

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
TAM

OCTOBER 27, 2016
7:00 PM

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



MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Stephanie Moulton-Peters, City of Mill Valley, TAM Chair
Judy Arnold, Marin County Board of Supervisors, TAM Vice Chair
Damon Connolly, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Dan Hillmer, Larkspur City Council
Diane Furst, Corte Madera Town Council
Eric Lucan, Novato City Council
Ford Greene, San Anselmo Town Council
Gary Phillips, San Rafael City Council
James Campbell, Belvedere City Council
John Reed, Fairfax Town Council
Katie Rice, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Kathrin Sears, Marin County Board of Supervisors
P. Beach Kuhl, Ross Town Council
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Members Absent: Thomas Theodores, Sausalito
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council

Staff Members Present: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director
Bill Whitney, Principal Project Delivery Manager
Dan Cherrier, Principal Project Delivery Manager
David Chan, Manager of Programming & Legislation
Derek McGill, Planning Manager
Li Zhang, Chief Financial Officer
Molly Graham, Public Outreach Coordinator
Nick Nguyen, Principal Project Delivery Manager
Scott McDonald, Senior Transportation Planner

Chair Moulton-Peters called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

1. Chair's Report (Discussion)

Chair Moulton-Peters commented on the potential renewal of the Measure A transportation sales tax increment, and indicated in December or January she will be forming a committee of volunteers from the Board to work in that area.

2. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda (Discussion)

No comments made.

3. Executive Director's Report (Discussion)

Executive Director (ED) Dianne Steinhauser began with the swearing-in of Commissioner Ford Greene, Alternate from the Town of San Anselmo. She also noted that the Commissioners have at the dais a copy of a quarterly report from TAM, the “*Look-Ahead Report*” - to keep them updated on upcoming activities, actions and information from and about TAM and transportation issues, specifically for the next 3 months. She mentioned upcoming Board meeting dates for November and December, where project fact sheets will be provided to the Board, to be updated on a regular basis. She explained ongoing TAM monitoring efforts including origin and destination information being collected, progress on development of a Vision Plan for TAM including online surveys that were completed, noting receipt of approximately 3800 to date, initiation of discussion by MTC (Metropolitan Transportation Commission) of raising toll rates for the Bay Area Bridges (except the Golden Gate Bridge, which is handled separately), potential application, jointly, between TAM, Sonoma County transportation Authority, and MTC for a bike share grant, and a technical issue with NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) renewal.

Chair Moulton-Peters noted that Commissioner Reed had wanted to make a comment under Commissioner Comments, so she was giving him the opportunity now.

Commissioner Reed commented on the deaths of three young men in a recent accident on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard near the Platform Bridge Road. He thought it would be good to place signage beginning at Platform Bridge Road, to make drivers aware that there are dangerous curves ahead. He expressed his condolences to the families.

a. Richmond – San Rafael Bridge Third Lane & Multi-use Path Report

ED Steinhauser noted that the bid process has been started for the third lane proposed for the Bridge, funded by the Bay Area Toll Authority, with bids to be opened November 1st. The other part of the project, the bike lane, will be handled separately; and is planned to be advertised before the end of the year.

There was no public comment on the Executive Director Report.

Chair Moulton-Peters also noted there seems to be some problem with the sound system, so she asked that Commissioners make an extra effort to speak into their microphones

4. Commissioner Reports (Discussion)

a. MTC Report

Commissioner Kinsey was optimistic about the Richmond Bridge Third Lane project because it is the only major project currently being advertised in the Bay Area right now, for the area between Monterey and the Sonoma County line. He commented on MTC efforts to secure the federal earmark repurposing funding for the San Rafael Transit Center, RM2 (Regional Measure 2) funds for the SMART extension to Larkspur and RM2 funding for the North South Greenway. He was appreciative of MTC staff being willing to meet with all parties involved in this group of related projects. He also reported on an upcoming joint meeting with ABAG (Association of Bay Area

Governments) regarding the potential staff consolidation with MTC, an upcoming workshop in November on the Draft Preferred Scenario for the next Regional Transportation Plan, and a later workshop scheduled for December 14 from noon-5:00 p.m. to begin discussions on Regional Measure 3, as well as the need to find creative funding sources for Bay Area transportation projects, given that the state and federal governments have not been forthcoming with their funds. He commented, as well, on MTC's posthumous recognition of Deb Hubsmith, through their annual Grand Award, as an individual who has done much for transportation.

b. Marin Transit Report

Commissioner Sears indicated she had no report.

c. SMART

Vice Chair Arnold reported on hiring of operations staff, train shunting, and discovery of a problem with the engine crankshaft, which the manufacturer has agreed to correct, but which will delay start of SMART service until the spring. She noted the SMART General Manager's report was at the dais, and she also commented on institution of quiet zones, which Marin has asked for at the beginning, but Sonoma has only belatedly requested.

5. Open Time for Public Expression

No comments made.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR (Action)

- a. Approval of TAM Draft Meeting Minutes of September 22, 2016
- b. Allocate Transportation Sales Tax (Measure A) for the Ferry "Wave Shuttle" Connector
- c. Allocate Transportation Sales Tax (Measure A) to Marin Transit for the Sir Francis Drake Rehabilitation Project in West Marin
- d. Cooperative Agreements Associated with the Construction of the MSN A2 and A3 Contracts, and Approval of \$167,000 in Payments Associated with Said Agreement and Amendments
- e. Award of the Information Technology Contact
- f. Revised Programming OBAG and Local Funds
- g. Acceptance of the FY2016-17 First Quarter Financial Report and Proposed Budget Amendments

Regarding Item 6f, ED Steinhauser noted that MTC had not agreed with the re-allocation of funds that TAM had approved at an earlier meeting. She asked that action on that item be postponed until a later date, after staff has time to talk further with MTC.

Commissioner Connolly moved to approve the Consent Calendar Items 6a-e and 6g. Commissioner Rice seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

7. Legislative Update (Discussion)

ED Steinhauser noted that consultant Gus Khouri would review last minute bill approvals as well as items being considered during the special session after the election.

Mr. Khouri pointed out that the remaining special session will go through November 30th and will be focused on transportation issues. Regarding the list of pending legislation attached to tonight's Board item, he indicated he

removed any bills that died during the process but left on any that are being reviewed by the governor. He reviewed the categories of funds being considered during the special session, as well as supporters for each, and funding strategies (cap-and-trade, sales tax, income tax, vehicle license fees). He also briefly touched on election issues.

Commissioner Greene asked about trade route corridor legislation vetoed by Governor Brown, especially given that so much of the damage to the major highways in the state is caused by commercial trucks, etc. Mr. Khouri discussed issues with proper apportionment of trade corridor infrastructure funding whereby the state received a certain percentage as did local agencies.

Commissioner Kinsey asked about the NEPA delegation to Caltrans, and Mr. Khouri noted it is included as a component in the Governor's plan and the Beall/Frasier plan, but he sees little movement on it as a stand-alone issue. He confirmed there could be opportunities to raise the issue during the special session via Senators McGuire and/or Levine. After further discussion, ED Steinhauser said she would look into it further and report back to the Board.

Commissioner Rice questioned whether another state, perhaps Nevada, passed a similar bill to raise funds as is proposed with the vehicle license fee. Mr. Khouri said he wasn't sure which state, but he discussed the pros and cons of the VLF funding and how it can be improved to reassure the voters of predictable revenue for transportation projects and programs.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked about AB1964 regarding electric vehicle access to HOV lanes, and Mr. Khouri confirmed that the provisions of this bill were incorporated into the Senate Budget Trailer Bill for transportation. He noted that SB 838 was enacted by the Governor, lifting the cap for plug-in hybrids to use the HOV Lanes.

ED Steinhauser also discussed the potential renewal of the sales tax measure before its expiration in 2024. She reviewed the difference between expansion and extension of the measure, ballot measures for the upcoming election in two weeks, evidence that the Bay Area has many unmet needs in transportation funding, and steps that need to be made to prepare for future action, including advocacy for legislation to raise the statewide sales tax cap in Marin.

ED Steinhauser explained unique aspects of Marin's transportation sales tax, noting that simply extending the measure will not free up much for additional projects/programs since approximately seventy-five percent of the tax is allocated to operations- Marin Transit, local streets and roads maintenance, and the Safe Routes to Schools program. Whereas, other counties have designated a certain percentage to go to capital projects and once those have been built, those funds are then viewed as another influx of revenue to build more capital projects when a sales tax is renewed. She noted that seven and a half percent of the current measure funds, approximately \$1.5 million/year, was designated for the now-completed Gap Closure project, and so those funds could be considered for reassignment.

Commissioner Phillips said he would not oppose raising of the cap if it is the will of this body. He added, however, that he is a bit concerned of a 10 percent "magic threshold" at which the public may begin to react as well as the possibility that other public agencies may be interested in taking advantage of a raise in the sales tax cap, which could affect the amount available for a transportation measure.

Commissioner Kinsey expressed appreciation for Commissioner Phillip's comments and that the City of San Rafael is, at least, open to the discussion; he thought it important to allow for the opportunity to discuss all the options in the future.

8. Allocate Transportation Sales Tax (Measure A) to Marin County for the Sir Francis Drake Rehabilitation Project in Ross Valley (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced this item which recommended that the Board allocate \$550,000 in Transportation Sales Tax (Measure A) funds to Marin County for the Sir Francis Drake Rehabilitation Project from Highway 101 to the Ross Town limit to complete the environmental (ENV) and preliminary engineering (PE) phases. She indicated that the project under consideration is an important one – to continue work on Sir Francis Drake project from Highway 101 to the Ross town limits. She introduced Principal Transportation Planner Dan Dawson from the County of Marin Public Works, who presented the staff report.

Mr. Dawson discussed the importance of Sir Francis Drake and its well-known congestion issues. He also reviewed public outreach (workshops, open house, walking tours), the makeup and work of a technical advisory committee, a community advisory committee, a summary of issues in the corridor, project goals, budget, recommended priorities, funding status including other potential fund sources, environmental review, and the anticipated project schedule.

Chair Moulton-Peters opened and closed public comment with no speakers coming forward.

Commissioner Rice expressed appreciation for the report and acknowledged the extensive public process thus far. She was also supportive of the proposed environmental review and indicated her willingness to move approval of the allocation request. She noted, however, that the chart showing the breakdown in project costs may not represent how the funding will ultimately be applied; the actual breakdown will depend on the results of the environmental review and action by the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Rice moved that the Board allocate \$550,000 in Transportation Sales Tax (Measure A) funds to Marin County for the Sir Francis Drake Rehabilitation Project from Highway 101 to the Ross Town limit to complete the environmental (ENV) and preliminary engineering (PE) phases. Vice-Chair Arnold seconded the motion.

Chair Moulton-Peters congratulated Mr. Dawson on the project application and the work to date. She also expressed appreciation for the chart showing the different phases of the project schedule.

Commissioner Kinsey asked whether the county considered including any conduit for fiber optic cabling to expand the county's network of broadband infrastructure. Mr. Dawson said not always, but in this case, they had included it, as well as provision for adaptive signal controls in the future. Commissioner Kinsey thought both were good for jurisdictions to consider whenever updating underground piping systems.

Commissioner Hillmer noted that the City of Larkspur appreciates the county's willingness to work with Larkspur staff in the process.

The motion for approval carried unanimously.

9. North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project – Approve RM2 Funding Request and Distribution to SMART for Right-of-Way Impacts (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced the item by noting that the project is behind its schedule in terms of design, the environmental process, and funding needs. She commented on the potential use of the SMART (Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit) right-of-way for the multi-use path, the work of Commissioner Kinsey (Metropolitan Transportation Commission [MTC] liaison) and Vice Chair Arnold (Chair of the SMART Board) in negotiations

and discussions about the project, and some of the issues involved. She indicated that Principal Project Delivery Manager Bill Whitney would present the staff report.

Mr. Whitney began the report which recommended that the TAM Board (1) approve a Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to submit a request to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to allocate Regional Measure 2 toll bridge funds for environmental, design and preliminary right-of-way activities associated with the southern segment of the North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project; (2) approve a resolution authorizing the funds be directed to SMART to address right-of-way impacts including conditions of the allocation, and (3) authorize the Chair send a letter to MTC to acknowledge the potential the path may be removed should SMART extend passenger rail service south from the Larkspur Station.

Mr. Whitney acknowledged the work of Ernest Klock and R.J. Suokko of the Marin County Department of Public Works. He also reviewed partnering agencies involved (and the roles of each), funding request, explained an aerial view of the project area, project phasing, current status, map showing the jurisdictions involved, timeline of project milestones, flow chart showing the project process for the southern segment, next steps, and staff recommendations for tonight's action for the southern segment.

ED Steinhauser noted that the proposed resolution at each Commissioner seat was updated from what was included in the staff report.

Commissioner Lucan asked whether Item #4 in the proposed action, which authorizes the payment of \$850,000, would not be done without SMART's agreement to move forward. He was concerned that if the payment is made but the project is never built, TAM would not be able to get the money back. Mr. Whitney confirmed the payment would not be made until mutual agreement has been reached and the project proceeds.

Commissioner Hillmer asked about emails he had forwarded to staff from private property owners potentially affected by the proposed path, which ED Steinhauser confirmed they were received and apologized for not including copies in the Board packets. Commissioner Hillmer requested that landowners be notified of any public workshops, etc. in the future.

Commissioner Greene asked staff to clarify his understanding that TAM is agreeing to pay SMART \$850,000 to build a path on the SMART right of way but that SMART has the option to remove the pathway if it so chooses. Mr. Whitney said yes. Commissioner Greene also questioned why the original deadline of January 2018 for determining whether the bike path was feasible was removed from the resolution. Mr. Whitney confirmed it had been changed to remove the hard deadline from the resolution, as the process through Environmental Document could be lengthy and complex.

Commissioner Greene asked what security TAM has that SMART won't accept the money from TAM but then change the proposed route or eliminate the pathway altogether. Mr. Whitney pointed out that SMART owns the right-of-way and can use the property as it sees fit, but that a followup MOU between the agencies would codify the mutual agreement.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked Commissioner Kinsey and Vice Chair Arnold to respond to Commissioner Greene's concerns since they've been working on this issue. Commissioner Kinsey explained that SMART is a rail and trail program, and if they decided to move their rail line, they would also be moving their portion of the trail. He thought it was extremely low risk that there would be any action on the project south of Corte Madera Creek for many years, maybe even decades. He stated that this money is being extended to SMART to accommodate the loss of lease revenues. He noted, as well, that SMART's MOU (memorandum of understanding) is obligated to allow for transportation purposes along that right of way. He added that the action tonight will clear the way for them to meet those obligations. He discussed even longer-term plans (from 2003) by the city of Larkspur as part of the Central Marin Ferry Connector Project. He confirmed that all the property owners and lessees have been informed of the plans and will continue to be notified as the project proceeds.

Commissioner Greene indicated he has been a long-term supporter of the North-South Greenway, and he acknowledged that the likelihood of the project proceeding south was slim. However, he noted that the staff report mentions the fact that the area in question is too narrow to accommodate the tracks and the pathway southbound.

Commissioner Hillmer expressed appreciation for Commissioner Greene's comments, as well as to Commissioner Kinsey for his work on the project planning. He noted there will be time for additional questions as the project moves forward, and he indicated the City of Larkspur will be bringing some questions on behalf of its citizens.

Commissioner Furst expressed concern that SMART may disagree with TAM on the proper timing of the payment from TAM. She was also concerned that the project not be delayed any further. ED Steinhauser commented on the progress recently made, and she was confident good communication would continue between the agencies involved.

Commissioner Furst asked what MTC's procedure will be for reallocating the funds if the southern segment of the Greenway fails to come to fruition, or if there are funds leftover after the project is completed (although she acknowledged that rarely happens). Commissioner Kinsey responded that Regional Measure 2 has very clear guidelines/criteria for any reallocation of funds, and the process would take two to three months, including a public process. ED Steinhauser added that MTC has said they would consider input from the project sponsor and TAM as the county transportation agency in Marin in looking at how best to redirect the funds.

Commissioner Furst noted that the original language for Regional Measure 2 calls for a multi-use pathway from Wornum Drive to East Sir Francis Drake Drive at the Cal Park Hill rail right of way and rehabilitation of the Cal Park rail tunnel and bringing the trail all the way to the San Rafael transit center. She was concerned that none of the funds be diverted to an alternative use.

Commissioner Phillips suggested inserting a clawback clause whereby SMART is only compensated for their actual financial loss. ED Steinhauser noted it was something that could be taken up in future discussions with SMART regarding the next step – developing an interagency agreement between SMART and TAM.

Chair Moulton-Peters opened public comment on the item.

Chris Skelton spoke on behalf of Pierre Josephs, tenant and landlord of the property at 69 Industrial Way, and his tenants. He expressed concern that copies of the revised resolution were not available to the public as well as related documents referenced in the staff report, lack of public noticing for tenants and landlords in addition to property owners; the need for clarity regarding the exact geographic area being considered, lack of available information including boundary surveys, and the ultimate displacement of locally-serving professionals.

Eric Miller of Larkspur, expressed support for the resolution. He thanked Commissioner Kinsey for all his hard work and all the Board for their diligence in this regard. He cited many local agencies and groups that have also indicated their support for the project.

Bjorn Gutenberg, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, expressed appreciation and excitement for the project finally moving forward. He commented on the regional significance of the pathway's eventual completion, as the spine of Marin County's non-motorized transportation network, and he noted that to compromise it would take away from already completed components. He thanked Commissioner Furst for pointing out the mention of the pathway in the Regional Measure 2 language.

Jean Severinghaus, Greenbrae, noted that the project has been in the works for over 20 years, and she expressed appreciation to Commissioner Kinsey and Vice Chair Arnold for their efforts. She indicated that Patrick Seidler could not be here tonight, but he had reminded her that the school districts are supportive of the pathway, as well as individual schools. She requested a change to the last "whereas" in the resolution from "SMART will require that the path be removed from the right-of-way when the southern extension is implemented" to "SMART will

require that path be removed from the track area and relocated within the right-of-way” so that there is a long-term future for this hard-fought trail.

Maureen Gaffney, San Francisco Bay Trail project, echoed earlier speakers in her support for the North-South Greenway project that has been under consideration for such a long time. She acknowledged its importance, not only locally, but also regionally.

Seeing no further speakers, Chair Moulton-Peters closed public comment on the item.

Commissioner Kinsey indicated he would like to ask Mr. Klock, Marin County Public Works, to correct the record regarding comments by Mr. Skelton. Mr. Klock confirmed that on June 3, 2015, a letter was sent to Mr. Josephs alerting him of potential effects to his lease and requesting a meeting with Mr. Josephs.

Commissioner Kinsey added that Mr. Josephs has a 30-day lease, a very transient opportunity, and the property is owned by SMART. He noted that language can be added to ensure that the timeline for SMART’s agreement with TAM and release of the \$850,000. He also discussed how the funding could be tied to the time period involved, as mentioned by Commissioner Phillips.

Commissioner Kinsey acknowledged the length of time it has taken to see this project come to fruition, but indicated this is one of the last steps in the process to achieve this very important goal. He encouraged the Board’s support.

Commissioner Hillmer expressed his gratitude to Commissioner Kinsey, Chair Moulton-Peters and ED Steinhauser for the joint effort in the process.

Commissioner Furst was also appreciative of Commissioner Kinsey’s efforts, TAM staff and county staff efforts as well as Farhad Mansourian. She commented on difficulties of business owners to find affordable spaces to rent; but she encouraged the Board and others to consider them when spaces become available. She also noted there is another route along the Redwood Highway where the pathway could be placed if obstacles come up to prevent this desired route from completion. She also recommended changes to the language of the resolution regarding SMART’s options regarding the re-location of the pathway if the rail ever continues southward; to ensure that the pathway is relocated within the right-of-way, not removed altogether. She indicated willingness to make the motion in favor with those changes. She asked for four changes to the resolution:

- 1) On the Draft Resolution she requested a change from the current language, “Whereas, SMART will require the path be removed from the R/W at the time the southern rail extension is implemented.” to “Whereas SMART will require the path be removed *from the track area or relocated within the right of way* at the time the southern rail extension is implemented.”
- 2) On the Draft Resolution, she requested a change from the current language: “TAM recognizes and supports SMART’s right to remove the path at a future date when SMART determine this R/W is needed for their operations.” to “TAM recognizes and supports SMART’s right to remove *or relocate* the path at a future date when SMART determines this R/W is needed for their operations.”
- 3) She asked for a change to the MTC Funding Request (page 3, paragraph H) to include “...removal *or relocation*”
- 4) She asked for a change in the last sentence on the Draft letter from: “The Board also recognizes that should the right-of-way become necessary for rail service the multi-use path will no longer be compatible and must be removed” to “The Board also recognizes that should the right-of-way become necessary for rail service the multi-use path ~~will~~ *may* no longer be compatible and must be removed.”

Vice Chair Arnold said that, as the SMART Chair, her agency worked very hard to come to agreeable terms as set forth in the draft resolution and that SMART should see the agreement and approve it before TAM votes on it; TAM can then vote on it at the December meeting. She was not comfortable changing what SMART staff and TAM staff had worked out together.

Commissioner Hillmer agreed, as did Chair Moulton-Peters.

Commissioner Furst said that the existing language means TAM is essentially agreeing with the removal of the path when the tracks are extended southward, as stated in item no. 4 in the last paragraph of the resolution in the supplemental packet.

Commissioner Kinsey said he thought staff has heard Commissioner Furst's concerns, and he was confident they will be able to work with SMART to find agreeable language to address the issue and then return to the TAM Board for approval at their December meeting

Commissioner Lucan asked for clarification from Commissioner Furst regarding the language, and she reiterated her concerns.

Commissioner Reed said he thought the intent of the Board should be clear - that they do not want the pathway to be removed after this substantial investment.

Commissioner Greene said he thought that it would be inappropriate for the Board to draft a legal document during the meeting and that he supported Commissioner Kinsey's suggestion to postpone taking action on this matter.

Commissioner Greene moved to continue the item until the December 1 TAM Board meeting and refer the matter back to staff to contact SMART staff to see whether agreeable language can be found to address the Board's concerns not to give up the bike path. Commissioner Kuhl seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

10. Plan Bay Area 2040 – Land Use and Transportation Preferred Scenarios (Discussion)

ED Steinhauser introduced the item, reviewing the process for Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2040 and how the Preferred Scenario, with respect to land use, jobs and households will be folded in with the transportation investment recommendations TAM made in 2015 and updated in 2016. . She also commented on the roles that MTC and ABAG (the Association of Bay Area Governments) will play.

Planning Manager Derek McGill presented the staff report, discussing the function of the preferred scenario, its three main elements, changes since the last round including updated goals, transportation strategies of the various agencies involved at the federal, state, regional, and local levels, demographics for the nine bay area counties, housing trends, transportation investments, breakdown of draft preferred scenario funding needs, amount of funding available, total expenditures for the Plan, the continued decline in funding allocated towards expansion projects, MTC's statement that for PBA 2040 the primary challenge is not transportation but finding an affordable place to live, and draft performance target results.

ED Steinhauser emphasized the challenge that MTC faces with respect to the need to reduce the percentage of income spent on housing as well as providing additional housing in the local communities – especially for lower income households.

Commissioner Phillips remarked that it is sometimes hard to grasp numbers such as the PBA anticipated revenue of \$309 billion. As an illustration, he noted that 1 billion seconds ago it was 1959, so \$309 billion is a lot of money.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked what conclusions the Board could take away from this, which Mr. McGill discussed – primarily, that these policies will continue to play an increased focus in how the methodology takes shape for the next RHNA allocation in 2020. The special interests and the housing advocates are well aware of this, so it will play a substantial role in how we move forward with the next round of RHNA and with future rounds of transportation funding policies.

Chair Moulton-Peters also asked what was represented by the local money referred to on page 10 of the report. Mr. McGill explained it was local sales taxes, bridge tolls, and parcel taxes for transit operators, counties and local jurisdictions.

11. Approval of Matching Funds to Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure and to Marin Transit for Electric Buses, and to Authorize the Executive Director to Enter into Funding Agreements with Said Agencies (Action)

Following a brief introduction by ED Steinhauser, Principal Project Delivery Manager Nick Nguyen presented the staff report which recommended that the TAM Board to approve matching funds, from Measure B – VRF, in the amount of \$35,000 to Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) for electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure and \$75,000 to Marin Transit for electric buses and related expenses, and to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate, execute and amend as necessary funding agreements with said agencies.

He discussed the background from 2014 when Marin Clean Energy partnered with TAM to identify pilot projects under the Measure B alternative fuel/electric promotion program, the two proposed projects that are now coming to the forefront through SMART (electric vehicle charging infrastructure) and Marin Transit (electric buses), and the funding requested by each agency, which staff is recommending for approval.

Vice-Chair Arnold moved to approve matching funds, from Measure B – VRF, in the amount of \$35,000 to Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) for electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure and \$75,000 to Marin Transit for electric buses and related expenses, and to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate, execute and amend as necessary funding agreements with said agencies. Commissioner Sears seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

12. Caltrans Report (Discussion)

ED Steinhauser reported it is expected that Caltrans will come to the December or January Board meeting to give an in-person update on some of their activity. She also indicated TAM has requested them to come quarterly to report on a more regular basis. She noted a written report was included in the Board packets.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 pm.

Approved:

Dianne Steinhauser