



MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Programming & Projects
April 9, 2018
2:00 p.m.

TAM CONFERENCE ROOM
900 FIFTH AVENUE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Alice Fredericks, Town of Tiburon
Diane Furst, Corte Madera Town Council
Eric Lucan, Novato City Council
Katie Rice, County of Marin Board of Supervisors
Kathrin Sears, County of Marin Board of Supervisors

Members Absent: Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Mill Valley City Council, TAM Chair

Staff Members Present: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director
Nick Nguyen, Deputy Executive Director
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
Bill Whitney, Principal Project Delivery Manager
Scott McDonald, Senior Transportation Planner

Due to the absence of Chair Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Acting Chair Lucan called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Chair’s Report (Discussion)

None given.

2. Commissioner Comments (Discussion)

There were none.

3. Executive Director’s Report (Discussion)

Executive Director (ED) Steinhauser discussed the recent completion of the San Antonio Bridge bridge that is part of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project, the upcoming shift of traffic to the bridge, progress on the eastbound 3rd lane of the Richmond bridge scheduled to open on April 20th, an electric vehicle test drive event coming up as part of the May Madness Car Show & Parade in San Rafael on Saturday, May 12th, a tentative date of May 18th or 19th for the TAM Junction Bike/Ped ribbon-cutting, the 2nd annual Innovations Workshop on June 8th, and the anticipated shortfall of about \$325,000 for the current project improving the approaches on East Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to the

Richmond-San Rafael bridge due to unforeseen circumstances in the field. She indicated there will be a full report at the April TAM Board meeting, noting that the City of Larkspur and TAM are planning on splitting the cost to cover the shortfall.

4. Open Time for Public Expression

Cindy Winter commented on a chart she found by Navigant, ranking autonomous vehicles with Uber and Tesla ranking at the bottom. She was concerned about potential problems from the companies' overconfidence in their abilities. She shared a copy with staff for distribution to the Committee. She also commented on the continued success of the Chevy Cruze and the Land Rover, two other autonomous cars being tested, as well as Lyft even though it was not on the Navigant list.

5. Approval of Minutes from March 12, 2018 (Action)

Commissioner Sears moved to approve the minutes of March 18, 2018. Commissioner Furst seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

6. Programming Scenarios for Measure B Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Funds (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced the item which requested the Committee to recommend approval to the TAM Board the programming of carryover funds under Element 3 of the \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee program. She introduced Programming Manager David Chan who lead the group effort in presenting the staff report, followed by Planning Manager Derek McGill, and the Alternative Fuels Project Manager Nick Nguyen. She briefly discussed the vehicle registration fee (VRF) established through Measure B, approved by the voters in 2010, and eligible for renewal in three years. She also reviewed some of the terms of the Expenditure Plan and the flexibility contained therein, but she pointed out that Measure B has a smaller, static amount of revenue, unlike Measure A, which is based on sales tax revenue. She reviewed the staff recommendation for the coming year, as well as a three-year projection.

Mr. Chan reviewed background information on Measure B, funds generated, the three Elements of the Measure (Local Streets & Roads, Transit for Seniors & the Disabled, and Congestion & Pollution Reduction programs), percentage of funds allocated to each sub-element, and efforts to generate other funding. He also discussed the flexibility of the program and the annual review, and he noted that any unused funds from a sub-element is returned back to the overall element for re-programming at the discretion of the TAM Board, with all the programs in the Element being eligible. He reviewed how the Measure B funds have generated over the 7 years since the beginning. After discussing the amount recommended for Element 3.1, he asked the Mr. McGill and Mr. Nguyen to review the budgets for Elements 3.1 and 3.2, respectively.

ED Steinhauser commented on the Crossing Guard program, noting it is recommended to be funded to position 88, as recommended to the TAM Board.

Mr. McGill explained Element 3.2, referred to as the Transportation Demand Management program, although it is actually a group of programs, including the Emergency Ride Home program, the Vanpool Incentive program, the Bikeshare program, Carshare program, and mobility as a service; goals, grant funding awarded, outreach and support for the programs, pilot programs, and the emerging trend of moving away from private vehicle ownership. Mr. Nguyen shared a chart showing the projected budgets for the next three fiscal years, based on the \$240,000 budget for the current fiscal year, allocated to six programs although two of the programs will be eliminated. Those programs are the Marin Transit Electric Bus contribution and the funding contribution to the SMART train to help make ready its infrastructure. He reviewed the remaining four programs: 1) Outreach/education; 2) consultant fee;

3) public fleet rebate program; and 4) public EV charger rebate program, and he indicated this year's full budgeted amount (\$240,000) will be spent. He reviewed outreach/education activities, social media campaigns, potential consultant to help plan for the program, rebates, fleet rebates, TAM matching rebates, grant opportunities, and charger infrastructure rebates/incentives.

Mr. Chan summarized the information presented about all three Elements and the staff recommendation for each, as well as how much will be available for carryover into the 11th year and beyond.

ED Steinhauser reiterated that carryovers can be programmed back for any of the strategies within the Element.

Commissioner Furst said she would like to hear more about the plan to expand the programs under Strategy 3.3, including rebates for public charging stations, which Mr. Nguyen provided. ED Steinhauser also discussed some of the policy decisions that need to be considering in establishing the program.

Commissioner Furst asked how many charging stations could be installed for the amount that is recommended for that strategy's budget share, and Mr. Nguyen indicated that staff has yet to define the detailed elements of the program but that he envisions continuing to provide 75 percent of coverage for the cost of installation with a cap of \$3,000 per charging point. He added that staff is projecting 50 charging points, although he acknowledged there are some variables that could change the estimate. ED Steinhauser noted that the size of rebate TAM offers could be changed also depending on the needs.

Commissioner Rice asked about current trends in the industry and prioritization of the needs – how TAM could use the budgeted amount for the maximum benefit. Regarding commercial sites, she mentioned sites along Hwy 101, as well as the malls in the area. She asked if any outreach has been done to the property managers, and ED Steinhauser said there has not been any to date.

Commissioner Rice wondered also how public agencies would feel about the planning & permitting process. Mr. Nguyen acknowledged he was not sure what the level of interest would be, but he indicated that could be part of the information gathering in the first year. He noted, however, that several public agencies have already expressed their interest to him. He expressed that there will be a limited number of charging points, infrastructure elements that each city could manage, so the need will plateau eventually.

Commissioner Rice asked when Mr. Nguyen thought the plateau would happen, and he said after 1-2 years probably.

Commissioner Rice asked about programming of the funds – how much will be available when. She was concerned about the timing of the outreach, etc. ED Steinhauser explained that TAM has received a request from the County for 41 charge points that she didn't think could be fulfilled in this year, but they will try. She also mentioned a request from the San Rafael School District for 32 chargers, which may have to roll into next year, too.

In response to a further question, ED Steinhauser pointed out a chart in the staff report on page 21 of the packet detailing specific items in the budget that are already committed to for next year.

Commissioner Furst questioned the advisability of postponing EV projects that are already committed. She thought it would be better to use unused funding from previous years to finish them while the interest is there. Mr. Nguyen sad he believed both the county and San Rafael would prefer to wait until next year.

Acting Chair Lucan asked about statistics related to the usage levels of the chargers already in place. Mr. Nguyen said it was considered proprietary information held by the site host. He noted, however, that if a charger is being maintained by a local municipality, the fleet manager would have direct access to that information.

Acting Chair Lucan opened public comment on the item.

Mary Bryan, Cool the Earth, expressed appreciation for TAM considering the reallocation of Measure B funds, but she indicated her concern that the allocation specified in the Expenditure Plan in Element 3.3 - Alternative Fuel Promotion over the next 3 years is not sufficient. She thought the total budget for this and future years should be increased to compensate for unexpended funding from previous years, especially given the governor's goals to increase the number of electric vehicles in use, estimated to be 5 million on the road by 2030.

Carleen Cullen, founder of Cool the Earth, reviewed research her organization has done regarding the EV market statistics, and infrastructure need, not just locally but within California as a whole. She commented on the daunting need the state is facing in terms of public infrastructure and potential costs. She strongly encouraged TAM to evaluate the budgets for Measures A and B to see where additional funding can be found to meet this pressing need.

Kate Powers, a member of TAM's Citizens' Oversight Committee, said she thought it would be better to evaluate Measure B funding every four years instead of every ten, and she thought the public should have more of a voice in the process. She discussed her experience with the limited range (80 miles) electric vehicle she is leasing, noting that more infrastructure would be helpful.

Seeing no further speakers, Acting Chair Lucan closed public comment.

Acting Chair Lucan asked about the budget process for Measures A and B, and ED Steinhauser confirmed both Measures would be discussed at the next TAM Board meeting, including the draft sales tax expenditure plan with a full review of both budgets.

Commissioner Sears asked about the proposed budget for electric vehicle programs and whether the Board could consider approving a different amount, and if so, what amounts could it consider. ED Steinhauser reviewed the amount currently being considered for the carryover as well as how much would likely be available at the end of the three years if the proposed budget is approved. She acknowledged there was flexibility in the Measure B program that could allow for changes if the Committee (and/or the Board) wants to recommend them. She indicated the Committee could direct staff to reduce or increase a budgeted amount, to shift amounts from one category to another, and/or to seek alternative fund sources, including grants, for parts of the budget.

Commissioner Furst said she would not recommend any changes to Element 3.2 Commute Alternatives Program, but she suggested taking \$90,000 of the \$96,000 anticipated carryover, and program \$45,000 each year for the next two years of FY 2018/19 and FY 2019/20, making the totals for those years \$390,000. She indicated her belief that the EV industry is going to increase greatly in the near future and that the demand will increase as well.

Commissioner Fredericks confirmed with staff that the budgets can be amended every year as needed. She was concerned about balancing the needs from both types of cars and their users – those with gas engines could be concerned about losing parking spaces if too many are dedicated to electric vehicles.

Acting Chair Lucan agreed that the budget flexibility means it could work either way – if more is programmed but not used, the excess can be rolled over; if the need is greater than the budgeted amount, it can be adjusted at that time as well. He also mentioned that charging stations may get more expensive once the spaces where it was easy

to install a charger have been dedicated and the more difficult ones, which may be further from an electrical source, are considered.

Commissioner Sears said she like Commissioner Furst's suggestion of increasing the budget for the first two years to encourage a robust program.

Commissioner Furst moved to accept the staff recommendation on Measure B funding, with the exception of adding \$45,000 per year in years 8 and 9 under Element 3.3 to expand installation of chargers at public agencies and/or publicly accessible private properties. Commissioner Sears seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Commissioner Rice added that steps that can be taken in the meantime to evaluate the Commute Alternatives program's cost effectiveness and prioritize accordingly. She also pointed out that TAM is not the only agency that should be involved in resolving these issues. ED Steinhauser agreed, and she reviewed other considerations, pointing out that TAM has always devoted funding to many different alternative modes citing that approximately 75 percent of revenues from the new measure is being dedicated to non-automotive modes.

Commissioner Fredericks added that it would be good to get regular updates from staff regarding the status of the program and how the funding is being used, to remind the Committee it is available and should be used.

7. Design Funding for Highway 101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) B1-Phase 2 and A4 Contracts (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced the item, explaining this represents the completion of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project in Marin (the carpool lane and bike path system).

Mr. Nguyen presented the staff report which asked the Committee to recommend that the full TAM Board approve the substitution of \$206,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Planning, Programming and Monitoring Program (PPM) funds with Cities/Towns and County Contribution funds to assist with funding preliminary design of the Highway 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) Phase 2 projects, and refer the item to the full Board for approval., discussing the activities completed along 101 in recent years, with Sonoma County now completing their design work. He commented on previously approved funds for Marin's design work and alternative funding to cover the costs. He indicated the money that had been allocated before will be used elsewhere. ED Steinhauser commented on the process thus far and her concerns regarding the need for additional funds, possibly through Regional Measure 3 (RM3) if the public approves it.

There was no public comment on the item.

Commissioner Sears moved to recommend approval of design funding for Highway 101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) B1-Phase 2 and A4 Contracts. Commissioner Fredericks_ seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Acting Chair Lucan asked, and ED Steinhauser confirmed it would be on the Consent Calendar at the next Board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY