

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
TAM

FEBRUARY 12, 2018
3:30 PM

TAM ROOM
900 FIFTH AVENUE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA



MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

- Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
- Brian Colbert, Town of San Anselmo
- Damon Connolly, Marin County Board of Supervisors
- Dan Hillmer, Larkspur City Council
- Dennis Rodoni, Marin County Board of Supervisors
- Diane Furst, Corte Madera Town Council
- Eric Lucan, Novato City Council
- Gary Phillips, San Rafael City Council
- John Reed, Fairfax Town Council
- Judy Arnold, Marin County Board of Supervisors, TAM Vice Chair
- Kathrin Sears, Marin County Board of Supervisors
- Katie Rice, Marin County Board of Supervisors
- P. Beach Kuhl, Ross Town Council
- Ray Withy, Sausalito City Council
- Stephanie Moulton-Peters, City of Mill Valley, TAM Chair

Members Absent:

- James Campbell, Belvedere City Council

Staff Members Present

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

Chair Moulton-Peters called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Chair's Report (Discussion)

Chair Moulton-Peters reported on her recent acquisition of an electric bike and its benefits.

2. Commissioner Matters Not on the Agenda (Discussion)

There were none.

3. Executive Director's Report (Discussion)

Executive Director (ED) Dianne Steinhauser highlighted items in the Executive Director's Report, including the new monthly newsletter, *The TAM Traveler*, a summary of the federal infrastructure plan as well as the President's infrastructure plan, the possibility of reduced federal funding with an expectation that states and local agencies fund the shortfall, SB (Senate Bill) 1 revenue plans, a summary report for the 2015-16 years regarding housing units, how the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) wants to condition funding based on production of housing, and TAM's partnering with Marin County on its application for an adaptation grant to study Manzanita, specifically the flooded areas.

a. Richmond-San Rafael Bridge

ED Steinhauser discussed the letter sent to BATA as developed from an ad hoc subcommittee formed at the January TAM Board meeting. The letter is regarding the possible joint use by both cars and bicycles of the additional lane on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. ED Steinhauser noted that public input can be made on TAM's website. The letter was shared with TAM board members and is available on TAM's website.

Commissioner Reed commented on another suggestion of creating non-moveable barriers for vehicle lanes on both levels of the bridge but at different times, rather than using a moveable one for motor vehicles to use jointly with bicycles.

Chair Moulton-Peters opened public comment on the Executive Director's Report.

David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, discussed the outdated view that widening the road is the best way to deal with congestion. He suggested promoting ridesharing or carpooling and the addition of an HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lane for the bridge instead.

Cindy Winter commented on progress made on developing autonomous vehicles, increase in Uber users, increased congestion, safety of cyclists and pedestrians from the new configuration being considered for the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. She suggested a cantilevered bike path design should be considered.

San Rafael resident Tim Gilbert discussed his commute to Berkeley for the past 28 years, including use of his bicycle for the last stretch every day. He agreed that the use of electric bikes will increase the number of people who try cycling to work and he thanked the Board for the evaluation process they are undertaking.

Linda Jackson, on behalf of the Aging Action Initiative, commented on the 14-minutes it takes to drive across the bridge with no traffic, the increased commute time beginning at 6:10 a.m. and lasting until 10:10 a.m. when traveling from east to west as the morning traffic continues, the percentage of commuters who come from the East Bay to Marin across the Richmond-San Rafael bridge, the heavy reverse commute period at the end of the day, the number of people in Marin who depend on caregivers from east Contra Costa County, and the urgency of the situation.

Greg Knell, president of the San Rafael City School Board, expressed appreciation for all the speakers at the last meeting and encouraged the Board to proceed with studies related to a joint-use lane and await the results of modal change testing that is ongoing for other Bay Bridges.

Roger Kirk of San Rafael, questioned how many will use the bridge for commuting by bicycle or walking, and he discussed a similar route available to cross the Carquinez bridge and how rarely it is used. He suggested using a van to shuttle cyclists across, which would provide an economic way to determine bicycle use for the Richmond-San Rafael bridge.

Dwayne Price, Larkspur, discussed concerns about the safety of cyclists and pedestrians, and his experiences as a cyclist that lead him to believe a movable barrier is not necessary and suggested rumble strips would be just as effective and cost much less. He suggested the third lane should be opened only for cyclists and pedestrians as originally proposed (rush hour) and opened as a shared lane the rest of the time for evaluation. He also agreed with Mr. Schonbrunn that the focus of future transportation planning, needs to be on alternative methods such as BART-Bay Area Rapid Transit, SMART-Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit, buses, etc.

Patrick Seidler, Transportation Alternatives for Marin, discussed the need for accurate transportation data. He shared updated statistics, particularly the connection between increased roadway capacity contributing to vehicle miles traveled, more greenhouse gas emissions, sea level rise and global warming; with no resulting economic benefits (more jobs, help for businesses, etc.) either. He encouraged the Board to consider the information carefully and realize that a multi-modal approach is needed.

Bruce Ackerman, Fairfax Town Council, speaking as an individual, expressed support for Commissioner Reed's idea of fixed barriers on both levels of the bridge, allowing for extra lanes during different times of the commute. He discussed the safety risks from a moveable barrier, the need for long-term relief from congestion and traffic issues, and solutions to the current situation.

Jim Geraghty said he did not think this body will be able to make the decision on this issue because of the political aspects involved. He acknowledged actions that can be taken at the local level (city, county) in their roles as councilmembers or supervisors to increase affordable housing and employment opportunities, through new businesses. He agreed that adding more capacity to the bridge traffic will only increase the number of cars coming in to Marin and overloading traffic on surface streets.

Diana Purdue, Fairfax resident, commented on the increase in traffic on the bridge over the 30 years that she has been commuting. Since motor vehicle owners contribute to highway costs through gas taxes and tolls, she thought the focus of any changes for the bridge should be increasing capacity for motor vehicle use. She thought there could be accommodation for cyclists by increasing the number and frequency of buses combined with bicycle amenities/facilities on the buses themselves. She discussed her concern that segregating the third lanes might result in only a single lane being available during vehicle break downs and noted that most days, there are drivers already using the third lane.

Cynthia Murray of the North Bay Leadership Council, representing the leading employers in Marin, Sonoma and Napa Counties, commented on the low unemployment rate in Marin and difficulties in attracting and retaining workers in the area, the need to improve commute times and the critical need for more housing. She urged the Board to seriously consider the addition of the third lane to improve the congestion issues.

Jean Severinghaus discussed a previous presentation when bicyclists spoke in support of the bike/pedestrian third lane, the problems with cars filling any additional commute lanes leaving cyclists with no viable option, and she also pointed out that bicycles are not just recreational – they are an alternative commute mode. She also wondered if TAM would be willing to invest in a ferry service that bicycles could use to get them across to Marin allowing them to continue their way on the other side.

Tim Johnson, representing James Campbell, Belvedere TAM Board Member, confirmed Councilmember Campbell's support for the letter dated February 7 that was handed out at today's meeting. He discussed the data

provided by the University of California at Davis, and the reasons some of the information is irrelevant to the third lane, including a footnote that uses an example based on the earthquake that closed the bridge altogether.

Daniel Meltzer noted that the TAM Board does not have the ability to stop the bike lane project, as it is an approved project with an approved project schedule. Mr. Meltzer said that Commissioner Connolly, as the MTC representative, has more influence than most of the other TAM Board members. He commented on the need for regional solutions for traffic and housing, and he stated as well that all the needed data has been published in the report for 580/101 over 1½ years ago with the proposed sharing of the third lane between cyclists and motor vehicles. He suggested going ahead with the plans for the third lane as proposed, and study/plan for a shared lane option in the future.

Seeing no further speakers, Chair Moulton-Peters closed public comment on the Report. She thanked the speakers, and she acknowledged the Board is aware of the current traffic congestion issues and most are aware that this is a time of transition for transportation modes. She added that the transition may need to be done over time, and not all at once.

Chair Moulton-Peters indicated that the Board would like to see the current data as expressed in the letter drafted at the last meeting. She noted some of the latest data was obtained during the recession and needs to be updated. She deferred to Commissioner Connolly for his comments on the issue.

Commissioner Connolly thanked the public for their interest on the subject and the input that was given. He noted that this was not an agenda item, but was only part of the Executive Director's Report, but he acknowledged that it is an issue that the public has shown great interest in. He expressed his support for the letter that was drafted after the last meeting and he felt that letter adequately expressed the Board's input on the issue. As the MTC rep, he indicated he has received many letters, calls and emails on the third lane and the increasing level of congestion on the bridge. He thought the time was right to do the study, and he indicated MTC/ BATA is drafting a scope of work regarding what the study would involve.

Chair Moulton-Peters asked the Board to consider moving Item #6 forward up on the agenda followed by Items #4 and #5.

Vice Chair Arnold moved to approve the change to the agenda, allowing Item #6 to be heard next. Commissioner Lucan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #6 taken out of order.

6. Accept the Transportation Sales Tax Measure Feasibility Survey Results (Discussion)

ED Steinhauser introduced the item, noting that Charles Hester, vice president of Godbe Research, was on the phone and was apologetic for not being present at this meeting. She noted that copies of the PowerPoint and the staff report were included with the supplemental agenda available at the dais. She noted this was an information item only, to present the survey results on the polling that was done in January regarding the possible extension or renewal of the Measure A Sales Tax measure.

Mr. Hester continued the staff report, giving an overview of the objectives of the survey, methodology, including success with online questionnaires over data collection via cellphones, questions used, including satisfaction with quality of life in Marin County and with transportation in Marin County, uninformed support for ½-cent sales tax, features of the proposed measure, influence of informational statements, influence of potential oppositional statements, resultant informed support, typical commute transportation used, key findings, summary and

recommendations. Ultimately, he indicated that Godbe Research recommends TAM proceed with next steps in the process towards preparing for a measure renewing the sales tax on the November 2018 ballot.

After the presentation, ED Steinhauser reiterated that this item is informational, with no action requested from the Board at this meeting. She discussed the next steps and suggested another presentation to the Board following presentations to the Board of Supervisors, and city and town councils.

Commissioner Hillmer asked about the impact from changes to federal funding responsibilities. ED Steinhauser said that was difficult to know for sure, but TAM will continue to monitor funding options and will keep the Board informed.

Commissioner Colbert commented on funding for crossing guards and for school bus service, which he said are hot topics among parents and which he believes are more important than the survey indicated. He thought that many people don't understand the relationship between TAM, school districts, and the cities/towns, and he encouraged TAM to take what steps it can to clarify the issues for the parents well ahead of the November election.

Commissioner Furst said she agreed with Commissioner Colbert, although she noted that crossing guards may not be a hot topic for the general population, but that it is popular when presented to parents of young children. She thought that reaching out to targeted groups could go far in educating voters about funding options.

Chair Moulton-Peters confirmed that in response to Commissioner Colbert's comments at the last meeting, staff indicated they would reach out and invite schools and encourage them to be involved with local jurisdictions on the issue.

Commissioner Fredericks observed that many of the school districts will be looking toward the local jurisdictions for funding of crossing guards which she knew would be difficult for many local governments. She agreed that outreach is key.

Commissioner Rice pointed out that even though the polling results may be accurate for those who participated, there is a broader group that hasn't provided input yet because of the time involved to do the polling.

Chair Moulton-Peters opened public comment on the item.

David Schonbrunn discussed his belief that the statement "relieve traffic congestion" has no long-term meaning and that he might lead a campaign against the sales tax renewal if this statement is included in the ballot documents. Mr. Schonbrunn said he belongs to a coalition who oppose RM3 for reasons he discussed.

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

4. Commissioner Reports (Discussion)

a. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Report

Commissioner Connolly reported that the Board of Supervisors in the near future will be considering whether to place RM 3 on the June ballot, as will each of the nine bay area counties.

b. Marin Transit Report

Commissioner Rice indicated she had nothing to report since there had been no meeting since the last TAM Board meeting.

c. SMART

Vice Chair Arnold said she also had nothing to report.

5. Open Time for Public Expression

None.

7. North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project – Request the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Allocate Funding to the San Rafael Multi-Use Path via TAM (Action)

ED Steinhauser introduced the item which recommended that the TAM Board:

- (1) Approve a Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to submit a request to MTC to allocate \$2.95M in Regional Measure 2 toll bridge funds for use by TAM to - be directed to the City of San Rafael to construct the Multi-Use Path from Second Street to Andersen Drive.
- (2) Update the Initial Project Report to reflect funds are being re-directed from the Southern Segment of the North/South Greenway in Corte Madera/ Larkspur to the San Rafael Multi-Use Path.
- (3) Authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a funding agreement up to \$2.95M with the City San Rafael, under several conditions as outlined below. If grant funds are realized between this time and when the funds are spent, this amount will be reduced accordingly.
- (4) Prioritize the southern segment in applying for future grant opportunities.

She indicated that Project Manager Bill Whitney was here to answer any questions about the staff report. She discussed completed elements and those currently at the planning stage, including the widening of the bridge at Corte Madera Creek, that have been part of the North South Greenway Project, partnering agencies, funding options, permitting, and remaining segments including a multi-use pathway. She also mentioned items proposed by the San Rafael Planning Director, Bill Guerin, who was present at this meeting, the funding request before the Board concerning the need to move funds temporarily to the multi-use path project between Second and Andersen in relation to SMART, the combination of city, county and potentially private funds involved, conditions attached to some of the additional funding possibilities, the anticipated timeline and increased costs.

ED Steinhauser further discussed action taken by MTC in December 2016, to guarantee funding for SMART projects and/or the San Rafael Transit Center if funds remain. Additionally, she reviewed funds TAM had authorized for environmental and engineering needs for the transit center under the OBAG2 program.

Vice Chair Arnold expressed appreciation for the report and support for bringing back any further conditions related to SMART.

Commissioner Lucan asked about the lead agency for construction of the San Rafael multi-use path project. ED Steinhauser said she thought it was the City of San Rafael. Mr. Guerin discussed the status of the project, contractor agreement and coordination with SMART.

Commissioner Phillips was also appreciative of the report and the information given. He commented on the benefit of the Transit Center to San Rafael and the County. He indicated his support for the proposed conditions and the safeguards for the city, and he provided background information on the project, as well as the readiness of the project to go forward once all agreements, contracts, funding, etc. are finished.

Commissioner Rice asked what would happen to the project if the \$490,000 funding gap is not covered, which Mr. Phillips discussed. Commissioner Rice commented on her frustration with last minute funding needs, although she confirmed her support for the project and the safeguards in place.

Commissioner Connolly noted that this particular path was precisely envisioned when they approved SMART, having been promised a functional multi-use path as part of the rail project. He also mentioned that the voters are watching and want to be sure that the gap is closed. He was confident that the safeguards and the funding will be in place to ensure that the goals are met to finance the gap closure.

Commissioner Furst discussed how much effort she has made to ensure that the southern segment can be completed too, but she recognized the urgency of the San Rafael project and indicated her support to move the funds. She discussed avenues of funding that the Board could consider specifically Caltrans and SMART, noting the benefit they will realize from the project.

Commissioner Furst also said she would like to see SMART consider contributing to the second half of the pathway, agreeing the voters were promised a rail and pathway project, not just rail. Regarding Condition #4, she was concerned about the commitment made. She read from the language of RM 2, which promised the North South Greenway project would “provide enhanced regional and local access around the Greenbrae interchange to reduce traffic congestion and provide multi-modal access to the Richmond-San Rafael bridge and Larkspur ferry terminal by extending a multi-use pathway from the vicinity of Wornum Drive to East Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and the Cal Park Hill” as well as approaches to the bridge. She thought RM 2 expressed a very logical approach, and she was concerned that giving the Transit Center priority could result in further hurdles for completion of the second segment.

Chair Moulton-Peters opened public comment on the item.

Responding to Commissioner Furst’s comments, David Schonbrunn suggested the Second-Anderson segment should be considered part of the North-South Greenway; thus there would be no “savings” because it would be “under construction.” In addition, he said the conditions of the transfer have not been framed appropriately. He thought a better frame of reference would be “what will it take to be sure that the critical part of the project (the pathway) gets done?” Following that, San Rafael could continue to seek funding for the Transit Center need, but he confirmed the pathway should be completed before the trains are rolling.

Patrick Seidler, Transportation Alternatives for Marin, thanked ED Steinhauser and TAM staff for their work, expressing his appreciation for the wording of condition #4. He also thanked the city of San Rafael for their excellent work as well, reminding the Board that originally it was thought that the pathway would not fit alongside the rail line. He also commented on the work of his organization in completing additional studies to show there was a way for the pathway to be accomplished successfully. He urged TAM and the other partnering agencies to support the proposal and complete the path.

Maureen Gaffney, San Francisco Bay Trail project, commented on the importance of all aspects of the Greenway project to the Bay Trail. She indicated they were reluctant to postpone the completion of any section, but she acknowledged it is necessary for the Second-Anderson portion to be completed first. Ms. Gaffney expressed appreciation to TAM, the city of San Rafael and all who worked to resolve funding issues for this part of the project.

Bjorn Gripenberg, Policy & Planning Director for the Marin County Bicycle Coalition (MCBC), discussed points made in a letter from MCBC to TAM, which reiterated many points already made tonight. He echoed other speakers as well and thanked those involved for the efforts to find a creative solution for the benefit of the entire region. He asked that the Board accept the report and take the action necessary to move this project forward.

Greg Knell noted that the San Rafael City School Board has been on record in support of this project for two years, and he urged the TAM Board to endorse it as well.

Cindy Winters indicated her support for the proposal. She expressed some concern, however, about the northbound offramp to East Sir Francis Drake, but she was confident that her concerns would be considered and addressed. She thanked all who contributed.

Jean Severinghaus, acknowledged the hard work that was involved with the proposal. She was concerned about funding for bicycle/pedestrian facilities needed in areas where SMART is already operating; currently in San Rafael and in Larkspur in the future, so she encouraged the Board not to lose focus on the southern segment of the project. Ms. Severinghaus also encouraged TAM to continue working with Caltrans to remind them of their financial responsibility (as owner of some portions of the Northern Segment properties) and make sure the additional funding is in place. She reviewed projects that remained for both the northern & southern segments and the need to obtain funds sooner rather than later and she urged the Board not to transfer funds from southern segment projects to any other northern segment projects.

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

Vice Chair Arnold reminded the Board that SMART has applied previously for federal and state funding to accomplish the completion of the North-South Greenway and bike/ped amenities, were unsuccessful. She also noted SMART is allowing the construction of facilities within the SMART right-of-way.

Vice Chair Arnold moved to approve the request that Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) allocate funding to the San Rafael Multi-Use Path via TAM (including the additional condition cited by the Executive Director relating to Wednesday's meeting). Commissioner Connolly seconded the motion.

Commissioner Rodoni expressed appreciation for the work of the Executive Director in reaching out to other agencies in seeking additional funding that was needed. He asked and the Board agreed that the backfill of funds to the Southern Segment be the priority for future funding cycles. He expressed his support for the proposal.

The maker and seconder of the motion agreed to the change, and the motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.