

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
THURSDAY, January 18, 2018
3:00 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.
TAM Conference Room
900 Fifth Avenue, Suite 100
San Rafael, California**

TAC Members Present: Craig Tackabery, Chair
Amy Van Doren, Vice Chair
Regan Candelario
Tim Gilbert
Jonathan Goldman
Mike Grant
Richard Myhre
Russ Thompson
Doug Wilson

Staff Members Present David Chan, Manager of Programming & Legislation
Dan Cherrier, Project Manager
Derek McGill, Planning Manager
Bill Whitney, Project Manager
James O'Brien, consultant

Guests Present: Dan Dawson, Marin County Dept of Public Works

Chair Tackabery called the Technical Advisory Committee meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

1. Introductions

Self-introductions were made around the room.

2. Administration of Oaths

Project Manager Dan Cherrier explained there was one member to be sworn in, Doug Wilson, who should arrive later. He indicated it could be done later in the meeting.

3. Staff Comments

Mr. Cherrier reminded the Committee members to identify themselves when speaking, for the benefit of the minutes clerk.

4. Committee Member Comments

Vice Chair Amy Van Doren asked whether a meeting was held in December 2017, as she was unable to attend. Mr. Cherrier explained there was a meeting but no record was made since there was no quorum present. He added however that staff made a presentation on the Crossing Guard Evaluation Report, there was a discussion of this meeting, as well as information given on the Vision Plan. Ms. Van Doren noted that after a thorough review, Marin Transit submitted comments regarding the Vision Plan, which were incorporated into the document.

5. Open Time for Public Expression

None.

6. Consent Calendar

a. Approval of Revised Draft TAC Minutes of June 15, 2017 Meeting (Action)

Mr. Cherrier reported that the Draft Minutes were different from those sent out earlier because corrections were given by Committee members and the Minutes were updated accordingly. Vice Chair Van Doren asked if any substantial changes were made, and Mr. Cherrier said the changes were primarily clarification of comments made by Members.

Member Russ Thompson noted that certain comments made by him were tongue-in-cheek and did not need to be included.

Member Thompson moved to approve the revised draft TAC Minutes of June 15, 2017 meeting. Member Mike Grant seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

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

Dave Chan, Manager of Programming & Projects, introduced the item, briefly commenting on the project background, total anticipated cost, amount previously requested by the county, scoping, environmental costs, design phase, and construction costs.

Dan Dawson, Marin County Public Works continued the report, discussing community workshops and other public outreach, environmental review, complexities of the project, involvement of the Marin Municipal Water District, comments regarding the draft environmental impact report (DEIR), including identification of project concepts, anticipated budget shortfall, and next steps in the process. He concluded with a summary of the Final EIR (FEIR) and action by the TAM Board in April of this year. He indicated construction of the project is expected to begin late this year and should be completed in 2019 or 2020.

Member Thompson asked what percentage of Measure A funds are still in the fund. Mr. Chan explained that the funds for one project do not affect the funding allocated/available for another project.

Chair Tackabery questioned why the funds for design and construction are released separately for each phase rather than releasing them all at one time. Mr. Chan replied that Measure A specifies that funds for each phase should be applied for and allocated separately. Mr. Chan confirmed that funding for the construction phase would likely be allocated at the end of 2018 or early 2019. He also noted that available funding for construction costs could increase if the sales tax increment increases.

Vice Chair Van Doren asked if there was any single component that accounts for the increase in projected construction costs. Mr. Dawson explained the increase from \$13.2 million to \$19.2 million was based on public input and what they wanted included in the scope of work. Vice Chair Van Doren asked, and Mr. Dawson confirmed that the add-ons had been identified and prioritized.

Member Goldman moved to recommend the allocation of \$1,200,000 in Transportation Sales Tax (Measure A) to Marin County for the Sir Francis Drake Rehabilitation Project in Ross Valley to complete final design in preparation to bid for construction, and Member Tim Gilbert seconded the motion.

Member Rich Myhre said he would like to see the slides detailing final design components and improvements, which Mr. Dawson reviewed.

In response to questions/comment from Bill Whitney, Mr. Dawson discussed right-of-way issues.

Vice Chair Van Doren was concerned about pedestrian safety from traffic going too quickly around curves, and Mr. Dawson commented on possible mitigation measures that could be taken, as well as traffic signalization upgrades that are planned.

Member Gilbert expressed appreciation for the directional crosswalks and ramps from the sidewalks.

Bill Whitney asked what process will be followed regarding which elements will be included and which will be dropped, which Mr. Dawson explained. As part of that discussion Mr. Dawson commented on additional community outreach in regard to environmental issues.

(Member Doug Wilson joined the meeting at 3:34 p.m. and was seated at the table.)

There was no public comment on the item.

The motion to recommend approval carried unanimously.

8. Crossing Guard Location Selection (Action)

Project Manager Dan Cherrier introduced the item, noting that consultant James O'Brien would be the primary presenter. He also discussed the Measure A requirements for the process, the role of the TAC, questions raised regarding the 2014 process, creation of an Ad hoc committee to evaluate/make recommendation as appropriate, and change(s) instituted as a result.

Mr. O'Brien continued the Report on the recertification process, the scoring criteria for ranking of each location, comparison of traffic counts, standards set by federal and state regulations for the use of Manual and Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), of which crossing guards are included; and how the criteria are used in the process.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Mr. O'Brien reiterated the makeup and role of the Ad hoc Committee in evaluating and vetting the criteria for the scoring/ranking of the locations.

Mr. Cherrier and Mr. O'Brien reviewed the attachments to the staff report, the data and information included therein.

Member Thompson asked about guard locations that are funded independently outside of the TAM crossing guard program, which Mr. Cherrier discussed.

Mr. O'Brien reviewed Attachment H, which was added to the report after the Committee packets were mailed out and includes a comparison of guard locations from 2010 with the list from 2017, to document trends over several years. He also discussed next steps in the process, and the action requested of the Committee at this time.

Mr. Cherrier commented on concerns expressed earlier today at the meeting with the Marin County Public Works Association (MPWA). He expressed willingness to discuss any questions, clarifications or concerns from the Committee.

Chair Tackabery suggested starting the Committee discussion with clarifying questions for staff.

Member Goldman said he was fine with the first part of the presentation, i.e. the methodology and the ranking. However, he did not think the funding issues should be discussed in this forum, because the TAC does not have time now to adequately review and make recommendation on that element.

Member Myhre asked about the 2017 Volume Survey and whether it was consistent across all locations that either no one was counted on a Wednesday (because of “Walk and Roll Wednesdays”) or everyone was counted on a Wednesday; otherwise those participating in “Walk & Roll” would have a skewed number. Mr. Cherrier confirmed that staff did consider any special days (including Wednesdays) that might have affected the counts.

Chair Tackabery asked how much the Committee can trust the data, since the counts were completed over a two-day period and sometimes the variation between years was extreme. He asked if there were any broad or unusual discrepancies for a particular location between years. Mr. Cherrier confirmed there was a change in methodology between 2010 and 2017 but not between 2014 and 2017. He also discussed the videos that were reviewed as part of the latest count process often allowed more precise review of people coming and/or going through a crossing guard location and increased the accuracy of the counts. He indicated that staff believes strongly in the accuracy of the data reviewed for 2017.

Chair Tackabery also asked whether any of the data has been disputed by the affected school districts. Mr. Cherrier acknowledged that the accuracy of the counts is a concern when it means a location will no longer be covered. While he knew the best way might have been to meet with each public works director involved as well as representatives of the affected school districts, he thought the sheer numbers would have been too many to finish in a timely manner. He expressed confidence because of the video backups to defend the counts. He also acknowledged they could have included 2014 as an intermediate year for better comparison.

Member Thompson commented that there was a location in his jurisdiction that had dropped in its ranking and the headcount at the school fell as well, while another location in a different jurisdiction dropped in its ranking but its headcount went up. Mr. O’Brien discussed the technicalities between the two locations and the two jurisdictions and the two years compared, not to mention how the criteria affected the ranking. Mr. Cherrier also noted it is possible some high school students might have been included in the highest year counts which boosted numbers from the intervening year at that location.

Chair Tackabery noted that the discussion about the rankings shows it is difficult for the Committee to fully understand the data with such a short time period, and he expressed that individual jurisdictions or school districts may have the same issues.

Member Grant concurred with earlier comments about having confidence in the criteria, ranking and methodology. He thought that it was important to have the input from the public works departments before making recommendation on the final actions. He also suggested that any apparent anomalies in the data should be reviewed and confirmed if possible; to narrow down the complexities for review by the districts (and ultimately by their constituents) and thus to preserve the integrity of the process.

Mr. O'Brien explained further the information requested by the MPWA, which will enable the Public Works directors to review the data and confirm the conclusions. He also discussed with the Committee how changes in the data could potentially change the rankings (and by how much). Mr. Cherrier reviewed exceptions to the scoring of the intersections that could change the final ranking as well.

Member Regan Candelario asked for clarification on the action requested of the TAC tonight, which Mr. Tackabery reviewed. Mr. Cherrier added that the Committee could also direct staff to provide clarifying information or further research for the next meeting.

Chair Tackabery said that a greater explanation of the anomalies (perhaps included as notes in the staff report) as well as input from the MPWA.

Chair Tackabery moved to carry the item over until the next TAC meeting, while staff gathers the information requested by the Committee.

Although he agreed with Chair Tackabery's motion, Member Goldman indicated he would need to abstain from the vote because of a conflict of interest in approving the process followed in the collecting of data, scoring and ranking (because he served on the Ad hoc Subcommittee that worked to develop the process). He commented that the guard positions that will be lost with the new ranking warrant additional analysis. He suggested a slight change to the motion, so that the analysis could begin right away.

Mr. O'Brien explained he didn't think it was necessary to account for every small difference in counts from one year to another but he agreed that the larger discrepancies should be reevaluated if they haven't already been reconsidered. He noted as well that one of the locations might have excluded bicycles in the final counts. He said he would try to get the needed information that the MWPA members had requested as soon as possible so the TAC members could have it also as soon as possible.

Mr. Cherrier confirmed with the Committee there was no other information requested that hadn't been specified yet.

Member Grant asked about the time needed for notifying districts that they will be losing guards, which staff reviewed. Member Grant also asked that the next staff report include the next steps in the process.

The motion made by Chair Tackabery was approved unanimously by the Committee.

In response to a question from the Committee, Mr. Cherrier discussed the estimated annual cost per guard (\$17,300).

There was no public comment on the item.

9. Next Meeting

Mr. Cherrier reviewed the expected schedule for meetings in 2018 for all TAM bodies. The next meeting date was set for February 15th.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY