1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Chernock welcomed the committee members, each of whom provided a general introduction and overview of their interests and representative group. She discussed protocol, noting that the Brown Act rules apply to the meeting.

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

The following amendments were made to page 1 of the minutes of June 19, 2017:
Regarding the name of the group, “Commission” changed to “Committee”. Monique Brown and Allan Bortel were added to the attendance list, and a motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes.

Chair Chernock provided an overview of the materials requested at the previous meeting and what was being distributed at this evening’s meeting, including an updated glossary, list of counties that have sales tax exemptions and sea level rise reference materials. Public Outreach Coordinator Molly Graham noted that reports concerning sea level rise, Bay Wave and Sea Smart have not been distributed due to their size and that links have been provided and can be found on the meeting date/calendar section of the TAM website.

3. **Comparison of Sales Tax Measures in the Region**

Facilitator Bonnie Nelson provided an overview of the committee’s purpose. Ms. Nelson said the TAM Board has asked the committee to consider an expenditure plan for both continuing the sales tax and an augmentation of the existing sales tax that could be added to the 2018 ballot. She explained that a 2/3 majority vote for a tax measure is difficult to achieve and an expenditure plan must provide services that are important to voters.

Ms. Nelson discussed recent successful sales tax measures in other counties, noting that they generally have both multiple categories of expenditure as well as similar categories of expenditure. She noted that Marin is unique in that, other than San Francisco County which has a Transit First policy, the county provides more money for public transit than other counties in the Bay Area.

Ms. Nelson said that Marin Transit will present to the EPAC tonight and other agencies relying on Measure A funds would be presenting information at upcoming meetings about programs funded by the current sales tax and unfunded needs.

Ms. Nelson responded to a question relating to road maintenance and clarified that TAM provides 50% of local street and road money directly to jurisdictions based on population and lane miles and the other half is for specific major road projects.

No one from the public wished to speak.
4. **Public Opinion Poll Presentation, Bryan Godbe, Godbe Research**

Brian Godbe discussed the survey they undertook relating to transportation services in the county, potential support and opposition for a sales tax measure, including renewal and potential augmentation. Mr. Godbe utilized a PowerPoint that was distributed to committee members.

Mr. Godbe explained the methodology used to conduct the survey. In addition to landline and cell phone polling, they include online surveying. Mr. Godbe discussed the potential differences in voter turnout for the 2018 gubernatorial election in comparison to the 2020 Presidential election, noting that the 2018 election would likely have a lower turnout.

Mr. Godbe provided a breakdown of responses for the different methods of polling, noting that they do not consider the response rate although they consider the margin of error. In response to a committee member, Mr. Godbe described the strategy for ensuring they target the correct proportional segment of the voting population and also described the ways in which they determine voter turnout for different elections.

Mr. Godbe answered questions from the committee members relating to the participant’s use of public transport, how subsets of voters are chosen, determination of the error rate and method used to calculate more precise information.

In response to a committee member, Executive Director Steinhauser said staff would provide results from other forms of surveys that TAM has conducted in the past few years, including the 2015 Regional Transportation Plan outreach results, and an informal survey for the Strategic Vision Plan conducted in the fall of 2016, for comparison purposes.

Mr. Godbe discussed the findings of the poll, noting that reduced traffic congestion on Highway 101 is a high priority, with other priorities including reduced congestion on local streets and improving the local bus service, and the bus and ferry service to San Francisco. Mr. Godbe discussed the chart comparing the responses in relation to the 2018 and 2020 elections. He provided comparisons with data from previous election results.
Executive Director Steinhauser noted that the TAM Board has asked for consideration by this group of a potential increase in sales tax, in addition to a renewal by the committee.

Mr. Godbe continued discussions on the methods used to more accurately record the poll participants’ priorities relating to how the sales tax revenue should be spent. He noted that efforts to reduce congestion on Highway 101 are ranked in the first tier, and also transit ridership and fixing pot holes. Mr. Godbe discussed the second tier, which includes reducing congestion by improving intersections and better timing of signals, and completing the carpool lanes, most notably the Marin Sonoma Narrows. He briefly discussed the remaining second tier transportation issues that are generally supported, and explained that items in lower tiers would not appear to attract the two-thirds level of support that is necessary.

Mr. Godbe discussed information provided in the report relating to the importance of funds being spent locally and the impacts of various positive and negative arguments.

Mr. Godbe discussed variations in support between the 2018 and 2020 elections for a renewal/increase of Measure A. He confirmed there is a solid base of support for a renewal. An increase is more challenging to achieve, although there is time to educate voters about transportation needs that would be addressed in the expenditure plan.

Executive Director Steinhauser noted the deliberate separation of maintenance of major streets and roads and maintenance of local/residential roads. Ms. Steinhauser noted that representatives from the Public Works departments will be invited for a presentation at a future meeting to discuss their priorities and local fund expenditure. She also noted that there is interest in improving interchanges and that this information will be provided at a subsequent meeting.

The following actions were agreed to by the group:

Staff will provide results from survey information for the 2015 Regional Transportation Plan outreach survey and an informal voluntary survey that was conducted in the fall of 2016.

Chair Chernock announced a 5-minute break at 7:10 p.m.

5. **Marin Transit Presentation, Nancy Whelan, General Manager and Robert Betts, Director of Operations and Planning**

General Manager Nancy Whelan provided a brief overview of the presentation, which will include the services they have provided since 2004 when Measure A passed, who they serve, funding from Measure A, their operating budget and their unfunded needs.
Ms. Whelan noted that the passage of Measure A has enabled significant transit service improvements.

Director of Operations and Planning Robert Betts presented a short video highlighting the services provided by Marin Transit and contract partners. Mr. Betts discussed the services they provide, including paratransit, local fixed route service, rural Stagecoach service, the Muir Woods shuttle, yellow school bus and supplemental school bus service.

Mr. Betts noted that Measure A has allowed them to extend the special needs transportation program for seniors and residents with disabilities, and he discussed a bus programs for students, including a College of Marin bus pass program, and a supplemental transit program. He also provided information on the Muir Woods Shuttle Service, noting that there are two routes and that they continue to expand the service.

Mr. Betts discussed the demographics of riders who use their services and funding sources, noting that this year, 41% of revenue will come from Measure A. He discussed the ways they have been able to control their costs to expand services, including the rebidding of services with contractors. Mr. Betts confirmed that service levels have increased.

Mr. Betts discussed the issues that would occur if Measure A ended. Facilitator Bonnie Nelson noted that extending Measure A in advance of the sunset date is important for long-term transit plans to be implemented and for other funding to be secured.

Mr. Betts noted that service levels are higher in Marin than other North Bay counties and transit usage is higher in Marin. He provided statistics to show traffic congestion reduced by bus users, including 12,500 daily transit trips, 4,000 daily student trips, and 3,000 weekend trips to Muir Woods.

A committee member discussed the challenges of increasing public awareness of the importance of Measure A for public transit and issues relating to bus fares remaining static.

In response to a committee member, Mr. Betts discussed that a reason why bus ridership has dropped slightly could be due to improved service reducing the amount of transfers required. The committee member commented on the problems of sustaining services at the current level if revenue declines and costs increase.
In response to a committee member, Ms. Whelan stated that other revenue sources, excluding Measure A, are relatively stable.

A committee member noted that fare revenue has increased and Mr. Betts noted increased services.

A committee member discussed her concern that only 13% of the revenue is from fares and the operating budget requires a great deal of Measure A funds. In response, Ms. Nelson suggested Marin Transit returns to a later meeting to discuss their future needs and the consequences if Measure A is not renewed. The group agreed to this future presentation.

A committee member noted that transit services serve people who choose not to drive, do not have a car or are unable to drive, so the primary value is in providing transportation for the whole community.

A member of the public commented that state and federal funding is very low. In response, Ms. Whelan discussed impending funding from SBI for operating and capital costs, and explained that federal sources of funding can be obtained for senior and rural transportation.

ED Steinhauser noted that federal funds pay for vehicle replacements, but that matching non-federal funds are required to obtain this funding.

Ms. Nelson explained why no Measure A funds are provided to Golden Gate Transit or SMART.

6. Senate Bill 1 and Regional Measure 3 Update on Activity

ED Steinhauser provided materials to the committee members for Senate Bill 1 (SB1) and discussed how the funds will be spent, including on local streets and roads. Ms. Steinhauser said that the topic of funding for local roads and streets will be discussed at an upcoming meeting. She noted that SB1 is expected to double the amount of money that jurisdictions receive from the state for local roads and streets, in addition to what TAM provides. However, Ms. Steinhauser noted that a recall effort of the bill is underway, which could ultimately end up in front of voters in 2018.

Ms. Steinhauser noted that Regional Measure 3 (RM3) is an effort by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to pursue legislation in 2017 allowing them to increase tolls on Bay Area toll bridges to fund transportation projects. The measure includes major projects for congestion relief in the North Bay. She noted that RM3 needs to be passed by the legislature and would then be put on the 2018 ballot and would need 50% +1 in order to pass.
In response to a committee member, Ms. Steinhauser stated that TAM itself receives very little in the way of funds from SB1.

Ms. Nelson provided materials on topics for upcoming committee meetings and reviewed the meeting dates. Ms. Steinhauser said there is room to add speakers if the committee members so wish.

7. Roundtable Discussion and Request for Additional Material / Information

The committee members did not request additional material or information.

8. Public Open Time

No one from the public wished to speak.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Visual Notes: