

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 16, 2008
3:30 p.m.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM
3RD FLOOR
SAN RAFAEL CITY OFFICES
1400 FIFTH AVENUE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Steve Kinsey, Chair
Al Boro, City of San Rafael
Joan Lundstrom, City of Larkspur
Alice Fredericks, Town of Tiburon
Peter Breen, Town of San Anselmo
Carole Dillon-Knutson, City of Novato
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commissioner Members Absent:

None

Staff Members Present:

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director
Bill Gamlen, Project Delivery Manager
Bill Whitney, Project Delivery Manager
David Chan, Programming Manager
Eric Schatmeier, Planning Manager
Li Zhang, Finance Manager
Carey Lando, Sr. Transportation Planner
Denise Merleno, Recording Secretary

Chair Kinsey called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Chair's Report

Chair Kinsey provided his Chair's Report and noted that 2008 will be a challenging year with regard to the state budget as it affects transportation. He went on to report that Marin Transit met last month and they approved an extension of the contract with the Golden Gate Bridge District (GGBD) to be Marin's service provider for local transit. As part of this extension, the hourly rate for service with GGBD was reduced which allows for a \$1.6 million revenue/year for increased local transit in return for having a long-term contract with GGBD. This means that MT will have a stable relationship with the primary transit provider for approximately the next 10 year period of time. This allows the MT board to reframe the executive director/general manager position for that agency. Chair Kinsey said that he has requested ED Steinhauser to speak to this Committee, at a later date, as to how TAM may want to engage with Marin Transit during their recruitment process. Chair Kinsey went on to report that the Doyle Drive project and its funding shortfalls have been a topic of interest for some time and that recently, under Mayor Boro's motion and Commissioner Brown's seconding of the motion, attempted to get the GGBD on record in opposition to the congestion pricing toll proposal that was being put forward by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority with some strong support from MTC. The motion did not pass and, at the present time, the issue has been carried over. Chair Kinsey mentioned that the

federal urban partnership funds from the federal government that need to be captured by the end of March. There is a likelihood that legislation will be required in order to achieve what the federal government would need in order to give the \$158 million to the Bay Area. The legislation would adopt a toll strategy for Doyle. Given that TAM needs to weigh in on legislation affecting it, Chair Kinsey feels that it may be appropriate for TAM to take a position and express concerns if the board has them. He asked for comments from this committee on whether or not they would like to have this matter agendized for the full TAM board meeting on January 24. He acknowledged the nods from the committee and said that he would proceed with agendizing this item. He noted that he, in conjunction with Supervisor Hal Brown, drafted a resolution of opposition for the Board of Supervisors to review at their January 29 meeting. Chair Kinsey said that a similar resolution might be appropriate for the TAM Board to act on.

Commissioner Dillon-Knutson asked if it would be prudent for city councils to take a position on this matter and Chair Kinsey responded that it would not be detrimental to do that. He added, however, that the composition of the TAM Board should be able to provide plenty of direction to the legislature as to how the cities/towns feel about this issue.

Commissioner Boro said that he went to the legislative committee meeting at the MCCMC and that they could not act on it at that meeting due to the process they need to go through. However the cities did ask for information on this. He added that, in speaking with representatives in Sonoma County, he understands that each city is willing to take a position. He suggested that it would be impressive if each council wrote a letter to our officials in Sacramento.

Chair Kinsey commented that it is important to be clear about why we are opposed rather than simply state that we are opposed to it.

In response to a question from Commission Breen as to whether it will be agendized as an action or discussion item, Chair Kinsey said that it would be agendized for action.

Chair Kinsey finalized his report by acknowledging that ED Steinhauser's review will take place in February. He said that it will probably take place in advance of a regularly scheduled TAM Board meeting and that he will encourage all TAM Commissioners to participate.

Chair Kinsey acknowledged a member of the public, Karen Nygren, who suggested that the resolution on Doyle Drive make mention that there will be a decrease in traffic with increased tolls which will have an impact the bus and ferry system in the way of reduced revenue.

Chair Kinsey thanked Ms. Nygren for her comment.

2. Commissioner Comments

None.

3. Executive Director's Report

ED Steinhauser presented the following items in her Executive Director's Report: Revised meeting schedule for this Committee, Hwy 101 Greenbrae/Twin Cities Corridor Improvement Project Open House/Public Workshop, TAM/Marin Transit update, and the State Budget.

Revised Meeting Schedule for Executive Committee

ED Steinhauser reported that TAM staff polled the members of this committee regarding changing the day that TAM's Executive Committee meets due to a scheduling conflict that the Chair has with his role on the Coastal Commission and a conflict the executive director has with the California Transportation Commission meeting calendar. It was agreed upon that this group will meet on Wednesday, February 13 in the Rug Room (Room 324A) in the Civic Center, but beginning in March, the regularly scheduled meetings of the TAM Executive Committee will move to the second Monday of the month and will take place at TAM's new offices located at 750 Lindero Street in San Rafael. These meetings will continue to be held at 2:00 p.m.

Hwy 101 Greenbrae/Twin Cities Corridor Improvement Project Open House/Public Workshop

She reminded everyone that there will be an Open House/Public Workshop for the Highway 101 Greenbrae/Twin Cities Corridor Improvement Project on Saturday, January 26 at Redwood High School in Corte Madera. The workshop will be two sessions, both the same, one starting at 9 AM, ending at 12 Noon, the second one starting at 1PM, ending at 4 PM.

TAM/Marin Transit Update

Reiterating comments made by the Chair during his report, ED Steinhauser stated that she intends to present to this committee, at a later date, some ideas about TAM's roles with regard to MT. TAM supplies MT with approximately 50% of their budget and TAM's defined role in the Expenditure Plan is to approve MT's Short-Range Transit Plan which they will be updating this year. Additionally, discussions will center around MT's reporting on a consistent basis as well as other oversight and cooperative efforts that TAM may want to engage in with MT.

State Budget

ED Steinhauser discussed two handouts that were provided at the beginning of the meeting – one from TAM's legislative advocacy group, Shaw Yoder, and the other from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) that discuss the transportation impacts of the state budget. She introduced David Chan, TAM's Programming Manager who provided an overview of the content of these documents.

Mr. Chan noted that the net effect of the state budget deficit may not create as large an impact on transportation in Marin County as originally feared. The Governor proposes to fully fund Proposition 42, not suspend it this year, and to make any repayment from previous years. Mr. Chan noted that there will be less money for the STIP and STA. The CTC is addressing the STIP issue since the funding decrease will amount to over \$600 million this year. They propose an allocation strategy that will prioritize all the STIP projects. He added that TAM is not going to be impacted by the decrease as all STIP funds have been committed, particularly recent funds to the Gap Closure and transit facility development in Novato. He said that there will be a shortfall in the TCRP which will receive significant less funding in FY 2008-09, but since TAM/SCTA have already received the final allocation of TCRP available to the Marin-Sonoma Narrows, earlier this year, it will not be impacted by this funding decrease.

ED Steinhauser added that some cuts will be necessary in the current fiscal year which the Legislature will be tasked with. If the Legislature does not deal with it after a 45-day period then they are forbidden on acting on other legislation until they do deal with it. She finalized her comments by saying that the general feeling in the transportation community is that the cuts made could have been worse.

4. Approval of Minutes from November 14, 2007 Meeting

The minutes from the November 14, 2007 meeting were approved without revision.

Chair Kinsey announced that he was moving Item 9 on the Southern Marin Transit Study to take place immediately after Item 4 – Approval of Minutes from November 14, 2007 meeting.. Further, he announced he would move Item 6 – SMART Working Group to take place immediately following Item 9 on the Southern Marin Transit Study.

5. Hwy 101 Gap Closure

Continued.

6. SMART Working Group (Discussion)

Chair Kinsey reminded this group that the predecessor to TAM, the county's Congestion Management Agency, adopted a transportation multimodal vision which included a rail program. However, he believes that, when SMART was on the 2006 ballot, TAM missed an opportunity to take a position and express an opinion on this major transportation program and that it is important to do so at this time. He added that, at the same time, he believes that it is not TAM's job to conduct a shadow feasibility study of a commuter rail program. Given that, he thinks that the focus of this working group is not to develop a recommendation as to what TAM's position should be, but rather, to become informed about what information is available, to assist TAM staff, and to inform SMART as to the information it believes TAM would like to see in a presentation. Then, in advance of the ballot measure of 2008, TAM would invite SMART to make a presentation, in a public meeting setting such as a TAM board meeting, and then TAM would take a position in that regard. The Chair passed out a draft of the charter for this working group which describes the purpose and approach that was developed by the executive director after receiving input by the Chair. This would be an ad-hoc group comprised of six TAM commissioners and would not be required to operate under the Brown Act. He envisions that this group would have an opportunity to provide a committee report at the TAM meetings. He acknowledged having received a letter dated January 11, 2008 from the Marin Conservation League requesting that the meetings be open to the public. The Chair asked the executive director for her comments after which he requested the committee to provide feedback on this idea.

ED Steinhauser stated that this group would screen information which would then be provided to the TAM Board.

In response to Commissioner Boro's request for clarification on the Chair's comments, Chair Kinsey said that the working group will not make a recommendation on taking a position. Rather, the TAM Board of Commissioners will have the ability to take an action after SMART makes a presentation to the entire TAM Commission. This would take place and would include a public hearing in which the public will also be allowed to comment.

Commission Boro said that he believes that this group could be construed as a shadow.

Chair Kinsey responded that while three members of the Board of Supervisors have expressed, if not opposition, reservation, and several members of the TAM Commission have expressed outright support for SMART. He added that, just as TAM as well as the cities/towns want to weigh in on the Doyle Drive

issue, it would be inappropriate for TAM to remain silent on SMART, a major transportation element in Marin, unless it makes the conscious decision to do so.

Commissioner Breen said that he is not comfortable with TAM sponsoring a debate and that it seems that we're not working towards the same end which is a multi-modal transportation system for the North Bay. He thinks that TAM's role is to see what SMART is producing and how that product does or does not integrate into the whole transportation system in Marin County. He concluded by saying that he is not sure whether it is within TAM's authority to have a hearing from which it will take a pro/anti position.

Commissioner Lundstrom commented that the central question which needs to be answered is the role of TAM today, even though the CMA, TAM's predecessor, did take a position to support rail years ago.

Chair Kinsey stated that, in his view, TAM is the transportation planning and financing agency for this county, and there is a proposal being made by SMART that would require millions of dollars and would be connected to other transportation systems that TAM invests in. He said that this is a political question that the community will, ultimately, have to answer. Given the work that TAM is engaged in, it is legitimate for TAM to take a point of view as to whether it sees this rail plan as a useful and appropriate complimentary program. He reiterated that TAM may decide that it does not want to take a position; but it needs to consider it in a public way.

Commissioner Fredericks commented that what is being proposed is to have a planning working group and what will be dealt with are questions that TAM has the right to ask. Among these are what is the role of SMART in TAM's multimodal vision, what the role of SMART is and its facilities and programs, and what is the role of the SMART project in TAM's budgeting.

In response to Commissioner Breen's comment that there is a subtle distinction between taking a technical vs. political point of view, Chair Kinsey reiterated that his goal for this group is for them to give the TAM Commission the ability to understand the issues and not for this working group to develop a point of view.

Commissioner McGlashan suggested issuing the charter for this committee with the caveat that the group will address questions raised by Commissioner Fredericks and not make a recommendation whether or not to endorse. He added that the next step would be to bring the separate question to this committee and to the Board as to whether or not TAM takes a position on SMART.

Chair Kinsey said he could agree with that idea.

Commissioner Dillon-Knutson said that she believes that it is appropriate for TAM to seek information on SMART, whether or not it chooses to take a position, so that it can be incorporated into TAM's planning process.

Commissioner Boro said that he is agreeable to this group looking for answers to planning, funding or technical questions, but he expressed concern that there could be other motivations, ultimately, with how this information might be used. He asked what the end result is that TAM is hoping to accomplish and wonders why the TAM Board cannot get the information directly from SMART?

ED Steinhauser said that the purpose of this working group is to advise staff on the totality of available information and whether or not it is available if and when TAM would choose to take a position. She added that this charter is specific to addressing whether or not information is available and not whether or not the information is valid.

Commissioner McGlashan said that he would agree to the formation of this group provided that the mandate of the committee is clearly spelled out. Additionally, he believes that it is important to separate out the question as to whether or not TAM chooses to take a position on SMART, and to ensure that the committee does not issue opinions.

Commissioner Boro said that he supports TAM receiving information but then it will reach the point where it has to address what it plans to do with that information. It will need to decide if any future hearing will be about the information it has received or on the project.

Chair Kinsey said that, in his letter to Supervisor Susan Adams dated December 14, he wrote, "TAM's position on a SMART ballot measure will result only if and when there is an action taken by the full commission following a public hearing on the matter at a properly noticed meeting." The Chair added that, in response to Commissioner McGlashan's earlier point, if TAM decides not to have a hearing or if SMART decides that it doesn't want to make a presentation, then no further action will be taken. However, the Chair is advocating to have SMART make a presentation to the Board and he believes the working group would be able to facilitate SMART's ability to know what types of questions that TAM would have and how best for SMART to organize their information to be effective in making their presentation.

Commissioner Boro presented a scenario whereby the TAM Board is satisfied with the working group's final product, but in a public hearing setting, issues come up - who would respond to any concerns made at a public hearing in a TAM meeting.

Chair Kinsey responded that the working group will have given to SMART the issues that would be germane to the TAM Board. Then SMART will make its presentation, and if they've paid attention to the interrelationship with the working group, they'll present it in a format that responds to the kinds of questions TAM wants answers to. Each TAM commissioner will need to formulate their own opinion should speakers come to the microphone and make derogatory comments about the proposed rail plan.

Commissioner McGlashan noted that Commissioner Boro raised a good point in that, regardless of how we structure the working group, it will be difficult to control what the group does. However, he believes that it is worth the risk because this group will provide valuable consulting to SMART about how it generates and shares information with the public.

Chair Kinsey opened the item for public comment.

Mike Arnold said that this should be an open process so that both sides can be heard from, numbers can be challenged and different points of view can be heard, but this will be difficult given that this group will take the form of an ad-hoc committee structure. He encourages that these meetings be put on the internet for those unable to attend. He added that it is right to be concerned about the politics because he believes that a good financial analysis of the SMART system will show that it is not fully funded and that the expenditure plan that was prepared by the SMART Board in the last election is filled with holes. He concluded by saying that this is a very controversial issue and that there will be many people who will attend a hearing if TAM does decide to hold one.

David Schonbrunn said that he determined that three functions that have been discussed: verifying completeness of information, second guessing the content, and developing an interface between TAM and SMART. He warned that second guessing the content is something the committee should avoid and that the issuing of verifying the completeness of information is a fairly small and manageable task.

Karen Nygren said that she would hate to see division amongst the Board of Supervisors, Marin county officials and TAM and she urged TAM not to take a position on this matter.

Commissioner Lundstrom suggested that another alternative would be to have this ad-hoc committee make a report to the full Board who could then accept it with no further action.

Don Wilhelm of the Marin Conservation League thanked the Chair for mentioning the letter MCL sent. He said that the letter describes a specific issue relating to the financial analysis and makes some suggestions as to the details that would be required to complete such a financial analysis. It also expresses the frustration that the MCL experienced when they were not able to get that information from SMART in the last election. He believes that the committee could act as a collector of information, not only for TAM but for the voters as well which could then be brought together in a public meeting to make dissemination but no conclusion. The attendees of the meeting would make their own conclusions. He concluded by asking that the meetings be open to the public.

The Chair closed the item to the public.

ED Steinhauser said that she is not able to determine at this time if she will be able to support this working group with her current staff resources and may want to bring temporary assistance on board.

Chair Kinsey thanked everyone for the formative discussion. He added that he will have an additional discussion with ED Steinhauser before bringing final recommendations forward to the TAM Board.

Commissioners McGlashan, Boro, and Dillon-Knutson left the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

7. Bike Path Maintenance Policy Adoption

Continued.

8. RTP – Marin Submittal of Candidate Projects – Process and Timeline (Discussion)

Mr. Schatmeier presented this informational item and reported that MTC released a Call for Projects to generate transportation improvement candidates for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) T-2035 and that March 5, 2008 is the deadline for submissions. Marin County's share of the \$20 billion dollar pot is \$790 million (the staff report erroneously indicated an amount of \$790,000). Staff will assemble a list of projects and will bring a recommended list to the TAM meeting on February 28.

In response to a question from Chair Kinsey regarding the attached fact sheets being examples of ideas that were raised at the June/July 2007 TAM RTP vision outreach process, ED Steinhauser answered in the affirmative. He then said that he would work with the executive director to come up with a format to gather thought on this.

*Commissioner Fredericks left the meeting at 5:45 p.m. and the Committee no longer had a quorum.
Commissioner Lundstrom left the meeting at 5:48 p.m.*

Chair Kinsey opened this item to public comment.

David Schonbrunn said that he does not see a way that the streetcar concept could be a viable idea based on financial parameters. He added that the variety of sources from which a recommended list

will be drawn are limited. He sees that one other possible source of funding could come from paid parking.

In response to a question from Chair Kinsey as to whether he believes that the public would appreciate a public hearing on this topic, Mr. Schonbrunn said he would attend.

In response to suggested word changes from members of the public, ED Steinhauser said that the fact sheets included in the agenda packet were from testimony made last year and will be updated.

9. Southern Marin Transit Study

ED Steinhauser presented this item which recommends that the TAM Executive Committee review and comment on the attached background statement and Scope of Work with the aim of including it in a Request for Consultant Proposals to conduct a Southern Marin Transit Study. Staff recommendation was for committee review and that the Committee recommend to the TAM Board the need for such a study and that \$200,000 in TAM-administered STIP PPM funds be authorized to finance it. Staff recommendation included that staff be authorized to negotiate and sign contribution agreements with study partners Marin Transit and GGT for \$25,000 each to allow a study budget of \$250,000. Marin Transit and Golden Gate Transit be invited as full partners in guiding the study and shaping its resultant products for their, as well as TAM's, usage.

Eric Schatmeier, Planning Manager added that the name of this study is a misnomer because southern Marin is not the only area covered; rather, east/west corridors extending west through the Ross Valley is also included. It is staff's intention to study areas not already covered in GG and MT's planning documents – their Short Range Transit Plan's. Instead, staff intends to study incremental improvements to enhance their performance including trunk line functions to connector service and transfer facilities. He stated that the study budget is \$250,000 and staff has asked GG and MT to contribute \$25,000 each, and staff proposes to use available STIP planning/programming/monitoring funds to pay for \$200,000 of the study budget. If the Board approves, staff would issue an RFP in February or March.

ED Steinhauser asked the committee to comment on the structure of this study which, currently, is being called a TAM study with GG and MT being "full partners". Additionally, staff wants to ensure the end product of this study is viable for taking the next step whether it might be a specific report format for programming of funds or a report that specifies operational parameters that fit into performance evaluations, or future transit plans and service plans.

In response to Chair Kinsey's request for an explanation of the geographic boundaries of the study, Mr. Schatmeier said that the boundaries include the area south and immediately west of the southern terminus of SMART – the Ross Valley and feeders to the bus trunk line south of San Rafael and on into San Francisco to the extent that the trunk line serves San Francisco as well as feeder service to the ferries.

Commissioner Lundstrom requested that the bus service, particularly to the Larkspur Ferry, be highlighted due to the increase in ferry ridership and the lack of parking to accommodate the increase. She added that it would be helpful to analyze from which direction the ferry riders come since she understands that many come from the southern Marin area.

Commissioner Boro asked for confirmation that this study will encompass trips from the Ross Valley area to downtown San Rafael for those intending to catch the bus or train. Mr. Schatmeier responded affirmatively.

Commissioner McGlashan noted that both the Mill Valley and Sausalito City Councils are interested in the concept of trolley service from Mill Valley to the Sausalito ferry and he asked if this study could incorporate the initial feasibility analysis of that idea.

ED Steinhauser responded that, when considering a trolley in terms of looking in any detail at the facilities, including impacts on right of way, and the operation of such a system, her immediate thought is that there is not enough money available for this undertaking. She said that what might be possible is a literature review of systems that are similar and some general parameters on ridership and cost effectiveness.

In response to Commissioner McGlashan's question about the ability to analyze the effect of a parking fee at the Larkspur Ferry as a way to fund local transit and what effect that might have on ridership, Mr. Schatmeier said that the scope asks the consultant to analyze the tradeoffs between off-street parking and transit service.

Commissioner Breen said that given the demographics of Marin County and the aging population, he firmly believes that 90% of Marinites would prefer a streetcar over a bus. Elderly people know the exact path of the trolley and are more comfortable climbing into a trolley over a bus. He believes that the trolley idea should be looked at and mentioned.

Chair Kinsey stated that it is important that all ideas are allowed to be heard but wanted to acknowledge the Executive Director's point that \$250,000 only goes so far. He added that, in his view, this study will focus on two main components: 1) the bus system – the trunk line and the feeders to it; and 2) the capital facilities associated with it. He asked for clarification on one part of the staff report that refers to "local bus service needs as applied to recreational trips".

ED Steinhauser responded that this study was not meant to be a recreational trip evaluation; rather it was intended to address existing local transit and how, if expanded, it might be able to accommodate recreational trips. She agreed to exclude language about recreational trips from the study.

Chair Kinsey opened this item to public comment.

Supervisor Susan Adams said that she was glad to hear that a partnership approach between transit agencies was taken on this study. She added that it seems that some of the recommendations that might be generated would not be under TAM's purview but rather would only be within the purview of another agency, not TAM. ED Steinhauser responded that the study was being actively scoped and managed by all three partners and that TAM would not be dictating to the other agencies what the priorities would be.

Supervisor Adams then requested that the study include the concept of implementing the "bus on shoulder" idea on highway 101 as a possibility, particularly during the peak commute hours. She also referred the group to point "b" of the staff report on page 45, and asked that the language be changed from, "Service added to make guaranteed connections to *SMART trains* at San Rafael and continue along US 101 through Marin" to "Service added to make guaranteed connections to *multiple services* at San Rafael and continue along US 101 through Marin" to avoid singling out one particular service program over another. Staff acknowledged they would make this change.

Mike Arnold stated that SMART's ridership projections show that very few Novato residents would take the SMART train. If they were taking the train into San Francisco, many would transfer at the ferry

terminal and very few people, as we know from their projections, are transferring from SMART trains to the ferry. So, what is the assumption that somehow that SMART is serving Novato in the trunk line?

Chair Kinsey responded that it was a matter of scope, funding, and not wanting to conflict with planning currently underway by SMART. No assumptions are being made beyond what SMART has included in their analyses.

Michael Rexx spoke on behalf of Marin Link and the Corridors Plan which aspires to put streetcars down all the major Marin roadways fed by SMART on demand shuttles, and linked to SMART trains, GG busses and ferries. Mr. Rexx distributed a letter addressed to the TAM Executive Committee and board members asking them to consider the content of it during the hearing taking place on January 24. He said that he believes the trolley system could serve as a key east/west trunk line link to the Hwy 101 corridor. He noted that the concept of steel wheeled trolleys was mentioned in the staff report for the November 14 meeting but was not included in this staff report. He requested that trolleys be considered in this study. He concluded his comments by stating that trolleys may be more expensive, but that more people would ride them (over busses) due to their popularity thereby cutting back on traffic congestion and greenhouse gases.

In response to a question from Chair Kinsey to Commissioner McGlashan about whether the southern Marin cities are moving forward with a trolley feasibility study, Commissioner McGlashan replied that there was a level of interest and that the next step is to consider potential feasibility analysis funding. He added that both city councils have expressed interest in this concept but at this point, they are unaware what a first level feasibility analysis would be and what it would cost.

Chair Kinsey said that, in the spirit of full partnering, there might be an opportunity to bring resources from those communities to this study.

Commissioner McGlashan said that he would speak to his colleagues on this topic.

Deb Hubsmith said that it is not enough that people ride transit; rather thought must be given as to how people will get to transit. Referring to the RFP, she said that it lacks an analysis of how people will get to transit stops and she asked that that analysis be added to the scope. She asked that focus be placed on conducting a poll to ask people if they would walk and bike to transit if there was safe access. She concluded by asking that the study look at bringing bikes onto transit as has been a policy in Marin for approximately 10 years.

Karen Nygren referred to the Study Work Elements/Tasks section regarding effectiveness and frequency of local transit routes and said that Nelson/Nygaard did a study for the Measure A program which pointed out that in order to increase ridership, it would be necessary to run busses off the major routes and provide on-demand ride service in order to get people to the main line. Ms. Nygren suggested that staff review the Nelson/Nygaard study to pick up some of these points. She requested, also, that when looking to locate facilities in the median of Hwy 101, as mentioned in the document, the cost and safety factor is thoroughly investigated.

David Schonbrunn suggested that the name of the study be changed to the Southern and Central Marin Transit Study to reflect, more accurately the intended scope. He added that he believes that the most important thing to come from this study occurs before it even gets underway which is to create plug projects in the RTP that would receive money for the outcome of the study.

Mr. Schonbrunn said that he had other suggestions for additions, but wanted to emphasize that any benefits evaluated for a possible project should be compared to its cost. He would like to see an HOV

lane studied between Fairfax and the San Rafael Transit study during peak commute hours because he believes that it is important to make transit attractive on a time-saving basis and this would be the best way to accomplish that. He supports the study of implementing a parking charge at the Larkspur Ferry Terminal and noted that transit, in the absence of a parking charge would not work. He concluded by saying that, if it is possible to achieve "15-minute service" on the trunk line, he would like to see alternating express and local service studied as well as express connections between downtown centers.

Chair Kinsey thanked everyone for their comments and then asked the executive director if she felt confident in moving forward with the recommendation or if she felt that additional work was needed to sharpen the focus of the scope.

ED Steinhauser suggested that this document be presented to the TAM Board, approaching the MT and GG boards for their agreement to partner in this study, and returning to the TAM Board with the final prospectus. However, in the interest of moving forward, staff would like to prepare the RFP while taking the above steps.

Chair Kinsey expressed that it is important to involve the community in the planning process and wants the ideas presented today to be considered. He cited the trolley system idea as an example of an alternative transportation idea, and said that it would need to be evaluated as to what the premium is from a financial perspective as well as the potential premiums from a land-use or ridership perspective. The Chair said that unless staff is under pressure to issue this RFP, it might be more valuable to evaluate some of the ideas presented today and present it to the TAM Board all at once. He clarified that he does not mean that these ideas should be incorporated into the scope; rather they should be considered at the same time as the scope is finalized.

Commissioner McGlashan suggested that staff issue an RFI if timing is an issue. This would allow staff to sort through the consultant applicants and discuss with them their budget concerns while TAM is discussing possible joint ventures with the cities, towns, as well as transit agencies.

Commission Breen suggested that the final RFP should mention the ideas presented by the community so that they're memorialized even if they are not included in the study.

Commissioner Lundstrom said she agrees on the process but would like to have the cities involved, Sausalito, Mill Valley, Fairfax and San Anselmo, go on record committing funds towards conducting a feasibility study for the trolley systems.

Commissioner Fredericks expressed a concern that many of these ideas depend on having a useable Hwy 101 corridor trunk and connector facilities which is a clear priority for the use of this money.

ED Steinhauser acknowledged the Committee's recommendations, and went to say that staff would develop a rough scale of costs for what it would take to include all of these ideas in this study and return it to this committee for review.

10. TDM Workplan Review

Continued.

11. FY2007-08 Quarterly Financial Report (Discussion)

Li Zhang presented highlights of the quarterly financial report and reported that everything is within budget. The impending office move could cause cost increases in some categories. She will report to this committee in February or March any line items that exceed the budget. She mentioned that transfers within the Admin category of the budget should cover any line item cost overruns. She also pointed out that while revenue for January 2008 is good but she expects a reduction in March and again in June when the actuals are received. She added that the first six months are trending well compared to last year, but she is unsure about the second half of the year due to unstable economic conditions.

In response to a question from the Chair whether TAM is trending two or four million dollars more for the year, Ms. Zhang said that TAM is trending two million dollars higher for the first half year excluding the actuals for December which will be "trued up" in March 2008.

12. Marin-Sonoma Narrows MOU

ED Steinhauser stated that staff is still waiting for information from Caltrans in response to concerns raised previously by this committee in July. They have yet to reply. However, she advised the group that recent activities at Caltrans indicates that they want to manage all design and aspects of the MSN project. While staff spoke to the TAM Board in November and received direction for TAM to have a major role in delivering the project, a concept Caltrans supported, Caltrans has changed their thoughts on this. Staff will continue to propose that TAM maintains a role with respect to what it believes are priorities and design needs in the corridor. It will participate as a partner but she is concerned that TAM's role may be much more limited than originally thought.

In response to a question from Karen Nygren about when the next MSN Policy Advisory Group meeting will take place, ED Steinhauser said that staff is going to try to arrange a meeting in February after the SMART meeting in Sonoma.

13. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda

Seeing no others wishing to speak, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.