



750 Lindero Street
Suite 200
San Rafael
California 94901

Phone: 415/226-0815
Fax: 415/226-0816

www.tam.ca.gov

Belvedere
Sandra Donnell

Corte Madera
Diane Furst

Fairfax
Lew Tremaine

Larkspur
Joan Lundstrom

Mill Valley
Stephanie Moulton-Peters

Novato
Madeline Kellner

Ross
Michael Skall

San Anselmo
Ford Greene

San Rafael
Al Boro

Sausalito
Herb Weiner

Tiburon
Alice Fredericks

County of Marin
Susan L. Adams
Hal Brown
Charles McGlashan
Steve Kinsey
Judy Arnold

April 16, 2010

TO: TAM EPAC Members:

FROM: TAM Staff

Please find attached a table with draft elements for a Vehicle Registration Fee Expenditure Plan for discussion at our next EPAC meeting. We will be reviewing this draft plan on Wednesday, April 21st and we hope that it will generate a productive and informative discussion.

This list of elements is TAM staff's latest iteration of the potential expenditure plan for the proposed VRF. This version incorporates guidance received from EPAC members from the two expenditure meetings thus far, as well as input from the TAM Executive Committee and additional TAM and agency staff. We view this as a starting point for additional discussion and debate among EPAC members, elected officials, and the Marin community at large.

Please take some time to review this draft plan before the next EPAC meeting. Come with your thoughts and questions. Also enclosed is a list of our questions for group discussion. **Our goal on April 21st will be to reach a committee consensus that can be tested with the broader stakeholders.**

Please note on the enclosed Agenda the change of location for this meeting which will be held at the San Rafael Community Center at 618 B Street rather than at TAM. We look forward to meeting with you on Wednesday.



**SB 83 Vehicle Registration Fee
Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC)**

**San Rafael Community Center
618 B Street
San Rafael, CA**

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

5:00 p.m. - 8 p.m.

- 1. VRF Update from Around the Bay**
- 2. VRF Outreach Update**
- 3. Review Preliminary Draft of Expenditure Plan**
- 4. BREAK**
- 5. Group Discussion**
- 6. Next Steps**

DRAFT Vehicle Registration Fee Expenditure Plan Elements

Item 10 – Attachment B

Annual \$	Expenditure Categories	Options	Description of Category	Evaluation Criteria			
				Modes Benefitting	Relationship to Fee Payer	Leverages Funds for Marin Countywide Programs	Meet TAM goals
35% (\$700,000)	LOCAL STREET AND ROAD REHAB/ COMPLETE STREETS	<p>Approach Options: Option 1: Assign to major roads of high usage in high need of repair or expansion</p> <p>Option 2: Formula to each jurisdiction, limit to Complete Streets (non-pavement) elements</p> <p>Option 3: Formula to each jurisdiction, open to any pavement or non-pavement need</p> <p>Option 4: Local Streets Only Neighborhood / Residential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding to the cities/county to improve maintenance of local roads. 	Autos and Trucks Bicycles Pedestrians Transit	<p>Strong: All users benefit from having roadways safely maintained and operating efficiently. Improved crossings and intersection performance improves safety and efficiency for all users.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal \$ State gas tax subventions State Proposition 1B Measure A TDA Article 3 TFCA Funds State or federal grants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reduce VMT/ GHG - Meet Nexus -From Approved Plans -Incr. Marin Mobility - Reduce congestion - Fund Local Needs -Leveragability - Measurability
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds will be used to create and maintain streets for all users. Allowable expenditures could be for pavement or non-pavement elements in a complete streets project, OR limited to non-pavement only , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Channelization, Creation and maintenance of pedestrian and bike facilities, Creation of turn lanes, striping changes, etc. Bus bulbs/bus stop and transit hubs Sidewalk improvements Accessibility improvements Signalization and other congestion solutions May be used to match other funds such as local assessments 				
35% (\$700,000)	TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS- SENIORS, DISABLED ACCESS, SCHOOL TRANSIT , FACILITIES (BUS STOPS/HUBS)	<p>Approach Options: Allow for match on transit capital that includes bus stop upgrades & vehicles. Increase flexibility for how the transit dollars can be spent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds to be allocated by formula to Marin Transit. 	Autos and Trucks Bicycles Pedestrians Transit	<p>Strong: Drivers benefit from effective and efficient transit service, which reduces work, school and shopping trips in congested corridors, and reduces air pollution. Reduced trips by "at risk" drivers can improve safety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal \$ State Transportation Development Act,TDA State Transit Assistance, STA State or federal grants Measure A AB 1107 1/2 cent sales tax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce VMT/ GHG - Meet Nexus - From Approved Plans -Incr. Marin Mobility - Reduce congestion - Fund Local Needs -Leveragability - Measurability -Cost Benefit- focused gp
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide on-going funding for Mobility Management Program at Marin Transit. 				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program would include expanding shuttles, taxi subsidy programs, expansion of paratransit and accessible transit services, school bus transit, transit training, and coordination of public/private services aimed at target populations. 				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand ADA paratransit capacity and add ADA Plus transportation for non-registered seniors on a space available basis. 				
15% (\$300,000)	SCHOOL SAFETY AND CONGESTION REDUCTION	<p>Approach Options: prioritize projects or programs that bring match of other funds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competitive program for school access projects 	Autos and Trucks Bicycles Pedestrians Transit	<p>Strong: Drivers benefit from reduced school trips, a large traffic generator in Marin. Improved crossings at school reduces collisions and improves safety for driver, pedestrian, and bicyclists.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal, state, and regional Safe Routes to School programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce VMT /GHG - Meet Nexus - From Approved Plans -Incr. Marin Mobility - Reduce congestion - Fund Local Needs -Leveragability - Measurability -Cost Benefit- focused gp
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fund additional crossing guards, leveraging Measure A funds. 				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds elements of Safe Routes to Schools that can be leveraged with Measure A and other funds. 				
10% (\$200,000)	COMMUTER ALTERNATIVES AND CLIMATE CHANGE	<p>Approach options: Prioritize employer programs that provide some matching funds; prioiritze leveraging of MTC regional rideshare funds or other TDM fund sources; allow innovative grant program for climate change awareness and education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentive programs with public and private employers. 	Autos and Trucks Bicycles Pedestrians Transit	<p>Strong: Drivers benefit from new commute programs which reduce trips, congestion, and pollution on a regional scale. At an individual level, commute programs reduce travel costs, provide flexibility, and improve health and productivity. Climate change programs would reduce congestion and improve air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal \$ TFCA funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce VMT/ GHG - Meet Nexus - From Approved Plans -Incr. Marin Mobility - Reduce congestion - Fund Local Needs -Leveragability - Measurability -Cost Benefit- focused gp
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase awareness of "safe routes to work" green commute alternatives in Marin County. 				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot "green" commute programs, such as countywide Emergency-Ride-Home (ERH) program, ridesharing, vanpool and carpool promotion, work-related vehicle trip reduction and safety programs, parking management programs, and telecommute support. 				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change education , matching funds for innovative grants such as electric vehicle charging stations, travel training/ trip consolidation programs, carsharing 				
5% (\$100,000)	BIKE/PED PATH MAINTENANCE	<p>Approach options: require 50/50 match similar to Measure A sales tax bike/ped path maintenance funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of Class 1 + exclusive multi-use path for bikes and peds. 	Autos and Trucks Bicycles Pedestrians	<p>Strong: Drivers benefit from bicycle and pedestrian safety programs because increased bike/ped use reduces localized traffic congestion and related air quality impacts. Also improves access to transit, resulting in fewer drivers in congested corridors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TDA Article 3 (major mtce) Measure A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce VMT/ GHG - Meet Nexus - From Approved Plans -Incr. Marin Mobility - Reduce congestion - Fund Local Needs -Leveragability - Measurability -Cost Benefit- focused gp



SB 83 Vehicle Registration Fee Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC)

Group Discussion Questions:

1. Have we captured all of the important categories in our list of Expenditure Plan Elements? Are we missing anything?
2. Are the % levels reasonable or should we adjust?
3. Will this plan give us visible results?
4. We have specifically pulled bike/ped path maintenance into its own category, based on experience with local jurisdictions who felt that unless this has its own category, it will never be funded. Does the need for path maintenance rise to the level of something that should be in a separate category?
5. There are a couple of options for administering several of these categories.
In the case of Complete Streets Maintenance does the group have an opinion –
 - a. Should the funds be distributed by formula or should they be competitive?
 - b. Should the funds be dedicated specifically to certain elements, like the non-pavement parts of complete streets or should they be less prescriptive?
 - c. To what degree do we “spell out” specific expenditures or do we keep in more “general”?
 - d. Should we fund only local streets (neighborhood/residential)?
 - e. Is 35% an acceptable level to produce visible results?

For the Transit Category –

- a. Should funds be available only to services for seniors and persons with disabilities or should the category be broader?
- b. Should there be an emphasis on visible capital improvements such as bus stop improvements and match for vehicles or will service increments be visible to fee payers?
- c. Will the 35% provide visible results?

For the Commute Alternatives/Green Initiatives Category-

- a. Should the award of funds to eligible elements in this category be based on a competitive match?
- b. Should we have time limited pilot programs?
- c. Will any business in Marin be able to participate?
- d. What should be included in this category?
- e. Can this amount generate meaningful results?

For School Safety and Congestion Reduction-

- a. Should we prioritize projects or programs that bring match of other funds?
- b. Can this amount generate meaningful results?