

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
TAM

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23rd, 2006
7:30 PM

ROOM 330
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Al Boro, Vice Chair, City of San Rafael
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Jeanne Barr, Ross Town Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council
Barbara Thornton, Alternate, San Anselmo Town Council

Members Absent: Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council
Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council

Staff Members Present: Dianne Steinhauser, TAM Executive Director
Craig Tackabery, Marin DPW Assistant Director
Bill Whitney, Marin DPW Senior Civil Engineer
Tho Do, Marin DPW Associate Civil Engineer
Art Brook, Marin DPW Engineer
Jessica Woods, TAM Recording Secretary

Vice Chair Boro called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

1. Chair Reports

Vice Chair Boro indicated that all topics on the agenda tonight were discussed at the Executive Committee meeting, so he would reserve his comments until later in the meeting.

2. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda

Commissioner Eklund informed the Commission about the League of California Cities position on infrastructure bonds. The Board of Directors met with Director Will Kempton of Caltrans prior to taking a position and expressed concern about the list of projects that are associated with the transportation bond. Director Kempton did not feel that those were projects mandated for funding, but the Board felt it did give the impression that those projects would be funded. She pointed out a major loophole on that list because the Marin-Sonoma Narrows was not listed. The League of California Cities has

recommended and is now lobbying to establish a new system for distributing the transportation dollars. They are recommending that no projects be put on the transportation bond and that a process be developed whereby the local governments recommend projects that would achieve the overall objective, which is to reduce congestion. Also, if they did not approve what Caltrans recommended, then the local governments could appeal to CTC, which is a new provision. She further added that they included a very strong statement that to achieve the objective of reducing congestion it should be for both State and local transportation systems, because 25% of congestion is around schools.

Commissioner McGlashan stated that since the Board receives tab packets, he asked staff to eliminate the sheet with the number as well as the pink sheet in order to save paper. Commissioner Eklund noted that she already made that recommendation a few months ago and staff is working on that change.

3. Executive Director's Report

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, provided TAM with an Executive Director's Report for their review that included the following:

- State – Bond Proposals
- Hwy 101 HOV Gap Closure Fund Vote by the California Transportation
- Regional – Bay Area Council Annual Poll
- Local – Safe Routes to School donations received from Trek.
- 511 Regional Rideshare Program follow-up on questions from the January 26, 2006 TAM meeting

Commissioner Eklund stated that Speaker Nunez asked the League to have some discussion about to what extent they connect the blue print planning effort of ABAG to this infrastructure bond. That discussion would occur tomorrow because it raises some concerns, but also there are some opportunities to do more Smart Growth and transit oriented development.

Commissioner Adams was in Sacramento today for the California State Association of Counties Board meeting and this issue was discussed, including the differences between the Governors proposal and Senator Perata's proposal. She added that CSAC expressed concern and is not ready to jump on board until they know how the policy development will work in alignment with the funding. Also, Bruce Babbitt made a presentation, and he felt this bond would hold them accountable, and, that currently there is no vision. She believed the challenge is how can they work together to make sure that some clear policies are developed to guide what this money will achieve for the long-term.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff how TAM is staying abreast, because they do not have a legislative representative. He asked how they are going to weigh in on these issues, and if they are piggybacking on the County. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that at this point she is taking advantage of existing venues and organizations. Also, she would like to build into next year's budget the inclusion of some legislative advocacy, to be able to access a professional that would be able to gather information.

Commissioner Swanson expressed concern for the longer-term. Vice Chair Boro recommended that the Executive Committee discuss this matter at their next meeting. Commissioner Eklund believed it would be great idea to have a lobbyist.

4. Commissioner Report **a. Executive Committee**

No report.

b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Groups

No report.

c. SMART

Vice Chair Boro reported that the February 15th meeting focused on administrative issues concerning the Draft EIR. The report would come back to the Board at the March meeting. Monies were allocated to two consulting groups to supplement, and do some of the work originally planned to be done by the initial consultant, on responding to questions raised. The Board agreed to have the General Manager appoint a Blue Ribbon Committee subject to approval by the Board that would look at the Draft Expenditure Plan and conduct a third party review. The process used would be the process adopted by the WTA about a year ago. Also, they are in the process of the RFP for Railroad Square and they have three very interested developers in Santa Rosa.

Commissioner Adams asked Vice Chair Boro to clarify who would be making up this Blue Ribbon Committee. Vice Chair Boro responded that professionals who have had experience with major projects would be used. The agreement is that the Executive Committee will review the names and then bring the matter back to the full Board for concurrence. Commissioner Adams suggested that TAM be considered on that Committee, or representatives from different transportation districts or authorities, in order to look at the relationship between those agencies and a rail system. She further believed it would be very important when talking about cost, especially that these agencies have an opportunity to identify any fatal flaws in the planning process.

d. Countywide Planning Ad Hoc Committee

Commissioner McGlashan reported that the Committee met twice since the last TAM meeting. The Committee will develop a power point presentation for TAM at the May meeting. It would be finished in the next two Committee meetings in March and hoped to get time on the MCCMC agenda during their April meeting to run the idea by the Mayors' and Councilmembers' across the County. The Committee has been refining the content and identified the three main objectives: collaborative planning; in housing, transportation, land use and sustainability; evaluate and monitor cumulative impacts of various independent planning decisions across the County; and sharing best approaches and ideas for improving the quality of life. This Committee would propose to remain a Committee of the Transportation Authority and convene four times a year, mostly as a coalition of the willing, so TAM members could come or appoint an alternate. The Committee will focus on sharing ideas and pursuing grant opportunities. The key role could also be to create exchanges with respect to the affordable housing targets established by ABAG, so the Agency could serve as a unified voice. The County Community Development Agency offered to staff the Committee and they will not ask the cities or County for any continued funding. They will need funding for about four days plus prep time to get started. They will not have the authority to make the cities or County do anything. They will focus on best planning concepts available that should be shared and energized as a collective. He is very enthusiastic about this idea.

5. Consent Calendar

- a. Approval of TAM Minutes of January 26, 2006. Recommendation: Approve.

- b. Resolution regarding STP Projects. Recommendation: TAM adopt attached Resolution directing the equal exchange of STP/CMAQ funds for Measure A funds and authorizing the Executive Director to approve any required agreements.
- c. Professional Services Contract with Gail Papworth for Human Resource Consulting. Recommendation: TAM approve a contract with Gail Papworth for an amount of \$22,000 to assist in the hiring of up to 5 staffpersons, and provide other administrative support as needed

Vice Chair Boro asked for a motion.

Commissioner Swanson moved and Commissioner Eklund seconded, to adopt the Consent Calendar as presented. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

6. Caltrans Report

Doanh Nguyen, representing Caltrans, reported on four follow up items from the last meeting. There was a question regarding the striping on U.S. 101 in the vicinity of Larkspur and Caltrans maintenance is planning to refresh the striping, which would be done by end of next week. Also, in regard to the traffic condition at the Marinwood exit, there is an ongoing County Draft Study to signalize two of the intersections. When the study is completed they will have further information regarding the proposal and funding needed for signalization. Regarding the overnight parking at park-n-ride lots, it is similar to other State facilities, which is a 72 hour limit. He agreed to review the policy occupied vehicles. He further stated that all lights at the Tunnel have been replaced and are working.

Vice Chair Boro discussed the design of the 101/580 wall on the west side of the soundwall ramp and asked if the design ideas that are part of the contract. Mr. Nguyen responded that aesthetic features are not in the contract at this time, but it is the intent to incorporate those features, and that they are coordinating with the City and TAM.

Commissioner Swanson asked for an update on Caltrans scheduled project at the southbound exit at Tiburon Boulevard. Mr. Nguyen responded that the design is complete for that off ramp, and they are securing all the right-of-way easements in order to construct the project. He stated that it is taking longer than expected due to the cooperation of property owners, but they continue to move forward to secure rights. Commissioner McGlashan pointed out that they missed this construction season because of the delay of getting the easements, so the best is to break ground around March of 07.

Commissioner Fredericks discussed the park-n-ride in Novato on Vintage Way and indicated that the island at the approach to the park-n-ride is not visible and wondered if Caltrans could place reflectors to make that area visible. Mr. Nguyen has contacted the maintenance crew in that regard and agreed to report back his findings at the next month.

7. TAM Benefit Options and Human Resources Choices

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that the Board adopt the suite of benefits outlined herein, consistent with the marketplace for transportation professionals. The Board directs TAM staff to pursue a contract/contract amendment with Local/Regional Government Services, LGS/RGS, to act as the employer of record for TAM staffing purposes, providing insurance, benefits, payroll services, and human resource management needs to TAM. The LGS/RGS contract shall be brought back to the TAM Board for approval at the March or April meeting. The agreement with LGS/RGS shall be for a minimum of approximately 30 months, with a reassessment to be presented to the Board in FY 2007-08.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff how typical it is to have the PERS coverage paid by the employer for non-Executive Director level employees. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that it is becoming a common practice amongst many agencies that were surveyed.

Commissioner Adams noted that Assembly member Keith Richman is in the process of preparing a pension reform package and it could completely change public pensions. She asked staff if they are tracking what is happening. Also, if it is not passed through legislative means, Keith Richman has stated he will get a ballot initiative going. She stated that CSAC is working on this issue and agreed to send such information to staff.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Vice Chair Boro asked for a motion.

Commissioner Adams moved and Commissioner Eklund seconded, to adopt the suite of benefits outlined herein, consistent with the marketplace for transportation professionals; direct TAM staff to pursue a contract/contract amendment with Local/Regional Government services, LGS/RGS, to act as the employer of record for TAM staffing purposes, providing insurance, benefits, payroll services, and human resource management needs to TAM. The LGS/RGS contract shall be brought back to the TAM Board for approval at the March or April meeting. The agreement with LGS/RGS shall be for a minimum of approximately 30 months, with a reassessment to be presented to the Board in FY 2007-08. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

8. FY 2006-07 Staffing Plan Classification Determination for TAM positions

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, provided a powerpoint presentation to TAM that included the following:

- Ongoing workload needs for FY 06/07
- How is work handled now?
- A total of eight FTE's are being spent in the current year for this work.
- Options for FY 2006/07
 - Hire additional staff
 - Extend County support contract for an additional year
 - Engage in consultant support
- Recommendation:
 - Hire a lead-person in each category of work
 - Utilize a limited amount of County Public Works staff for a lengthened transition position
 - Utilize consultants to fill remaining workload needs
 - Expect the functional lead-person, a working manager, to assess additional needs and now best to meet them, once they are onboard and up to speed with TAM activity.
- Salary Ranges
- Budget Capacity
- Recommendation:
 - TAM approve three additional TAM staff positions and their salary ranges; authorize staff to negotiate a renewed Memorandum of Understanding with the County of Marin for staffing in FY 2006-07; and authorize staff to assign remaining workload to consultant support.

Vice Chair Boro noted the Executive Committee reviewed this several months ago and decided to move forward on the two positions first, and that by hiring lead-persons now this will provide direct control on work.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff which County staff would be identified. Executive Director Steinhauser has not negotiated that with Public Works Director Mansourian, but they have a tentative small group and they are willing to do this work for FY 06-07.

Alternate Commissioner Thornton asked staff how is the "*controlled point*" determined. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that it is a true average of all the positions considered.

Commissioner Swanson is supportive of the recommendation. He felt it is financially more advantageous to do so. Also, as soon as the financial information is available, TAM should work with MTC and Caltrans to consider a cost rate, so when staff is spending time on RM2 projects TAM can recoup the costs above and beyond both salaries and benefits. Also, at the next meeting he asked staff to provide a simple organizational chart to better understand the relationships. He further added that if this is a year or two snapshot, maybe include a long-term staffing plan as the Agency matures and grows.

Commissioner Eklund is very supportive and hoped to get away from using consultants sooner than what the proposal presents. The faster TAM builds up institutional knowledge within TAM, the better. She desired an opportunity to discuss some of the planned workload for 06/07. Her two main concerns are with SMART tasks. She wanted to know whether or not TAM should invest their limited resources at this point. Executive Director Steinhauser stated that the intention is to have a more thorough discussion on the work plan. They have a work plan in terms of financial management and it would be brought back along with a Draft Budget hopefully in March.

Commissioner Adams supported having a plan for priorities.

The item was opened to public input, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the public input was closed.

Vice Chair Boro asked for a motion.

Commissioner Adams moved and Alternate Commissioner Thornton seconded, to approve three additional TAM staff positions and their salary ranges as outlined in the staff handout; authorize staff to negotiate a renewed Memorandum of Understanding with the County of Marin for staffing in FY 2006-07; and authorize staff to assign remaining workload to consultant support. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

9. Highway 101 GAP Closure Projects Status Report, including Puerto Suello Hill Soundwall and Bike Path

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM provide authorization for staff to present the recommended sound absorption strategy and aesthetic options for the multi-use path and soundwalls to an Executive Committee meeting on March 8th and then set a meeting date later in the month for a public outreach meeting.

Connie Preston, representing, Nolte Consultants, discussed the change order work on Sir Francis Drake, which is underway and she anticipated work to be completed within the next three weeks. Segment 3 (Central San Rafael Project) has a public open house scheduled for March 2nd from 6–8pm

at the San Rafael Community Center and encouraged all to attend. Also, a groundbreaking ceremony is being planned. However, until the contract is awarded there is no date. For Segment 4 (Puerto Suello Hill project), they are working on co-op agreement with Caltrans. They received a draft and hoped in March to bring that document to TAM for approval. The maintenance of the path will be addressed in a separate agreement and they are continuing to work on a final solution as to who would maintain the path. In regard to the environmental clearance, a draft amendment was submitted to Caltrans earlier this month. They received some comments back on the draft and the consultant team is working on addressing those comments with the hope to have environmental clearance in March.

Chris Metzger, representing, Nolte Consultants, provided a powerpoint presentation to TAM that included the following:

- o Update on Path Elements
- o Sound Reduction Strategy
- o Proposed Public Meeting On Aesthetics
- o Schedule

Vice Chair Boro discussed that east soundwall modifications and mentioned that when he and Commissioner Adams met with the Caltrans District 04 Director, he wanted the proposed shoulder widths, but it does not make sense to condemn property in order to gain that width, so that if they can develop design exception, that would be great. Executive Director Steinhauser indicated that is the goal. She stated that this is a balancing act, so they are trying to find ways to leave the wall in place and add sound absorptive material on the front. They are not sure if that could occur for the entire length, but they are trying to minimize impacts on the local community.

Commissioner Adams encouraged feedback from the public on the aesthetics of the wall. In regard to the maintenance of the bikeway, San Rafael does not want to have a project that was high maintenance, so she suggested some type of interesting asphalt color to make the pathway look interesting and possibly some ivy along the wall to have a nice thoroughfare. Finally, she reiterated her commitment to the consultants to continue to work on this east sound wall mitigation. Consultant Metzger responded that ivy on the sound absorption wall would not have any impact on the sound absorbing qualities. Vice Chair Boro noted that it would minimize graffiti when the ivy is grown.

Commissioner Eklund stated that Novato has a requirement that demolition be recycled 50% and asked if included in the bid document is a condition that 50% of that material would be recycled. Consultant Preston responded that there is no current requirement in the contract for recycling the material. Commissioner Eklund recommended inserting a condition that 50% of the material be recycled. Executive Director Steinhauser agreed to further review the possibility of recycling the debris. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that the soundwall is concrete over steel, so they must review the cost effectiveness of separating the concrete from the steel.

Commissioner Fredericks believed 4 to 6-decibel reduction perceptibility would depend on the base noise levels. Consultant Metzger agreed to investigate and report back his findings. Commissioner Eklund researched the product online and she came across a website that demonstrated the noise reduction from using open graded asphalt in combination with a soundwall. She is using that website in some of Novato's community meetings in regard to noise complaints, so there will be more requests for open graded asphalt. She further recommended that this Board actually hear it because it was as much as 7-decibel reduction and felt it would be valuable to have a better understanding of open graded asphalt in noise reduction.

The item was opened to public input.

Patrick Murphy, representing, Soundwall Noise Abatement Committee, expressed concern for reflective noise impacting the City of San Rafael and asked that reflective noise be investigated, so they must address actual and reflective noise. He added that it is a cumulative effect and it will impact the community immensely. He believed that the investigation of different types of approaches that are practical is in front of the Board; it is just a matter of doing it. He further recommended investigating "clatting" in a very aggressive way to meet the deadline to go out to bid.

Eric Anderson, representing, MCBC, thanked staff and consultants for being incredibly responsive to the Coalition. He added that going south to north starting at Mission/Stevens he appreciated the fact that the consultants are reviewing options not requiring bikes to cross Mission at Hetheron. He believed that if there is a way to route cyclists and pedestrians onto the sidewalks and provide a directional ramp for cyclists to go west on Mission is the way to go. Research has shown that side paths along busy streets encounter accidents. Also, in regard to Linden, he thanked the consultants for making the best out of a really constrained situation. He stated that the pathway design guidelines that Caltrans prepared states 8 feet is the minimum width for a path, but that is intended in areas where there is lower traffic, and that a 10-foot path should be the standard for the north/south greenway. He stated that they must go back to Caltrans and indicate that 8 feet is not a standard that applies to the pathway widths at this location, and maybe they would reduce the width of their shoulder. Also, the description of the grade of the pathway going from the north portal up to Los Ranchitos was not discussed tonight, but at the steepest point it could be up to 8.3%, which is extremely steep for cyclist. He understands that there could be significant expense incurred in reducing that to a 5% grade and encouraged the Board to review and weigh that expense and the value of that additional expense.

Craig Yates, San Rafael Manor resident, believed an introduction of common sense must be involved. He felt these questions and issues should have been developed prior to this stage. Also, he expressed concern for removal of the soundwall on the west side because the reflective sound in Terra Linda is horrendous.

Rocky Birdsey, representing, MCIL, echoed thoughts from Mr. Murphy that if there is a better solution it should be explored quickly. He then discussed Linden Lane and that 8 feet is too narrow. He further hoped the Board would strive to maintain a 10-foot pathway.

Mr. Murphy wanted to know if the west wall would be a cinderblock wall with the sound absorbing material added on. Also, he lives in the corridor and he rarely views graffiti in the corridor.

The public input was closed.

Commissioner Gill asked staff when the maintenance issue must be resolved. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that at this point when the package is finalized and sent to Caltrans around April or May the agreement must be finalized, so they will process the package and get ready for construction.

Commissioner Eklund asked staff if they are still looking at the width of path. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that the location on Linden is very constrained by not being able to receive a design exception on the freeway shoulder and not being able to go into the SMART right-of-way, so the best possible combination is being considered. She further explained that it would be 10 feet on the main path; 9 feet on the access path, but that 9 feet would pinch down to about 7 feet when that path hits Linden.

Commissioner Adams believed the other two agencies should be able to work together to find a solution that will give the community a path that would not create problems and move people effectively through that corridor. She asked that the representatives from SMART discuss this issue at their next meeting. She did not understand the obstacles and wanted to figure out the challenges. Vice Chair Boro responded that staff contacted Lillian Hanes about this issue and there are issues with respect to SMART and its ability to maintain the right-of-way and maintain its track at that point, but certainly it could be revisited.

Consultant Metzger pointed out that the access path is over 300 feet long and there is a point where there is a triangle shaped reduction from the SMART right-of-way. The minimum width is an instantaneous point, so that is the narrowest section. Also, Caltrans is concerned about being sued for safety, and the 8-foot path and access path fit and meet the minimum standard. Caltrans cannot justify reducing safety on the freeway to accommodate the desire to have a larger path. Executive Director Steinhauser added that it will almost be impossible to move Caltrans, but staff would go back to SMART in regard to widening the path.

Vice Chair Boro asked for a motion.

Commissioner Eklund moved and Commissioner Gill seconded, to authorize staff to present the recommended sound absorption strategy and aesthetic options for the multi-use path and soundwalls to an Executive Committee meeting on March 8th; come back with recommendations on the recycling; and set a meeting date later in the month for a public outreach meeting. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Commissioner Barr left the TAM meeting.

10. Request for Proposals for Greenbrae Corridor Project Report and Environmental Document

Bill Whitney summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM review and comment on the scope of the RFP. Staff will incorporate Commissioners comments and will initiate the consultant solicitation and selection process.

The item was opened to public input.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, is pleased to see that the scope of the area was expanded to also study Sir Francis Drake and the areas parallel to Highway 101, but it did not include information about how far east or west of Highway 101. Staff responded that the study would include Sir Francis Drake from I-580 through the interchange and to at least Bon Air.

Eric Anderson, representing, MCBC, felt the overall RFP looked good, but had a few clarifications that the Coalition desired incorporated as follows:

1. Prior Studies – Central Marin Ferry Project should state, *“final report completed in April 2004.”*
2. Recent Public Meeting Section – did not include many comments about bike/pedestrian access and safety and the Coalition felt it is an important aspect of the overall project and those comments should be mentioned along with other listed comments.
3. Under Services To Be Provided – The multi-use path should mention the connection to the Cal Park Hill Tunnel as is done in the previous Prior Study Section. It is important because a grade separated crossing of East Sir Francis Boulevard to connect the two pathways is an important component of the project and should always be included in each step of the project description.

4. Since this is a multi-modal project, it is important to include an assessment of bicycle/ pedestrian use in the corridor. They suggested collecting information at the proposed and existing interchanges; access points to the Larkspur Ferry Terminal; include bicycle/pedestrian counts and compilation of bicycle/pedestrian/car collision to have a picture of what is occurring in the corridor.
5. Future Task Orders No. 6 - include mention of local street travel for all modes. Since multi-use pathways exist and are proposed as a part of this project the item should read, *"local street and multi-use pathway travel for all modes."*

They are pleased to see that the process would prioritize project components before the development of the environmental studies. They feel the Central Marin Ferry Connection should be considered for implementation as a stand-alone project. Also, earlier implementation would not interfere with the highway improvements and would provide near term benefits to the community, including access to the ferry terminal and a connection to the Cal Park Hill Tunnel before the larger project is completed.

Bill Whitney reported that Mr. Anderson's comments seemed reasonable, and that they would be reviewed in more detail.

The public input was closed.

Commissioner McGlashan is interested in pursuing the recommendations made by Mr. Anderson.

11. Recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee and the Marin Public Works Association for Measure A Strategy 4 Crossing Guard Locations

Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM authorize staff to conduct a contractor solicitation and selection process providing crossing guards at the listed locations, as a first phase of the Measure A Crossing Guard substrategy. Staff will return to the May TAM meeting for final contract approval.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff about Crossing 11 and pointed out that it would only serve the Mill Valley Middle School. Assistant Director Tackabery stated that the schools are listed are for informational purposes, but agreed to remove Park School and credit that intersection only to Mill Valley Middle School.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff what could be done to help Park School. Assistant Director Tackabery responded that all schools were asked to submit locations that would benefit from a crossing guard. Commissioner Swanson would rather see a guard near Park School because there is no controlled intersection for students. Commissioner McGlashan recommended that staff focus on adding the Park School site. Assistant Director Tackabery noted that Park School has not responded to their survey. Commissioner Swanson agreed to contact Park School.

Commissioner Eklund asked staff how many requests are not recommended for funding. Assistant Director Tackabery responded that staff received about 70 requests and 39 met the criteria. Commissioner Eklund asked staff if Olive and Hamilton replied to the survey. Assistant Director Tackabery responded that both submitted locations, but they did not meet the pedestrian count criteria. Commissioner Eklund desired more discussion. Staff agreed to look at this area.

Commissioner Adams felt a crossing guard might be better served at the stop sign at Miller Creek School on Las Gallinas. Consulting Staff explained that schools requested all the locations listed. Commissioner Adams recommended that Miller Creek School and Lucas Valley Road be reviewed.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff if this list was compiled from perspective of financial constraints. Assistant Director Tackabery responded that they could afford about 60 or so sites. The Executive Committee felt they should not fund 60 the first time out because there would be none left in the second phase.

Vice Chair Boro expressed concern for the Davidson School intersection. He felt that the schools must take an initiative and identify the need. Assistant Director Tackabery noted that staff received 83 requests, but funding is only available for 60 locations.

Vice Chair Boro asked for a motion.

Commissioner Adams moved and Commissioner Gill seconded, to authorize staff to conduct a contractor solicitation and selection process providing crossing guards at the listed locations, as a first phase of the Measure A Crossing Guard Strategy.

The item was opened to public input.

Rocky Birdsey, representing, MCIL, expressed concern for the seniors currently working as crossing guards, and if the schools desired, he hoped to have those seniors retained as crossing guards.

Commissioner Eklund asked staff how TAM could incorporate additional locations in May. Assistant Director Tackabery responded that it would be through an amendment.

The public input was closed.

Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Commissioners Gill and Tremaine left the TAM meeting at 10:09 p.m.

12. Marin County Transit District Short Range Transit Plan

Amy Van Doren, representing, MCTD, provided TAM copies of a powerpoint presentation on the Short Range Transit Plan for their consideration.

Commissioner Fredericks left the TAM meeting at 10:29 p.m.

Commissioner Eklund expressed concern that service in Novato is contingent upon the location of a new Southern Novato Transit Hub. There is no funding for it and the study has not been done. She added that there is growing opposition on this issue. She added that looking for an interim site might not be the solution. She desired her concerns to be transmitted to the MCTD Board. Also, page 5-1 discussed the marketing aspect, and states that MCTD should take action to adopt a logo and color theme in order to encourage transit use. She suggested having a local contest to get people involved rather than just adopting a logo that was presented by the contractor.

Commissioner Swanson discussed the proposed changes for local bus services shown in the handout in Southern Marin and asked how direct service between the Canal, San Rafael Transit Center, Marin

General Hospital, and College of Marin would impact Southern Marin. Vice Chair Boro asked staff to review.

Commissioner Adams expressed concern about the elimination of Route 57 and 58 Service. Although new Route 49 is accessible at Highway 101, those who walk would travel more than a mile. Several that use that service are either students or seniors. Would that eliminate their ability to access Paratransit. Ms. Van Doren stated that on an annual basis they are increasing the service hours for Paratransit and looking at providing other options to improve the efficiency of their scheduling and the options that ADA eligible clients have. They are striving toward eliminating the trip denials due to capacity experienced for the non-mandated service areas, so it will be addressed.

The item was opened to public input.

Craig Yates, representing, Transportation Advisory Groups, pointed out several deficiencies in this report. Also, in regard to bus surveys, they were extremely selective. He noted that they have a narrow window of transportation to Marin General Hospital, and if someone is very dependent on public transportation, cannot afford a taxicab, and the use of an ambulance is not warranted, they would be impacted. He further noted that he would submit written documentation on his concerns.

Commissioner Swanson left the TAM meeting at 10:39 p.m.

Don Wilhelm, Novato resident, made reference to \$5 million amount that appears to be the same \$5 million considered for the Public Work Departments for repairing roadways, so some clarification is needed in regard to those funds. He worked on a concept for the South Novato Hub and he would present the objectives, which were to provide transfers between all routes that travel through Ignacio, and to prevent transfers occurring that would impact travel times of Routes 70, 71 and 80 extended, which are most critical due to high ridership. Also, to allow transfers to occur without having riders to use crosswalks at busy intersections, and to avoid costly capital infrastructure projects. He then submitted his proposal to staff.

Rocky Birdsey, representative of MCIL, discussed the service plan proposed and that there is a provision on page 4-9 that talked about grandfathering for a period of three years. If the fixed route is cut it would become a non-mandated area, and the provision is that the person who has existing service would continue to have service, so a three year transitional period is being suggested. He believed financial consideration must be given when grandfathering. Also, the majority of users are 65 and over. He believed a grandfathering provision should be extended. He then commented that page 4-8 discusses partnering with community based agencies, and that King's County gives \$5,000 for the maintenance of their vehicles, and this plan suggests that \$25,000 be given. The cost for King's County is \$5.87 per trip, and the cost in this plan is \$25.00, so discrepancies must be further studied to look at the ranges. He further agreed to submit additional comments.

Eric Anderson, representing, MCBC, read the plan and the word "bicycle" was not included, Bicycles and transit work hand-in-hand to enable bicycling as a regional mode of transportation along with transit and the word "bicycle" should be included in every section of this report, such as bicycle racks on the front of transit vehicles and marketing to cyclists to increase ridership. Also, the Capital Plan outlines bus shelters and trash receptacles, but bike racks are not included. He further noted that the Coalition would submit written comments.

The public input was closed.

Vice Chair Boro wished staff luck with their next four hearings.

13. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items - None

14. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda - None

By Order of Vice Chair Boro, the TAM meeting adjourned at 10:47pm.