rafael. This project is designed to relieve a critical bottleneck on Highway 101, in both the Northbound and Southbound directions.
- Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District** The agency responsible for the Golden Gate Bridge, as well as for regional transit including ferries and bus service between Sonoma, Marin, and San Francisco counties. Golden Gate currently operates local transit services in Marin County under contract to the Marin Transit.
- HOV Lane** High Occupancy Vehicle or Carpool lane, open to vehicles with 2 or more occupants—including buses—during peak commute hours.
- Leverage or Leveraging (*also Matching*)** The planned use of local sales tax dollars to attract other local, regional, State, or Federal funds. Can include the use of local funds as a required match to these other fund sources.

**Marin Transit (formerly Marin County Transit District (MCTD))**

The existing local transit district, Marin Transit currently contracts for local transit services with Golden Gate Transit. Marin Transit also currently contracts for paratransit services with Whistlestop Wheels, as well as contracting for the West County Stagecoach. Marin Transit is governed by two city representatives and five representatives from the Board of Supervisors.

**Paratransit**

Specialized transportation services for seniors and/or persons with disabilities who are unable to use regular bus routes.

**(to) Program**

To assign a future expenditure of funds to a particular use within a particular timeframe.

**Self-Help County**

A county with a local sales tax dedicated to transportation is called a “self-help” county because the tax demonstrates that the County is willing to “help itself” to solve its own transportation problems. A self-help county has greater opportunities to compete for regional, State, and Federal grants by establishing a reliable source (i.e., sales tax revenues) for the local matching funds that are required by most grantors.

**Short Range Transit Plan**

A 10-year vision of the capital and operating needs of a transit agency. Required by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), under guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), an SRTP is required from each major transit agency in the Bay Area. The SRTP serves to identify transit needs and develop priorities.

**Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan, or “Measure A” Strategic Plan**

A detailed plan of expenditures and revenue completed by the Transportation Authority of Marin every two years. The plan projects the availability of sales tax funds, and assigns or ‘programs’ the revenue to eligible projects and programs, per the sales tax Expenditure Plan approved by voters.

**Technical Advisory Committee**

A committee of TAM made up of Public Works staff, other city staff, and representatives of diverse public interests who will prioritize infrastructure improvements and make recommendations to the Transportation Authority of Marin.

**Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM)**

See “Authority.”

**Transit District**

See “Marin Transit”

## Executive Summary

The Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan, approved by voters as Measure A in November 2004, dedicates an estimated \$332 million in local sales tax revenues to transportation needs in the county over a twenty year period. The current 2016 estimate is approximately \$499 million. The sales tax was approved at a time when formerly reliable state and federal sources of transportation funding were sorely lacking and has continued to dwindle to date. A number of transportation options in Marin were in danger of being severely reduced—or eliminated entirely—if the sales tax measure had not passed.

The Sales Tax Expenditure Plan approved by voters lists projects and programs that are eligible for sales tax funds and establishes the maximum percentage of funds that can be allocated to each strategy. It did not establish exactly when allocations will be made. The Transportation Authority of Marin has developed this Strategic Plan to establish the timing of allocations and address funding priorities among the projects. The Strategic Plan reconciles the timing of expected revenues with the schedule for when those revenues are needed in order for sponsors to deliver projects and services. It takes into consideration the availability of federal, state, and other funds beyond Measure A.

The 2016 Measure A Strategic Plan Update continues to provide a 20-year outlook for how the local transportation sales tax has been spent and will be spent. While the 2016 Strategic Plan Update contains few changes from the 2014 SPU, it is still useful because it continues to present to the financial community and the Authority's stakeholders at large a clear sense of the agency's strategy in managing its revenues and expenditures responsibly and cost effectively. It provides the best available understanding of when revenue will be available and how that revenue will be spent. The resulting assignment of dollars to programs and projects is a commitment to sponsors that the funds will be available. The Strategic Plan itself does not constitute a final funding commitment. Commitments to individual projects and programs are secured through actual allocation actions by the TAM Board.

The Strategic Plan makes provisions for project management oversight, administration, and overhead necessary to manage and oversee a program of this complexity. The Plan also accounts for the necessary reserves that take into account the fluctuations in sales tax revenue seen over the last several years of shifting economic trends. It programs funds for repayment to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for a loan of funds for the Hwy 101 Gap Closure, in lieu of previously planned debt financing. The first payment to MTC was made in FY 2008-09 and the last payment will be remitted in FY 2015-16. It also plans for debt financing beginning at the earliest in FY 2019-20 for several Major Road projects. It programs funds according to realistic project and program schedules. The Strategic Plan provides the overall structure for the management of the sales tax revenues. Finally, guidance is provided for sponsors on requesting, utilizing, and reporting on the results of the sales tax allocated.

In short, the Strategic Plan provides the overall roadmap for the programming of Measure A funds consistent with sponsor's expectations. The Revenues and Expenditures Element of the Strategic Plan will continue to be updated annually to ensure that funds are readily available for the years needed and to prepare for debt issuance to accommodate project delivery.

As outlined in the Expenditure Plan, the revenues generated by the ½ cent sales tax are programmed to four Strategies and their associated Sub-Strategies. The Strategies and Sub-Strategies are as follows, with a brief summary of what the Strategic Plan includes for each:

**Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit**

Sub-Strategy 1.1: Maintain and expand local bus transit service

Sub-Strategy 1.2: Maintain and expand the rural bus transit system

Sub-Strategy 1.3: Maintain and expand transit services and programs for those with special needs—seniors, persons with disabilities, youth and low-income residents

Sub-Strategy 1.4: Invest in bus transit facilities for a clean and efficient transit system

**Strategy 2: US 101 HOV Gap Closure**

**Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure**

Sub-Strategy 3.1: Major Roads and Related Infrastructure

Sub-Strategy 3.2: Local Roads for all Modes

**Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools**

Sub-Strategy 4.1: Safe Routes to School

Sub-Strategy 4.2: Crossing Guards

Sub-Strategy 4.3: Safe Pathways to School

**Strategy 1**—Marin Transit is the sole claimant for Strategy 1. The Expenditure Plan requires that Marin Transit prepare a Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP)—to be approved by the TAM Board of Commissioners—that provides a 10-year outlook for revenues and needs for local transit in the county. The first SRTP was prepared and approved by the Marin Transit Board in March 2006 and accepted by the TAM Board as part of the approval process. Subsequent SRTPs were incorporated into the Strategic Plan in 2009, 2012, and 2015. Currently, the 55% maximum share identified for Strategy 1 is fully programmed annually, consistent with local transit needs identified in the SRTP.

**Strategy 2**—While the funding horizon has shifted somewhat since the Expenditure Plan was created—making available some federal funds that were not originally planned for on the Highway 101 HOV Gap Closure project—the costs of construction rose. As a result, the full 7.5% of Measure A funds, capped at \$25 million, were programmed to this Strategy, which includes completing the multi-use path through Puerto Suello Hill and adding sound-reduction strategies in the project area. The entire facilities were completed and a HOV Gap Closure Project completion ceremony was held in March 2011. While the HOV Gap Closure Project is complete, activities remain for Strategy 2. These includes tracking repayment to MTC on a loan secured for the Gap Closure Project, allocating Measure A funds to one remaining project that swapped its federal funds with the Gap Closure Project, and fulfilling commitments to backfilled State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) funds with Measure A Debt Reserved funds to projects in the Major Roads category. The last payment on the MTC loan was remitted in December 2015 and the remaining project with swapped federal funds was allocated in FY 15/16. For the SLPP commitments, \$2 million of the \$6 million has been allocated to two major road projects. It is anticipated that the final allocation on the SLPP backfilled will be made in FY 18/19.

**Strategy 3**—The approach to allocating funds to the two Sub-Strategies that comprise Strategy 3 is different in each case. Regarding Sub-Strategy 3.1, Major Roads and Related Infrastructure, programming of available sales tax revenues is recommended for the first few years for the

development phases of the Major Road projects. The first major road project to start construction was the City of Novato's Novato Boulevard in the Fall of 2007, followed by the City of San Rafael's Fourth Street in Spring of 2008. Novato Boulevard is divided by three segments. Novato has completed Segments 2 and 3 of the project. Segment 1 of the Novato Boulevard project is scheduled to commence final design in FY 16/17 and construction in FY 18/19.

The Fourth Street project completed construction early 2009. San Rafael received an allocation of Measure A funds in March 2016 to conduct a scoping exercise on the second prioritized project, Third Street, in the Central Planning Area. Construction for the Third Street is scheduled for FY 19/20.

Mill Valley and Marin County have received funds for major roads. Mill Valley will start construction on the Miller Avenue Rehabilitation Project in the Summer of 2016 and Marin County completed the West Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Rehabilitation Project (Samuel P Taylor State Park to Platform Bridge) with a ribbon cutting ceremony held in February 2014. Marin County has also received funds to commence preliminary engineering for the Ross Valley Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Rehabilitation Project (Highway 101 to Ross Town limit).

Regarding Sub-Strategy 3.2, Local Roads for all Modes, programming is based on the local jurisdiction formula outlined in the Expenditure Plan, which is based on population and road miles within the local jurisdiction. The formula share was updated with the 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014 Strategic Plan Updates, utilizing the most current population data from the California Department of Finance and lane miles from MTC. The measurement of lane miles versus road miles was a more accurate representation of each jurisdiction's maintenance responsibilities. The distribution formula for the 2016 Strategic Plan Update will be updated once again with latest population and lane miles data.

**Strategy 4**—The three Strategies comprising Strategy 4 are at various stages of implementation, and so funds are programmed accordingly. Strategy 4.1, Safe Routes to School, has begun receiving an annual allocation based on the historical program cost with an assumed escalation over the next 20 years. Strategy 4.2, Crossing Guards, has recommended programming for crossing guards at approximately 64 critical intersections. Measure B has been funding another 12 intersections. The Crossing Guard Program is entering its tenth year, having received its first allocation for the Fall 2006 school year. Strategy 4.3, Safe Pathways to School, is the capital improvement element of the Safe Routes to School program. The initial set of projects, selected based on performance criteria and approved Safe Routes plans, were authorized in 2007 and 2010. Projects were allocated with the third cycle funding in March 2015.. Estimated programming is included in this Strategic Plan; with specific projects listed in Appendix 3d.

The detailed dollar amounts programmed for each Strategy and Sub-Strategy are included as Attachments to the Strategic Plan (See Attachments 3-1 through 3-4.)

A number of policies are outlined or included in this Strategic Plan to make clear the actions, intentions and expectations of TAM. The policy elements discussed in this document include: the Separation of Strategies and Sub-Strategies, Reserves, Debt, Investments, Fund Swaps, and Strategic Plan Amendments. These policies are part of the structure and guidelines for prudent administration of the Measure A program.

Of paramount interest to local sponsors due to receive a portion of the sales tax revenues are the implementation guidelines; how sponsors, or claimants, receive and utilize the funds. This Strategic Plan provides various claimant policies, including: Eligibility for Funding, the Application Process, Allocations and Disbursement of Funds, Monitoring and Reporting Requirements, and Eligible and Ineligible Costs.

This Strategic Plan programming roadmap will serve as the starting line for sales tax usage. Each time a sponsor requests the next phase of funding for a project or program, TAM will assess progress and eligibility, assuring that sponsor reporting requirements are met. The incremental allocation of funds along with regular monitoring done by TAM staff will provide additional assurance that the goals of the Expenditure Plan, the strong message from voters, are being met.

This assignment of the current estimated \$499 million in sales tax revenue to the voter approved projects and programs will assure that the primary goal of the ½-cent sales tax for transportation is being met:

**Improve mobility and reduce local congestion for everyone who lives or works in Marin County by providing a variety of high quality transportation options designed to meet local needs.**

## I. Introduction

The Transportation Sales Tax Measure Expenditure Plan approved by voters as Measure A in November 2004 dedicates an estimated \$332 million in local sales tax revenues to transportation needs in Marin County. The current estimate is \$499 million.

The Strategic Plan implements the primary goal of the Transportation Sales Tax Measure, Measure A, as set forth in the Expenditure Plan:

**Improve mobility and reduce local congestion for everyone who lives or works in Marin County by providing a variety of high quality transportation options designed to meet local needs.**

The Expenditure Plan lists transportation projects and programs that are eligible for sales tax funds and establishes the maximum percentage of sales tax funds that can be allocated to each strategy over the 20-year life of the Expenditure Plan. The Expenditure Plan provided minimal guidance on the timing of allocation of the ½ cent sales tax revenue to each of the strategies. TAM has developed the Strategic Plan to establish the timing of allocation amounts, addressing funding priorities among the projects. The Strategic Plan reconciles the timing of expected revenues with the schedule for when those revenues are needed in order for sponsors to deliver projects and services. It takes into consideration the schedule of availability of federal, state, and other funds beyond Measure A; the debt issuance capacity within the Measure A program; and an assessment of the reasonableness of project and program schedules.

The Strategic Plan has been developed in close coordination with project and program sponsors. Independent but related efforts, such as the ongoing implementation of Marin Transit's Short Range Transit Plan, a 10 Year outlook of revenue capacity and needs, as well as the ongoing implementation of the comprehensive funding plan for the completion of the Highway 101 Gap Closure project, have been closely coordinated with TAM, to assure that sales tax revenues are not overstated, and are consistent with TAM forecasts and Expenditure Plan commitments. The resultant Strategic Plan continues to provide the overall roadmap for the programming of Measure A funds consistent with sponsor's expectations. The Strategic Plan will be updated every two years.

In the development of the Expenditure Plan, a number of themes on how the sales tax funds should be spent emerged. The Strategic Plan codifies these themes as *guiding principles*. These principles have guided the Strategic Plan policies and the specific programming recommendations, as Strategic Plan Updates are implemented:

1. Maximize leveraging of outside fund sources
2. Support timely and cost-effective project delivery, ensuring all strategies progress towards measurable improvements.
3. Maximize the cost effective use of sales tax dollars.
4. Promote a balanced use of funds throughout the County
5. Promote high environmental and conservation awareness.

These guiding principles guide both the policies on the use of Transportation Sales Tax funds, as well as programming recommendations.

The Strategic Plan makes provisions for project management administration consistent with the voter-approved Expenditure Plan and overhead necessary to oversee a program of this complexity. The Plan also accounts for the necessary reserves that take into account the fluctuations in sales tax revenue seen over the last several years of shifting economic trends. The Strategic Plan provides the overall structure for the management of the sales tax revenues. Finally, guidance is provided to sponsors on requesting, utilizing, and reporting on the results of the sales tax allocated.

The Strategic Plan roadmap will serve as the starting line for sales tax usage. Each time a sponsor requests the next phase of funding for a project or program, TAM will assess progress and eligibility, assuring that sponsor reporting requirements are met. The incremental allocation of funds along with regular monitoring done by TAM staff will provide additional assurance that the goals of the Expenditure Plan—a strong message from voters—are being met.

### ***A. The Transportation Authority of Marin***

TAM was created in 2004 by the Marin County Board of Supervisors to develop and administer the Expenditure Plan. With the passage of Measure A, TAM now manages the implementation of the transportation programs financed by the ½-cent, 20-year sales tax. TAM also serves as the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for the County, providing countywide planning and programming for transportation related needs. TAM plays a leading role in the planning, financing and implementation of transportation projects and programs in the County.

The TAM sixteen member governing board comprises representatives from each of the cities and towns in Marin County, and all five members of the County Board of Supervisors. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), made up of Public Works staff, other local government staff and representatives of diverse public interests prioritize infrastructure improvements and make recommendations to TAM. A twelve member Citizens' Oversight Committee, made up of five representatives from the five planning areas and seven representatives from diverse interest groups in the County, report directly to the public on all issues related to the Expenditure Plan and sales tax use.

### ***B. Overview of the Strategies***

The development of the Transportation Sales Tax Measure Expenditure Plan was the result of over four years of planning and extensive input from the public and from the cities and towns of Marin County. The Expenditure Plan was developed with the assistance of five Citizens' Advisory Committees, representing diverse interests, including environmental, social justice, business and advocates for every travel mode and advocates for underserved populations including seniors, persons with disabilities, and those with limited income.

In order to meet the goal of improving mobility and reducing local congestion for everyone who lives or works in Marin County, the Expenditure Plan defined four strategies to provide improvements to multiple modes of travel, thereby improving future mobility. The strategies are:

1. Develop a seamless local bus transit system that improves mobility and serves community needs, including special transit for seniors and the disabled (paratransit services).

2. Fully fund and ensure the accelerated completion of the Highway 101 Carpool Lane Gap Closure Project through San Rafael.
3. Maintain, improve, and manage Marin County’s local transportation infrastructure, including roads, bikeways, sidewalks, and pathways.
4. Reduce school related congestion and provide safer access to schools.

The Expenditure Plan was based on the expectation that the ½-cent sales tax would generate approximately \$332 million (originally estimated in 2004) over 20-years, net of expenses for administration and program management, debt service and bond issuance costs. The current estimated revenue collection is \$499 million, with \$447 million programmed the four strategies. The respective allocation for each strategy —by percentage and estimated revenue—is shown in the table below.

		(in millions)
<b>Strategy 1 Bus Transit</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>\$252.9</b>
1.1 Maintain and Improve Local Service	37%	\$170.1
1.2 Maintain and Improve Rural Service	3%	\$13.8
1.3 Maintain and Improve Special Needs Service	9%	\$41.4
1.4 Transit Capital	6%	\$27.6
<b>Strategy 2 Highway 101 Gap Closure</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>\$25</b>
<b>Strategy 3 Local Transportation Infrastructures</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>\$122.4</b>
3.1 Major Roads and Related Infrastructures	13.25%	\$61.2
3.2 Local Roads and Related Infrastructures	13.25%	\$61.2
<b>Strategy 4 School-Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>\$46.7</b>
4.1 Safe Routes to School Program	3.3%	\$14.0
4.2 Crossing Guard Program	4.2%	\$17.8
4.3 Safe Pathways to School Program	3.5%	\$14.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$447</b>

Per the Expenditure Plan, each of the four strategies is further divided into sub-strategies. Each sub-strategy is allocated a percentage of actual sales tax receipts, after expenses. The sections that follow provide a brief overview of each of the strategies. A more detailed description of each—including the related sub-strategies and the current estimated figures, is included in Section III. D.

## **1. Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit**

**Develop a seamless local bus transit system that improves mobility and serves community needs, including special transit for seniors and the disabled (paratransit services).** – 55% of sales tax revenue will be used for this strategy, which is intended to support and maintain a local bus (and paratransit) service that meets the needs of the local community.

As transportation funding has failed to keep pace with the need for it, it has become increasingly difficult to maintain transit services that effectively provide mobility to the communities that rely on them. Strategy 1 is specifically intended to help meet this need. It is divided into four sub-strategies:

1. Maintain and expand local bus transit service
2. Maintain and expand the rural bus transit system
3. Maintain and expand transit services and programs for those with special needs
4. Invest in bus transit facilities for a clean and efficient transit system

Marin Transit is the sole claimant for Strategy 1. Marin Transit developed its first Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP), approved by the MCTD (predecessor to Marin Transit) Board on March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2006, a 10 year outlook of revenues and needs of local transit service in Marin County. The latest adopted SRTP was incorporated to the Strategic Plan Update in July 2015. The SRTP correlates specific programs and projects with the sub-strategies that make up Strategy 1. The TAM Board of Commissioners approved the SRTP, as part of the Strategic Plan approval process, committing to the funding levels outlined in the SRTP. The SRTP and its related Service Plan continue to be implemented by the Marin Transit Board and staff.

## **2. Strategy 2: US 101 HOV Gap Closure**

**Fully fund and ensure the accelerated completion of the Highway 101 Carpool Lane Gap Closure Project through San Rafael** – 7.5% of sales tax revenue will be used for this strategy, which includes completing the final segments of the HOV lane and including elements that will improve this project in the neighborhoods adjacent to it, including landscaping, noise reduction, completion of the multi-use path through Puerto Suello Hill.

The Highway 101 Gap Closure project has been the highest priority transportation project in Marin County for over two decades. Initially, the costs for design and construction of the project were to have been paid for with federal and state transportation funds through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). At the time that Measure A was passed, the STIP had been unable to meet the demands of cities and counties for several years. This dire situation is likely to continue unabated for several more years, as fuel tax revenues are barely able to keep up with maintenance needs of the existing system. The Measure A Program came along at a time when local funds are more often expected to make up for the shortfalls at the state and federal levels on major projects such as the Highway 101 improvements.

Since the passage of Measure A, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission dedicated discretionary federal funds to the Highway 101 Gap Closure project, covering a portion of the escalating project costs. Measure A funds are being used to cover remaining carpool lane costs, as well as the design and construction of an adjacent bike path and a sound-absorbing facing for the planned and existing soundwalls. All available Measure A sales tax funds have been used to complete the final segment - Segment 4 over Puerto Suello Hill.

### **3. Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure**

**Maintain, improve, and manage Marin County’s local transportation infrastructure, including roads, bikeways, sidewalks, and pathways** – 26.5% of sales tax revenue is used for this strategy, which includes roads, bikeways, sidewalks, and pathways of local and regional significance.

The purpose of this strategy is to provide funding to maintain and improve transportation infrastructure that is of county-wide significance, as well as those that primarily serve local jurisdictions. Half of the funds are allocated for regionally significant facilities, while the other half are allocated for local facilities.

The Measure A sales tax funds help to address the over hundreds of millions of dollars in road rehabilitation needs facing local jurisdictions in Marin County. With the majority of available federal and state funds dedicated to the maintenance and rehabilitation of state highways and bridges, the Measure A funds begin to address a historical backlog of local road needs.

Since inception of the Measure A program, a number of Major road projects have been developed and are underway, including Novato Boulevard Rehabilitation in Novato, the 4<sup>th</sup> Street West End improvements in San Rafael, Miller Avenue in Mill Valley, West Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in West Marin County, and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Ross Valley.

### **4. Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools**

**Reduce school related congestion and provide safer access to schools** – 11% of sales tax revenue is used for this strategy, which includes Safe Routes to School, Crossing Guards, and Safe Pathways to School.

The purpose of this strategy is to provide a reliable funding stream for school-related transportation and safety issues. School-related traffic is a significant contributor to congestion in the county, generating over 21% of morning peak period trips. Strategy 4 provides several programs to improve school-related traffic and safety.

The Safe Routes to School program was established in 2000 and has proven to be very successful—increasing alternative mode use and reducing single-student occupant auto trips by over 15%. The overall program utilizes the following elements to maintain success and deliver a comprehensive solution to school related congestion:

- Education – of students, parents, school administrators and teachers, as well as the community on alternative strategies for school travel and ways to enhance safety of school trips,

- Encouragement - of students and parents to select alternative modes of travel to school,
- Enforcement – of safe practices of crossing busy streets , as well as safe practices in biking and walking to school,
- Engineering – of improvements around school sites to make access safer and more usable for all modes, and
- Evaluation – of the program in the eyes of school administrators and teachers, parents, students and the community to determine what else needs to be done and whether existing programs need to be changed

Measure A provided funding to continue this successful program beyond the 2004-2005 school year, when the previous funding expired. In addition to continuing the program, Measure A is allowing it to be expanded to all schools in the county. At present, nearly 50 schools have active Safe Routes elements underway at the schools. Goals for expansion particularly include more activity around high-schools. TAM is piloting two new innovative programs as part of the Safe Routes strategy – the School Pool Program to get students and parents to carpool to school, and the Street Smarts Program, an innovative program of marketing safety for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians, on the heaviest and most dangerous streets in our local jurisdictions. If proven successful, these programs will be expanded to all jurisdictions in Marin.

The Crossing Guard program provides funding for trained crossing guards at approximately 75 (increasing to 76 in the upcoming year) key intersections throughout the County. Measure A expenditures will account for 64 of the guards in the program. In accordance with the Expenditure Plan, the crossing guards are provided by a professional company that specializes in crossing guard programs in order to “eliminate liability concerns and to ensure that there are well trained crossing guards with back-ups for every critical intersection.” The program was evaluated in 2009 and 2013 and found by the survey participants to be a good expenditure of Measure A funds.

The Safe Pathways program is integral to the success of the overall strategy; it is the capital improvement element of the Safe Routes to School program. This program provides funds to design and construct projects identified through the implementation of the Safe Routes Plans developed under the Safe Routes to School program. Typical projects might include the construction of pathways, sidewalk improvements, or traffic safety devices. In 2007, 2010, and 2015 approximately \$7.4 million in project funding was awarded to local schools and Marin’s cities, towns, and the County, to enable a number of safe pathway projects to be constructed over the next few years.

### ***C. Strategic Plan Purpose & Guiding Principles***

This Strategic Plan serves as the programming document for the programs and projects that are contained in the four strategies defined in the Expenditure Plan. In the development of the Expenditure Plan, a number of themes on how the sales tax funds should be spent emerged. The Strategic Plan codifies these themes as guiding principles. These principles guide the Strategic Plan policies and the specific programming recommendations:

## **1. Maximize leveraging of outside fund sources**

The ability of local sales tax to serve as an incentive to match outside fund sources is a distinct advantage realized by the passage of the Transportation Sales Tax Measure. The message sent by voters that the County is willing to fund many of its transportation needs create opportunities at the federal, state, and regional level for funding to come to Marin County. The ability to utilize these sources will provide TAM with the flexibility to respond to emerging transportation issues. The active pursuit of these opportunities, whereby sales tax within the framework of the Expenditure Plan can be utilized to bring additional funds to the County, will continue to be a primary focus of TAM. A discussion of TAM's successful leveraging efforts to date is included in Section III.C.3.

## **2. Support timely and cost-effective project delivery, ensuring all strategies progress towards measurable improvements.**

With the recent dearth of funding at the federal and state level resulting in an increasingly larger backlog of transportation needs, it is imperative that local dollars be utilized efficiently and effectively. Local dollars should be actively delivering those projects with the greatest local impact based on measurable performance criteria. Projects or programs that progress towards delivering a public improvement should receive priority funding. Funding commitments should be examined for projects or programs that are not progressing adequately toward delivery, and remedies to promote progress should be actively supported by TAM. All strategies should progress towards measurable improvements.

## **3. Maximize the cost effective use of sales tax dollars.**

The projects and programs envisioned in the Expenditure Plan may only be deliverable if they receive a concentrated influx of funding over a relatively short time period. The timing of sales tax collection may not exactly fit the delivery needs of projects. While the Expenditure Plan envisioned the need for advancing sales tax revenue for the largest of its projects, the Hwy 101 Gap Closure project, the Strategic Plan process will examine the need to advance funds for other project delivery needs as well. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways, by the leveraging of outside fund sources, the loaning of revenue within or between Expenditure Plan strategies, and the advancing of sales tax through short or long-term debt financing, all of which will be considered. The imperative to advance funds through financing means that, over the 20-years of the Expenditure Plan, fewer dollars will be available for projects and programs because of the need to pay interest. The trade-off is the ability to deliver projects early on, for the benefit of Marin residents today. Prudence dictates that we strike a balance between accelerated delivery and financing costs, and minimize—to the extent feasible—the cost of financing.

## **4. Promote a balanced use of funds throughout the County.**

The Expenditure Plan provides the basis for how funds are distributed throughout the County over the life of the Measure A program. TAM will remain committed to working with program and project sponsors to move all strategies forward simultaneously to provide a balanced expenditure of Measure A funds throughout the County.

**5. Promote high environmental and conservation awareness.**

TAM will remain committed to working with program and project sponsors in a cooperative manner to deliver the Measure A program with attention to environmental and conservation awareness. Allocation of Measure A funds for right of way capital and construction will be contingent upon demonstration of completed environmental documentation. Attention shall be paid to any impacts on local traffic circulation, bike and pedestrian safety and accommodation, minimizing disruption to Marin County residents.

## II. Policy Elements

The Strategic Plan sets policy and provides guidance for the administration of the Measure A program, ensuring prudent stewardship of the funds. Policies considered by the TAM Board and incorporated into this document not only guide the financial decisions TAM expects to make but also will determine how sales tax funds are allocated to specific projects and programs. Some policies have been adopted as separate and distinct actions of the TAM Board; others are defined in this Strategic Plan.

### A. *Separation of Strategies & Sub-strategies Policy*

The Strategic Plan captures the intent of the Expenditure Plan in assigning funding commitments to the four key Strategies. The Expenditure Plan is organized around four strategies designed to protect the environment and quality of life enjoyed in Marin County. Each strategy is supported by specific but flexible programs that have been designed to “provide a high degree of accountability to the voters.” In the Strategic Plan, a percentage share of Measure A revenues is programmed to each strategy or sub-strategy within the four strategies. As sales tax receipts increase or decrease, the dollar amounts programmed to each strategy and sub-strategy may fluctuate accordingly, but the overall percentage will be maintained.

For purposes of developing the Revenue and Expenditure element of the Strategic Plan, financial assumptions concerning how Measure A revenues would be programmed, interest earned, and funds borrowed between strategies were developed. These assumptions have guided the development of the fund tracking and monitoring systems, which track what levels of sales tax have been expended for each strategy and sub-strategy over time. In general, for tracking purposes, each strategy or sub-strategy is considered as a discreet and separate “fund” that is eligible for its percentage share of revenues annually. Sales tax revenue may be allocated for eligible projects and programs within the strategy or sub-strategy annually or they may be allocated at a later time.

The Expenditure Plan states that “actual revenues will be programmed over the life of the Plan based on the percentage distributions identified in the Plan.” The actual requirements for funds in a specific program or sub-strategy may be higher or lower than the projected revenue availability in any given year. To address these variances, annual allocations may be greater than or be less than the amount available. With the biennial updates to the Strategic Plan, and the annual updates to the Revenue and Expenditure element within the overall Strategic Plan, status information on actual expenditures will be presented and reconciliation options discussed, to ensure that percentage distributions will be achieved over the life of the plan.

Borrowing between strategies or sub-strategies is allowed to the extent it lessens debt financing and allows projects and programs to move forward based on their readiness. In the biennial Strategic Plan updates, and the annual updates to the Revenue and Expenditure element, revenues and expenditures within each strategy and sub-strategy will be reported and options for reconciling any share imbalance will be discussed. At the sunset of the Measure, each of the strategies will have received their respective percentage shares per the Expenditure Plan.

Interest earnings on Measure A fund balance are allocated as determined by the TAM Board. In November of 2006, the TAM Board allocated a specific amount of interest revenue, \$225,000, to the Highway 101 Gap Closure project to close a funding gap in the project in order for the project to proceed to construction. This revenue was consistent with interest collected, in that several years of Highway 101 revenue had been accumulated, pending major construction on the corridor starting. In 2010, the TAM Board allocated \$300,000 to SMART design needs for the Highway 101 Gap Closure. In 2013, the TAM Board made two allocations in the amounts of \$85,000 and \$250,000 to the Golden Gate Ferry Shuttle and an insurance policy for the SMART Central Marin Ferry Connection, respectively. The TAM Board continued to fund Golden Gate Ferry Shuttle in 2014 and 2015 at the same amount of \$85,000 each year.

Besides the abovementioned allocations, routine maintenance of the primary north-south trunk-line multi-use path system, known in part as the North-South Greenway, has been adopted by the TAM Board as an eligible expenditure of interest earned on fund balances. TAM conduct an inventory of what is needed to provide maintenance of the existing North-South Greenway path system, examining primary Class 1 bi/pedestrian facilities, Class 2 facilities, and differentiating between those facilities built, funded, and not-yet funded. In February 2008, the TAM Board adopted a policy of allowing for a 50% reimbursement of routine maintenance cost of local Class 1 bike/pedestrian facilities of regional or countywide usage and significance, approved on a case-by-case basis. This policy allows TAM to utilize Measure A funds, with bike/pedestrian path maintenance an allowable expense under the original Expenditure Plan, to offset the high cost of a regionally significant facility being built maintained by a local jurisdiction within Marin County. This policy does not preclude the TAM Board from allocating Measure A interest earnings to other projects in the Expenditure Plan if it deems necessary.

Local jurisdictions, defined as the County of Marin as well as the cities and towns of Marin County, who are responsible for routine maintenance of the Class 1 multi-use path facility may apply for the Measure A Transportation Sales Tax interest funds. TAM will provide up to 50% on a reimbursable basis, to local jurisdictions in which the path segment lies. Projects are to be considered by the TAM Board on a case-by-case basis and exception was made for the maintenance Puerto Suello Hill multi-use path. In its agreement with the City of San Rafael, TAM agreed to pay the City \$40,000 annually in advance. Maintenance cost of the path is estimated to be over \$80,000 annually and the City agreed to cover the difference.

Over the life of the plan, all direct Measure A sales tax revenues will be programmed according to the percentage distributions identified in the Expenditure Plan.

Specific policies related to programming sales tax revenue to strategies and sub-strategies are discussed in the *Revenue & Expenditure* section of the Strategic Plan.

### **B. Reserve Policy**

The Expenditure Plan states “The Authority will also have the ability to set aside a reserve fund of up to 10% of the annual receipts from the tax for contingencies, to ensure that the projects included in this plan are implemented on schedule.” The purpose of establishing a reserve is to not only ensure that projects are implemented on time, but to allow for fluctuations in annual sales tax receipts that might negatively impact ongoing operating programs. The impacts on revenue availability to strategies of establishing a 5% and a 10% annual reserve fund were

analyzed. Given that the reserve fund is only one mechanism TAM will use to address fluctuations in sales tax revenue and that a conservative (low) sales tax forecast will be used, a 5% annual reserve is established for the first five years of the Strategic Plan. The conditions and process for disbursing revenues from the reserve will be considered in future policy discussions of the Board.

### ***C. Debt Policy***

The Transportation Sales Tax Measure Expenditure Plan acknowledges and allows for debt to be issued for expediting the delivery of transportation projects. As envisioned in the Expenditure Plan, approximately \$30 million in debt capacity is reserved in the Strategic Plan to meet the cash flow needs of the 101 Gap Closure project, estimated at \$25 million and other eligible projects, and estimated \$5 million. Issuing debt was originally anticipated to meet the cash demand for the Gap Closure Project, but an infusion of \$12.5 million in federal funds loaned by MTC in 2007 in exchange for future Measure A funds alleviated this demand. The MTC loan secured offers more favorable terms and lower interest expenses to TAM compared to private bond financing. However, in order to meet the rapid repayment schedule and other funding commitments under Strategy 2, it was necessary for TAM to borrow from the 5% reserve set aside starting in FY2012-13. At any time, TAM will maintain a reserve level over \$1 million. And reserve will be restored to its intended level by debt reserve funds off the top once the MTC loan is fully repaid.

Issuing debt may still be necessary for the major road projects from Strategy 3.1. Based on the current construction schedules for several major road projects, debt financing is anticipated in FY2019-20 if projects do not experience delays. A specific description of debt financing assumed in the Strategic Plan is provided in Section III.B.

The debt policy that the TAM Board adopted in July 2007 provides a framework for issuing debt, addressing restrictions on the amount and type of debt to be issued, the issuance process, and the management of the debt portfolio.

Objectives of TAM's debt policy are to:

- 1) Maximize the use of Measure A cash and other leveraged funds to capital projects, thereby minimizing the amount of debt required to deliver projects cost effectively and in a timely manner;
- 2) Maintain cost effective access to the capital markets through prudent yet flexible policies;
- 3) Moderate debt principal and debt service payment through effective planning and project cash management in accordance with TAM project sponsors; and,
- 4) Achieve the highest practical credit ratings.

An effective debt management policy provides guidelines to manage a debt program in line with the available resources. Adherence to its debt management policy signals to rating agencies and the capital markets that TAM is well managed and will likely meet its obligations in a timely manner.

To assure that Major Road projects that may require debt financing have an assured scope, cost, and schedule, so as to issue debt only when necessary, TAM staff recommend a policy revision

as part of this Strategic Plan Update whereby the local jurisdiction responsible for the delivery of the Major road project will be required to adopt a project scope, cost, and schedule through the local governing board in a timely manner to allow TAM to pursue the issuance of debt without undue delays to the project. This board action will be accompanied by a request to TAM to supply sufficient Measure A funds, in accordance with the project's funding plan, and in accordance with the project's expected cash flow needs. TAM will reserve the right to supply Measure A or equal funds to meet the project's needs.

#### ***D. Investment Policy***

The TAM Administrative Code Article VI, Section 106.8 states that "all funds of the Authority will be invested in the manner and upon the conditions set forth in Government Code 53601, and the receipt, transfer or disbursement of such funds during the term of the Agreement shall be accounted for in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to governmental entities." The Marin County Director of Finance is appointed as TAM's Treasurer by the Board. Currently, TAM holds investments in both the Marin County Investment Pool and CalTRUST. CalTRUST is a program established by public agencies in California for the purpose of pooling and investing local agency funds.

To expand upon the Administrative Code, TAM developed an investment policy with the help of its financial advisor team and input from the Marin County Department of Finance. The TAM Investment Policy was adopted by the Board in April 2007. This policy has been reviewed and updated annually. The following objectives were set forth in the policy:

- a) **Preservation of capital through high quality investments and by continually evaluating the credit of financial institutions approved for investment transactions, and securities considered and held in safekeeping;**
- b) **Maintenance of sufficient liquidity to enable the participants and other depositors to meet their operating requirements; and**
- c) **A rate of return consistent with the above objectives.**

#### ***E. Fund Swap Policy***

The Expenditure Plan envisioned the role of other fund sources to help meet Marin's transportation needs. It recognized that the sales tax funding opened up new opportunities to compete for state and federal grants that require a local match. The Expenditure Plan also discusses TAM's authority to bond "and use other financing mechanisms for the purposes of expediting the delivery of transportation projects and programs and to provide economies of scale." The Expenditure Plan specifically mentions that TAM will be able to use "other means to accelerate the delivery of projects and programs, including seeking outside grants and matching or leveraging tax receipts to the maximum extent possible."

Leveraging funds through a "fund swap," i.e., exchanging Measure A funds for an equivalent or greater amount of state or federal dollars is one mechanism that TAM will utilize in the delivery of the Measure A program. In its role as the Congestion Management Agency for Marin, TAM

has the responsibility for programming the majority of state and federal funds that come to the county. TAM is therefore well-situated to identify opportunities where such an exchange would be appropriate. Specifically, TAM looks for fund swap opportunities that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- The fund swap will in some way reduce overall project costs of TAM sales tax strategies, e.g. by reducing or eliminating the need for other financing.
- The fund swap will facilitate the accelerated delivery of TAM's sales tax strategies.
- The fund swap will facilitate the accelerated or reduced delivery cost of TAM funded projects that would otherwise have been funded with federal funds.

TAM has engaged in a number of fund swaps that have accelerated the delivery of TAM funded projects and programs, specifically projects and programs that would have been delivered with federal funds. These fund swaps include the following:

- TE/TLC/STP Funds - In December 2005, TAM approved the swapping of federal funds and Measure A funds, originally programmed to the Highway 101 Gap Closure Project, to alleviate burdens on local project sponsors which would have otherwise used federal funds on smaller projects. The Highway 101 Gap Closure Project was already "federalized", meaning that it had already met all requirements to use federal funds, and would not incur any additional burden by adding more federal funds.

The total amount of swapped federal funds includes \$1.039 million in Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds, \$1.392 million in Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) funds, and \$3.48 million in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. The federal funds were programmed to the Highway 101 Gap Closure Project with the commitment from TAM that the equal amount of Measure A funds would be programmed to other projects in the County that would have otherwise used these federal funds.

- State Local Partnership Program (SLPP) - In July 2010, the TAM Board committed nearly \$6 million in SLPP funds to the Major Roads Category of Strategy 3.1. However, in July 2011, the TAM Board diverted all available SLPP funds from the Major Roads category to the SMART project. Concurrently, the TAM Board directed the same amount of Measure A Debt Service Reserve to the Major Road Category to make those projects whole. To date, \$2 million of the \$6 million available has been allocated to two projects: West Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in the West Planning Area and Miller Avenue in the South Planning Area. The remaining \$4 million is still available for allocations to three Planning Areas (North, Central, and Ross Valley). The commitment to backfill SLPP funds with Measure A Debt Service Reserve is anticipated to be satisfied in FY 18/19 when project sponsors plan to go to construction on Major Road projects. As noted previously, the targeted FY 18/19 date can be delayed if construction schedules do not proceed as planned.
- NTPP - Concurrent to the abovementioned funds swap, TAM approved the below list of County TE projects that would be receiving Measure A funds, including \$400,000 to City of San Rafael's Medway/Canal Improvement Project. TAM helped to facilitate a transaction between Marin County and the City of San Rafael to swap \$265,300 in

Measure A funds with equal amount in Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Program (NTPP) funds in order to assist Marin County to implement its Bicycle Signing and Striping Project more expeditiously.

- Safe Routes to School – TAM received federal Safe Routes to School funding as part of the Block Grant Program and One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program from MTC. The funds were intended to establish a Safe Routes to School Program in each CMA, but Marin already has a mature and respected Safe Routes to School Program that was being modelled in other counties. Furthermore, the federal funds could not be used in TAM's existing Safe Routes to School contract because the contract was not "federalized." In consultation with MTC, the federal funds were programmed to the County for the Strawberry Point and Venetia Valley Safe Pathway capital projects and to San Rafael for the Grand Avenue Bridge project and equivalent Safe Pathway funds were programmed to the existing Safe Routes to School Program.

#### ***F. Compliance Audit Policy***

The Measure A Expenditure Plan provided TAM with the authority to audit all Measure A fund recipients for their use of the sales tax proceeds. An independent compliance audit is explicitly permitted under the terms and conditions of TAM's funding agreements/contracts with all Measure A funding recipients. Compliance Audits are typical practice amongst sales tax agencies around the state. With the assistance of TAM's Citizens' Oversight Committee, the TAM Board adopted the Measure A Compliance Audit Policy at its October 28, 2010 Board meeting. TAM has been conducting annual Measure A compliance Audits since FY2011-12.

#### ***G. Strategic Plan Amendment Policy***

The Strategic Plan is the programming document that directs the use of the transportation sales tax revenue over the next 20 years. The Strategic Plan provides the intent of the Board and resultant assurance to sponsors. While the programming is a statement of intent, the Board must approve individual allocations before the sales tax can be used.

It is envisioned that annual adjustments to the Revenue and Expenditure element of the Strategic Plan will be routinely done to update revenue status, and allow adjustments to programming. These are envisioned to occur at the change of the Fiscal Year in June/July. For any other adjustments in the revenue and expenditure element that occur prior to the annual update, and which result in a reduced use of sales tax, the change will be noted in the allocation action of the Board, but an amendment to the Strategic Plan's revenue and expenditure element will not be necessary. If changes in the revenue and expenditure element result in increased use in sales tax over \$250,000, these changes will be noted in the allocations action of the Board, and an amendment to the Strategic Plan's revenue and expenditure element will be approved simultaneously.

An amendment to the strategic plan will be implemented as part of a regularly scheduled Board meeting. Noticing of the amendment will occur as part of the current process for noticing Board meetings. In all cases, the noticing shall comply with the Brown Act. Comments will be accepted at the meeting regarding the amendment. Approval of the amendment will occur at the following Board meeting, allowing time for additional comment. Any changes to policies

contained in the Strategic Plan will also necessitate an amendment to the Strategic Plan, done simultaneously with changes to the policy.

For amendment changes \$250,000 and under, the Board will have the authority to program funds from prior year(s) that were not allocated and/or unprogrammed carryover funds without formally amending the Strategic Plan and opening a formal public comment period. All TAM allocation actions will continue to be done at regularly scheduled and noticed TAM board meetings, allowing public comment and input.

### III. Revenues & Expenditures

The **Measure A – Transportation Sales Tax 2016 Strategic Plan** provides a 20-year outlook for how the local transportation sales tax will be spent. The Revenue and Expenditure Element of the Strategic Plan is the result of an analysis and modeling of revenue capacity, matched to project costs and project delivery schedules. The resulting assignment of dollars to programs and projects does not constitute a final funding commitment. Commitments are secured through actual allocations actions by the TAM Board to individual projects and programs.

#### *A. Updated Sales Tax Revenue Forecast Assumptions*

TAM evaluated and revised its revenue assumptions during the 2016 Strategic Plan update. The budgeted Measure A revenue level for FY2016-17, which is \$26.3 million, was used as the base for future revenue growth. With the steady recovery of sales tax revenue in the last seven years in Marin County, staff recommended a 2% annual increase starting in FY2015-16.

It is anticipated that sales tax revenue projections will be updated annually as part of the Revenue and Expenditure update process. Actual revenue and expenditure data will be added to the forecast, which, through the effects of compounding, could impact future revenue estimates. Revised economic analyses could suggest that more robust growth forecasts should be applied at that time, or that continuation of conservative forecasts is the more prudent option.

#### *B. Off-the-top Expenditure Assumptions / Debt Capacity*

The Expenditure Plan indicates that allocations to strategies and sub-strategies are made after taking “off-the-top” expenses for administration, program management, debt service reserve and up to 10% reserve. The Expenditure Plan originally assumed a \$30 million bond issue in the first year of the sales tax.

For purposes of developing the revenue and expenditure plan, it is important to understand how funds are taken “off-the-top” and how the net amount available to strategies and sub-strategies is calculated.

Sales tax revenues are received monthly from the Board of Equalization. From the revenues remitted to TAM, the following off-the-top allocations are made consistent with the Expenditure Plan:

- 1% of sales tax receipts to TAM administration of the sales tax,
- 4% of sales tax receipts to sales tax overall program administration,
- \$2.35 million debt reserve for project expenditures under Strategy 2 and debt service and financing costs needed for the 101 Gap Closure project and other eligible projects,
- 5% of sales tax receipts reserved annually for the first five years of the Strategic Plan.

The remaining revenues are allocated to each sub-strategy, with the exception of Strategy 2, which is funded with the debt reserve, according to re-calculated percentage shares per the Expenditure Plan. The above-mentioned off-the-top expenditures were envisioned at the time the

Expenditure Plan was developed and approved. Funding levels programmed to strategies in this Strategic Plan, as well as allocated to strategies in the first year—such as transit and Safe Routes to School— reflect this off-the-top assumption.

As called for in the Expenditure Plan, debt payment is reserved off-the-top in the Strategic Plan to account for some form of debt financing. Specifically, approximately \$2.35 million is taken off-the-top for debt service and debt issuance costs annually, beginning in FY 2005-06. This amount was calculated based on a bond issuance of approximately \$30 million and interest assumptions at the time the Expenditure Plan was developed. Staff will revisit the debt finance assumptions before the issuance of the bond and adjust assumptions and bond reserve needs appropriately. Note that sufficient debt reserve will be maintained to cover Strategy 2 expenditures, including direct project design and construction support costs and repaying a MTC loan (\$12.5 Million for the Hwy 101 Gap Closure), paying the State Local Partnership Program swap, as well as debt issuance that may be needed for the delivery of Major Road projects.

Current schedules for several Major Road Projects indicate that funding needs will exceed revenues collected starting in FY2017-18. Staff will monitor the progress of the projects and present various financing options to the Board for review when financing appears imminent.

### ***C. Revenue and Expenditure Plan***

#### **1. Revenue Available for Programming**

The ½ cent sales tax forecast for Marin County is the gross revenue available for the Measure A Expenditure Plan. As noted previously, certain “off the top” deductions are made for expenditures required by law as anticipated in the Expenditure Plan. After the off-the-top expenditures and reserves are set aside, the amount available for programming to strategies is calculated based on the percentage share of each strategy and sub-strategy in the Expenditure Plan. Measure A sales tax revenue available for programming for each year of the plan period is shown in Attachment 1.

#### **2. Revenue & Expenditure Plan by Strategy/Sub-Strategy**

The Expenditure Plan dedicated funding to strategies and sub-strategies by percentage share. The four strategies and associated sub-strategies are progressing at slightly different paces, given the nature of the project or program.

The sales tax revenue and expenditures programmed for each strategy and sub-strategy are shown in the Attachments to this Strategic Plan:

**Attachment 1 – Sales Tax Revenues and Assignment to Strategies** – this table exhibits in tabular format the revenue available by Strategy in each of 20 years of the Strategic Plan.

**Attachment 2 – Sales Tax Programming Summary** – this table exhibits programming of each Strategy over the 20 years of the Strategic Plan.

**Attachment 3-1–Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit System Revenues and Expenditures**

**Attachment 3-2–Strategy 2: Highway 101 Gap Closure Revenues and Expenditures**

**Attachment 3-3–Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure Revenues and Expenditures**

**Attachment 3-4–Strategy 4: School-Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools Revenues and Expenditures**

The tables in Attachments 3-1 through 3-4 provide the basis for which allocations to sub-strategies will be made. For each Strategy, there is a detailed table of planned revenues and programming to those revenues.

Methodology and assumptions for how funds are programmed for each strategy and sub-strategy are described in Section III.D Programming Methodology and Assumptions for Strategies. Note that many of the aforementioned strategies will require TAM and consultant support staff to manage their direct delivery. For purposes of establishing sales tax availability targets for each sub-strategy, direct project management costs were included as a cost to each strategy. For Strategy 2 project management costs are included in the overall capital cost of the project and may be funded with debt proceeds or with debt reserves in the first two years of the program. For Strategy 3, project management costs are included only for the major infrastructure projects. For all other sub-strategies, direct project management costs are deducted before sales tax revenue availability is calculated by percentage shares for each sub-strategy.

Note that at the end of each fiscal year, if direct project management costs are not expended as envisioned, the funds are returned to the Strategy and allowed to be claimed by the project or program sponsor in the following year.

**3. Fund Leveraging**

As discussed previously in this document, as well as in the Expenditure Plan, one of the important principles that guide the implementation of Measure A is the commitment to leverage sales tax revenues to help attract other regional, state and federal funds to transportation needs in Marin County. While the timing and availability of such funds is not always easy to predict, TAM has already proven successful at capturing federal funds largely due to Marin’s status as a self-help county. To date, \$21 million in CMAQ and \$19 million in additional STIP funds have been secured for the Highway 101 Gap Closure Project, as well as \$5.9 million in exchange funds. As a result of receiving these funds, the need for bonding has been postponed until at least FY2019-20, and the total amount of bond funds needed may be reduced.

Measure A funds for transit will assist in leveraging other local funds for the Local Initiatives program introduced in Marin Transit's Short Range Transit Plan by providing matching funds for local transit services. Additionally, new federal rural transit dollars will be matched with Measure A, and several federal, state, and regional transit capital grant programs can be accessed with the availability of Measure A funds.

TAM has utilized Measure A funds dedicated to engineering support for our Safe Routes to School program to develop grant applications for both state and federal Safe Routes programs. Marin has been very successful in securing federal and state grants, in large part due to the efforts of our Safe Routes team in developing grant applications supported by the local jurisdiction, the local neighborhood community, and the local volunteer task forces of parents and school officials who identify and support capital improvements around schools.

TAM staff will continue to work to identify potential funding sources that can likely be captured by leveraging sales tax revenues. TAM will continue to secure additional funding from regional, state and federal sources on an ongoing basis.

**D. Programming Methodology & Assumptions for Strategies**

**1. Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit**

Strategy 1 of the Expenditure Plan is to “develop a seamless local bus transit system that improves mobility and serves community needs, including special transit for seniors and the disabled (paratransit services).” Measure A provides a dedicated source of local funds for public transit that Marin Transit uses to plan and implement services for the County’s residents. The four sub-strategies in the Measure A Expenditure Plan and the share of Measure A revenue for each sub-strategy is as follows:

<b>Sub-strategies</b>	<b>Percentage Share</b>
1.1 Maintain and expand local bus transit service	37%
1.2 Maintain and expand the rural bus transit system	3%
1.3 Maintain and expand transit services and programs for those with special needs – seniors, persons with disabilities, youth, and low-income residents	9%
1.4 Invest in bus transit facilities for a clean and efficient transit system	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>55%</b>

The Expenditure Plan requires Marin Transit to prepare a Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) every two years through a planning process that includes extensive public input from all areas of the county. Marin Transit embarked on development of its first SRTP in Spring 2005. This SRTP is a balanced five-year plan with a ten-year outlook based on extensive data collection, assessment of financial inputs, and public participation. The SRTP and supplemental documents provide detailed performance data that address the criteria in the Expenditure Plan. As part of the Strategic Plan, the TAM Board of Commissioners approved the first SRTP in 2006. Marin Transit has updated the SRTP in 2009, 2012, and 2015, and these are incorporated in the Strategic Plan Updates.

After the 2012 SRTP, Marin Transit introduced the concept of service typologies to better match local fixed route service design and delivery to community needs. These typologies identify a range of vehicles and services targeted to address the needs of different travel

markets in the County. These include service focused on the Highway 101 corridor, and basic, connector, rural and seasonal, and community services.

Marin Transit has four categories of fixed route services:

- **Local Fixed Route.** The local fixed route program represents the majority of service within the County and consists of 18 routes. These services carry approximately 80% of the riders and account for 65% of the revenue hours within the Marin Transit system. All fixed route vehicles carry up to three bicycles.
- **Muir Woods Shuttle.** In partnership with the National Park Service, Marin Transit manages the Route 66 service to Muir Woods National Monument during the extended summer season and select holiday periods.
- **Rural Stagecoach.** The West Marin Stagecoach provides weekday and weekend service connecting two major transfer hubs to West Marin: Marin City to Bolinas and San Rafael to Inverness. All Stagecoach vehicles carry up to two bicycles.
- **Community Shuttle.** This program consists of six shuttle bus routes that provide neighborhood connector service in Tiburon, San Rafael, San Anselmo, Fairfax, and Novato. All shuttle vehicles carry up to two bicycles.

Marin Transit also provides demand response service - curb-to-curb service offered to individuals who are unable to use fixed route transit services. Two primary types of demand response services are offered:

- **Local Paratransit.** Paratransit service is curb-to-curb service for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) eligible individuals unable to use fixed route transit services due to disability. Marin Transit operates the service under the umbrella of Marin Access. Marin Access provides service as mandated by the ADA and additional service outside of the ADA-required service area.
- **Novato Dial-A-Ride.** The Novato Dial-A-Ride service provides a flexible route and demand responsive service primarily targeted to seniors, students, and persons with disabilities riding within Novato. The Dial-A-Ride provides passengers curb-to-curb pick-up and drop-off service. All trips start and end within the City of Novato, and everyone is welcome to use the service. Rides are reserved and scheduled up to seven days in advance. The Novato Dial-a-Ride vehicle can carry two bicycles.

Seniors and riders with disabilities also have additional options through the Marin Access Mobility Management Program. These services include the Travel Navigator, Volunteer Driver, and Catch-A-Ride subsidized taxi programs.

- **Travel Navigators:** This service is the first resource for program information and eligibility for all Marin Access programs. Navigators recommend the program or programs that will best suit the needs of individual riders and walk them through the eligibility process for those specific programs.

- **Volunteer Driver:** Marin Transit supports two types of volunteer driver programs in Central Marin and in West Marin. These are open to Marin residents who are over the age of 60 or who are eligible for paratransit and supported by Measure B. The first program empowers the rider to find their own driver by providing mileage reimbursement for their trips. For the second program, drivers are pre-screened and assigned to the rider.
- **Catch-A-Ride:** Marin Catch-A-Ride allows Marin residents who are age 80 and older as well as residents 60 and older who no longer drive to receive a subsidy to ride on Taxis and other licensed vehicles within Marin. Once eligible, seniors call Catch-A-Ride’s call center to schedule rides with a minimum two hour advance notice. The call center will give them an exact, mileage-based price for that discounted ride. Depending on the destination, the discount may cover the full price of short distance rides.

Marin Transit’s Capital Plan includes replacement and expansion of vehicles needed to operate service, bus stop improvement and maintenance, technology improvement projects and a consolidated operations and maintenance facility in Marin County. In addition to hybrid electric vehicles, Marin Transit is investigating the possibility and requirements of providing electric only bus service.

Marin Transit continues to study the local needs of transit riders in the County through its planning, outreach, and data collection efforts. In June 2016, the District will implement its most substantial service change and expansion resulting in nearly 20 percent increase in service. The service change package improves frequency on high demand corridors, speeds up service, and eliminates or reduces the need to transfer.

The District’s SRTP will continue to provide the foundation for the Strategy 1 revenues and expenditures in the Strategic Plan. The SRTP Financial Plan is based on the forecasted sales tax availability by sub-strategy.

## **2. Strategy 2: US 101 HOV Gap Closure**

Strategy 2 of the Expenditure Plan “fully fund and accelerated completion of the Highway 101 carpool lane gap closure project through San Rafael.” Eligible use of funds identified in the Expenditure Plan include completion of final construction segments through Central San Rafael and Puerto Suello Hill; noise reduction strategies to improve quality of life in adjacent neighborhoods; aesthetic and landscaping improvements; and completion of the north-south bicycle way through Puerto Suello Hill to improve bicycle safety. Note that while the other Strategies under Measure A receive a percentage share of funding under the Expenditure Plan, the Strategy 2 funding for the Gap Closure is capped at \$25 Million total. Any excess funds, of which there is likely to be none, are designated for usage under Strategy 1- transit.

In FY 2005-06, Measure A funds began to be utilized for the development of the Gap Closure’s Puerto Suello Hill bike/pedestrian path and sound-absorbing soundwall features. At that time, no Measure A funds had been utilized for the Gap Closure Segment 3 project through central San Rafael and including the 580 connector reconstruction, which began construction the Spring of 2006, except for construction oversight by TAM necessary on the project. Throughout FY 2005-06 and into FY 2006-07, TAM developed the multi-use path

over Puerto Suello Hill and the sound-absorbing soundwall system, for incorporation into Caltrans' carpool lane project. This last phase of major construction began in June 2007, and includes the path and soundwall construction. The facilities were completed and HOV Gap Closure Project completion ceremony was held in March 2011.

In December 2005, the TAM Board approved two "fund swaps" for reducing the amount of debt that will need to be entered into to fund the Highway 101 carpool lane. These "fund swaps" entailed the assignment of federal funds available to Marin County for other projects in exchange for Measure funds. The federal funds were available in Summer 2006, when the last phase of the Highway 101 carpool lane work started, with payback in Measure funds over a three year period starting in FY 2006-07. The total amount of swapped funds, \$2.432 million in Transportation Enhancement or "TE" funds, as well as \$3.48 million in Surface Transportation Program, or "STP" funds have were replaced by Measure funds and are identified in the programming summary for Strategy 2, Attachment 3.2. In October 2007, the TAM Board approved another agreement with MTC to exchange \$12.5 million in CMAQ funds for future Measure A funds. MTC agreed to provide the entire amount of CMAQ funds in FY 2008-09 while TAM will repay MTC with Measure A funds over seven years, with the last payment made in December 2015. In 2008, the TAM Board approved committing \$1.5 million in TDA Article 3 funds to the project in order to fulfill TAM's financial commitments to the State.

All programmed Measure A funds have been allocated to the US 101 HOV Gap Closure project by the TAM Board, with most of the funds directly funded capital construction through a Cooperative Agreement entered into with Caltrans. The approved funds have been expended. Caltrans needs to bill TAM for reimbursement.

### 3. Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure

Strategy 3 of the Expenditure Plan addresses the need to "maintain, improve, and manage Marin County's local transportation infrastructure, including roads, bikeways, sidewalks, and pathways." Eligible uses of funds identified in the Expenditure Plan include a variety of roadway, bikeway, sidewalk and pathway improvements:

- Pavement and drainage maintenance;
- Signalization and channelization;
- Transit and traffic flow improvements;
- Transportation Systems Management and Demand Management;
- Improvements to reduce response times for emergency vehicles;
- Bike path construction and maintenance;
- Sidewalk and crosswalk construction and maintenance

The two sub-strategies in the Measure A Expenditure Plan and the share of Measure A revenue for each sub-strategy is as follows:

Sub-strategies	Percentage Share
3.1 Major Roads and Related Infrastructure	13.25%
3.2 Local Roads for all Modes	13.25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.5%</b>

### 3.1 Major Roads and Related Infrastructure

The Expenditure Plan describes the Major Road and Related Infrastructure sub-strategy as targeting “the most heavily traveled and significant roads and related infrastructure in Marin County.” These are roads of countywide significance that may cross jurisdictional boundaries. Included in the Expenditure Plan is a list of roadways that were identified as “priority candidates” for funding under this sub-strategy (see Appendix 1.a).

Funds are allocated to the five County planning areas based on a formula weighted 50% by the population of the planning area and 50% by the number of road miles within the limits of the planning areas. This distribution will be balanced every six years to address changes in population and road mile figures (see Appendix 1.b for current distribution).

The Expenditure Plan assigned the responsibility for establishing the priorities for Major Roads projects to the Public Works Directors of each city, town, and the county working together with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Through a process that was conducted over a 10 months period in FY 2005-06, the Public Works Directors and the TAC made recommendations to TAM regarding the anticipated distribution of Measure A funds under this sub-strategy. The prioritization process was based on the following performance criteria identified in the Expenditure Plan:

- Condition of roadway
- Average daily traffic
- Transit frequency
- Bicycle and pedestrian activity
- School access
- Accident history
- Opportunities for matching funds
- Geographic equity

As an initial exercise in implementing the Major Infrastructure sub-strategy, the Public Works Directors and the TAC reviewed the performance criteria listed in the Expenditure Plan and developed criteria descriptions and weighting criteria for evaluation of the roadway segments. The criteria definitions they developed are listed below:

- **Condition of roadway:** The Pavement Condition Index (PCI), a common standard of measure for roadways, was used to evaluate the roadway condition. The PCI is a numerical rating of the pavement condition that ranges from 0 to 100, with 0 being the worst possible condition and 100 being the best possible condition
- **Average daily traffic:** The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is another industry standard, consisting of the total traffic volume on a roadway during a given period (from 1 to 365 days) divided by the number of days in that period.
- **Transit frequency:** Transit frequency is a measure of availability of fixed route public transit to the public. As an objective measure, the calculation of average daily bus seat trips was used as a performance measure.

- **Bicycle and pedestrian activity:** Bicycle and pedestrian activity was assessed by determining if the roadway includes an existing pedestrian facility and/or bicycle facility or if a pedestrian and/or bicycle facility is planned in the community's adopted Bicycle Master Plan.
- **School access:** School access was determined by the number of designated school zones included in the roadway segment.
- **Accident history:** Accident history was evaluated by calculating the number of accidents for a certain volume of traffic.
- **Opportunities for matching funds:** This performance criterion was evaluated by determining whether matching funds were available for the project. By obtaining matching funds, a project could be implemented with fewer Marin County tax dollars, freeing those dollars to be used on other projects.
- **Geographic equity:** The available funding based on the Expenditure Plan allocation formula determined the prioritization for this performance criterion. Further refinements to the geographic equity criterion will be achieved by examining the distribution of projects within each planning area.

The Public Works Directors reviewed the roadways identified in the Expenditure Plan and developed logical roadway segments limits based on local knowledge of the route within each of the planning areas. They also developed proposed weighting criteria for the performance measures listed above. These weighting criteria were reviewed and refined by the TAC. The Public Works Directors and the TAC agreed that consideration of the opportunities for matching funds and the geographic equity performance criterion would be excluded from the initial selection of projects, but would be used in a second phase of the evaluation process.

The Public Works Directors completed a matrix that incorporated data for the performance criteria for evaluation using their preferred performance criteria weighting system. Based on this evaluation, the Public Works Directors then developed a preliminary list of priority segments, using a weighted system that reflected the importance of pavement and traffic as performance criteria.

In a concurrent effort, the TAC evaluated the roadway segments using a weighted system that reflected a more multi-modal consideration of the performance criteria, with greater weighting for transit frequency and bicycle and pedestrian activity (see Appendix 1.c, Project Prioritization Criteria for Major Roads). Although two distinct weighting systems were used, the Public Works Directors and the TAC evaluations resulted in the same priority ranking for the high ranking roadway segments.

Project sponsors for the priority segments were identified and agreed to by the Public Works Directors. Project sponsors were requested to develop project scopes for their segments, as follows:

- **Northern Marin**  
City of Novato – Novato Blvd between Diablo Avenue and San Marin Drive.
- **Central Marin**  
City of San Rafael – 4<sup>th</sup> Street between Red Hill Avenue and Grand Avenue.
- **Ross Valley**  
County of Marin – Sir Francis Drake Blvd between US 101 and Wolfe Grade and between Wolfe Grade and the Ross City limit. (note: these two segments tied in their scoring, so the County will come back with a proposal as to which goes first).
- **Southern Marin**  
City of Mill Valley – Miller Avenue between Camino Alto and Throckmorton Avenue.
- **Western Marin**  
County of Marin – Sir Francis Drake Blvd between Samuel P. Taylor and the Platform Bridge.

It was recommended by the Public Works Directors and agreed to by the TAC that the detailed scoping of the project will occur at the local level by the project sponsor. The draft scope will be brought back to the TAC for review. The approval of the scope will occur at a publicly noticed meeting of the local sponsor legislative body. TAM will post public notices regarding these projects as well as available project information on the TAM website. TAM will receive a final scoping recommendation from the local jurisdiction.

The TAC will receive regular updates to the projects as they progress through their various phases of development. Furthermore, the TAM Board receives updates as sponsors request Measure A allocations. Since the Strategic Plan policies dictate that sponsors can only receive Measure A funds for the current phase of a project, the TAM Board is ensured to be kept abreast of a project's progress when funding requests are presented to for funding consideration.

Since inception, Measure A allocations were made to the following Major Roads projects:

- **Northern Marin**  
Novato Boulevard – Funding for the environmental document and PS&E of Segment 1 (Diablo Avenue to Grant Avenue). Full funding for the completion of Segment 2 (Grant Avenue to Eucalyptus Avenue) and Segment 3 (Eucalyptus Avenue to San Marin Drive). Segments 2 and 3 are completed.
- **Central Marin**  
4<sup>th</sup> Street, San Rafael – Construction funds were allocated in FY 2007-08. Project is completed. Approximately \$11.4 million is available for the next prioritized project in Central Marin, which is 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (2<sup>nd</sup> Street to Grand Avenue). San

Rafael is the sponsor for 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. Funds were allocated to San Rafael in March 2016 to commence preliminary engineering on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. If funding remains after completion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, the third prioritized project is Las Gallinas/Los Ranchitos/Lincoln with the County as the sponsor.

- **Ross Valley**

Sir Francis Drake Boulevard between US 101 and Ross town limits – Funding for preliminary engineering was allocated to the County in June 2013. The segment from US 101 to the Ross town limit represents both priorities one and two of the Ross Valley Planning Area.

- **Southern Marin**

Miller Avenue, Mill Valley – Funding for preliminary engineering began in FY 2006-07. Funding for PS&E was allocated in May 2017. Funding for construction was allocated in March 2016..

- **Western Marin**

Sir Francis Drake Blvd from Samuel P. Taylor Park to the Platform Bridge – Funds for the environmental document and PS&E were allocated in FY 2006-07. Design funds were allocated in FY 2010-11 with construction in FY 2011-12. The project was completed in January 2014. Approximately \$935,000 remains for the second prioritized project in the West Marin Planning Area, which is Sir Francis Drake Blvd from Fairfax Limit to Samuel P. Taylor (Shafter Bridge). The County is also the sponsor for this segment. While the remaining funds are insufficient for the construction phase of the project, it should sufficient to conduct preliminary engineering to move the project as a “shovel ready” project for other funding.

Final programming of the capital portion of the projects will take place and allocations of funds considered by the TAM Board once the project scope is defined and environmental activity and design are substantially complete. For that reason, remaining capital funds are listed as a lump sum in the Strategic Plan by year, less the expenditures described above.

It will be impossible to guarantee the programming and allocation of funds for all of the Major Infrastructure segments in the years they are needed, without debt financing or some or type of loan strategy to allow the projects to proceed. Under the current revenue estimate for the sales tax, approximately \$6 million is available annually for the Major Infrastructure projects. There are not sufficient funds available for all projects to proceed simultaneously, without debt financing or other loan provisions.

With the exception of the Central planning area and possibly the Southern planning area, it should be noted that the current revenue assumptions only support funding the first prioritized projects in each planning area based on the current cost estimates for each project. Based on the current cost estimates for the first priority project in the Central planning area, Measure A funds would also be available for the second priority project.

Based on the costs and schedules on key major road projects shown in Attachment 3-3, the need to issue debt to ensure project delivery is anticipated in FY 2019-20. Protocols have been established to issue debt and a team has been assembled to facilitate any transactions, including a financial advisor, a bond counsel and a disclosure counsel. Given that the costs to issue debt are significant and will lessen the overall Measure A revenues for other projects, it is the policy of the Strategic Plan to require a project sponsor's board to adopt a project scope, cost, and schedule, and submit that information formally to TAM at least six months prior to anticipated debt issuance to ensure TAM that these projects are ready for delivery as scheduled and the costs are reliable.

### **3.2 Local Infrastructure for All Modes**

The Expenditure Plan recognized that each jurisdiction has unique needs and that local priorities are best identified at the local level. Because of this, Local Roads funds are distributed on a programmatic basis. Funds are allocated to local agencies based on a formula weighted 50% by the population of the local agency's jurisdiction and 50% by the number of lane miles within the limits of that agency's jurisdiction. This formula is updated on a biennial basis to address changes in population and road mile figures (see Appendix 2 for current distribution). The formula in the 2016 SPU was updated with the most current population data from the California Department of Finance and lane miles from MTC.

Local Infrastructure funds can be used for any eligible local transportation need identified by the jurisdiction's Public Works Director and approved by the respective governing board. As defined by the Expenditure Plan, eligible projects include street and road projects, local transit projects, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. Where feasible, locally defined bicycle and pedestrian projects will be implemented in conjunction with a related roadway improvement. This could include safety improvements, pedestrian facilities including disabled access, or bicycle facilities such as bike lanes or signage.

The TAM Board made its first allocation to local cities, towns and Marin County in July 2006, allocating funds available immediately as they had been accumulated over FY 2005-06, following the adoption of the original Strategic Plan. Since inception, the TAM Board has made annual allocations at the beginning of each fiscal year (as shown in Attachment 3-3).

To continually receive funds from TAM for Local Infrastructure needs, the local city/town and the county are required to submit a report at the end of each fiscal year outlining what the funds were spent on. The purpose of these reports is to have ongoing documentation showing that this element of Measure A funds was spent on eligible activity in accordance with the Expenditure Plan. It is up to each jurisdiction to decide what to spend the funds on, in accordance with the Measure Expenditure Plan. Reports are collected annually and posted on the TAM Website, in order for broad viewing of what our local transportation sales tax funds are being spent on.

## **4. Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools**

The Expenditure Plan identifies school-related trips as a "significant component of traffic congestion" in Marin, accounting for over 21% of all trips in the morning peak period.

Consequently, Strategy 4 is intended “to make a significant improvement in local congestion while encouraging safe and healthy behavior” in the County’s young people.

Strategy 4 is comprised of three sub-strategies designed to complement each other with the overall objective of providing safer access to Marin schools. These sub-strategies include an educational/planning component and a capital improvement element, sub-strategies 4.1 and 4.3, respectively. Sub-strategy 4.2 represents an investment of Measure A funds in crossing guards.

The three sub-strategies in the Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan and the share of revenue for each sub-strategy are as follows:

Sub-strategies	Percentage Share
4.1 Safe Routes to Schools	3.3%
4.2 Crossing Guards	4.2%
4.3 Safe Pathways to School	3.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.0%</b>

#### 4.1 Safe Routes to Schools

The Expenditure Plan describes Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) as a “proven program designed to reduce local congestion around schools while instilling healthy and sustainable habits in our young people.” Sub-strategy 4.1 provides an on-going, long-term revenue source for the Safe Routes to School program that began in 2000 as a partnership between local parents and bicycle and pedestrian advocates. The program’s mission was—and continues to be—to relieve congestion around schools by promoting alternatives to students being driven alone. In doing this, the program seeks to improve safety, create a healthy lifestyle for children, and enhance the sense of community in their neighborhoods.

Over the last several years, the Safe Routes program has expanded to include over 58 schools throughout the county. The program includes classroom education, special events and contests, and Safe Routes development, mapping and engineering assistance. Structure is provided through the development of “Safe Routes Travel Plans,” which map out future improvements and target the use of funds used in sub-strategy 4.3, “Safe Pathways.”

The success of the Marin County program is based largely on the broad based involvement of parents, teachers, local public works officials, engineers, school administrators, local elected officials, and law enforcement all working together with program staff to ensure that the program is successful over the long term.

TAM’s Safe Routes to Schools program continues to make a significant impact across the county, reducing car trips to and from schools and making a safer environment for all:

- In 2000, there were nine schools participating in Safe Routes to Schools; today, there are 60 schools, representing over 28,000 students.

- Since the program began, there has been an eight percent mode shift countywide from single-student car trips to walking, bicycling, riding a bus, and carpooling to/from schools.
- Twenty-five schools have exceeded the countywide average since joining SR2S. Old Mill and Tam Valley elementary schools in Mill Valley and Bacich Elementary in Kentfield, for example, have increased the number of green trips to/from their school by over 20 percent.
- Over 40 percent of families responding to parent surveys said they changed their travel mode to be more “green”.
- Over 140 Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure projects, totaling more than \$27 million, have been constructed or are currently under design.
- In 2015, Street Smarts Marin was deployed in ten Marin communities, and featured new messaging to bring awareness to distracted driving.

In order to strengthen the relevance and long-term impacts of Marin’s Safe Routes to Schools program, the program must continually evolve and develop new ideas. With that in mind, the program’s recent Evaluation Report lists recommendations intended to improve the effectiveness of the existing program and set it up for even greater success in future years. The following are some of the successes that address those recommendations:

1. The consulting team of Parisi Transportation Consulting is preparing an evaluation report of the last four years of the program (2011-2015).
2. Five school districts and one city have adopted a comprehensive Safe Routes to School policy.
3. Safe Route to Schools has extended its reach into every middle school and five high schools.
4. Safe Routes to Schools has tripled the number of schools that hold Walk and Roll Wednesdays monthly or weekly. Thirty-nine schools participate in these regular events.
5. Safe Routes to Schools has developed the Green Sneaker Challenge – a contest which has been implemented in 28 schools.
6. Safe Routes to School’s bi-lingual outreach specialist is now working in six schools in Marin and the County Department of Health and Human Services has assigned an additional staff person to implement the program in more schools.
7. Marin representatives attend a quarterly meeting at MTC with other programs in the Bay Area. Five Marin students presented on active transportation at the third Bay Area Youth for Environment and Sustainability Conference.
8. Safe Routes to Schools has taught 24 Family Biking classes showing parents how to teach their child confident cycling and rules of the road.
9. Safe Routes to School continues to collect Student Tally Surveys from all schools twice a year. In the latest survey of Fall 2015, the average countywide mode share for green trips was 50%, and 28% for active trips, a 2% increase since 2010.
10. Five schools joined the Safe Routes to School program since 2014, and the program continues to expand.
11. Using a grant from the Bay Area Air Quality District, Safe Routes to Schools developed and implemented a Transit Scavenger Hunt and Transit education at two high schools in Marin.

12. Safe Routes to Schools has expanded the distracted driving program to address all aspects of distractions while driving.
13. The program has developed Suggested Route Maps for many schools, providing guidance on recommended walking and cycling routes to schools.
14. Eight transportation audits were completed in 2015/16, working with Task Forces to identify issues and with Public Works Departments to develop short-term and long-range solutions.
15. Fifteen engineering concept plans focused on increased pedestrian and bicycle safety are prepared since 2014.

## **4.2 Crossing Guards**

The 2016 Strategic Plan Update provides for establishment of crossing guards at approximately 56 intersections throughout the county and tasks local Public Works Directors and the TAC with their prioritization. An additional 11 guards are administered through the Vehicle Registration Fee, separate from the 56 locations funded with Measure A funds. In accordance with the Expenditure Plan, the crossing guards are provided by a professional company that specializes in crossing guard programs in order to “eliminate liability concerns and to ensure that well trained crossing guards with back-ups are available for every critical intersection.”

TAM has provided crossing guards at 63 locations since the FY 2008/09 school year, with the exception of FY 2010/11 that funded 75 locations. The 12 additional locations in FY 2010/11 were funded in anticipation of the infusion of newly authorized Vehicle Registration Fee. Once the Vehicle Registration Fee became available for the 12 locations, Measure A returned to funding 63 locations in FY 2011/12.

Rising costs in the 2015/2016 School Year reduced the number of guards able to be funded by the Sales Tax from 63 to 56 and from 12 to 11 from the Vehicle Registration Fee. Short term funding from MTC and the Vehicle Registration Fee has been used and allocated to maintain the total number of guard until the 2018/2019 School Year. At that time cuts to the program may be required. Possible solutions include the recently approved Volunteer Guard Program

Selection of crossing guard locations is based on responses to a crossing guard survey sent to local schools. To these locations, the TAC and Public Works Directors apply selection criteria approved by the TAM Board. The process is based on standard criteria (see Appendix 3.a) generally used by communities in California to determine if a crossing guard would be warranted and cost effective, namely pedestrian counts and traffic data

The location selection process resulted in a revised ranked list for the 2014/2015 school year. The next list is expected to be ready for the 2018/2019 School Year/ In 2011 the TAM Board adopted new polices to accommodate changed conditions around schools including new travel patterns. In addition the policy accommodates changes associated with school openings and closing as well as accepting new requests from Public Works Directors.

The Crossing Guard program was assessed in 2009 and 2013 and found to be accepted by the users as a good use of Measure A funds. The current level of 56 guards is expected to be maintained for the life of the Measure A program. Should revenue or expense projections not be realized, an adjustment will be made to the number of guards (either an increase or a decrease) in future years.

### **4.3 Safe Pathways**

The Expenditure Plan closely links sub-strategies 4.3 and 4.1. As the capital improvement element of the Safe Routes to School program, Safe Pathways is integral to the success of the overall strategy. The sub-strategy provides funds to design and construct projects identified through implementation of the Safe Routes Plans developed under sub-strategy 4.1, the Safe Routes program. As defined in the Expenditure Plan, typical projects might include the construction of pathways, sidewalk improvements, or traffic safety devices. Key to the success of Safe Pathways projects is the opportunity to leverage other fund sources and the ability to incorporate Safe Pathways elements into larger infrastructure projects.

The Expenditure Plan states that eligible Safe Pathways projects will be selected based on performance criteria that focus on improving safety throughout the County. All projects will come from approved Safe Routes plans.

Approved Safe Routes plans are developed in a cooperative effort of schools' Safe Routes to Schools teams, which include school officials and staff, parents and children local elected officials and representatives of public works departments of local jurisdictions and at times, neighborhood representatives. A primary element in development of the plans is the "walkabout" where the team identifies on-site, the routes to the school and areas for safety improvement. Plans resulting from this reconnaissance are reviewed by the local jurisdictions' public works department. This thorough review means that the final approved concept reflects support of parents, school officials and local jurisdictions.

Since inception, TAM issued a Call for Projects in 2007, 2010, and 2014. The next call is anticipated for the summer of 2019. The call required schools and public work departments to submit only projects covered by plans. Most cities and towns in the county and the County itself meet this criterion. After a rigorous selection process governed by criteria established in the Measure A Expenditure Plan, TAM staff recommendations were also reviewed by the Marin Public Works Association (MPWA) and the TAC. The Expenditure Plan's performance criteria encourage a candidate project to:

- Relieve an identified safety or congestion problem along a major school route
- Complete a "gap" in the bicycle and pedestrian system along a major school route
- Maximize daily uses by students and others
- Attract matching funds
- Respect geographic equity

Similar to the Major Roads sub-strategy, the MPWA and TAC refine the definitions of the performance criteria and develop a project evaluation program. Based on the evaluation of projects, the TAC recommends projects to the TAM Board for inclusion in future updates to the Revenue and Expenditure element of the Strategic Plan.

Safe Pathway projects are also coordinated with other projects being funded by Measure A funds, federal funds or gas tax subventions from the state (i.e., Prop 42).

Recommended programming in the Strategic Plan will coincide with the funding levels available each year for this sub-strategy. In 2007,2010, and 2015 the TAM Board awarded Safe Pathways funding of \$1.766 million to 12 projects, \$2.595 million to 13 projects, and \$3.48 million to 27 projects, respectively. The projects selected in FY 2007-08, FY 2010-11, and FY 2014-15 for funding are listed in Appendix 3d-iv. Based on projected revenue, a fourth call for Safe Pathways projects will be issued in the summer of 2019.

## **IV. Implementation Guidelines**

Before Measure A Transportation Sales Tax funds can be spent on a project or program, the sponsoring agency will need to request an allocation of funds and execute a funding agreement with TAM. In general, the funding agreement will describe the project/program scope, the anticipated schedule, and an estimated cash flow of Measure A funds. The agreement will also specify the responsibilities of both TAM and the project sponsor, as described in this section. The TAM Executive Director shall have the authority to execute such funding agreements on behalf of the TAM Board of Commissioners.

### ***A. Claimant Policies***

The following claimant policies provide a framework for the funding agreements that will be developed for the allocation of Measure A funds. These policies clarify TAM's expectations of sponsors to deliver their projects and have been designed to support the Implementation Guidelines provided in the Expenditure Plan and the Strategic Plan Guiding Principles discussed in Section I.C.

#### **1. Eligibility for Funding**

- Project types and sponsors are to be as identified in the Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan.
- The addition of new project types and/or sponsors can only be accomplished through an Expenditure Plan amendment.
- Projects are to be consistent, as applicable, with regional and state plans, such as Marin Transit's SRTP, Marin County's Congestion Management Plan, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) regional Transportation Improvement Plan (including Air Quality Conformity).

#### **2. Application Process**

- There are two paths for the allocation of funds:
  1. Programmatic funding, such as Strategy 3.2, Local Roads for all modes.
  2. Project specific funding, such as Strategy 3.1, Major Roads projects.
- Allocations for programmatic funding will be on an annual basis, in accordance with formulas specified in the Strategic Plan. For Local Roads projects, sponsors need to submit an allocation request form that specifies projects anticipated for implementation. The proposed projects should come from sponsors' Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) or equivalent. Sponsors may also use Local Roads funds for unanticipated emergency projects not in their CIP. If sponsors use such funds for projects not mentioned in the allocation request form, a revised allocation request form needs to be submitted to TAM before proceeding to implementation.
- For an allocation of project specific Measure A funds, project sponsors will need to submit a complete application package (See Appendix 4.a), consisting of the following information:
  1. Identification of Lead Sponsor

2. Inclusion in local and/or regional plans (as required)
3. Status of environmental review (as required)
4. Notice of impediments to project or program
5. Scope of Work / Description of Service
6. Adherence to Performance Measures (as required)
7. Delivery Schedule (by Phase)
8. Funding Plan
  - ✓ Cost and funding for each phase of the project, including the status on non-Measure A funds on whether these funds have been secured or have expiring deadlines
  - ✓ Cash flow needed on Measure A funds
  - ✓ Expenditures to Date

### **3. Allocation and Disbursement of Funds**

- All allocations of Measure A funds by TAM will be reviewed for the following:
  1. Consistency with the Strategic Plan [Program of Projects]
  2. Completeness of the application via the Allocation Request Form (See Appendix 4.c) and consistency with Strategic Plan requirements.
- All allocations of Measure A funds will be governed by a funding agreement between TAM and the sponsoring agency. The TAM Board will approve such allocations. TAM's Executive Director will have the authority to execute funding agreements.
- Programmatic funding will be approved annually and project specific funding will be approved based on project readiness. For multi-year projects, funding allocations and funding agreements may be for the term of project phases (i.e. environmental, design, construction).
- All agreements will document the following (See Appendix 4.b):
  1. Scope of Work
  2. Project Schedule
  3. Funding Plan
  4. Adherence to Performance Measures (if applicable)
  5. Reporting requirements
  6. Acceptance of TAM's Claimant Policies
- Funding agreements shall be executed by resolution of the sponsor's governing board.
- Prior to the disbursement of funds, a project must have:
  1. an approved allocation resolution from the TAM Board
  2. an executed funding agreement between the sponsoring agency and TAM.
- The standard method of payment will be through reimbursement, with the exceptions of Strategies 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, which can be distributed one month before costs have been incurred, and Strategy 3.2 (Local Roads and Related Infrastructure), which are distributed on a formula basis. Project advances will require approval from the TAM Board.
- Funds may be accumulated by TAM or by recipient agencies over a period of time to pay for larger and long-term projects. All interest income generated by these proceeds will be used for the transportation purposes described in the Expenditure Plan.
- Timely use of funds requirement will be specified in each agreement.

- Project reimbursement requests must be accompanied by evidence of payment. Reimbursement requests shall be submitted no more frequently than on a monthly basis.
- Measure A funds will not substitute for another fund source that has been programmed or allocated previously to the project or program without prior approval of TAM.
- Other fund sources committed to the project or program will be used in conjunction with Measure A funds. To the maximum extent practicable, other fund sources will be spent down prior to Measure A funds. Otherwise, Measure A funds will be drawn down at a rate proportional to the Measure A share of the total funds programmed to that project phase or program.
- After a multi-year allocation of funds has been made to a project phase, the release of funds in any subsequent fiscal year will be subject to the submittal and acceptance by TAM's Executive Director of a complete Progress Report meeting the requirements for progress reports as adopted by the TAM Board.
- Measure A funds will be allocated to phases of a project or to a program based on demonstrated readiness to begin the work and ability to complete the project phase.
- Measure A allocations for right-of-way and construction will be contingent on a completed environment document.

#### **4. Monitoring and Reporting Requirements**

- Recipients of Measure A funds will be required to submit status reports per the provisions of the funding agreement.
- The report will provide information on compliance to established performance measures.
- Audit requirements will be specified in the agreement.

#### **5. Eligible and Ineligible Costs**

- Funds are to be expended in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Expenditure Plan and the Public Utilities Code Section 180000 et seq.
- Eligible phases are as follows:
  1. Planning / Conceptual Engineering
  2. Preliminary Engineering / Environmental Studies
  3. Design Engineering (PS&E)
  4. Right of Way Support / Acquisition
  5. Construction
- Eligible project sponsor costs include the following:
  1. Direct staff time (salary and benefits)
  2. Consultants selected through a competitive selection process
  3. Right of way acquisition costs
  4. Competitively bid construction contracts
- TAM oversight costs are eligible costs.
- Indirect costs (as defined by OMB Circular A-87) will not be considered an eligible expense.
- Retroactive expenses are ineligible. No expenses will be reimbursed that are incurred prior to Board approval of the Measure A allocation for a particular project or

program. TAM will not reimburse expenses incurred prior to fully executing a funding Agreement.

## **6. Other**

- Project sponsor will provide signage at construction sites for projects funded partially or wholly by Measure A sales tax revenue so that the Marin County taxpayers are informed as to how funds are being used.
- Project cancellation will require repayment of all unexpended funds and funds determined by audit not to have been expended as provided for in the funding agreement.

## V. Conclusion

The Measure A – Transportation Sales Tax 2016 Strategic Plan Update is a comprehensive document guiding the allocation of sales tax revenue over 20 years. With comprehensive policies and procedures corresponding to principles outlined in the Expenditure Plan approved by voters, this guiding document will provide the necessary assurance to project and program sponsors, as well as the banking community, that TAM is managing its sales tax funds well.

The public was notified—via U.S. mail and a notice on the TAM website homepage ([www.tam.ca.gov](http://www.tam.ca.gov))—that the 2016 Strategic Plan Update will be circulated for comment from May 19, 2016 to July 3, 2016. Copies of the document were be available electronically on the TAM website, and hard copies were be available at the TAM’s office at 900 Fifth Avenue, Suite 100; San Rafael, CA 94901. A public hearing was held on June 23, 2016, immediately prior to the regular meeting of the TAM Board of Commissioners. The TAM Board of Commissioners approved the final 2016 Strategic Plan Update at their regular meeting on June 23, 2016, on the condition that no public comments would be received by July 3<sup>rd</sup> that would necessitate TAM Board attention. The 2016 Strategic Plan Update became effective on July 3, 2016.

**Transportation Authority of Marin  
Attachment 1: Sales Tax Revenues and Assignment to Strategies**

	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Measure A Sales Tax Revenue</b>	\$ 499,196,059	3,793,461	20,062,713	23,068,785	22,427,786	19,320,196	18,984,492	20,259,801	21,265,462	23,619,507	24,086,678	25,265,790	25,770,000	26,285,400	26,811,108	27,347,330	27,894,277	28,452,162	29,021,206	29,601,630	30,193,662	25,664,613
<b>Usage of Measure A Reserve</b>	\$ -																					
<b>Total Annual Measure Available</b>	\$ 499,196,059	\$ 3,793,461	\$ 20,062,713	\$ 23,068,785	\$ 22,427,786	\$ 19,320,196	\$ 18,984,492	\$ 20,259,801	\$ 21,265,462	\$ 23,619,507	\$ 24,086,678	\$ 25,265,790	\$ 25,770,000	\$ 26,285,400	\$ 26,811,108	\$ 27,347,330	\$ 27,894,277	\$ 28,452,162	\$ 29,021,206	\$ 29,601,630	\$ 30,193,662	\$ 25,664,613
<b>Off the Top Assignment</b>																						
1% TAM Sales Tax Admin	\$ 4,991,961	\$ 37,935	\$ 200,627	\$ 230,688	\$ 224,278	\$ 193,202	\$ 189,845	\$ 202,598	\$ 212,655	\$ 236,195	\$ 240,867	\$ 252,658	\$ 257,700	\$ 262,854	\$ 268,111	\$ 273,473	\$ 278,943	\$ 284,522	\$ 290,212	\$ 296,016	\$ 301,937	\$ 256,646
4% TAM Program Management	\$ 19,967,842	\$ 151,738	\$ 802,509	\$ 922,751	\$ 897,111	\$ 772,808	\$ 759,380	\$ 810,392	\$ 850,618	\$ 944,780	\$ 963,467	\$ 1,010,632	\$ 1,030,800	\$ 1,051,416	\$ 1,072,444	\$ 1,093,893	\$ 1,115,771	\$ 1,138,086	\$ 1,160,848	\$ 1,184,065	\$ 1,207,746	\$ 1,026,585
Debt Service/Capital Projects Reserve	\$ 47,000,000	\$ -	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000
5% Reserve	\$ 5,382,872	\$ 189,673	\$ 1,003,136	\$ 1,153,439	\$ 1,121,389	\$ 966,010	\$ 949,225	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Subtotal, Off the Top</b>	\$ 77,342,675	\$ 379,346	\$ 4,356,271	\$ 4,656,879	\$ 4,592,779	\$ 4,282,020	\$ 4,248,449	\$ 3,362,990	\$ 3,413,273	\$ 3,530,975	\$ 3,554,334	\$ 3,613,289	\$ 3,638,500	\$ 3,664,270	\$ 3,690,555	\$ 3,717,367	\$ 3,744,714	\$ 3,772,608	\$ 3,801,060	\$ 3,830,081	\$ 3,859,683	\$ 3,633,231
<b>Net Measure A Revenue</b>	\$ 421,853,384	\$ 3,414,115	\$ 15,706,442	\$ 18,411,907	\$ 17,835,007	\$ 15,038,176	\$ 14,736,043	\$ 16,896,811	\$ 17,852,189	\$ 20,088,532	\$ 20,532,344	\$ 21,652,500	\$ 22,131,500	\$ 22,621,130	\$ 23,120,553	\$ 23,629,964	\$ 24,149,563	\$ 24,679,554	\$ 25,220,145	\$ 25,771,548	\$ 26,333,979	\$ 22,031,382
Plus: Debt Reserve	\$ 47,000,000	\$ -	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000
5% Reserve Close Out <sup>1</sup>	\$ 5,382,872																					\$ 5,382,872
<b>Total Revenue Available to Strategies</b>	\$ 474,236,256	\$ 3,414,115	\$ 18,056,442	\$ 20,761,907	\$ 20,185,007	\$ 17,388,176	\$ 17,086,043	\$ 19,246,811	\$ 20,202,189	\$ 22,438,532	\$ 22,882,344	\$ 24,002,500	\$ 24,481,500	\$ 24,971,130	\$ 25,470,553	\$ 25,979,964	\$ 26,499,563	\$ 27,029,554	\$ 27,570,145	\$ 28,121,548	\$ 28,683,979	\$ 29,764,254
<b>Assignment to Strategies</b>																						
<b>Strategy 1</b>																						
Project Management	\$ 1,115,707	\$ -	\$ 77,661	\$ -	\$ 13,387	\$ 21,585	\$ -	\$ 3,074	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Strategy 1 - Local Bus Transit	\$ 252,916,661	\$ 2,030,014	\$ 9,261,304	\$ 10,947,620	\$ 10,591,212	\$ 8,920,033	\$ 8,761,972	\$ 10,043,678	\$ 10,614,815	\$ 11,944,532	\$ 12,208,421	\$ 12,874,460	\$ 13,059,270	\$ 13,350,402	\$ 13,647,356	\$ 13,950,249	\$ 14,259,200	\$ 14,574,330	\$ 14,895,762	\$ 15,223,623	\$ 15,558,042	\$ 16,200,367
<b>Strategy 2</b>																						
Project Management	\$ 1,035,012		\$ 331,614	\$ 256,666	\$ 370,982	\$ 75,751	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Strategy 2 - 101 Gap Closure/Debt Reserve	\$ 32,196,844		\$ 2,114,662	\$ 1,031,500	\$ 849,515	\$ 1,830,117	\$ 4,301,967	\$ 2,837,117	\$ 3,173,963	\$ 5,729,025	\$ 2,211,360	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 2,179,960	\$ 1,175,804	\$ -	\$ 2,825,529	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Strategy 3</b>																						
Local Infrastructure	\$ 120,653,109	\$ 978,098	\$ 4,409,233	\$ 5,149,762	\$ 5,087,904	\$ 4,282,121	\$ 4,221,677	\$ 4,819,603	\$ 5,079,964	\$ 5,699,688	\$ 5,826,361	\$ 6,138,827	\$ 6,215,376	\$ 6,355,648	\$ 6,498,726	\$ 6,644,665	\$ 6,793,523	\$ 6,945,359	\$ 7,100,231	\$ 7,258,200	\$ 7,419,329	\$ 7,728,813
Project Management	\$ 1,744,305	\$ -	\$ 90,450	\$ 125,000	\$ 21,585	\$ 26,113	\$ -	\$ 21,105	\$ 34,447	\$ 55,405	\$ 55,878	\$ 64,322	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000
<b>Strategy 4</b>																						
School Access	\$ 46,702,616	\$ 156,003	\$ 1,769,643	\$ 2,189,524	\$ 2,010,779	\$ 1,649,334	\$ 1,652,394	\$ 1,920,733	\$ 1,931,665	\$ 2,158,272	\$ 2,247,096	\$ 2,373,452	\$ 2,381,854	\$ 2,440,080	\$ 2,499,471	\$ 2,560,050	\$ 2,621,840	\$ 2,684,866	\$ 2,749,152	\$ 2,814,725	\$ 2,881,608	\$ 3,010,073
Project Management	\$ 4,103,858	\$ 250,000	\$ 98,150	\$ -	\$ 110,141	\$ 138,990	\$ 100,000	\$ 88,617	\$ 191,298	\$ 230,634	\$ 194,588	\$ 201,440	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
<b>Assignment to Strategies</b>	\$ 459,352,405	\$ 3,414,115	\$ 18,152,718	\$ 19,700,073	\$ 19,055,504	\$ 16,944,044	\$ 19,038,010	\$ 19,733,928	\$ 21,026,152	\$ 25,817,556	\$ 22,743,704	\$ 23,588,825	\$ 24,311,460	\$ 23,796,934	\$ 23,120,553	\$ 26,455,493	\$ 24,149,563	\$ 24,679,554	\$ 25,220,145	\$ 25,771,548	\$ 26,333,979	\$ 27,414,254
<b>Balance</b>	\$ 14,883,851	\$ -	\$ (96,276)	\$ 1,061,834	\$ 1,129,503	\$ 444,132	\$ (1,951,967)	\$ (487,117)	\$ (823,963)	\$ (3,379,025)	\$ 138,640	\$ 413,675	\$ 170,040	\$ 1,174,196	\$ 2,350,000	\$ (475,529)	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000
<b>Measure A Interest Revenue &amp; Assignment</b>																						
<b>Interest Earning on Cash Balance</b>	\$ 5,190,115	\$ -	\$ 145,218	\$ 732,602	\$ 1,042,742	\$ 621,929	\$ 261,262	\$ 132,281	\$ 67,224	\$ 40,778	\$ 47,466	\$ 154,517	\$ 214,096	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000
<b>Board Approved Expenditures</b>	\$ 2,757,000			\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 170,000	\$ 271,000	\$ 211,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 137,000
Gap Closure - Nov. 2006	\$ 225,000			\$ 225,000																		
Gap Closure SMART Design - Dec. 2009	\$ 300,000						\$ 300,000															
Bike/Ped Path Routine Maintenance - Feb. 2008 & April 2014	\$ 1,245,000							\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000
GGT Ferry Shuttle	\$ 255,000										\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000									
SMART CMFC Ins. Policy apvd April 2013	\$ 190,000											\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
San Rafael Bike Path Study (2nd to Anderson Dr.) - May 2015	\$ 60,000											\$ 60,000										
MSN & CMFC Phase 1 Routine Maintenance - April 2014	\$ 242,000											\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000
CMFC N/S Greenway Phase 2 Routine Maintenance - April 2014	\$ 240,000														\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
<b>Balance for Future Board Actions</b>	\$ 2,433,115	\$ -	\$ 145,218	\$ 652,820	\$ 1,695,562	\$ 2,317,491	\$ 2,278,753	\$ 2,336,034	\$ 2,328,258	\$ 2,294,036	\$ 2,171,502	\$ 2,055,019	\$ 2,058,115	\$ 2,182,115	\$ 2,276,115	\$ 2,370,115	\$ 2,464,115	\$ 2,558,115	\$ 2,522,115	\$ 2,486,115	\$ 2,450,115	\$ 2,433,115

**Notes:**  
 1. A 5% reserve is set aside for the first 6 fiscal years. For the purposes of the Strategic Plan, the reserve is assumed to be paid out to strategies in F2024-25. Actual use of reserve funds will be determined by the TAM Board.  
 2. Debt service reserve fund retired in FY2024-25.  
 3. Annual balance in FY08/09: Unprogrammed bond proceeds to demonstrate capacity included in Expenditure Plan.

**Transportation Authority of Marin  
Attachment 2: Sales Tax Programming/Expenditure Summary**

Strategy 1 - Local Bus Transit	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
Substrategy 1: Local Bus Transit System	\$ 174,105,059	\$ 2,755,000	\$ 7,195,156	\$ 6,147,252	\$ 6,548,000	\$ 7,594,615	\$ 6,527,304	\$ 6,579,438	\$ 6,427,463	\$ 6,811,501	\$ 7,824,594	\$ 7,109,173	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 13,995,922	\$ 9,180,948	\$ 9,384,713	\$ 9,592,552	\$ 9,804,549	\$ 10,020,785	\$ 10,241,347	\$ 10,466,319	\$ 10,898,429
Substrategy 2: Rural Bus Transit System	\$ 13,880,944	\$ 92,000	\$ 259,627	\$ 592,202	\$ 530,920	\$ 635,083	\$ 514,642	\$ (192,059)	\$ 333,754	\$ 554,086	\$ 570,757	\$ 886,505	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,450,213	\$ 744,401	\$ 760,923	\$ 777,775	\$ 794,963	\$ 812,496	\$ 830,379	\$ 848,620	\$ 883,656
Substrategy 3: Special Needs Transit Service	\$ 42,333,363	\$ 615,000	\$ 1,950,765	\$ 1,337,742	\$ 1,764,797	\$ 1,775,065	\$ 1,507,622	\$ 1,567,907	\$ 1,550,728	\$ 1,875,095	\$ 1,949,564	\$ 2,303,870	\$ 2,203,546	\$ 2,572,019	\$ 2,233,204	\$ 2,282,768	\$ 2,333,324	\$ 2,384,890	\$ 2,437,488	\$ 2,491,138	\$ 2,545,861	\$ 2,650,969
Substrategy 4: Bus Transit Facilities	\$ 28,796,514	\$ -	\$ 983,988	\$ 1,000,313	\$ 1,264,367	\$ 1,142,267	\$ 678,999	\$ 702,895	\$ 955,931	\$ 670,157	\$ 964,439	\$ 1,078,590	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 4,948,140	\$ 1,488,802	\$ 1,521,845	\$ 1,555,549	\$ 1,589,927	\$ 1,624,992	\$ 1,660,759	\$ 1,697,241	\$ 1,767,313
<b>Subtotal, Strategy 1</b>	<b>\$ 259,115,879</b>	<b>\$ 3,462,000</b>	<b>\$ 10,389,535</b>	<b>\$ 9,077,509</b>	<b>\$ 10,108,084</b>	<b>\$ 11,147,030</b>	<b>\$ 9,228,567</b>	<b>\$ 8,658,181</b>	<b>\$ 9,267,876</b>	<b>\$ 9,910,839</b>	<b>\$ 11,309,354</b>	<b>\$ 11,378,138</b>	<b>\$ 13,903,546</b>	<b>\$ 22,966,293</b>	<b>\$ 13,647,356</b>	<b>\$ 13,950,249</b>	<b>\$ 14,259,200</b>	<b>\$ 14,574,330</b>	<b>\$ 14,895,762</b>	<b>\$ 15,223,623</b>	<b>\$ 15,558,042</b>	<b>\$ 16,200,367</b>
Strategy 2 - 101 Gap Closure	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Subtotal, Strategy 2</b>	<b>\$ 32,196,844</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,114,662</b>	<b>\$ 1,031,500</b>	<b>\$ 849,515</b>	<b>\$ 1,830,117</b>	<b>\$ 4,301,967</b>	<b>\$ 2,837,117</b>	<b>\$ 3,173,963</b>	<b>\$ 5,729,025</b>	<b>\$ 2,211,360</b>	<b>\$ 1,936,325</b>	<b>\$ 2,179,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,175,804</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,825,529</b>	<b>\$ -</b>					
Strategy 3 - Local Infrastructure	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
Substrategy 1: Major Roads	\$ 61,157,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 776,000	\$ 2,972,050	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 178,256	\$ 1,312,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,996,278	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,348,286	\$ 8,350,000	\$ 1,840,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 13,485,000	\$ 14,800,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Substrategy 2: Local Roads	\$ 61,198,707	\$ 146,968	\$ 2,177,684	\$ 2,651,406	\$ 2,574,881	\$ 2,490,553	\$ 2,135,371	\$ 2,188,101	\$ 2,499,777	\$ 2,681,338	\$ 3,434,390	\$ 3,049,918	\$ 3,233,573	\$ 3,240,324	\$ 3,311,863	\$ 3,384,833	\$ 3,459,262	\$ 3,535,179	\$ 3,612,615	\$ 3,691,600	\$ 3,772,165	\$ 3,926,907
<b>Subtotal, Strategy 3</b>	<b>\$ 122,356,577</b>	<b>\$ 146,968</b>	<b>\$ 2,177,684</b>	<b>\$ 3,427,406</b>	<b>\$ 5,546,931</b>	<b>\$ 5,790,553</b>	<b>\$ 2,313,627</b>	<b>\$ 3,500,101</b>	<b>\$ 4,499,777</b>	<b>\$ 4,677,616</b>	<b>\$ 5,434,390</b>	<b>\$ 4,398,204</b>	<b>\$ 11,583,573</b>	<b>\$ 5,080,324</b>	<b>\$ 5,111,863</b>	<b>\$ 16,869,833</b>	<b>\$ 18,259,262</b>	<b>\$ 8,535,179</b>	<b>\$ 3,612,615</b>	<b>\$ 3,691,600</b>	<b>\$ 3,772,165</b>	<b>\$ 3,926,907</b>
Strategy 4 - School Access	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
Substrategy 1: Safe Routes to Schools	\$ 12,948,719	\$ -	\$ 362,866	\$ 293,650	\$ 524,863	\$ 507,307	\$ 635,528	\$ 717,535	\$ 756,676	\$ 704,616	\$ 459,782	\$ 703,878	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 655,000	\$ 655,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 730,000	\$ 730,000	\$ 775,000	\$ 807,018
Substrategy 2: Crossing Guards	\$ 17,354,636	\$ -	\$ 45,700	\$ 568,736	\$ 775,539	\$ 659,867	\$ 719,899	\$ 811,679	\$ 699,007	\$ 811,918	\$ 928,160	\$ 912,131	\$ 1,065,000	\$ 946,000	\$ 1,076,000	\$ 1,015,000	\$ 970,000	\$ 1,010,000	\$ 1,175,000	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 1,035,000	\$ 1,110,000
Substrategy 3: Safe Pathways	\$ 14,351,115	\$ -	\$ 3,715	\$ 135,620	\$ 1,961,130	\$ 297,267	\$ 79,684	\$ 2,154,002	\$ 86,104	\$ 156,718	\$ 148,201	\$ 3,260,680	\$ 96,689	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 437,858	\$ 834,222	\$ 854,276	\$ 874,730	\$ 895,594	\$ 916,875	\$ 957,751
<b>Subtotal, Strategy 4</b>	<b>\$ 44,654,471</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 412,281</b>	<b>\$ 998,006</b>	<b>\$ 3,261,532</b>	<b>\$ 1,464,441</b>	<b>\$ 1,435,111</b>	<b>\$ 3,683,216</b>	<b>\$ 1,541,787</b>	<b>\$ 1,673,252</b>	<b>\$ 1,536,143</b>	<b>\$ 4,876,689</b>	<b>\$ 1,971,689</b>	<b>\$ 1,856,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,831,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,107,858</b>	<b>\$ 2,464,222</b>	<b>\$ 2,514,276</b>	<b>\$ 2,779,730</b>	<b>\$ 2,645,594</b>	<b>\$ 2,726,875</b>	<b>\$ 2,874,769</b>
<b>Total Sales Tax Programming</b>	<b>\$ 458,323,771</b>	<b>\$ 3,608,968</b>	<b>\$ 15,094,162</b>	<b>\$ 14,534,421</b>	<b>\$ 19,766,062</b>	<b>\$ 20,232,141</b>	<b>\$ 17,279,272</b>	<b>\$ 18,678,615</b>	<b>\$ 18,483,402</b>	<b>\$ 21,990,732</b>	<b>\$ 20,491,247</b>	<b>\$ 22,589,355</b>	<b>\$ 29,638,769</b>	<b>\$ 31,078,421</b>	<b>\$ 20,590,219</b>	<b>\$ 35,753,468</b>	<b>\$ 34,982,683</b>	<b>\$ 25,623,784</b>	<b>\$ 21,288,108</b>	<b>\$ 21,560,818</b>	<b>\$ 22,057,082</b>	<b>\$ 23,002,042</b>



**Transportation Authority of Marin  
Attachment 3-2 -- Strategy 2: Highway 101 Gap Closure/Debt Reserve -- Detail  
Revenues and Expenditures**

	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Strategy 2 Revenue</b>																						
Prior Year Carryforward			\$ -	\$ 235,338	\$ 1,569,932	\$ 2,339,847	\$ (217,057)	\$ (73,771)	\$ 332,610	\$ 108,315	\$ (2,370,334)	\$ (2,220,226)	\$ (1,806,550)	\$ (2,120,511)	\$ (946,315)	\$ 1,403,685	\$ 928,156	\$ 3,278,156	\$ 5,628,156	\$ 7,978,156	\$ 10,328,156	\$ 12,678,156
Bond Reserve Revenue	\$ 47,000,000	\$ -	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,350,000
Measure A Interest Dedicated	\$ 225,000			\$ 225,000																		
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 47,225,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,350,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,810,338</b>	<b>\$ 3,919,932</b>	<b>\$ 4,689,847</b>	<b>\$ 2,132,943</b>	<b>\$ 2,276,229</b>	<b>\$ 2,682,610</b>	<b>\$ 2,458,315</b>	<b>\$ (20,334)</b>	<b>\$ 129,774</b>	<b>\$ 543,450</b>	<b>\$ 229,489</b>	<b>\$ 1,403,685</b>	<b>\$ 3,753,685</b>	<b>\$ 3,278,156</b>	<b>\$ 5,628,156</b>	<b>\$ 7,978,156</b>	<b>\$ 10,328,156</b>	<b>\$ 12,678,156</b>	<b>\$ 15,028,156</b>
<b>Strategy 2 Expenditures</b>																						
101 Gap Closure Contract Costs	\$ 4,141,468		\$ 2,114,662	\$ 1,031,500	\$ 803,085	\$ 192,221																
MTC Loan Payment	\$ 13,253,052					\$ 892,857	\$ 1,785,714	\$ 1,861,019	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 968,162									
Swap Projects Reimbursement	\$ 5,910,624		\$ -	\$ 208,906	\$ 777,000	\$ 3,821,826	\$ 421,000	\$ 82,600	\$ -	\$ (376)	\$ 115,668	\$ 484,000										
SLPP Funds Backfill: Cash Flow	\$ 5,999,000								\$ 637,970	\$ 147,899		\$ 1,211,798	\$ 1,175,804		\$ 2,825,529	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Caltrans Construction Support	\$ 2,892,700								\$ 2,892,700													
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 32,196,844</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,114,662</b>	<b>\$ 1,240,406</b>	<b>\$ 1,580,085</b>	<b>\$ 4,906,904</b>	<b>\$ 2,206,714</b>	<b>\$ 1,943,619</b>	<b>\$ 2,574,295</b>	<b>\$ 4,828,649</b>	<b>\$ 2,199,892</b>	<b>\$ 1,936,325</b>	<b>\$ 2,663,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,175,804</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,825,529</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Strategy 2 Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 235,338</b>	<b>\$ 1,569,932</b>	<b>\$ 2,339,847</b>	<b>\$ (217,057)</b>	<b>\$ (73,771)</b>	<b>\$ 332,610</b>	<b>\$ 108,315</b>	<b>\$ (2,370,334)</b>	<b>\$ (2,220,226)</b>	<b>\$ (1,806,550)</b>	<b>\$ (2,120,511)</b>	<b>\$ (946,315)</b>	<b>\$ 1,403,685</b>	<b>\$ 928,156</b>	<b>\$ 3,278,156</b>	<b>\$ 5,628,156</b>	<b>\$ 7,978,156</b>	<b>\$ 10,328,156</b>	<b>\$ 12,678,156</b>	<b>\$ 15,028,156</b>

\$ 26,197,844

MTC Loan Payment Schedule	FY2008/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	Total
	\$ 892,857	\$ 1,785,714	\$ 1,861,019	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 1,936,325	\$ 968,162	\$ 13,253,052

**Swapped Project Allocation Details**

TLC Swap	FY04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY 15/16
Fairfax	\$ 180,000		\$ 10,000	\$ 170,000								
Fireside	\$ 198,906		\$ 198,906									
Corte Madera HIP	\$ 371,826			\$ 30,000	\$ 341,826							
Tousin Senior Housing & San Rafael Grand Ave Bridge	\$ 525,600					\$ 41,600						\$ 484,000
Whistlestop (moved to Vision Plan on 2/15)	\$ 115,668									\$ 115,668		
<b>Subtotal, TLC Swap</b>	<b>\$ 1,392,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 208,906</b>	<b>\$ 200,000</b>	<b>\$ 341,826</b>	<b>\$ 41,600</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 484,000</b>
<b>TE Swap</b>												
Bicycle Guide Signing	\$ 107,700					\$ 107,700						
Bus Stop Improvements	\$ 82,600						\$ 82,600					
Pine Terrace Multi Use Path	\$ 87,000			\$ 87,000								
East SFD Multi Use Bridge	\$ 90,000			\$ 90,000								
Olema Bolinas Pathway	\$ 271,700					\$ 271,700						
Striping and Signing	\$ 134,700			\$ 134,700								
Medway/Canal Improvements	\$ 265,300			\$ 265,300								
<b>Subtotal, TE Swap</b>	<b>\$ 1,039,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 577,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 379,400</b>	<b>\$ 82,600</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>STP Swap</b>												
Marin County	\$ 1,928,321				\$ 1,928,321							
Belvedere	\$ 21,022				\$ 21,398				\$ (376)			
Corte Madera	\$ 99,896				\$ 99,896							
Fairfax	\$ 54,914				\$ 54,914							
Larkspur	\$ 110,756				\$ 110,756							
Mill Valley	\$ 153,675				\$ 153,675							
Novato	\$ 366,579				\$ 366,579							
Ross	\$ 28,935				\$ 28,935							
San Anselmo	\$ 145,395				\$ 145,395							
San Rafael	\$ 415,620				\$ 415,620							
Sausalito	\$ 53,872				\$ 53,872							
Tiburon	\$ 100,639				\$ 100,639							
<b>Subtotal, STP Swap</b>	<b>\$ 3,479,624</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,480,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (376)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>TOTAL Swap</b>	<b>\$ 5,910,624</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 208,906</b>	<b>\$ 777,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,821,826</b>	<b>\$ 421,000</b>	<b>\$ 82,600</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (376)</b>	<b>\$ 115,668</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

Project(s) Funded
Point Reyes-Petaluma Road Rehabilitation
Speed limit, stop, and street signs replacement
Tamalpais/Redwood/Corte Madera Avenue Improvements
Tamalpais Road Overlay
Doherty Drive Reconstruction
Buena Vista Street Rehabilitation
Vallejo Avenue Improvements
Glenwood Avenue Overlay
Saunders Avenue Resurfacing
Francisco East and Manuel T. Freitas Parkway Resurfacing
Nevada Street from Bridgeway to Tomales
Mar West Street Improvement Project

**Notes:**

- Swapped projects can only use Measure A cash
  - Approximately \$1.8 million of the Gap expenditures from FY 06 and FY 07 are bond eligible, using the TAM adopted Reimbursement Resolution, March 30, 2006
  - MTC Swap assumes a 0% interest rate
  - STP Swap on Local Streets and Roads funds needs to be awarded by March 27, 2009.
- Shaded boxes indicate that funds have been allocated by TAM Board

**SLPP Funds Backfilled Allocation with Measure A Debt Reserved Funds**

Planning Area	Distribution	Total	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
Northern	19.60%	\$ 1,175,804						\$ 1,175,804								
Central	25.40%	\$ 1,523,746								\$ 1,523,746						
Southern	20.20%	\$ 1,211,798					\$ 1,211,798									
Ross Valley	21.70%	\$ 1,301,783								\$ 1,301,783						
West Marin	13.10%	\$ 785,869	\$ 637,970		\$ 147,899											
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 5,999,000</b>	<b>\$ 637,970</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 147,899</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,211,798</b>	<b>\$ 1,175,804</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,825,529</b>	<b>\$ -</b>					

**Notes:**

- In July 2010, the TAM Board committed SLPP funds to the five planning areas in the Major Roads category of Measure A in the same distribution formula to distribution Strategy 3.1 funds.
- In July 2011, the TAM Board diverted all available SLPP funds from the Major Roads category to the SMART project. Concurrently, the TAM Board directed the same amount of Measure A Debt Service Reserve to the Major Roads category of projects per the planning area distribution.
- SLPP is a five year program with a final revenue collection of \$5,999,000, which was adopted by the CTC in June 2012.
- SLPP must be matched dollar for dollar with transportation sales tax funds for the construction phase of a capital project.

**Transportation Authority of Marin  
Attachment 3-3 -- Strategy 3: Local Transportation Infrastructure -- Detail  
Revenues and Expenditures**

	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Revenue Available to Strategy 3<sup>1</sup></b>	\$ 122,397,414	\$ 978,098	\$ 4,499,683	\$ 5,274,762	\$ 5,109,489	\$ 4,308,234	\$ 4,221,677	\$ 4,840,708	\$ 5,114,411	\$ 5,755,093	\$ 5,882,239	\$ 6,203,149	\$ 6,340,376	\$ 6,480,648	\$ 6,623,726	\$ 6,769,665	\$ 6,918,523	\$ 7,070,359	\$ 7,225,231	\$ 7,383,200	\$ 7,544,329	\$ 7,853,813
<b>13.25% To Substrategy 3.1</b>																						
<b>Major Roads and Related Infrastructure<sup>2</sup></b>																						
<b>Revenue</b>																						
Prior Year Carryover		\$ 489,049	\$ 2,738,891	\$ 4,600,272	\$ 4,182,966	\$ 3,037,083	\$ 4,969,666	\$ 6,078,020	\$ 6,635,225	\$ 7,516,494	\$ 8,457,613	\$ 10,210,902	\$ 5,031,089	\$ 6,431,413	\$ 7,943,276	\$ (2,156,891)	\$ (13,497,629)	\$ (14,962,450)	\$ (11,349,834)	\$ (7,658,234)	\$ (3,886,070)	\$ (3,886,070)
Strategy 3.1 Revenue	\$ 61,198,707	\$ 489,049	\$ 2,249,842	\$ 2,637,381	\$ 2,554,744	\$ 2,154,117	\$ 2,110,839	\$ 2,420,354	\$ 2,557,205	\$ 2,877,546	\$ 2,941,120	\$ 3,101,574	\$ 3,170,188	\$ 3,240,324	\$ 3,311,863	\$ 3,384,833	\$ 3,459,262	\$ 3,535,179	\$ 3,612,615	\$ 3,691,600	\$ 3,772,165	\$ 3,926,907
Minus Project Management Cost		\$ -	\$ (90,450)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (21,585)	\$ (26,113)	\$ -	\$ (21,105)	\$ (34,447)	\$ (55,405)	\$ (55,878)	\$ (64,322)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)	\$ (125,000)
<b>Total Revenue<sup>3</sup></b>	\$ 61,198,707	\$ 489,049	\$ 2,738,891	\$ 5,376,272	\$ 7,155,016	\$ 6,337,083	\$ 5,147,922	\$ 7,390,020	\$ 8,635,225	\$ 9,512,772	\$ 10,457,613	\$ 11,559,188	\$ 13,381,089	\$ 8,271,413	\$ 9,743,276	\$ 11,328,109	\$ 1,302,371	\$ (9,962,450)	\$ (11,349,834)	\$ (7,658,234)	\$ (3,886,070)	\$ 40,837
<b>Planning Area: Northern Marin Revenue</b> 19.90%	\$ 12,178,543	\$ 97,321	\$ 447,718	\$ 524,839	\$ 508,394	\$ 428,669	\$ 420,057	\$ 481,650	\$ 508,884	\$ 572,632	\$ 585,283	\$ 617,213	\$ 630,867	\$ 644,824	\$ 659,061	\$ 673,582	\$ 688,393	\$ 703,501	\$ 718,910	\$ 734,628	\$ 750,661	\$ 781,454
Prior Year Carryover		\$ -	\$ 97,321	\$ 545,039	\$ 997,878	\$ 784,222	\$ 462,892	\$ 882,948	\$ 1,182,599	\$ 1,691,483	\$ 2,264,114	\$ 2,849,397	\$ 3,518,325	\$ 4,149,192	\$ 4,194,016	\$ 4,153,077	\$ 826,659	\$ (3,684,948)	\$ (2,981,447)	\$ (2,262,537)	\$ (1,527,908)	\$ (777,248)
Novato Boulevard - Seg 1	\$ 10,901,085				\$ 114,450	\$ 286,635								\$ 600,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 5,200,000					
Novato Boulevard - Seg 2	\$ 656,251		\$ 72,000	\$ 452,600	\$ 38,365		\$ 145,000				\$ (51,714)											
Novato Boulevard - Seg 3	\$ 617,000			\$ 155,000	\$ 425,000		\$ 37,000															
<b>Subtotal Expenditures</b>	\$ 1,273,251	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,000	\$ 722,050	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ 182,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (51,714)	\$ -	\$ 600,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 5,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Year End Balance</b>	\$ 97,321	\$ 545,039	\$ 997,878	\$ 784,222	\$ 462,892	\$ 882,948	\$ 1,182,599	\$ 1,691,483	\$ 2,264,114	\$ 2,849,397	\$ 3,518,325	\$ 4,149,192	\$ 4,194,016	\$ 4,153,077	\$ 826,659	\$ (3,684,948)	\$ (2,981,447)	\$ (2,262,537)	\$ (1,527,908)	\$ (777,248)	\$ 4,207	
<b>Planning Area: Central Marin Revenue</b> 25.40%	\$ 15,544,472	\$ 124,218	\$ 571,460	\$ 669,895	\$ 648,905	\$ 547,146	\$ 536,153	\$ 614,770	\$ 649,530	\$ 730,897	\$ 747,044	\$ 787,800	\$ 805,228	\$ 823,042	\$ 841,213	\$ 859,747	\$ 878,652	\$ 897,936	\$ 917,604	\$ 937,666	\$ 958,130	\$ 997,434
Prior Year Carryover		\$ -	\$ 124,218	\$ 695,678	\$ 1,365,573	\$ (235,522)	\$ (1,938,376)	\$ (1,030,479)	\$ (415,709)	\$ 233,821	\$ 964,718	\$ 1,711,762	\$ 2,499,562	\$ 3,004,790	\$ 3,827,832	\$ 3,569,045	\$ 4,428,793	\$ 307,445	\$ (3,794,619)	\$ (2,877,015)	\$ (1,939,349)	\$ (981,219)
4th Street San Rafael <sup>4</sup>	\$ 4,128,256				\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,250,000	\$ (371,744)															
3rd Street San Rafael	\$ 11,400,000											\$ 300,000		\$ 1,100,000		\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000					
<b>Subtotal Expenditures</b>	\$ 15,528,256	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,250,000	\$ (371,744)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Year End Balance</b>	\$ 124,218	\$ 695,678	\$ 1,365,573	\$ (235,522)	\$ (1,938,376)	\$ (1,030,479)	\$ (415,709)	\$ 233,821	\$ 964,718	\$ 1,711,762	\$ 2,499,562	\$ 3,004,790	\$ 3,827,832	\$ 3,569,045	\$ 4,428,793	\$ 307,445	\$ (3,794,619)	\$ (2,877,015)	\$ (1,939,349)	\$ (981,219)	\$ 16,216	
<b>Planning Area: Southern Marin Revenue</b> 20.00%	\$ 12,239,741	\$ 97,810	\$ 449,968	\$ 527,476	\$ 510,949	\$ 430,823	\$ 422,168	\$ 484,071	\$ 511,441	\$ 575,509	\$ 588,224	\$ 620,315	\$ 634,038	\$ 648,065	\$ 662,373	\$ 676,967	\$ 691,852	\$ 707,036	\$ 722,523	\$ 738,320	\$ 754,433	\$ 785,381
Prior Year Carryover		\$ -	\$ 97,810	\$ 547,778	\$ 825,254	\$ 1,336,203	\$ 1,767,027	\$ 1,639,194	\$ 2,123,265	\$ 2,634,706	\$ 3,210,216	\$ 3,798,439	\$ 4,301,754	\$ (4,397,208)	\$ (3,989,143)	\$ (3,326,771)	\$ (4,399,804)	\$ (3,707,952)	\$ (3,000,916)	\$ (2,278,393)	\$ (1,540,073)	\$ (785,640)
Miller Avenue Mill Valley	\$ 10,250,000		\$ 250,000		\$ 550,000						\$ 1,400,000	\$ 8,050,000				\$ 240,000		\$ 1,750,000				
E. Blithedale Avenue	\$ 1,990,000																					
<b>Subtotal Expenditures</b>	\$ 12,240,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 240,000	\$ -	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Year End Balance</b>	\$ 97,810	\$ 547,778	\$ 825,254	\$ 1,336,203	\$ 1,767,027	\$ 1,639,194	\$ 2,123,265	\$ 2,634,706	\$ 3,210,216	\$ 3,798,439	\$ 4,301,754	\$ (4,397,208)	\$ (3,989,143)	\$ (3,326,771)	\$ (4,399,804)	\$ (3,707,952)	\$ (3,000,916)	\$ (2,278,393)	\$ (1,540,073)	\$ (785,640)	\$ (259)	
<b>Planning Area: Ross Valley Revenue</b> 21.60%	\$ 13,218,921	\$ 105,635	\$ 485,966	\$ 569,674	\$ 551,825	\$ 465,289	\$ 455,941	\$ 522,796	\$ 552,356	\$ 621,550	\$ 635,282	\$ 669,940	\$ 684,761	\$ 699,910	\$ 715,362	\$ 731,124	\$ 747,201	\$ 763,599	\$ 780,325	\$ 797,386	\$ 814,788	\$ 848,212
Prior Year Carryover		\$ -	\$ 105,635	\$ 591,600	\$ 1,161,275	\$ 1,713,099	\$ 2,178,389	\$ 2,634,330	\$ 3,157,126	\$ 3,709,483	\$ 3,531,033	\$ 4,166,315	\$ 4,836,255	\$ 5,521,015	\$ 5,420,925	\$ 6,136,288	\$ (132,589)	\$ (3,985,388)	\$ (3,221,789)	\$ (2,441,464)	\$ (1,644,079)	\$ (829,291)
SFD between US 101 & Wolf Grade	\$ 7,800,000									\$ 400,000				\$ 400,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 3,000,000						
SFD between Wolf Grade & Ross	\$ 5,400,000									\$ 400,000				\$ 400,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,600,000						
<b>Subtotal Expenditures</b>	\$ 13,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 800,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 4,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Year End Balance</b>	\$ 105,635	\$ 591,600	\$ 1,161,275	\$ 1,713,099	\$ 2,178,389	\$ 2,634,330	\$ 3,157,126	\$ 3,709,483	\$ 3,531,033	\$ 4,166,315	\$ 4,836,255	\$ 5,521,015	\$ 5,420,925	\$ 6,136,288	\$ (132,589)	\$ (3,985,388)	\$ (3,221,789)	\$ (2,441,464)	\$ (1,644,079)	\$ (829,291)	\$ 18,921	
<b>Planning Area: West Marin Revenue</b> 13.10%	\$ 8,017,031	\$ 64,065	\$ 294,729	\$ 345,497	\$ 334,672	\$ 282,189	\$ 276,520	\$ 317,066	\$ 334,994	\$ 376,959	\$ 385,287	\$ 406,306	\$ 415,295	\$ 424,482	\$ 433,854	\$ 443,413	\$ 453,163	\$ 463,108	\$ 473,253	\$ 483,600	\$ 494,154	\$ 514,425
Prior Year Carryover		\$ -	\$ 64,065	\$ 358,795	\$ 250,292	\$ 584,963	\$ 567,152	\$ 843,672	\$ 30,739	\$ (1,634,267)	\$ (2,453,587)	\$ (4,068,300)	\$ (3,661,994)	\$ (3,246,699)	\$ (3,022,217)	\$ (2,588,363)	\$ (2,879,950)	\$ (2,426,786)	\$ (1,963,678)	\$ (1,490,425)	\$ (1,006,826)	\$ (512,672)
SFD SP Taylor - Platform Bridge	\$ 7,080,278		\$ 454,000		\$ 300,000		\$ 1,130,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,196,278	\$ 2,000,000												
Fairfax Limit - Samuel P. Taylor (Shafter Bridge)	\$ 935,000													\$ 200,000		\$ 735,000						
<b>Subtotal Expenditures</b>	\$ 8,015,278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 1,130,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,196,278	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ 735,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Year End Balance</b>	\$ 64,065	\$ 358,795	\$ 250,292	\$ 584,963	\$ 567,152	\$ 843,672	\$ 30,739	\$ (1,634,267)	\$ (2,453,587)	\$ (4,068,300)	\$ (3,661,994)	\$ (3,246,699)	\$ (3,022,217)	\$ (2,588,363)	\$ (2,879,950)	\$ (2,426,786)	\$ (1,963,678)	\$ (1,490,425)	\$ (1,006,826)	\$ (512,672)	\$ 1,753	
<b>Strategy 3.1 Total Expenditures</b>	\$ 61,157,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 776,000	\$ 2,972,050	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 178,256	\$ 1,312,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,996,278	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,348,286	\$ 8,350,000	\$ 1,840,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 13,485,000	\$ 14,800,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Strategy 3.1 Cumulative Balance</b>	\$ 489,049	\$ 2,738,891	\$ 4,600,272	\$ 4,182,966	\$ 3,037,083	\$ 4,969,666	\$ 6,078,020	\$ 6,635,225	\$ 7,516,494	\$ 8,457,613	\$ 10,210,902	\$ 5,031,089	\$ 6,431,413	\$ 7,943,276	\$ (2,156,891)	\$ (13,497,629)	\$ (14,962,450)	\$ (11,349,834)	\$ (7,658,234)	\$ (3,886,070)	\$ 40,837	

	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>13.25% To Substrategy 2</b>																						
<b>Local Roads for all Modes<sup>2</sup></b>																						
<b>Revenue</b>																						
Prior Year Carryforward		\$ 342,081	\$ 414,239	\$ 400,214	\$ 380,077	\$ 43,642	\$ 19,109	\$ 251,362	\$ 308,791	\$ 504,999	\$ 11,729	\$ 63,385	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Strategy 3 Revenue	\$ 61,198,707	\$ 489,049	\$ 2,249,842	\$ 2,637,381	\$ 2,554,744	\$ 2,154,117	\$ 2,110,839	\$ 2,420,354	\$ 2,557,205	\$ 2,877,546	\$ 2,941,120	\$ 3,101,574	\$ 3,170,188	\$ 3,240,324	\$ 3,311,863	\$ 3,384,833	\$ 3,459,262	\$ 3,535,179	\$ 3,612,615	\$ 3,691,6		

**Transportation Authority of Marin  
Attachment 3-4 -- Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safer Access to Schools -- Detail  
Revenues and Expenditures  
(Programming based)**

	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Revenue Available to Strategy 4 <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$ 46,702,616</b>	\$ 156,003	\$ 1,769,643	\$ 2,189,524	\$ 2,010,779	\$ 1,649,334	\$ 1,652,394	\$ 1,920,733	\$ 1,931,665	\$ 2,158,272	\$ 2,247,096	\$ 2,373,452	\$ 2,381,854	\$ 2,440,080	\$ 2,499,471	\$ 2,560,050	\$ 2,621,840	\$ 2,684,866	\$ 2,749,152	\$ 2,814,725	\$ 2,881,608	\$ 3,010,073

3.3% To Substrategy 1 Safe Routes to Schools																						
	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Revenue</b>																						
Prior Year Carryforward			\$ 46,801	\$ 214,828	\$ 578,035	\$ 656,406	\$ 643,899	\$ 504,089	\$ 362,774	\$ 185,598	\$ 128,463	\$ 342,810	\$ 544,968	\$ 629,524	\$ 706,548	\$ 801,389	\$ 914,404	\$ 1,040,956	\$ 1,196,416	\$ 1,291,162	\$ 1,405,579	\$ 1,495,062
Strategy 4 Revenue 3.30% 30.00%	\$ 14,010,785	\$ 46,801	\$ 530,893	\$ 656,857	\$ 603,234	\$ 494,800	\$ 495,718	\$ 576,220	\$ 579,500	\$ 647,482	\$ 674,129	\$ 712,036	\$ 714,556	\$ 732,024	\$ 749,841	\$ 768,015	\$ 786,552	\$ 805,460	\$ 824,746	\$ 844,417	\$ 864,482	\$ 903,022
Funds from 4.3 for Added Scope <sup>6</sup>	\$ 529,000											\$ 194,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 155,000								
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 14,539,785</b>	<b>\$ 46,801</b>	<b>\$ 577,694</b>	<b>\$ 871,685</b>	<b>\$ 1,181,269</b>	<b>\$ 1,151,206</b>	<b>\$ 1,139,617</b>	<b>\$ 1,080,309</b>	<b>\$ 942,274</b>	<b>\$ 833,079</b>	<b>\$ 802,592</b>	<b>\$ 1,248,846</b>	<b>\$ 1,439,524</b>	<b>\$ 1,516,548</b>	<b>\$ 1,456,389</b>	<b>\$ 1,569,404</b>	<b>\$ 1,700,956</b>	<b>\$ 1,846,416</b>	<b>\$ 2,021,162</b>	<b>\$ 2,135,579</b>	<b>\$ 2,270,062</b>	<b>\$ 2,398,084</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>																						
Substrategy 1 - Education and Encouragement Program	\$ 12,613,719		\$ 362,866	\$ 293,650	\$ 524,863	\$ 507,307	\$ 635,528	\$ 717,535	\$ 756,676	\$ 704,616	\$ 459,782	\$ 703,878	\$ 630,000	\$ 655,000	\$ 655,000	\$ 655,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 730,000	\$ 730,000	\$ 775,000	\$ 807,018
Substrategy 1 - Added Scope from 4.3 Funds <sup>6</sup>	\$ 335,000											\$ 180,000	\$ 155,000									
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 12,613,719</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 362,866</b>	<b>\$ 293,650</b>	<b>\$ 524,863</b>	<b>\$ 507,307</b>	<b>\$ 635,528</b>	<b>\$ 717,535</b>	<b>\$ 756,676</b>	<b>\$ 704,616</b>	<b>\$ 459,782</b>	<b>\$ 703,878</b>	<b>\$ 810,000</b>	<b>\$ 810,000</b>	<b>\$ 655,000</b>	<b>\$ 655,000</b>	<b>\$ 660,000</b>	<b>\$ 650,000</b>	<b>\$ 730,000</b>	<b>\$ 730,000</b>	<b>\$ 775,000</b>	<b>\$ 807,018</b>
<b>Substrategy 1 Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>\$ 1,926,066</b>	<b>\$ 46,801</b>	<b>\$ 214,828</b>	<b>\$ 578,035</b>	<b>\$ 656,406</b>	<b>\$ 643,899</b>	<b>\$ 504,089</b>	<b>\$ 362,774</b>	<b>\$ 185,598</b>	<b>\$ 128,463</b>	<b>\$ 342,810</b>	<b>\$ 544,968</b>	<b>\$ 629,524</b>	<b>\$ 706,548</b>	<b>\$ 801,389</b>	<b>\$ 914,404</b>	<b>\$ 1,040,956</b>	<b>\$ 1,196,416</b>	<b>\$ 1,291,162</b>	<b>\$ 1,405,579</b>	<b>\$ 1,495,062</b>	<b>\$ 1,591,066</b>

4.2% To Substrategy 2 Crossing Guards																						
	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Revenue</b>																						
Prior Year Carryforward			\$ 59,565	\$ 689,547	\$ 956,811	\$ 949,024	\$ 1,127,094	\$ 1,038,109	\$ 959,801	\$ 998,339	\$ 1,010,488	\$ 940,311	\$ 960,407	\$ 914,842	\$ 926,509	\$ 830,852	\$ 793,326	\$ 824,392	\$ 839,523	\$ 714,199	\$ 768,912	\$ 834,163
Strategy 4 Revenue 4.20% 38.18%	\$ 17,831,908	\$ 59,565	\$ 675,682	\$ 836,000	\$ 767,752	\$ 629,746	\$ 630,914	\$ 733,371	\$ 737,545	\$ 824,068	\$ 857,982	\$ 906,227	\$ 909,435	\$ 931,667	\$ 954,344	\$ 977,474	\$ 1,001,066	\$ 1,025,131	\$ 1,049,676	\$ 1,074,713	\$ 1,100,250	\$ 1,149,301
Funds from 4.3 for Additional Guards <sup>6</sup>	\$ 188,000											\$ 26,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000							
Repayment from Strategy 4.3	\$ 208,192				\$ 208,192																	
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 18,228,100</b>	<b>\$ 59,565</b>	<b>\$ 735,247</b>	<b>\$ 1,525,547</b>	<b>\$ 1,724,563</b>	<b>\$ 1,786,961</b>	<b>\$ 1,758,008</b>	<b>\$ 1,771,480</b>	<b>\$ 1,697,346</b>	<b>\$ 1,822,406</b>	<b>\$ 1,868,471</b>	<b>\$ 1,872,538</b>	<b>\$ 1,979,842</b>	<b>\$ 1,872,509</b>	<b>\$ 1,906,852</b>	<b>\$ 1,808,326</b>	<b>\$ 1,794,392</b>	<b>\$ 1,849,523</b>	<b>\$ 1,889,199</b>	<b>\$ 1,788,912</b>	<b>\$ 1,869,163</b>	<b>\$ 1,983,463</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>																						
Loan to Strategy 4.3	\$ 208,192				\$ 208,192																	
Substrategy 2 - Data Evaluation and Recertification	\$ 605,030		\$ 45,700	\$ 19,520	\$ 20,000	\$ 46,973		12,212	\$ -	\$ 50,625		\$ 40,000		\$ 90,000	\$ 50,000				\$ 160,000			\$ 70,000
Substrategy 2 - Contract Guards	\$ 16,379,414		\$ 549,216	\$ 547,347	\$ 659,867	\$ 672,926	\$ 811,679	\$ 686,795	\$ 811,918	\$ 877,535	\$ 912,131	\$ 915,000	\$ 920,000	\$ 960,000	\$ 965,000	\$ 970,000	\$ 1,010,000	\$ 1,015,000	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 1,035,000	\$ 1,040,000	
Substrategy 2 - Additional Guards from 4.3 Funds <sup>6</sup>	\$ 162,000											\$ 110,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000								
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 17,192,636</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 45,700</b>	<b>\$ 568,736</b>	<b>\$ 775,539</b>	<b>\$ 659,867</b>	<b>\$ 719,899</b>	<b>\$ 811,679</b>	<b>\$ 699,007</b>	<b>\$ 811,918</b>	<b>\$ 928,160</b>	<b>\$ 912,131</b>	<b>\$ 1,065,000</b>	<b>\$ 946,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,076,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,015,000</b>	<b>\$ 970,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,010,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,175,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,020,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,035,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,110,000</b>
<b>Substrategy 2 Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>\$ 1,035,463</b>	<b>\$ 59,565</b>	<b>\$ 689,547</b>	<b>\$ 956,811</b>	<b>\$ 949,024</b>	<b>\$ 1,127,094</b>	<b>\$ 1,038,109</b>	<b>\$ 959,801</b>	<b>\$ 998,339</b>	<b>\$ 1,010,488</b>	<b>\$ 940,311</b>	<b>\$ 960,407</b>	<b>\$ 914,842</b>	<b>\$ 926,509</b>	<b>\$ 830,852</b>	<b>\$ 793,326</b>	<b>\$ 824,392</b>	<b>\$ 839,523</b>	<b>\$ 714,199</b>	<b>\$ 768,912</b>	<b>\$ 834,163</b>	<b>\$ 873,463</b>

3.5% To Substrategy 3 Capital Funds for Safe Pathways																						
	Total	FY 04/05	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
<b>Revenue</b>																						
Prior Year Carryforward			\$ 49,637	\$ 608,991	\$ 1,170,037	\$ 56,893	\$ 284,414	\$ 730,491	\$ (812,368)	\$ (283,851)	\$ 246,154	\$ 812,938	\$ (1,912,552)	\$ (1,457,379)	\$ (961,989)	\$ (376,703)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Strategy 4 Revenue 3.50% 31.82%	\$ 14,859,923	\$ 49,637	\$ 563,068	\$ 696,667	\$ 639,793	\$ 524,788	\$ 525,762	\$ 611,142	\$ 614,621	\$ 686,723	\$ 714,985	\$ 755,189	\$ 757,863	\$ 776,389	\$ 795,286	\$ 814,561	\$ 834,222	\$ 854,276	\$ 874,730	\$ 895,594	\$ 916,875	\$ 957,751
Loan from Strategy 4.2	\$ 208,192				\$ 208,192																	
OBAG SRTS Funds Moved to 4.1 and 4.2 <sup>6,7</sup>	\$ (717,000)											\$ (220,000)	\$ (206,000)	\$ (181,000)	\$ (110,000)							
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 14,351,115</b>	<b>\$ 49,637</b>	<b>\$ 612,706</b>	<b>\$ 1,305,657</b>	<b>\$ 2,018,023</b>	<b>\$ 581,681</b>	<b>\$ 810,175</b>	<b>\$ 1,341,634</b>	<b>\$ (197,748)</b>	<b>\$ 402,872</b>	<b>\$ 961,139</b>	<b>\$ 1,348,127</b>	<b>\$ (1,360,690)</b>	<b>\$ (861,989)</b>	<b>\$ (276,703)</b>	<b>\$ 437,858</b>	<b>\$ 834,222</b>	<b>\$ 854,276</b>	<b>\$ 874,730</b>	<b>\$ 895,594</b>	<b>\$ 916,875</b>	<b>\$ 957,751</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>																						
Substrategy 3 - Payment to 4.2	\$ 208,192				\$ 208,192																	
Substrategy 3 - Program Development	\$ 2,047,090		\$ 3,715	\$ 135,620	\$ 187,531	\$ 89,075	\$ 134,393	\$ 118,263	\$ 86,855	\$ 158,832	\$ 79,515	\$ 253,291	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	
Substrategy 3 - Capital Projects <sup>5</sup>	\$ 12,654,405				\$ 1,773,599	\$ -	\$ 2,044,000		\$ 85,000	\$ 3,480,500		\$ -		\$ 337,858	\$ 734,222	\$ 754,276	\$ 774,730	\$ 845,594	\$ 866,875	\$ 957,751		
Unused Funds - Completed/Cancelled Projects	\$ (558,572)						\$ (54,709)	\$ (8,261)	\$ (752)	\$ (2,114)	\$ (16,314)	\$ (473,111)	\$ (3,311)									
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 14,351,115</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,715</b>	<b>\$ 135,620</b>	<b>\$ 1,961,130</b>	<b>\$ 297,267</b>	<b>\$ 79,684</b>	<b>\$ 2,154,002</b>	<b>\$ 86,104</b>	<b>\$ 156,718</b>	<b>\$ 148,201</b>	<b>\$ 3,260,680</b>	<b>\$ 96,689</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 437,858</b>	<b>\$ 834,222</b>	<b>\$ 854,276</b>	<b>\$ 874,730</b>	<b>\$ 895,594</b>	<b>\$ 916,875</b>	<b>\$ 957,751</b>
<b>Substrategy 3 Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 49,637</b>	<b>\$ 608,991</b>	<b>\$ 1,170,037</b>	<b>\$ 56,893</b>	<b>\$ 284,414</b>	<b>\$ 730,491</b>	<b>\$ (812,368)</b>	<b>\$ (283,851)</b>	<b>\$ 246,154</b>	<b>\$ 812,938</b>	<b>\$ (1,912,552)</b>	<b>\$ (1,457,379)</b>	<b>\$ (961,989)</b>	<b>\$ (376,703)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>						

**Projects Allocated under 4.3 Safe Pathway Program**

Projects	FY 07/08	Projects	FY 10/11	Projects	FY 13/14	Projects	FY 14/15	Projects	FY 14/15
San Rafael-Laurel Dell	\$ 250,000	Novato-Hill Middle School	\$ 250,000	County-Pine Hill RRFB	\$ 85,000	Fairfax-SFD/Taylor RRFB	\$ 25,000	Mill Valley-Camino Alto Bike Ped	\$ 350,000
TAM HSD-TAM HS	\$ 250,000	Ross-Ross, Wade T., Branson, St. Ans	\$ 250,000	<b>Total Awarded</b>	<b>\$ 85,000</b>	County-Changeable Message Signs	\$ 18,000	San Rafael-Grand Ave Bridge	\$ 107,000
San Anselmo-Brookside	\$ 160,856	County-Strawberry Point <sup>2</sup>	\$ 62,000			County-SFD/Lagunitas RRFB	\$ 25,000	TAM-TAM Junction Bike Improvement	\$ 350,000
Fairfax-Manor	\$ 54,500	Mill Valley-Tam HS, MV Mid., Edna M.	\$ 41,000			County-Butterfield/Green Valley RRFB	\$ 25,000	Larkspur-Doherty Drive Bike Ped	\$ 350,000
San Anselmo-Wade/St. A	\$ 89,144	County-Venetia Valley School <sup>3</sup>	\$ 50,000			County-Strawberry Pt School RRFB	\$ 25,000	Novato-Plum Street Sidewalk	\$ 350,000
Larkspur-Hall M.S. Path	\$ 149,760	County-Edna Maguire	\$ 250,000			Mill Valley-Throckmorton Sidewalk	\$ 25,000	San Anselmo-Brookside Elementary	\$ 350,000
Ross-Shady Lane	\$ 246,207	County-Tomales Elem. & HS	\$ 250,000			Novato-Solar Speed Signs	\$ 24,500	Tiburon-Greewood Cove/Blackfield	\$ 116,000
Corte Madera-Neil Cummins	\$ 80,000	Sausalito-Bayside Elem. & Willow Cree	\$ 52,000			Novato-Ignacio/Laurelwood Cross	\$ 25,000	Sausalito-Bridgeway Ped	\$ 204,000
Mill Valley-Edna McGuire	\$ 73,040	San Anselmo-Wade Thomas Elem.	\$ 150,000			Novato-Ignacio/Country Club Cross	\$ 25,000	County-Bridgeway Lighting	\$ 146,000
Larkspur-Hall/Redwood S/S	\$ 128,750	Sausalito-Marin and New Village	\$ 42,000			Novato-S Novato/Lark Ct Crosswalk			

## **APPENDICES**

Appendices 1-7 have not been revised and are not included. Appendices 1-7 will be made available upon request.

Appendix 8 has been omitted since no comments were received.