

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
TAM

THURSDAY, APRIL 27th, 2006
7:30 PM

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

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Al Boro, Vice Chair, City of San Rafael
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Paul Albritton, Alternate, Sausalito City Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo City Council
Larry Chu, Alternate, City of Larkspur
Carole Dillon-Knutson, Novato City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council

Members Absent: Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Jeanne Barr, Ross Town Council
Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax City Council

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

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

1. TAM Annual Selection of Chair and Vice Chair, Review of Committee Appointments, and Review of Ex-Officio Members

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM elect a Chair and Vice Chair; review current TAM member committees and appointments and make any changes, if desired; provide direction to staff to prepare an agenda item for the May TAM Board meeting to consider a resolution to establish Ex Officio members to the Authority, if desired; and review the vacancies on the TAC and the OC.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Frederick moved and Commissioner Gill seconded, to nominate Steve Kinsey to continue as Chair of TAM. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.



Commissioner Frederick offered her gratitude to Chair Kinsey for all his leadership.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Breen moved and Commissioner Gill seconded, to nominate Al Boro to continue as Vice Chair of TAM. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Executive Director Steinhauser recommended postponing the swearing in of Commissioners in order to develop more material. Commissioner Adams suggested that the clerk of the TAM privately do the swearing in of Commissioners and submit to staff. Executive Director Steinhauser agreed to conduct the swearing in privately. She then announced that there are some existing Committee vacancies in the Citizens Oversight Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee. In terms of the Executive Committee, TAM could review and make any changes if desired to the membership of the Committees.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Adams moved and Vice Chair Boro seconded, to approve the existing Executive Committee in their current form. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Commissioner Chu pointed out that Jim Leland in the northern area is now an elected official, so he must be replaced.

2. Chair Reports

Chair Kinsey announced that he was pleased to be part of MTC's action that provides a total of \$1.85 million out of the \$2 million that the Golden Gate Bridge District will need to support a suicide barrier study on the Golden Gate Bridge. San Francisco contributed to the study along with Marin County. Also, MTC's Connectivity Plan looks at transit connections throughout the region and was required as part of RM2, which was the toll bridge increase that required MTC to look at the issues of connectivity amongst the 20 plus transit providers. The report is an excellent presentation of what needs to be done in terms of signage and real time transit information and a number of other ways in which to make the experience for the use of the transit system as convenient and safe as possible. He added that it is important to note that there will be 21 facilities considered as part of the major hub system, and that the San Rafael transit center is the one hub identified in Marin County. Between now and July, they are figuring out how to finance the recommendations.

Chair Kinsey noted that last month there were concerns raised about the County's Nonmotorized Demonstration project, which is a bicycle pedestrian program that was created under the SAFETEA-LU federal program. The County of Marin has adopted a specific process for agendaing or selecting projects to be implemented. In discussing the matter with a number of Commissioners, he decided that it is in TAM's interest to support the County's Nonmotorized Program by creating an Adhoc Committee that will be able to follow the progress of the Nonmotorized Program selection efforts at the County, and to place special attention on the part of TAM to the leveraging opportunities available using funds. The Committee will be able to report back to full TAM body following the Director of Public Works recommendations, and prior to the action of the Board of Supervisors. This Committee's life will extend through the end of this year. He asks those Commissioners interested to contact the Executive Director.

Also, he is still looking for the opportunity to having a meeting with Sonoma County Transportation Authority.

Commissioner McGlashan asked Chair Kinsey if volunteers are needed in regard to the Sonoma meeting because he is interested in participating. Chair Kinsey agreed to take that under consideration. He indicated that at the present time the Chair of the PAG, which is Commissioner Murray, himself, and Executive Director Steinhauser are participating.

Commissioner Breen acknowledged the Chair's willingness to discuss this Nonmotorized Program matter and believed the resolution is in the best interest to all parties and this would meet his concerns.

3. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda - None

4. Executive Director's Report

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

- Regional
 - o Regional Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Call for Projects
 - o BAAQMD Call for Projects
 - o Golden Gate National Recreation Area General Management Plan Open House
 - o MTC Study of Parking Policies to Support SMART Growth
- Local
 - o Canal Neighborhood Community Based Transportation Plan
 - o MCTD Service Pan Meetings
 - San Rafael – May 3rd, 7:00pm
 - Ross Valley – Thursday, May 4th, 7:00pm
 - MCTD – Tuesday, May 9th, 9:00am
 - MCTD – Tuesday, May 16th, 9:00am
- Cal Park Tunnel Project Public Meeting
- TAM Citizen's Oversight Committee
- 101 Central San Rafael Segment Groundbreaking
- Federal/State
 - o Strategic Highway Safety Plan
 - o Safe Routes 05-06 Funds
 - o Safe Routes 06-07 Funds
- Infrastructure Bond Proposal
- Regional
 - o SMART Blue Ribbon Panel
 - o MTC Strategic Plan Adoption
- Local
 - o MCTD SRTP adoption

Commissioner Albritton asked staff if the doubling of the gas price in the last year and the anticipated increase to \$4.00 a gallon at the end of this year has been taken into account in determining that the trust fund tax would not increase. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that it is a fixed tax per gallon and it is not a percentage sales tax. Chair Kinsey added that it is not indexed and it has not been increased since 1992, so it is the same amount.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff about the timing for the Marin City Community Based Transportation Planning. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that they are starting to coordinate in the community regarding how to develop a Stakeholder Committee, which will consider an appropriate scope that will be taken to MTC. They are beginning discussions on how to form that initial group and then kick off the process of forming a scope for that study. The study itself will involve a lot of additional outreach and trying to bring a consensus program of priorities which is the general goal. Commissioner McGlashan requested that Leslie Alden be involved. Executive Director Steinhauser responded in the affirmative.

5. Commissioner Report
a. Executive Committee

Chair Kinsey reported that Executive Committee minutes are provided in the packet and he had nothing further to add.

b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Groups

No report. Commissioner Murray not in attendance.

c. SMART

Vice Chair Boro reported that a Peer Review Committee was put in place to evaluate the Expenditure Plan for SMART and will continue over the next several weeks. The intent is to bring it back to the SMART Board for review in May and adoption in June.

Also, a question was raised about the status of the ballot measure for SMART and it has been put on the ballot, but staff recommended and the Board agreed that until the Expenditure Plan and certification is completed that they will not formerly move forward with the next step.

He added that there is a large site in downtown Santa Rosa called "*Railroad Square*," which SMART owns and that there are three finalists for a development proposal. This is being done jointly between the City of Santa Rosa and SMART. There are three very creative proposals one from a company called "*John Stewart*," another from "*Creative Housing*," and the last called "*Sayan Donimus*." They range in housing from 176 units under one plan; 250 units on the second plan; and 236 units on the third plan. The first two plans are all "*for sale*" condominiums. The third is a mixed of "*for sale*" and "*apartments*" and there will be a 15% affordable factor. There will be a market hall including a food and wine center along with retail space, including restaurants and other activities, such as a culinary academy, childcare and community space. There will be a substantial amount of open space in this plaza downtown from 25,700 square feet under the plan that has the most units to 76,500 square feet in the plan that has the least number of units. Two of the three projects will have the bulk of their parking underground.

Also, he represents the Golden Gate Bridge on Water Transit Authority and they released an order for two new high speed ferry boats to the Nicholas Construction Company in Seattle. Those boats will be developed within a year, and service will start out of South San Francisco at Oyster Point to the ferry building.

d. Countywide Planning Ad Hoc Committee

Commissioner McGlashan stated that the Committee is in the process of getting input and feedback from interested stakeholders in the cities, County and different JPA members. He indicated that Alex Hinds met with the City Manager's group to inform them about what was going on and he gave a report last night at the Mayor's/City Council dinner. Many are voicing concerns about the scope of committee, the power it may have and the staff time. The plan is to make a presentation to the Executive Committee on May 10th and then discuss the idea at TAM's May 25th meeting. Currently, they are collecting input from outside community members and he will be reworking the draft recommendation over the next couple of weeks, in order to turn it into the Executive Committee at the end of next week.

5. Consent Calendar

- a. Approval of TAM Minutes of March 30, 2006. Recommendation: Approve.
- b. Legislative Assistance RFQ. Recommendations: Authorize staff to proceed on the hiring of a governmental relations/legislative assistance firm to represent TAM in Sacramento, with the final contract returned to the TAM Board for approval.
- c. Regional Measure 2 Project Allocation request for the Cal Park Hill Tunnel Rehabilitation and Pathway Improvements. Recommendation: Approve the Initial Project Report Update; and Approve Resolution No. 2006-06.
- d. TAM Communications Plan. Recommendation: Adopt the attached Communications Plan.
- e. Accept FY 2004/05 Audit. Recommendation: Accept Audit.
- f. Award of Projects for Transportation Funds for Clean Air Program. Recommendation: Approve both projects; and adopt Resolution No. 2006-5, authorizing submittal of proposals for AB-434 Funds.
- g. 2006/07 Work Program. Recommendation: Staff presents for informational purposes the Draft 2006-07 Workplan, with recognition that the plan will receive minor adjustments authorized by the Executive Director during the course of the year. The Workplan will guide the FY 2006-07 budget process, and will be approved by the TAM Board along with the FY 2006-07 Budget in May 2006.
- h. Donations Policy. Recommendation: Adopt donations policy.

Chair Kinsey shared Commissioner Tremaine's consideration that he desired the annual audit be placed on the policy agenda for discussion in the future.

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

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Adams moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded, to adopt the Consent Calendar as amended. Motion carried unanimously by TAM, except for Item 5.a. with Commissioner Chu abstaining because he was not present at the last meeting.

7. HIP application summary

Diane Steinhauser, Executive Director, reported that in accordance with the policies and procedures adopted for the HIP Program they received an eligible candidate. She then introduced Senior Planner Carry Lando to discuss the HIP application.

Carry Lando, Senior Planner, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM accept the HIP Program Entitlement Timing Policy Exception for the Corte Madera San Clemente Family Housing Project; find that the Corte Madera San Clemente Family Housing Project meets the Local HIP eligibility

criteria; and direct staff to reserve \$371,826 for Corte Madera's Bayside Trail Park Improvement project with \$71,826 in FY 06/07 and \$300,000 in FY 07/08, to be included in TAM's Strategic Plan.

Commissioner McGlashan noted that the County is working on a rebuild of the Tennessee Valley pathway with a spur that goes up to the Fireside affordable housing project. He asked staff if that would be fundable under this HIP Program. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that staff decided, in concert with MTC, that the guidelines needed to establish a cut off date. That date is when they established this as a local program in February 2004. They must review the planning entitlement date on the Fireside project. Staff will be glad to investigate its eligibility.

Commissioner Adams asked staff if a Marinwood project could be coming down the track in the future because they are doing a community based planning project with mixed-use housing and retail. Senior Planner Lando responded that she is working with Community Development Agency staff in helping them prepare their application, and to guide them on the kinds of components that would make a qualified project. Also, Novato may be coming forward with an application shortly, and there is another application from the Community Development Agency for a project in Kentfield. She then noted that San Rafael is also putting together some possible housing development related projects that would qualify for funding. They are quite pleased with the responses that they have received from the jurisdictions.

Chair Kinsey acknowledged Corte Madera and congratulated Commissioner Gill's Council for being rewarded and creating mixed-use communities that fit in with the existing neighborhood fabrics. Commissioner Gill is very proud of this project and the ground breaking will be held on May 19th at 4:00pm at the site. She invited all to attend. She then thanked the Executive Director for working with Corte Madera staff to get the application together.

Senior Planner Lando mentioned that staff is recommending that partial funding be made available in Fiscal Year 06/07 to allow for design, engineering and environmental to move forward on the Bayside project and the remainder in the Fiscal Year 07/08.

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

TAM thanked Senior Planner Lando for the report and concurred with the staff recommendation

8. TAM Annual Report

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the annual report and recommended that TAM provide feedback and concurrence on the Draft TAM 2005 Annual Report and the plans for reproduction and distribution.

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

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Dillon-Knutson moved and Commissioner Gill seconded, to adopt the Annual Report presented by staff. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

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

Connie Preston, representing Nolte Associates, summarized the staff report on the Highway 101 Gap Closure projects, including Puerto Suello Hill soundwall and bike path for TAM's consideration. She indicated that the soundwall and undercrossing aesthetics were reviewed by the City of San Rafael's Design Review Board. She provided a graphic showing the preferred alternative. Also, the SMART Board approved the Linden Lane access for the bike path with conditions. The next step with SMART is to work on an agreement and they hope to bring back to TAM at the next meeting in May. She further stated that they are on schedule to submit the final plans for bike path and soundwall in June to Caltrans.

Commissioner Adams asked staff to clarify what the City of San Rafael's Design Review Board approved. Consultant Preston responded that what is shown on the graphic is what was approved.

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

Chair Kinsey thanked Consultant Preston and the entire team for a tremendous amount of work.

10. Measure A Strategic Plan

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM provide feedback on the Draft Strategic Plan and authorize staff to release the draft for a 45-day public comment period.

Trudy Presser, representing Nolte Associates, presented the Draft Strategic Plan to TAM for their consideration that included the following:

- Allocation Chart
- Strategic Plan Guiding Principals
- Policy Elements
 - Policies Adopted as part of this plan
 - Separation of Strategies & Sub-Strategies Policy
 - Reserve Policy
 - Fund Swap Policy
 - Strategic Plan Amendment Policy
 - Policies to be adopted at a later date
 - Debt Policy
 - Investment Policy
- Revenues & Expenditures

Commissioner Adams discussed page 11 in regard to the Overview of Strategies No. 1 and noted that accessible taxis is not included as a possible project. Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director, responded that special needs is a very broad category, so taxis could be included.

Commissioner Adams pointed out that several projects for major roads under Appendix 1.a are repeated, which must be corrected. Consultant Presser agreed.

Commissioner McGlashan discussed the Debt Policy and asked staff if they are headed toward a policy decision such that a strategy that issues debt pays for the debt service or would the debt service get spread across all strategies. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that staff is not ready to bring that forward as a policy at this time because there are no projects that demand it, except for Highway 101. When the Expenditure Plan was developed, a small amount of debt service reserve was provided that is available for up to \$5 million in capital project debt, other than

Highway 101. The debt reserve is based on the amount of \$30 million, \$25 million of that was necessary for Highway 101; so the remaining \$5 million most likely will need to be contained within a strategy or sub-strategy. They are not prepared to incorporate that at this point because there are no candidates proposed.

Commissioner Swanson stated that cash flows show \$37 million in debt service being paid off the top, which means that the other strategies other than the Gap Closure project are subsidizing the Gap Closure project. Are those other strategies, in effect loaning money to the Gap Closure project over the debt service? Executive Director Steinhauser responded that there would be an off the top amount associated with bond strategies. In terms of borrowing from the other strategies that is not how staff is treating it and that is not the intent of that reserve. The counter argument is more likely true, which is if they do not spend that \$37 million on some kind of debt service; it would be redistributed to the strategies according to percentage share.

Commissioner Swanson indicated that the project itself is \$37 million plus the net of the proceed, which is another \$6 million, so about a \$43 million project. He asked staff for the increment that is basically supported by the other strategies, are those ever reimbursed because debt service is paid proportional by all the strategies. Executive Director Steinhauser indicated that there is not an accrual of sales tax on top of the debt service to Highway 101, so the assumption that this \$37 million plus the percentage share of the revenue is not correct. She added that this debt service amount is the only amount available for Highway 101.

Commissioner Swanson noted that the cash flow shows that there are sales tax proceeds going into the project in addition to bond proceeds. Executive Director Steinhauser responded in the affirmative. She explained that they took what was assumed to be debt service from Year 1 and assigned it as direct revenue to the project.

Chair Kinsey stated that the fundamental principle at work is that they anticipated they will need to finance up to \$30 million in capital projects and that they wanted to reflect the cost of that, so they took that money off and they did not assign it by strategy, they assigned it to the sales tax program as a whole.

Commissioner Adams excused herself from the TAM meeting at 8:55pm

Commissioner Swanson stated that sales tax proceeds off the top are for administration, staffing and debt service. The authority never sees debt service and that money over a 20-year period amounts to \$37 million in addition to sales tax proceeds going into the project. So it is not longer a \$24 million project, it is a \$43 million project and wondered once that project is paid for do they recalibrate or reimburse those other four strategies that fronted the money for the Gap Closure project. Consultant Whelan explained that by the numbers shown in the Expenditure Plan that there was an off the top amount for debt service, and the plan footnote said that there was a \$30 million bond assumed to be issued in Year 1. For purposes of modeling, they assumed that a \$30 million is issued and in doing that they laid that out across the top. They knew there was not a bond issued, but that is what it would be for, so they set that amount aside.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff once the Gap Closure cost is known will they plug the construction cost requirements in and configure the debt service to match that. Executive Director Steinhauser agreed to do that, but looking at what they experienced in the last four months they did not know until today if they would receive the \$11 million in STIP funds for next year. There is an

entire series of steps they must get through all the way to the completion of construction and settlement of claims until they know the true cost of Highway 101.

Commissioner Swanson asked staff if they would know what the finance requirements would be. Executive Director Steinhauser recommended at this point to keep the entire \$30 million available for its original intent until there is more information.

Chair Kinsey added that the point Commissioner Swanson made is that if all that is needed for the Gap Closure is budgeted, then he wanted to see those unneeded financing cost, reallocated to the other strategies, but staff is not in a position to know at this time. At some future date when those costs are certain for Strategy 2, they will have an opportunity to revisit what to do with any excess funds. Executive Director Steinhauser noted that the intent of the Expenditure Plan and the direction provided was that excess percentage share funds go back to Strategy 1 - Transit.

Commissioner McGlashan wanted to make sure that the other strategies are not paying extra and asked staff to respond. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that the funding amount in the Expenditure Plan for strategies is being met or exceeded by this Strategic Plan. A \$30 million bond capacity was included.

Nancy Whelan, Nancy Whelan Consulting, discussed the following for TAM's consideration:

- III. Revenue & Expenditures
- Attachment 1 – Sales Tax Revenue and Assignment to Strategies
- Attachment 2 – Sales Tax Programming Summary
- Attachment 3- – Strategy 1: Local Bus Transit System revenues & Expenditures
- Attachment 3-2 – Strategy 2: Highway 101 Gap Closure Revenues & Expenditures
- Attachment 3-3 – Sub-Strategy 3.1: Major Roads Revenues and Expenditures
- Attachment 3-3 – Sub-Strategy 3.2: Local Infrastructure Revenues and expenditures
- Attachment 3-4 – Sub Strategy 4.1: Safe Routes to Schools Revenues & Expenditures
- Attachment 3-4 – Sub Strategy 4.2: Crossing Guards Revenues & Expenditures
- Attachment 3-4 – Strategy 4: School Related Congestion and Safe Access to School Revenues & Expenditures

Executive Director Steinhauser noted that under the major road priority segments they are programming the support funds for the five planning areas and top projects in each planning area. A rough estimate indicated that the capital funds necessary for those projects will fully use roughly all the funds available over the 20 year life of the Sales Tax Measure, so there are a number of other segments and routes that will be hard pressed to actually see any Measure funds. Also, they programmed the support funds, and they will have a lump sum of money available that is accumulated revenue for capital. This comes back to the bond question and the fact they do have a bit of capacity within their assumed bond strategy to advance some of this, but they are postponing that decision until these projects get further developed. They will not be able to fund all those projects at the same time, so they will have some tough decision with respect to how they capitalize the projects over the next three or four years.

Consultant Presser then discussed the following Implementation Guidelines:

- Eligibility Consistent with Expenditure Plan
- Application Process
- How funds will be Allocated and Disbursed
- Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

The item was opened to public input.

Karen Nygren, Marin resident, stated that looking out to the future revenues and expenditures are flat every single year, which did not take into account inflation. With flat revenue as projected they must decrease service in transit, because they will have less money to achieve what they must do. If that is the case, at some point TAM must consider how to continue funding what is promised to the voters without having declining service. Otherwise the transit system and Safe Routes to School will be decreased. She further believed they must target other groups to distribute these plans.

Deb Hubsmith, MCBC, thanked staff for the very thorough presentation and materials. She added that the foundation for the Strategic Plan is the Expenditure Plan that was about six years in the making. Right after the 1998 sales tax did not pass they began working on this plan. Also, some items associated with Strategy 3 are going to be the subject of her comments tonight. She appreciated that in the writing of this plan, the terms used are major roads, local roads, sidewalks and bikeways. She stated that as they are beginning to construct the bicycle and pedestrian network in Marin County, that there is a need to be able to have some entity that will maintain those pathways and accept the liability for those pathways. In the process of building major pathways like the north/south greenway, they are seeing a lot of local jurisdictions holding up their hands, and they do not have an agency that will step forward and take responsibility for the maintenance, ownership and liability for some of those facilities. These are very important for providing access to transit, schools and emergency services. They worked diligently to insure that pathway maintenance is an eligible expenditure under Strategy 3. This is still an outstanding issue that has not yet been addressed, but they have been in discussion with staff about that. With gas prices at all time highs and this being a 20 year plan, the need for a north/south greenway and strategy in general for bicycle and pedestrian maintenance must be solved through this Strategic Plan. If they do not they will have missed a huge opportunity. She did not know the strategy to do that, but there are entities used such as a joint powers authority to be able to make it so the liability is spread out over a variety of jurisdictions and maintenance is taken off the top as well as much more cost effective. They look forward to working with staff and the Commission on this issue because this will benefit all jurisdictions and all for the long run.

Craig Yates, representing, MCCOD, discussed the Gap Closure project and asked the Chair if Caltrans did or did not put a cost on that project. If MTC gave an expenditure of funds, why is there not an idea of the Gap Closure projects expense. Also, in regard to crossing guards, he asked the Chair if that is inclusive of children being involved, as developing their skills of quality leadership. Chair Kinsey responded that it is anticipated to be a program that would be bid on by a contracting firm and there are a number of opportunities associated with the leadership ideas that could be developed through the Safe Routes program, but not through the crossing guard program itself specifically. Executive Director Steinhauser stated that they are dealing with two projects that at the time discussions began that had not gone to construction: 1) Central San Rafael project; and 2) Puerto Suello Hill project. At the time staff came to TAM in October with recommended State funding they had a cost estimate, but since that time the increased bid prices on certain elements caused the Central San Rafael project to go up by \$12 million, so they had to react to the latest information at bid opening. In regard to Puerto Suello Hill, that had a \$4 million cost increase. Since that time the project has gone up \$7 million on the highway side. They convinced the State to program those funds in an action that CTC took today. The volatility in the construction materials market is still there, especially as related to asphalt and the price of oil. However, when we advertise this last phase they might have a different number based on the cost of asphalt, in particular, as well as the bike path, soundwall and landscaping. They will try to seek funds from others, but sales tax must pick up the balance. They have 4 to 5 years of construction and a lot can happen on the job site, so they must look to all the different fund sources.

Margaret Zegart, Marin resident, was very impressed with the presentation and appreciated money set aside for Miller Avenue, but Miller Avenue connects to a portion in the County, which is Almonte Boulevard and hoped that the continuation from Miller Avenue includes the high school up to Almonte Boulevard. She then discussed liability and that Southern Marin has trails, and the County since 1906 has refused to accept liability for these trails. She further hoped the cities assume liability for their substandard streets because there needs to be flexibility of standards.

The public input was closed.

Vice Chair Boro asked the consultant to discuss the flat revenues and expenditures. Consultant Whelan responded that when they see actual revenues they would have a better basis for making a projection that would include some growth and inflation. The intent was to establish a good base year, but they do not necessarily grow the cost beyond what is available. Regarding transit and the SRTP in detail, Spreadsheet 3.1 shows a reserve. They are trying to account for inflationary effects, so they are trying to accommodate that through this reserve process. They can get through the first 6 years without any sort of detriment that will allow the transit system to grow while the sales tax remains the same.

Vice Chair Boro asked staff if once the sales tax passed, and they became a self-help County, won't receive more money. They have already received some money that was not anticipated. He believed there should be another sheet that does the following:

- Start to reflect what TAM is receiving over and above what is anticipated that; and
- Provide a goal each year of some level of matching funds they hope to achieve

Vice Mayor Boro believed they must be realistic and some how reflect that in their financial projections. Executive Director Steinhauser responded that for capital projects they portrayed, they cannot exceed the revenue available. For service programs they have exercised caution in leaving a small amount of funds, either with the Safe Routes to School contract or crossing guard contract, in order to have some room to grow a bit in that program and not hit the ceiling on revenue in Year 1. That is two of the assumptions regarding fixed review that are built in. Also, when she spoke to the CTC on February 2nd and asked them to approve the \$12 million for the Gap Closure project. What sold them on that argument was the fact that they are a Self-Help County, so this is not only pure matching, but this is also the political capital that comes with being a Self-Help County, and the acknowledgment that they are helping themselves.

Chair Kinsey suggested that they record that document leveraging and carry it forward in their reports. Executive Director Steinhauser agreed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Boro moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded, to accept this document for release for a 45-day public comment period and at their June meeting they will discuss this matter; and conduct a public hearing at the May TAM meeting.

Commissioner Albritton discussed the local incentive service that is included in Strategy 1 and asked the consultant if revenues from other agencies for local incentive service are included in the plan on the spreadsheets. Consultant Whelan indicated that this document only addresses Measure A, so they do not have any leveraged funds being discussed, so that would be another item.

Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

11. First Amendment to the Agreement for Management and Administrative Services with Local Government Services Authority

Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM adopt an agreement for management and administrative services with Local Government Services authority.

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

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Swanson moved and Commissioner Breen seconded, to adopt the Agreement for Management and Administrative Services with Local Government Services Authority. Motion carried unanimously by TAM.

12. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items - None

13. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda

Deb Hubsmith, representing, MCBC, reminded everyone that May is “*National Bike Month.*” May 18th will be bike to work day in Marin County and there will be 15 energizer stations set up on the bike commute routes on the way to work and encouraged those to bike to work on May 18th. She then provided the registration information at MTC’s website: www.511.org. Also, there is a “*Team Bike Challenge*” starting on May 1st going on all month. She acknowledged Mayor Larry Chu from the City of Larkspur for being on a team. Assistant Director Tackabery put a team together for County Public Works that is competing with the Community Development Agency. She further noted that they have an exciting North/South Greenway Bicycle Tour occurring on Saturday, May 20th at Albert Park in San Rafael at noon.

By Order of Chair Kinsey, the TAM meeting adjourned at 9:45pm.