



MEETING OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
TAM

MARCH 23, 2017  
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  
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council  
Beach Kuhl, Ross Town Council  
Damon Connolly, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Dennis Rodoni, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Diane Furst, Corte Madera Town Council  
Eric Lucan, Novato City Council  
Gary Phillips, San Rafael City Council  
James Campbell, Belvedere City Council  
Kevin Haroff, Larkspur City Council, Alternate  
Kathrin Sears, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Katie Rice, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Ray Withy, Sausalito City Council  
Tom McInerney, San Anselmo Town Council

Members Absent: Dan Hillmer, Larkspur City Council  
John Reed, Fairfax Town Council

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

Chair Moulton-Peters called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. with all members present as indicated.

**1. Chair's Report (Discussion)**

Chair Moulton-Peters and ED Steinhauser presented Caltrans representatives Dan McElhinney with a letter of appreciation for the rapid mobilization of resources to make emergency repairs to Highway 37 in Marin after recent heavy rains in the area made the highway impassable. A similar letter of appreciation was accepted by Mr. McElhinney on behalf of Caltrans Director Malcolm Dougherty. She acknowledged the difficult tasks that face Caltrans after so much rain and thanked Caltrans for making Highway 37 repairs a priority, given its importance regionally as well as locally.

Mr. McElhinney accepted the letters and expressed appreciation for TAM's teamwork with Caltrans. He briefly summarized the work that was done, companies involved in that work, and future plans for the highway.

**2. Commissioner Matters Not on the Agenda (Discussion)**

No comments made.

Item #11 taken out of order.

**11. Caltrans Report (Discussion)**

Dan McElhinney, Caltrans Chief Deputy District Director for the Bay Area, thanked ED Steinhauser and TAM staff for their assistance with Caltrans projects through the years. He also reviewed a handout listing 2017 Storm Damage Emergency Contracts in Marin County due to impacts of the heavy storms, South Marin County Enlargement Map including impacts on Route 1, estimated project costs and timeline for the repairs. Chair Moulton-Peters thanked Mr. McElhinney for the update and for the hard work being accomplished by Caltrans.

**3. Executive Director's Report (Discussion)**

Executive Director (ED) Dianne Steinhauser reviewed items in her written report, including the successful Innovations Workshop held on February 24, plans for similar events in the future, TAM's sponsorship of Bike-to-Work Day on May 11, recent discussions regarding HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lane hours for Highway 101, an upcoming presentation preceding the April 27 TAM Board meeting sponsored by MTC (Metropolitan Transportation Commission) and ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) regarding Plan Bay Area 2040, release of a draft EIR for the same, and an outreach event on the subject planned for Saturday, May 20<sup>th</sup> in Mill Valley. She also discussed the governor's expected approval of the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) Delegation bill, AB 28, projects pending NEPA approvals while the bill is waiting for approval, a California Climate Investment annual report that may affect how the California Air Resources Board sets climate emission goals for different areas of the state- likely raising of reduction goals, the state's recently produced local street and road data set for the entire state, and Senate Bill 1, which may provide funding for those needs, seeking legislative approval by the April 6<sup>th</sup> legislative spring break.

a. Transportation Acronyms

ED Steinhauser pointed out for the Board the list of commonly used transportation acronyms for their reference, as part of the Board packet.

b. Look Ahead Report

ED Steinhauser referred everyone to the *Look Ahead Report* for April, May and June that illustrates upcoming TAM activity, with potential events and topics for discussion.

c. Richmond – San Rafael (RSR) Bridge Third Lane & Multi-Use Path Report

Regarding the Richmond–San Rafael Bridge report, the ED discussed construction activity and the expected opening of the third lane for the bridge in November 2017. She also reported on the progress of the design and planning of the secondary project, the multi-use path for the upper deck of the bridge, which is expected to begin construction in the next few months.

Commissioner Phillips asked about the roadway assessments done by the state, specifically the non-pavement essential components, that had been part of the earlier report. ED Steinhauser explained it would include features like sidewalks, bike paths, lighting, drainage improvements and bridge maintenance needs. Commissioner Phillips asked about comparisons between jurisdictional needs and cost estimates, and ED Steinhauser said she couldn't explain why the non-pavement components differ but noted the rating was based on self-evaluations done by each of the local jurisdictions. She indicated TAM staff would be glad to meet with individual jurisdictions for further clarification or modification.

There was no public comment on the Executive Director Report.

**4. Commissioner Reports (Discussion)**

a. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Report – Commissioner Connolly

Commissioner Connolly summarized a report he made the previous evening to the Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers meeting. He noted that on March 24th is a meeting regarding the potential merger of MTC and ABAG to continue to work through the proposed memorandum of understanding and the contract for services. He also indicated that on April 27<sup>th</sup> there will be a meeting about Plan Bay Area 2040 just prior to the next TAM Board meeting.

b. Marin Transit Report – Commissioner Rice

Commissioner Rice thanked Chair Moulton-Peters and ED Steinhauser for including Marin Transit in the presentation TAM is making to the various Councils regarding the potential renewal of Measure A. She was very appreciative of the information presented about Marin Transit as an important component.

c. Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) – Vice Chair Arnold

Vice Chair Arnold commented on changes in leadership for SMART, including Marin Supervisor Kate Sears as the new Vice Chair of SMART's Board, Mill Valley Councilmember Stephanie Moulton-Peters stepping down from the SMART Board and the addition of Larkspur Councilmember Dan Hillmer as the new representative to SMART, from Larkspur. She reported as well that the last SMART Board meeting had included a presentation by Denis Mulligan, the General Manager of Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District with a plan for the interim Bettini Transit Center. She noted that the same presentation will be made to the Golden Gate Bridge Board, and suggested that it might be helpful if the report is given to the TAM Board, too.

Commissioner Phillips expressed appreciation for the effort that was given toward the plans for the temporary transit center.

**5. Open Time for Public Expression**

No comments made.

**6. CONSENT CALENDAR (Action)**

- a. Approval of TAM Draft Meeting Minutes of February 23, 2017
- b. Award of a \$5,000 Grant to the San Rafael Chamber of Commerce In Support of Its 2016-2017 Leadership Class Emergency Bicycle Repair Fixit Station Project
- c. Review and Approval of FY2017-18 Measure A 1/2 Cent Sales Tax and Measure B \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee Revenue Estimates and Budget Development Schedule
- d. Accept Construction Contract for the Brookdale Avenue Visual Mitigation Project
- e. Exercise First Second-Year Option on Contract with Transmetro to Manage TAM's Emergency Ride Home Program

Vice Chair Arnold moved to approve the Consent Calendar, and Commissioner McInerney seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously.

**7. Adopt Positions on State Legislative Bills (Action)**

ED Steinhauser introduced this item which recommended that the TAM Board adopts positions on State Legislative bills as listed in staff report. Legislative Consultant Gus Khouri joined the executive director in a discussion of new and existing transportation bills, noting the information was presented to the Finance & Policy Executive Committee, who recommended approval of the proposed positions.

Mr. Khouri began with a review of the various budget proposals for transportation funding, all of which include a restoration or increase of the gas tax, the diesel tax and the vehicle registration fee. He discussed the provisions of each proposal, the proponents of each, and the estimated amounts for each.

Commissioner Haroff asked for specifics on the US 101 project for which Governor Brown requested environmental streamlining. Mr. Khouri indicated there was no specific project right now, just general recognition of the role that Hwy 101 plays with congestion issues. He explained further that once the funding is approved, TAM and partnering agencies would develop the actual project which would be submitted to the California Transportation Commission for approval, such as under multimodal and/or a congestion management program, to manage the funding and the expedited environmental review.

Commissioner Connolly clarified that the letter sent by the governor in response to the federal request, did specify the Novato Narrows as one of nine projects recommended.

Mr. Khouri highlighted twelve of the 29 pending bills (new ones as well as those from past legislative sessions) and his recommended positions for each: support (AB 1, AB 17, AB 28, AB 151, AB 1113, AB 1218, ACA 4, SB 1, SCA 2, SCA 6), oppose (AB 1640, SB 423), and monitor (SCA 2 – changed from “support” as shown in the staff report, based on recent information he had received).

Commissioner Sears commented on AB 1640, noting that Marin low-income residents have benefited from public transit. She asked if it could be changed from “oppose” to the “monitor” category while all the details are ironed out. Vice-Chair Arnold and Commissioner Connolly agreed. ED Steinhauser discussed the history of STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program) funding for low income communities, as well as TAM’s traditional opposition to programs that allow other than local governments to decide how STIP funds are spent. Commissioner Sears acknowledged TAM’s position in this regard, but she expressed concern about TAM’s reputation in Sacramento as not supportive of low income communities. She was concerned that opposing the bill only validated that perception.

Commissioner Fredericks stated the best way to improve TAM’s reputation would be to take available funding and spend it on transit options for the communities that most need it.

Commissioner Lucan commented on the two proposals for lowering the voter threshold, one which specifies infrastructure but the other lists individual needs. He asked for clarification about the two proposals and how they differed, as well as how they could be used in TAM’s efforts with renewal of Measure A. Mr. Khouri confirmed that infrastructure is a generic term for the project type. He indicated as well that he would check with the author of the bill and see what the intent was. Regarding AB 1613 which looks to adjust the retail transactions and use tax cap by 0.5 percent, Commissioner Lucan asked how many counties will have passed legislation like this if this one is approved, which Mr. Khouri discussed. He stated that there have been 9 bills which have become law and AB1613 is only a placeholder until the San Mateo Transit District decides how to proceed. ED Steinhauser said this is the ninth, but some are multi-jurisdictional, so the actual number is greater.

Commissioner Lucan also asked about AB 1 and SB 1, noting both have a fee for electric vehicles that is currently being debated. He asked for any updates, as well as what fee structures are proposed. Mr. Khouri said that it is a flat fee vs. a fee based on the price of the vehicle and he reviewed the options being considered, as well as the likelihood of any of them being approved. ED Steinhauser added some history of the 55% voter threshold, noting it has been considered every election cycle since she has been with TAM, but has never come to fruition. Mr. Khouri provided additional clarification on what constitutes infrastructure based on ACA 4 noting the text which states “funding the construction, rehabilitation, replacement of public infrastructure or affordable housing.”

Commissioner Phillips asked about AB 1218 and CEQA exemptions for bicycle projects, and Mr. Khouri discussed the proposal which would eliminate the sunset date.

Commissioner Fredericks asked about SB 423 and the previous bill referenced by Mr. Khouri. He indicated it was SB 885 (Wolk).

Vice Chair Arnold commented further regarding AB 1640 and the reaction of other jurisdictions to Marin County’s reluctance to build new housing. She suggested changing it from “oppose” to “monitor” with the understanding that it can be changed back if needed. Mr. Khouri pointed out the amount of funding received by the state is so low that to further restrict how the funds are spent results in an incorrect perception; sometimes the projects are multifaceted and may address housing at the same time as other priorities.

Commissioner Sears expressed disagreement with the conclusions being reached by Mr. Khouri. She discussed the language of the bill and clarified that it doesn’t require the funds be used on a project in a low-income community, only that it provide service to them. She reiterated her suggestion that the bill be monitored rather than opposed by

TAM. Commissioner Rice agreed, adding that in some instances funds were provided to a community for low income benefit have ended up being used for something quite different.

Chair Moulton-Peters opened public comment on the item.

Bjorn Gripenburg, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, asked for the Board to consider supporting SB 760, which would require implementation of Caltrans' Complete Streets provisions on facilities owned by them.

Commissioner Sears asked what the rationale was for placing that bill under "monitor" rather than "support", and Mr. Khouri explained that he didn't see the bill as having a direct impact on TAM, but he was willing to reconsider it. He noted, however, that the Active Transportation Program (ATP) is not adequately funded.

ED Steinhauser also reminded the Board that Caltrans has been promoting bike/ped projects but has not identified a funding source. She added, as well, that TAM directly competes for ATP funds, which could make this bill a conflict with the ATP TAM relies upon, as described in the Cap and Trade Program - it could potentially direct future ATP funds to Caltrans' priorities, and might not agree with TAM's priorities.

Jean Severinghaus urged the Board to support SB 760. She said that while she doesn't want to direct all the ATP funds to Caltrans, it was her understanding that this is a move to direct SHOPP funds to Complete Streets. She spoke about the Tamalpais Overcrossing project in Corte Madera that she believes would directly benefit because it is currently relying on ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) funds.

Mr. Khouri commented further on the competitive nature of the ATP program, and he pointed out the next ATP funding cycle will probably be Fiscal Year 2020. He expressed concern that allocating monies to Caltrans projects could affect meeting local needs.

ED Steinhauser mentioned that a large share of the ATP funding is geared towards projects in low-income areas, and she cited the East Francisco Blvd sidewalk project as an example. She suggested that staff review SB 760 further and make a recommendation on it later.

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

Commissioner Sears moved to approve the recommended positions for the bill presented, with the changes discussed. Vice Chair Arnold seconded the motion.

Commissioner Furst asked for clarification of the proposed changes from the positions listed in the staff report, which Mr. Khouri summarized (to change AB 1640 from "oppose" to "monitor" and SCA 2 from "support" to "monitor").

Commissioner Sears and Vice Chair Arnold agreed to change the motion accordingly, and the Board unanimously approved the motion, as amended.

## **8. Regional Measure 3 – Project Candidate List (Action)**

ED Steinhauser presented the staff report which recommended that the TAM Board consider adopting Tier One candidates for consideration by MTC to be included in the Regional Measure 3 proposal. Staff recommend Tier

Two candidates be adopted as well. Finally, staff recommended a pool of candidates to be brought forward “if the opportunity arises”. The candidate pools were described as:

Tier One:

- Bettini Transit Center Permanent Relocation - \$25M
- US 101/I-580 Direct Connector Project– \$135M (existing footprint Curve Connector) - \$255M (Hillside Connector)
- US 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows Carpool Lane and Multi-Use path system - \$42M - \$75M (bridges all rebuilt)
- State Route 37 Multi-Modal Corridor Project – \$20M (amongst 4 counties)

Tier Two:

- Highway Interchange Improvements
- Highway 101 Transit Capital Elements (Transit Access, Bus On Shoulder and Park and Ride Improvements)
- Bike and Pedestrian Program of Projects
- Marin Transit Local O&M Facility

Opportunity Candidates:

- Bike and Pedestrian Candidates (same group as above)
- Local and Regional Transit rehab needs
- Local Streets and Roads rehab needs

She discussed the background history, status of the MTC guidelines for RM3 based on state funding, earlier presentations to the Board, input from the Executive Committees, staff recommendations for Tier One projects, Tier Two projects, and “opportunity” projects; brief descriptions of the three groups, estimated project costs, other fund sources, and the expected time frame for the RM3 process.

Commissioner Connolly noted that the process will not end with submission of the projects to MTC because the list will also go to the legislature for drafting of the measure. ED Steinhauser agreed, adding that there may be a requirement to name specific projects in the Measure, and it will need voter approval, also, hopefully to be on the ballot in 2018.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked for information on the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project, which ED Steinhauser discussed, including strong interest from both Marin and Sonoma counties as well as the business communities for finishing the project.

Commissioner Haroff asked about the 101/580 connector project and which of the options presented previously were preferred. ED Steinhauser clarified that TAM is not, at this point, recommending a specific alignment for the connector, and she discussed the importance of understanding the needs and preferences for the jurisdiction in which the project will lie (in this case, San Rafael) in order to be successful, as well as estimated funding needs from RM3.

Mr. Haroff acknowledged San Rafael’s issues, but he commented on the interests of the broader community as well. He thought that all the options for the project should be left under consideration for the time being.

Commissioner Lucan asked how the project recommendations will be submitted to MTC, which ED Steinhauser discussed. She said that a letter to MTC from TAM will be developed reflecting TAM’s process and recommendations. Commissioner Lucan further asked whether the project list from TAM will come back to the Board for further input. ED Steinhauser indicated the staff recommendation is for the Board to give direction tonight to staff to submit the letter.

Commissioner Lucan asked Commissioner Connolly about the delay to MTC's consideration/finalization of its project list until the state legislation is clarified but wondered if he had a sense as to the dollar increment of the toll. Commissioner Connolly said it is too early to say what that will be.

Commissioner Rice commented on the order in which projects are listed for the various tiers, which could give an impression regarding the relative importance or priority of the projects; she thought the letter that TAM sends to MTC should make it clear they are not presented in a particular order. Commissioner Connolly noted that the presentation slides are in a different order from the staff report, although still grouped the same by tier. Commissioner Rice cited language used in the letter to MTC sent by Marin Transit and suggested that similar language might be used in TAM's letter.

Commissioner Rice acknowledged the point made by Commissioner Haroff regarding the number of options presented for 101/580 connector, but she thought it was not necessary to limit the number of options at this point. She pointed out, as well, that information about traffic patterns which will be heard in the next agenda item could be useful in this discussion too.

Commissioner Connolly asked whether the slide presentation tonight was the latest listing of projects by tier. ED Steinhauser confirmed that the change was made to list the Bettini Transit Center first to reflect input from the Marin Transit letter and the indication of that facility's great importance, and that any future list that is published will depict this.

Commissioner Phillips discussed information received by the San Rafael City Council that showed three options for the 101-580 connector, and they were asked to prioritize the three. He confirmed that the third option (which was not included in this staff report) was third in preference because of the disruptive impacts on the community. He hoped that, given the two other options still on the table, that this would be respected by the other jurisdictions.

Commissioner Lucan noted his Council had discussed the process at its latest meeting and was supportive of the tiered approach and the projects listed under each tier. He indicated their support for the Marin Sonoma Narrows project, also.

Commissioner McInerney asked whether a specific design for the 101-580 project was being presented at this point as well as cost considerations. ED Steinhauser explained the tiered list would be given to MTC. She acknowledged that cost estimates would be discussed later that could affect MTC's decision regarding specific projects since those with additional local funding identified would fare better. She also commented on how other counties are presenting their project lists. One approach is to put every project on the list and the other is to submit a list based on the estimated share of the toll revenue. She indicated that the list before the Commission represents the latter approach.

Commissioner Furst observed there are obvious preferred projects among the various Board members, and she expressed it is likely that there will be difficult decisions as this process goes forward. She reminded the Board, however, that all of TAM's major projects have been accomplished with multiple fund sources for each. She agreed with earlier speakers that the letter to MTC should specify that the projects in each tier are listed in no particular order. She also pointed out that the importance of these projects, particularly in Tier One, and should all be funded if possible and that these needs which the voters are expecting TAM to solve could be used in the Measure A renewal campaign.

Commissioner Haroff asked if it is necessary to state the preferred option for the 101-580 connector at this point. ED Steinhauser confirmed there was no need to specify which design but there would be discussion in the future about cost considerations. She clarified that the only reason the design issue arose was so that San Rafael's preference could be made known. She also added MTC will be seeking input from the public, which could affect the final decision as to the status of the Tiers One and Two projects.

Chair Moulton Peters expressed appreciation that there was a mix of highway projects and transit projects in both tiers. She added that the Mill Valley Councilmembers are interested in the 101-580 connector because they believe that could alleviate some traffic issues in southern Marin.

ED Steinhauser noted that the Marin-Sonoma Narrows is a carpool lane project with a 17-mile bike path system, making it multi-modal in nature, Highway 37 improvements could also be multi-modal, and the 101-580 project should reduce congestion and thereby improve air quality.

There was no public comment on the item.

Commissioner Phillips moved to approve the staff recommendation, and Commissioner Lucan seconded the motion.

Commissioner Haroff asked that the motion make clear that all options for the 101/580 connector remain on the table. Commissioner Phillips questioned why the third option could not be eliminated given the potential impacts to San Rafael – he thought none of the cities would want it in their city either. ED Steinhauser clarified that staff is not asking for a recommendation from the Board regarding the alignment of the connector. She suggested listing it as the 101/580 connector project, with no design specs given.

There was further discussion between the Board and ED Steinhauser regarding the best way to list the 101-580 project as well as the cost estimate. Commissioner Furst asked Commissioner Phillips if he would be willing to accept an edit in the Direct Connector line so that it lists \$135-\$255 million but does not list the names of the alignments. She added that a discussion regarding the three options would occur later if needed.

Commissioner Phillips agreed to that approach. He expressed concern that MTC may question the wide range in cost for that project. Commissioner Furst responded that a footnote could be added stating that the cost would depend on the design and features of the alignment selected.

ED Steinhauser stated that MTC may likely choose to provide funding for the lowest cost option of the connector and leave it to TAM to source out the funding should one of the two more expensive options is selected by the TAM Board.

Commissioner Connolly suggested that the best strategy is to be as focused as possible and acknowledged that the tough decisions will come once there is information regarding the state legislation and the funding limits.

ED Steinhauser suggested having further discussion with Caltrans and MTC once the details are revealed. In the meantime, she also suggested alluding to three potential design options with a range of cost estimate.

Commissioner Phillips proposed a compromise design option using the best parts of options 1 and 2. Commissioner Kuhl recommended this language, "\$135 million to \$255 million, depending on the footprint selected."

Commissioners Phillips and Lucan agreed to the proposed amendment to the motion made by Commissioner Kuhl.

The amended motion read that the TAM Board adopts Tier One candidates for consideration by MTC to be included in the Regional Measure 3 proposal, that Tier Two candidates are adopted as well and that a pool of candidates will be brought forward "if the opportunity arises". The candidate pools were described as:

Tier One:

- Bettini Transit Center Permanent Relocation - \$25M
- US 101/I-580 Direct Connector Project– \$135M-\$255M depending on the footprint selected

- US 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows Carpool Lane and Multi-Use path system - \$42M - \$75 M (bridges all rebuilt)
- State Route 37 Multi-Modal Corridor Project – \$20M (amongst 4 counties)

Tier Two:

- Highway Interchange Improvements
- Highway 101 Transit Capital Elements (Transit Access, Bus On Shoulder and Park and Ride Improvements)
- Bike and Pedestrian Program of Projects
- Marin Transit Local O&M Facility

Opportunity Candidates:

- Bike and Pedestrian Candidates (same group as above)
- Local and Regional Transit rehab needs
- Local Streets and Roads rehab needs

The amended motion passed unanimously.

## **9. Consider the Origin & Destination Data Collection Draft Report (Discussion)**

ED Steinhauser introduced Planning Manager Derek McGill to present this discussion item.

Mr. McGill reviewed the background history for the Origin & Destination Data Collection and purpose of the study. He then introduced Travel Demand Modeling consultant Kevin Johnson from Fehr & Peers.

Mr. Johnson began with a discussion of “Big Data” and what it means, how it can be applied to transportation statistics, based on tracking of cell phones and data points to determine traffic routes, interpreting the data and plan accordingly, relatively low cost for a larger sample, continuous passive data collection and customization/flexibility in application of the data.

Mr. Johnson also reviewed questions in the survey, conclusions, implications of each, surprising results when compared with public perception of traffic patterns and congestion issues, Golden Gate bridge traffic, origin-destination trips, live-work statistics, and potential carpool lane users depending on origin and destination as was cited by users entering Hwy 101 at the Tiburon Exchange and exiting in Corte Madera.

Commissioner Furst asked whether some of the trips where origin and destination are close could be parents driving children to school. Mr. Johnson clarified that the software ignores intermediate trips but tries to determine where the device is for most of the day and most of the night and makes comparisons therefrom. He acknowledged there could be some inaccurate data but the majority of the conclusions are accurate.

Commissioner Furst asked how the software differentiates between phones of parents and phones of students. Staff explained that federal regulations do not allow cell phones registered to children under 16 to be tracked. In response to a further question from Commissioner Rice about cell phone movement on the roadways, Mr. McGill and Mr. Johnson explained how it was determined that a phone’s data translates into a trip to work depends on how many hours it spends in one location for a certain number of hours.

Commissioner Fredericks asked about those who take the ferry or other commute modes than automobile. Mr. Johnson said the software should be able to identify ferry trips because the phone has moved a significant distance and is captured in another zone or county. He acknowledged that the data does not differentiate though between the various modes of transportation used in those trips.

Commissioner Campbell asked about the determination that Tiburon and Belvedere residents work in Mill Valley, but no one else does, including Mill Valley residents. Mr. Johnson explained how the information was extrapolated from a large amount of data, resulting in just the top four work destinations being shown on the live-work chart.

Mr. McGill added that the raw data is available for review, which was also reflected in a separate chart in the report. He also commented on the advances this process allows in determining traffic patterns because previous traffic counts were unable to differentiate between the different destinations, whether work, school or social trips.

ED Steinhauser explained there would be subsequent hearings based on the data and the Board's preferences, followed by the Board taking action on the final report.

Commissioner Sears expressed appreciation for the depth of the data and that she looked forward to reviewing it all to see how it can be used. Mr. Johnson noted that other jurisdictions have often found the information still to be relevant even 1-2 years later.

Commissioner Rice was appreciative, also, and commented on the confirmation of conclusions from past traffic studies. She encouraged everyone to read through the report, in part because of the story it tells about work patterns in addition to just the traffic study itself.

Commissioner Sears asked, and staff confirmed weekend data was also collected.

Commissioner Furst agreed the report was helpful, but she asked staff to do what they can to confirm that the school data is accurate. She suggested that the full report be made available on the TAM website in addition to a summary of the key points. Mr. McGill indicated the draft report is currently available, and the final report will be posted when it is completed.

ED Steinhauser reported that MTC is interested in the extensive data from the study.

#### **10. Approve Letter to MTC Requesting Study of Hwy 101 / SR 37 Traffic Impacts (Action)**

ED Steinhauser noted that staff would like to withdraw the action requested on this item. She indicated there are four counties involved in the study of this corridor, and Marin is recommending that two aspects need to be further explored – traffic impacts on 101 due to interim widening on Highway 37, and flood levels including potential new areas of concern from sea level rise. She discussed the scope of the study as planned by MTC which did not include flooding issues and efforts to find a way to add it to the scope of work. She also explained that a meeting with MTC is planned to review the issues further; TAM will update the Board afterwards.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.