



**TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
SEPTEMBER 10, 2012  
4:00 P.M.  
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER, ROOM 330  
3501 Civic Center Drive, San Rafael, California**

**AGENDA**

750 Lindero Street  
Suite 200  
San Rafael  
California 94901

Phone: 415/226-0815  
Fax: 415/226-0816

[www.tam.ca.gov](http://www.tam.ca.gov)

**Belvedere**  
Sandra Donnell

**Corte Madera**  
Diane Furst

**Fairfax**  
John Reed

**Larkspur**  
Dan Hillmer

**Mill Valley**  
Stephanie Moulton-Peters

**Novato**  
Eric Lucan

**Ross**  
P. Beach Kuhl

**San Anselmo**  
Ford Greene

**San Rafael**  
Gary Phillips

**Sausalito**  
Mike Kelly

**Tiburon**  
Alice Fredericks

**County of Marin**  
Susan L. Adams  
Katie Rice  
Kathrin Searns  
Steve Kinsey  
Judy Arnold

1. Chair's Report (Discussion)
2. Adjourn to Closed Session - **Attachment**  
CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – PENDING LITIGATION  
California Government Code section 54956.9(a)  
*REPEAL SMART, et al. v. Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM)*  
Marin County Superior Court Case No. 1103334
3. Reconvene in Open Session  
Announcement from Closed Session
4. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda (Discussion)
5. Executive Director's Report (Discussion)
6. Commissioner Reports (Discussion)
  - a. Executive Committee – Commissioner Moulton-Peters
  - b. SMART – Commissioner Arnold
7. CONSENT CALENDAR (Action) – **Attachment**
  - a. Approve TAM Minutes of July 17, 2012
8. Proclamation of Support for National Plug-In Day (Action) - **Attachment**
9. Transit Assessment (Action) - **Attachment**
10. Office Relocation Review and Selection (Action) - **Attachment**
11. Open time for items not on the agenda



Late agenda material can be inspected in TAM's office between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.  
TAM is located at 750 Lindero Street, Suite 200, San Rafael.

The meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for special accommodations (assisted listening device, sign language interpreters, etc.) should be directed to Denise Merleno, 415-226-0820 or email: [dmerleno@tam.ca.gov](mailto:dmerleno@tam.ca.gov) **no later than 5 days** before the meeting date.

The Marin County Civic Center is served by several bus lines including Marin Transit Routes 45, 45K, 49, 233, and 259. Route 45 provides service to the Civic Center Hall of Justice Arch until 8:43 PM. In the evening, Golden Gate Transit provides service until 11:24 PM with routes 70 and 80 along Highway 101 from the San Pedro Road bus pads, which are about a half mile away. To access the San Pedro bus pad NB, walk south down San Pedro Rd and take the footpath to the NB 101 onramp where the bus stop is located. To access the SB pad, walk down San Pedro Rd and under the freeway, turn right on Merrydale and then take the footpath near the SB onramp to the bus pad. For arrival and departure times, call 511 or visit [www.marintransit.org](http://www.marintransit.org), or [www.goldengate.com](http://www.goldengate.com).



September 10, 2012

Transportation Authority of Marin  
Board of Commissioners  
750 Lindero Street; Suite 200  
San Rafael, CA 94901

**SUBJECT:** Closed Session – Existing Litigation (Agenda Item 2)  
Dear Commissioners:

I request that you conduct a closed session, during your meeting on September 10, 2012 to discuss pending litigation. In my opinion, public discussion of this matter would prejudice your position. The specific reason and the legal authority for the closed session is Government Code Section 54956.9(a).

The title of the case or adjudicatory proceeding is *REPEAL SMART, et al. v. Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM)*, Marin County Superior Court Case No. CV 1103334 and the tribunal before which it is pending is Marin County Superior Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Mari-Ann Rivers  
Deputy County Counsel  
Attorney for TAM

Cc: Dianne Steinhauser, TAM Executive Director  
Clerk of the Board

MEETING OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
TAM

JULY 17, 2012  
4:00 PM

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council, TAM Chair  
Diane Furst, Corte Madera Town Council  
Eric Lucan, Novato City Council  
Ford Greene, San Anselmo Town Council  
Gary Phillips, San Rafael City Council  
John Reed, Fairfax Town Council  
Judy Arnold, Marin County Board of Supervisors, TAM Vice Chair  
Kathrin Sears, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Katie Rice, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Len Rifkind, Larkspur City Council (Alternate)  
Mike Kelly, Sausalito City Council  
P. Beach Kuhl, Ross Town Council  
Sandra Donnell, Belvedere City Council  
Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Mill Valley City Council  
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Members Absent:

Dan Hillmer, Larkspur City Council

Staff Members Present

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director  
Bill Whitney, Project Delivery Manager  
Dan Cherrier, Project Delivery Manager  
David Chan, Manager of Programming and Legislation  
Jit Pandher, Project Delivery Manager  
Li Zhang, Chief Financial Officer  
Linda Jackson, Manager of Planning  
Scott McDonald, Associate Planner  
Suzanne Loosen, Senior Transportation Planner

Chair Alice Fredericks called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

Executive Director Dianne Steinhauser administered the Oath of Office to new Commissioner Beach Kuhl representing the Town of Ross and to Len Rifkind, the Alternate Commissioner representing the City of Larkspur.

**1. Chair's Report (Discussion)**

Chair Fredericks had no report, but she noted that there is some interest in doing a transit study of needs for more communities than just Tiburon.

**2. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda (Discussion)**

Commissioner Moulton-Peters indicated she had given each Commissioner some bookmarks from the Environmental Forum of Marin, and she recommended taking one of the courses offered for more information on environmental issues.

**3. Executive Director's Report (Discussion)**

ED Steinhauser discussed her written report included in the Board's supplemental packet. She discussed progress on the Central Marin Ferry Project bridge design. She also introduced the summer interns, Sarah Cronin and Dennis Villalobos. She concluded her report with an update on the opening of carpool lanes through Novato.

**4. Commissioner Reports (Discussion)**

a. Executive Committee

Commissioner Moulton-Peters said she had no report since this month the Executive Committee meeting was combined with this Board meeting.

b. SMART

Vice Chair Arnold noted she was leaving in the morning with the SMART General Manager to visit the Nippon Sharyo factory near Chicago, where the SMART trains will be built.

Commissioners Kinsey and Sears joined the meeting at 4:15 p.m. and were seated at the dais.

**5. Caltrans Report (Discussion)**

ED Steinhauser updated the Board on the progress of several Caltrans projects, including paving from Lucky Drive to the Golden Gate Bridge, and increasing project construction in the Narrows.

Commissioner Moulton-Peters thanked Caltrans for the smoother freeway ride in southern Marin.

Commissioner Lucan asked about the dates that the carpool lanes will be opening, which ED Steinhauser provided.

**I. Request to approve \$30,000 of CMA funds to do an independent Risk and Assessment Survey (Action)**

Executive Director Steinhauser presented the item which recommended that the TAM Board authorize staff to engage in an assessment of risks and opportunities of a new contract vendor for local transit service. She noted that the original recommendation has been changed as staff is no longer looking for an approval of funds to conduct this study. Instead, additional questions and concerns would be collected from TAM Board members, and passed to Marin Transit (MT) and Golden Gate Transit (GGT) staff to supply information in response. The revised recommendation is to authorize staff to engage in an assessment of risks/opportunities of a new contract vendor for local transit service in Marin.

Chair Fredericks acknowledged the progress made by the transit agencies' working group, a combination of Marin Transit and Golden Gate board members, and that it is not TAM's intent to second guess the negotiations.

Commissioner Rice, a member on the working group, said that she was surprised to see this item on the TAM Agenda last Friday. She added that she understood why TAM would have an interest in the ongoing negotiations given that fifty-five percent of Measure A revenues are allocated to Marin Transit. She asked if the TAM Board had a history of scrutinizing other Requests for Proposals issued for contracting of services. She noted that the questions TAM staff included with the staff report were heavy on the risks associated with discontinuing service with GGT and light on the potential rewards/opportunities of such a split. She requested staff to generate questions that would indicate the benefits if this separation were to occur. Finally, she asked what type of product would be generated from this assessment as well as the timing of a presentation to the TAM Board in case TAM would like to take a position on MT's decision that will be made at their September meeting. She noted that an RFP will not be generated until after that meeting since a decision will need to be made as to how much of the 120,000 services hours MT may choose to put out to bid.

Commissioner Adams stated that she, too, was concerned when she saw the TAM Agenda revised late last Friday with the addition of this item and that she just received a staff report a short time before this meeting. She said that the subcommittee of MT has been working diligently with GGT but was not making much progress until MT members of the subcommittee suggested that they were considering issuing a full RFP. At that point, GGT provided a new proposal that opens the door for some flexibility in the RFP that is issued. She said that while the proposal is not quite there yet, she is hopeful that, over the next 45 days, a contract will be agreed upon that will not only take MT out of deficit mode but will allow the flexibility from Measure A funds to enhance services.

Commissioner Adams noted that the subcommittee looked at a number of different scenarios and emphasized that the group has been working very hard to comply with the stated purpose of Measure A which is "...to procure the highest quality and lowest cost transit system for Marin county residents." She said she felt that the questions included with this item were heavily slanted toward the GGT's perspective and regional perspective.

Commissioner Adams made specific recommended changes to questions. Regarding the first question, she recommended changing it to read, *What is the risk to regional and local riders?* Regarding question 3, she noted that there are many variables that would result in different answers including attrition and retirement, elimination of services that would displace employees and union / labor issues which is not an area within the purview of the subcommittee. Regarding question 4, she recommended revising it to read, *Are there efficiencies in operation that will be lost or gained when under a new vendor contract?* Regarding question 5, she recommended reworking the language to ask how

interconnectivity will work if a change is made. Regarding question 6, she recommended changing the language to read, *Are there opportunities for functional consolidation including administration, planning, human resources, etc.?*

She encouraged the Board to invite MT's General Manager, David Rzepinski, and GGT's General Manager, Denis Mulligan, to the podium to answer any questions the Board has since the deadline for making a decision lies in the next 45 days. She concluded her comments by stating that she would have appreciated receiving these questions nine months ago when the initial discussions occurred instead of tonight due to the burden this will place on MT staff to provide a response when they should be working on the negotiation process.

Chair Fredericks acknowledged the previous speakers' suggested directions for a more balanced set of questions, and ED Steinhauser replied that she will revise the questions based on Board input as the original list was generated from Board member concerns, and changes could be made.

Commissioner Moulton-Peters offered up two suggestions to add to the list: 1) the question, What are the best practices from MTC's sustainability study that will be incorporated into the new interagency agreement?; and 2) she would like to see a question developed that would address the need for a transition that is orderly, fair, and reasonable for both organizations.

Commissioner Reed stated that he agreed with statements previously made and went on to emphasize the need to remember that it is important to arrive at a decision that will keep the impact to users of transit at a minimum.

Commissioner Lucan asked for more information as to the process for conducting the study.

ED Steinhauser explained that the original thought was for TAM to conduct a study in concert with MTC and funded equally by both agencies. However, given the time constraints, staff would, instead, meet with staff from MT, GGT, and MTC to gain information regarding the risks and rewards associated with a separation of the two operators. The original funding request is no longer needed. Staff would like to entertain a special TAM Board meeting in early September to present information from the effort. Additionally, staff will most likely meet with staff from Solano and Napa County who have gone through recent consolidation efforts. Staff may rely, also and to a lesser extent, on TAM's on-call consultant support to assist in this assessment.

Commissioner Greene spoke about question no. 4 - *Are there efficiencies in operation that will be lost when under a new vendor contract?* – and asked if that will clarify whether there will be an increased or decreased level of service that will occur.

Commissioner Kinsey suggested a question about the service improvements that would be prioritized with savings from a new contractor. Another suggestion would be what a transit user's experience would be at the different levels of contract service from the Bridge District.

Regarding the Measure A funding that MT receives, Commissioner Rice suggested the following question, "Under what scenarios can MT continue to meet Measure A goals of maintaining and expanding service?" since this is the driver for this negotiation process and what TAM should be most concerned about.

Commissioner Rifkind asked why staff finds it necessary to incur the cost of a consultant to answer these questions when MTC is available for this task. He suggested utilizing MTC as a partner to the analysis.

Commissioner Arnold asked about the timing of a TAM special meeting and the subsequent MT meeting.

ED Steinhauser said that the intended date of the TAM special meeting would be September 6 and the MT meeting is scheduled for September 17.

Commissioner Adams clarified that there is no mandate to incorporate into the MT negotiations any of the findings of TAM's assessment; rather it would be for informational purposes only.

Commissioner Kinsey asked ED Steinhauser to respond to Commissioner Rifkind's earlier question on the need for using a consultant.

Commissioner Arnold left the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

ED Steinhauser replied that MTC staff will be the first source for additional assistance and information. Additionally, she anticipates that the bulk of responses to the final set of questions will be addressed through information from the two transit operators. There may be a need for consultant assistance with transit expertise. She added that TAM has a fiduciary oversight role, and this type analysis has been done in the past. She referred to investigative activity that the TAM Board engaged in prior to giving SMART \$8 million in 2011. She finalized her comments by agreeing that it would have made more sense to raise these questions at the beginning of the negotiation process but that TAM trusted that the process was progressing well. It was only in the last couple of weeks that TAM Board members began raising questions which resulted in this action item being added to the evening's agenda.

Chair Fredericks opened the item for public comment.

Marin Transit General Manager David Rzepinski assured the Board that MT is good stewards of Measure A funding it receives from TAM.. He cited the paratransit, rural/seasonal, community shuttle, and large bus programs are reaching all -time highs in terms of productivity. Mr. Rzepinski stated that a concern he has with moving forward with this assessment is that the same staff working on the assessment will also be the ones involved in the negotiation process. His concern is to stop deficit spending and to create flexibility to address some of the Measure A goals that MT has yet to meet. He was encouraged that negotiations with GGT are progressing and he has heard, clearly, from both the MT Board and now the TAM Board that the partnership between the two operators is an important one. He finalized his comments by stating that he looks forward to working with TAM staff to the extent this Body requests him to do so.

Commissioner Phillips made a motion to approve the staff recommendation which was seconded by Commissioner Moulton-Peters. The motion passed 12-2-2 with Commissioners Adams and Rifkind opposed and Commissioners Arnold and Lucan needing to leave the meeting early. .

Commissioner Adams commented that she voted in opposition due to the amount of work that will be required on the part of MT staff at this point in time.

## **6. Approve CMP Monitoring Contract (Action)**

ED Steinhauser introduced Dan Cherrier, Principal Project Delivery Manager, to present the staff report which requested the TAM Board to authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract to conduct traffic monitoring necessary for the 2013 Congestion Management Program in an amount not to exceed \$90,000 which have been approved in the 2012/2013 TAM budget.

Mr. Cherrier discussed the requirements that necessitate the monitoring and the process involved. ED Steinhauser commented on cost-saving measures that staff plan to implement, monitoring protocol that are less labor-intensive.

Commissioner Moulton-Peters asked whether TAM is tracking the shift in transportation modes. ED Steinhauser noted it is hard to track that specific correlation itself, but travel times are surveyed, and with related bus transit increased ridership, and carpool lane usage, mode shift can be estimated.

Chair Fredericks asked what the industry standard is to determine a mode shift. ED Steinhauser indicated she would report back with that information.

Commissioner Kinsey commented that the CMP process seems to be a "gateway" for federal funds. He asked why the cost was as stated. ED Steinhauser noted that budget for this item is lower by \$15,000 than the previous round; and the study he referenced will also be below the previous budget, by \$5,000, partly due to the use of alternative technologies.

Commissioner Greene asked what the scope of federal funding available is, which ED Steinhauser addressed.

There was no public comment on the item.

Commissioner Kinsey moved to approve the CMP Monitoring Contract. Commissioner Greene seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

## **7. Allocation of TFCA and TDA Article 3 Funds (Action)**

David Chan, Manager of Programming and Legislation, presented the staff report which requested the TAM Board to adopt project priorities as recommended.. He provided a background on the two fund sources, programs covered, funding allocations, and staff recommendations.

When staff made their recommendation, they pointed out that their original intent had been to assign funds to the candidates that were submitted. But due to the County not having completed their Housing Element in order to receive upcoming federal funds ( OBAG), and TAM's need to assign funds as promised to the County for the Marin Sonoma Narrows bike/ped facility oversight, these TDA Article 3 funds were being assigned instead to the County for the Narrows.

Commissioner Sears commented that the remaining unfunded county projects may need to be delayed due to funding shortfalls, including the pathway rehab project in Mill Valley. ED Steinhauser said she did not believe they would be substantially delayed, as new funds would be available next summer of 2013, and the projects were not due to go to construction until then. She also mentioned that TAM staff is looking for replacement funding.



Commissioner Moulton-Peters asked whether the state funds might be at risk next year. ED Steinhauser said that due to the history of TDA being statutorily prescribed, she didn't think so.

Commissioner Rice asked how close the projects were to being fully funded, and whether TAM continually looks for sources to help with project funding. Staff indicated they would send her information on the various projects, and ED Steinhauser confirmed that is one role that TAM plays, to match transportation funds with transportation projects.

Commissioner Rice said she thought maintenance on existing facilities should be a priority.

Chair Kinsey pointed out the history of the Marin Sonoma Narrows Redwood Landfill Bike/Pedestrian Facility and how staff was able to prevent the complete relocation of part of Highway 101 by putting this path on State Park land. This demonstrates how TAM can work on behalf of local jurisdictions to accomplish what was needed

Chair Fredericks opened and closed public comment on the item with no one coming forward.

Commissioner Rice moved to approve the allocation of funds. Commissioner Kinsey seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

#### **8. Review and Approval of the Draft 2011 TAM Annual Report (Action)**

Chief Financial Director Li Zhang presented the report which requested that the TAM Board review and approve the draft TAM 2011 Annual Report, and authorize staff to finalize and distribute the final report in the following few weeks.

Commissioner Adams commented on the need for the Board to get information on projects in a timely manner before a meeting rather than last minute or after the fact.

Eric Lucan left the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Commissioner Moulton-Peters said she would like to see more statistics related to projects and how well the Measure A goals are being met.

Chair Fredericks asked what turnaround time staff would like met for receiving Board comments. Ms. Zhang said two weeks.

Chair Fredericks opened and closed public comment on the item with no speakers coming forward.

Commissioner Moulton-Peters moved to approve the Draft 2011 TAM Annual Report. Commissioner Donnell seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

#### **9. Office Relocation Option Review and Selection (Action)**

ED Steinhauser introduced the item which requested the TAM Board to review the detailed lease option results and staff's recommendation of the new office location. She discussed the background and work with partner agencies to consider what is available for a location of the staff offices since the current lease ends soon. She indicated that the choice now seems to be between two locations, but staff has

been unable to narrow it down to one strong recommendation, so they would like the Board to make the final decision at its next meeting in September.

The Board agreed by consensus to continue the item to the next meeting.

#### **10. Measure B – Electric Vehicle Update (Discussion)**

ED Steinhauser introduced the item as part of the ongoing effort to annually present TAM activity around our Vehicle registration Fee Programs\_ Employer/employee commute alternatives ( TDM), Senior Mobility ( lead by Marin Transit), and Electric Vehicle support. Senior Transportation Planner Suzanne Loosen presented the staff report, commenting on the trend toward electric vehicles and the need for adequate infrastructure and financing, education and public outreach. She explained the status of the chargers being installed in Marin County under the AB 118 grant managed by the CEC. She also described ongoing coordination efforts

Commissioner Ford left the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Commissioner Moulton-Peters asked if usage statistics could be obtained from the PUC on a county basis.

Commissioner Kinsey commented on how difficult it has been to get this information from the DMV. He thought it might be possible to find a legislative way to force that agency to share the information.

Commissioner Rice asked if the charging stations could provide statistical information. She noted that the numbers are going to continue to shift in favor of electric vehicles, and it is important to stay ahead of the curve.

ED Steinhauser noted there are still questions regarding who might be using the electric vehicles, whether for private purposes or job-related, which would affect where the charging stations are located, as well as peak periods of usage.

Commissioner Reed commented on the materials that go into the electric batteries, and he questioned the recyclability of the batteries. By comparison, he noted that electric bicycles are a viable alternative that might be more easily provided for.

Commissioner Rifkind confirmed that the charging stations would be level 2. He asked how it would be decided who uses the stations and whether they will use clean energy. He thought the users should be the ones paying for the services. Ms. Loosen said most of the stations have been part of a pilot program that is being closely monitored for information-gathering. Info will likely be available as the stations get utilized.

Commissioner Adams asked if there are plans for a web-page that people can go to and see where the stations are. Ms. Loosen said yes, there are several websites.

In response to a question from Commissioner Phillips regarding long-term planning for placing charging stations, Ms. Loosen noted that most people will charge at home if they are able. Staff also discussed coordinated efforts to track siting of the stations, including a second level siting study following up on the siting study TAM completed in the Summer of 2011.

Commissioner Kinsey discussed the multi-faceted approach in the Bay Area, from the standpoint of governments and electric vehicle owners, as well as siting and manufacture of new vehicles and chargers. He also commented on equity issues, since not everyone can afford them. He encouraged staff to think creatively in moving forward.

ED Steinhauser noted that Bill Carney who works with Sustainable San Rafael is present tonight at the meeting , as well as members of the electric vehicle community in Marin.

Chair Fredericks opened public comment on the item.

Dale Miller, Golden Gate Electric Vehicle Association, commented on the reduced cost for electric vehicle and the most efficient vehicles. He also indicated there are many private charging stations and smart-phone apps for identifying locations. He responded to some of the issues raised, as well as tracking through DMV paperwork. He encouraged TAM to partner with other agencies to keep the Bay Area in the forefront of the industry.

Jan Alf-Wiegel, also part of the TAM Electric Vehicle Working Group, thanked Ms. Loosen and Mr. McDonald for their work. She also noted there is still much to be done, especially in terms of promotion, etc. and she reviewed some possibilities. She reviewed types of promotion that could be done, once TAM decides what it wants to do in the future.

Commissioner Adams left the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Bill Carney, TAM EV Working Group, emphasized the importance of a good promotional policy, including the need for TAM to continue the pursuit of sufficient charging stations and fleet purchases

Commissioner Donnell left the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Seeing no further speakers, Chair Fredericks closed public comment on the item.

#### **11. Adopting Strategies for the One Bay Area Grant (Action)**

ED Steinhauser provided a brief staff report which requested that the TAM Board to **1)** Authorize an outreach process meeting MTC policy requirements to commence; **2)** Invite candidates meeting PDA policy requirements, assuring the final program of projects is within the 50% target requirement for supporting PDAs; **3)** Adopt candidate categories for consideration as described: a) Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements and b) Transportation for Livable Communities; and **4)** Recommend funds to Local Streets and Roads as close as possible to previous federal funding. She reviewed the process thus far and next steps in the process. She also noted that Mr. Chan and Ms. Jackson were available to answer questions from the Board.

Commissioner Furst asked for clarification on the funding for planning activities and how much will be assigned directly to PDAs. ED Steinhauser said that staff was still developing that information, and it could be provided at a future meeting. . Commissioner Furst said it would be helpful to have the breakdown between PDAs and non-PDAs with the next report.

Commissioner Reed asked what happens if a regional project coincides with a PDA. ED Steinhauser said it would probably be designated as a PDA.

Chair Fredericks opened public comment on the item.

Andy Peri, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, commented on the requirement for each jurisdiction to have a complete streets policy, especially given the update passed in 2008, in order to receive OBAG funding. He expressed doubt that all the cities could meet the specific requirements at this point. He indicated appreciation for TAM's support of the concept and indicated willingness to share the information with anyone who is interested.

Chair Fredericks asked staff about compliance issues, and ED Steinhauser said she thought TAM's jurisdictions did meet the intent of the ordinance but she would review the information again.

Seeing no further speakers, Chair Fredericks closed public comment on the item.

Commissioner Phillips moved to approve the four points of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Kinsey seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

**12. Open time for items not on the agenda**

Seeing no speakers, Chair Fredericks adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Approved on:

---



September 10, 2012

TO: Transportation Authority of Marin Board of Commissioners

FROM: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director

THROUGH: Suzanne Loosen, Senior Transportation Planner  
Scott McDonald, Associate Transportation Planner

RE: Proclamation of Support for National Plug In Day (Action), Agenda Item 8

Dear Commissioners:

**Executive Summary**

TAM staff is gearing up to take part in “Marin National Plug In Day,” one of 50 local celebrations of National Plug In Day, which is being sponsored nationwide by Plug In America, the Sierra Club, and the Electric Auto Association.

Marin’s Plug In Day will provide the general public first-hand experience with Electric Vehicles and charging equipment, as well as the opportunity to test drive one of several electric vehicle models. This collaborative effort will include EV owners, advocates, government agency representatives, and vendors. With the Transportation Authority of Marin and Golden Gate Electric Vehicle Association sponsoring the event, TAM will contribute approximately \$5,000 in Measure B funds, consistent with previous Board direction to support EV outreach and education, specifically to develop marketing materials and provide a table at the event.

The event will also include a speaking opportunity for local officials to help encourage the adoption of electric vehicles. Event details are listed below:

**National Plug In Day Marin 2012**

**Date: Sunday, September 23, 2012**

**Time: 8 am to 2 pm**

**Location: Marin Civic Center, adjacent to Sunday Farmer’s Market**

The TAM planning staff will provide a brief overview of the event, and be available for questions at the September 10 TAM board meeting.

**Recommendation: Authorize Chair Fredericks and Executive Director Steinhauser to sign a proclamation of support for National Plug In Day on behalf of the TAM Board.**

Attachments: “Proclamation of Support for National Plug In Day”



## Proclamation of Support for Marin National Plug In Day 2012

### **Promoting Electric Vehicles in Marin on September 23, 2012**

The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) is committed to supporting efforts that promote sustainable transportation choices for residents, businesses and visitors alike. Supporting **Marin National Plug in Day 2012** is consistent with TAM's goal of contributing to a reduction of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions, which, according to local studies, can account for as much as 60% of air pollution originating in Marin County each year.

In collaboration with the Golden Gate Electric Vehicle Association and TAM's Electric Vehicle Advisory Working Group, TAM will organize and sponsor **Marin National Plug In Day 2012** on September 23, 2012 at the Marin County Civic Center to promote the importance of expanding the number of electric vehicles in Marin.

Across the country, National Plug In Day 2012 will be celebrated in more than 50 cities "to draw global attention to the environmental, economic, and other benefits of plug in electric vehicles," according to national organizers Plug In America, the Sierra Club, and the Electric Auto Association.

By showcasing market-available electric vehicles in Marin, offering EV test drives, demonstrating the ease of charging station use, and providing accurate and useful cost information about the benefits of driving electric, **Marin National Plug In Day 2012** will help educate and motivate more members of the public to consider a plug in electric vehicle for themselves, the next time they consider purchasing a new vehicle.

During **Marin National Plug In Day 2012**, current EV owners will share their experiences, reasons why they choose electric vehicles, and how convenient they are to drive.

The Transportation Authority of Marin supports **Marin National Plug In Day 2012** as part of its larger effort to accelerate adoption of electric vehicles and improve air quality, which includes outreach and education, promotion of zero-emission transportation, and facilitating the installation of EV charging stations in Marin County. TAM looks forward to continuing to promote electric vehicle adoption in Marin County.

---

Alice Fredericks  
Commission Chair

---

Dianne Steinhauser  
Executive Director



September 10, 2012

TO: Transportation Authority of Marin Board of Commissioners

FROM: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director

RE: Transit Assessment (Action), Agenda Item 9

Dear Commissioners:

### Background

For the past 40 years, Marin Transit has contracted with the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (Golden Gate) to provide its local fixed route bus operations. During that time, the Bridge District has also been the exclusive provider of regional bus services from Marin to San Francisco, Contra Costa, and Sonoma counties.

In the course of financial planning for Marin Transit, the agency determined that they could not afford to sustain existing bus services under their existing contract and acted to address the matter. In December 2011, the Marin Transit Board approved a 24 month notice of intent to terminate the long-term service contract with Golden Gate Transit.

Concurrently, the Marin Transit Board initiated a request for a working group of both Marin Transit and Golden Gate Directors to explore contracting options. Both agencies agreed to meet and the first Working Group meeting was held on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2011. The Working Group has continued to meet and their activities are regularly reported back to each transit agency.

In both June and July, the Bridge District submitted written proposals for contract modifications that would address Marin Transit's financial goals. After reviewing the most recent proposal July 11<sup>th</sup>, Marin Transit staff received approval from their Board on Monday July 16<sup>th</sup> to authorize continued negotiations with the Bridge District over the next 45 days with the goal of producing a new interagency agreement for adoption at the September 2012 Marin Transit Board meeting, scheduled for Monday September 17<sup>th</sup>.

Marin Transit staff also received approval to simultaneously proceed with completion of a Request for Proposals (RFP) packet to solicit bids for any services that Golden Gate would no longer provide, or, if negotiations failed to result in a satisfactory conclusion in 45 days, all local bus service.

The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) is responsible for managing the Measure A Transportation Sales Tax funds in accordance with the 2004 Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan. The voter approved plan established a mechanism by which the transportation needs of a variety of users could be met. Through its Board of Commissioners,

representing all of the jurisdictions in Marin, TAM assures the residents of Marin that the goals and intent of the plan are being met.

Given that the Measure A program funds over 30% of Marin Transit's local service budget, our agency has responsibility in affirming the best use of funds. This includes the responsibility to consider both opportunities that might exist for local bus riders under a new provider, and risks of undesirable consequences that either local or regional bus service could experience from major changes in this long-standing relationship.

### Process followed

At TAM's Board of Commissioner meeting on July 17<sup>th</sup>, TAM staff received direction to conduct a risk and rewards analysis of the potential complete separation by Marin Transit from Golden Gate as their local bus service provider. TAM staff received 11 groups of questions from TAM Commissioners at the meeting of July 17<sup>th</sup>. Staff were directed to conduct the analysis in a 45 day timeframe, to utilize information from Marin Transit and Golden Gate, and to utilize expertise and financial support from MTC.

Staff assembled a team of consultants, in concert with support from MTC, and have conducted analysis and derived key findings associated with each of the group of questions asked by the TAM Board. Those results will be presented to the TAM board at their meeting of September 10<sup>th</sup>. The results are summarized below. See list of original questions attached. Information was provided by Golden Gate and Marin Transit in conducting this assessment.

TAM staff recommend the following assessment results be transmitted to Marin Transit via letter form the TAM Board.

### Assessment results

#### Question 1

- What are the risks to regional and local riders when deconstructing the existing system?
- Are there efficiencies in operation that will be lost or gained when under a new vendor contract?
- Will each regional ride cost more?

If GGT and MT part ways, GGT plans to:

- Discontinue Routes 10, 70 and 80
- Add service to Route 101(X)
- May add additional stop to 101(X) in Sausalito

MT would need to operate additional service hours (approx. 15,000-20,000 per year, or 10% of current levels) in order to provide the local coverage that Routes 10, 70 and 80 currently provide. MT already operates other transit routes which serve most of the 10, 70, and 80 service area – in order to cover the local portions of these routes, MT will likely add service to current Route 71. It should be noted that Golden Gate currently reports providing 39,000 hours of service covering this same service area, frequency, and time span. The additional projected 15,000-20,000 service hours estimated by Marin Transit are not accounted for in the current MT Short Range Transit Plan. MT plans to operate them with cost savings generated through a



new service contract. According to the team's analysis, MT is well positioned with cost savings and fare revenue to cover the cost of 15,000 to 20,000 service hours. It should be noted that additional vehicles will likely be needed for expanded Route 71- cost and revenue for these must be identified and included (estimate 2 vehicles).

If GGT discontinues Routes 10, 70, and 80, passengers most highly impacted are regional riders who use stops which are not served by GGT's Route 101(X); these are primarily off-peak period riders, a possible issue that may need mitigation. Note that a Title VI assessment of changed service will need to be conducted. They will likely pay the higher GGT regional fare.

Between Routes 10, 70, and 80, 5 key stops/areas would be affected: Ignacio Bus Pad, Marin City, Strawberry Village, Manzanita park-n-ride, Sausalito. Note Golden Gate reports other less primary stops may be affected as well. .

#### Question 5

- How will interconnectivity work between local and regional riders?
- Are there other changes in connectivity?
- Are there associated cost changes? Note that interconnectivity is important no matter how the relationship changes

Communication and cooperation between agencies is key to a successful, seamless operation. Coordination occurs now between the agencies. Under a new vendor contract, interconnectivity and coordination is equally important, and possible.

Interconnectivity issues will be most pressing for customers who need to transfer between MT local service and GGT regional service. This is likely due to several key stops/areas that may no longer be served under a GGT regional express only scenario ( the 101X). This includes the primary stops: Ignacio Bus Pad, Marin City, Strawberry Village, Manzanita park-n-ride, Sausalito. Note Golden Gate reports other less primary stops may be affected as well. .

Interconnectivity to school pickups will need to be maintained under any new vendor contract.

Some service inefficiency may be introduced when connectivity is a high priority- this could result in additional vehicles and operating costs.

#### Question 2

- What is the status of current assets including vehicles and facilities and how will that change under a new contract?
- Since additional buses may be required if Golden Gate Transit is no longer the vendor, how will they be purchased?
- Where will they be stored?

Fleet and facilities are currently owned by GGT. Maintenance and storage facilities MT would need for the contracted local service are not yet identified. Indicative pricing (hourly rate) for contracted service does not currently include facilities.

It is feasible that if local service is contracted through a private provider, Marin Transit would use the savings realized by not paying Golden Gate the \$430,000 annually for capital facilities and miscellaneous, to lease a facility. While a facility lease was initially estimated at \$225,000 annually, depending on where the facility is, this cost could be higher. Golden Gate's experience indicates from 4 to 6 acres of storage area may be necessary for Marin Transit's planned vehicle fleet. There is very low likelihood that this size of new bus-yard could be established in Marin. Present availability of land in the Richmond area indicates that the \$225,000 could be low. It is also possible that the assumed 12 % service hours as deadhead time could be underestimated ( see assumptions under Question 4 regarding costs), which could have a modest affect on contract vendor price. If more of the \$430,000 annually is spent for a facility, then other savings will need to be utilized to purchase the buses needed (19 vehicles). Note that leasing 19 vehicles in the marketplace is the highest cost option- it is possible that other operators would make used vehicles available for lease or purchase, at a lower cost.

#### Question 4

- Will there be less bus service or will there be an improvement in bus service?
- What are assumed labor costs of new vendor service?
- Do recent vendor contracts around the region support the cost assumptions used by Marin Transit with respect to labor costs?

Under certain cost assumptions, it is feasible Marin Transit would generate \$1 Million+/- annually in utilizing a private vendor, which could be folded back into providing service. For this to be true, assumptions would need to be verified. These assumptions include:

- MT contracts for current local service plus 16,000 hours for Routes 70 & 80 at \$105 per hour
- Current TDA and STA revenue sharing formula continues
- GGT local paratransit payment to MT is eliminated/ MT provides eliminated funding
- MT does not pay for shared costs of Customer Service Center at SRTC
- MT does not incur additional staffing costs
- No additional costs beyond the \$430,000 are incurred for facility and vehicle leases
- Facility location does not add more than 12% in deadhead to service hours

It is possible that additional staff may be necessary, particularly for operations oversight. It is also possible that the \$430,000 is not sufficient for all facility and vehicle needs (see explanation under Question 2) and that the 12% deadhead hours could be increased.

Note that Golden Gate has indicated a desire to adjust the TDA/STA formula, which would need to be negotiated, under the auspices of MTC.

#### Question 3

- What are the impacts to Golden Gate employees?
- Note union and labor issues are not the responsibility of Marin Transit

The team did not have sufficient expertise, nor were familiar enough with potential issues, to address the details of employee impacts. Golden Gate has mentioned that pension benefits and other post-employment benefits (OPEB) will be an issue for them to manage under a smaller

workforce due to bus division size reduction.

Note that a transition to a new vendor could be at a pace whereby the natural attrition of Golden Gate bus division employees matches the transition to a new vendor.

#### Question 6

- Are there opportunities for functional consolidation including administration planning, human resources, etc.?
- What are the best practices that will be included from MTC's sustainability study?

In MTC's Transit Sustainability Project, peer review did not uncover evidence of a preferred organizational structure or any near-term impetus for consolidation amongst operators in the Bay Area. Instead, the study identified best practices that can improve customer experience and internal cost efficiencies.

From the TSP done by MTC, small operators are encouraged to focus on coordination, not consolidation:

- Joint fare structure
- Clipper roll-out
- County-level SRTPs
- Joint purchasing (e.g., consumables, services)
- Joint call centers, marketing

While Marin operators already embrace many practices, these suggestions should be further explored. Note their implementation does not substantially depend on the preferred future service delivery model.

#### Question 7

- What would a transition look like that is orderly, fair, and reasonable?

There are a number of items that will need to occur for a smooth transition. These are not yet completed by the Marin operators:

- Service Plans need to be finalized and communicated (GGT 10,70,80 most prominent example)
- Interagency Agreements, Federal designation process and asset acquisition process complete
- Vendor (provider) scope and selection process complete and implemented

Note that sufficient time must be allowed for these coordination efforts to occur. Also note that since a transition plan has not yet been developed, all of the aspects of the transition may not yet have been identified.

Question 9

- What service improvements would be prioritized if funding was available due to the change in relationship?

Marin Transit has recently completed planning efforts which suggest that both Tiburon and Novato could benefit from service increases.

Marin Transit has a number of service enhancement goals spelled out in their Short Range Transit Plan.

An in-depth transit planning process that includes extensive public input from all areas of the county would transpire through the Marin Transit Board in assessing how to re-invest any savings. Note that the 2004 Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan outlines the performance criteria under which transit investments will be prioritized:

- Fills a gap in the bus transit network
- Meets productivity standards based on passengers per hour
- Meets cost effectiveness standards based on subsidy per trip
- Relieves congestion as measured in total ridership
- Provides seamless connections to regional service
- Eliminates “pass ups” or overcrowding on existing routes
- Promotes environmental justice based on demographic analysis
- Attracts outside funding sources, including federal state and toll revenue as well as other local funds

Question 10

- What can Marin Transit do to meet the Measure A goals ?

Note that Marin Transit has been reporting regularly on performance per the expectations of the Measure A voter-approved Expenditure Plan. There are no compliance issues associated with Measure A.

Additional service is desirable.

Note the criteria outlined above under Q9 are valid considerations for any change in service provider.

Question 11

- Are there benefits from experienced staff that would be lost under a new vendor contract?
- Are there benefits from experienced operators including bus drivers that would be lost under a new vendor contract?

The staffing approach outlined in Marin Transit’s RFP for the 2011 Rural/Seasonal bus service outlines personnel performance in detail. The expectations, and delivery, of quality staff through those contract processes can be repeated for a new vendor contract for local service.

With respect to a transition to a new vendor, note the following:

Prepare	But Expect
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate changes and plans to policy makers, stakeholders customers</li> <li>• Monitor contractor start up plan – staffing and recruitment; facility; vehicle</li> <li>• Identify contingency responses independently and with selected contractor</li> <li>• Monitor contractor performance and response in key areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start-up transition issues</li> <li>• 3-6 months “growing pains” or “learning curve”</li> <li>• Some nervous or critical customers</li> <li>• Staffing and turnover issues</li> <li>• Issues not thought of will arise</li> <li>• Issues will diminish over time</li> </ul>

In the ongoing negotiations that have occurred between the two operators over the last 45 days, note that the Golden Gate offering to bring their savings forward now is a distinct cost benefit that would not occur if a new vendor contract is pursued and the current Golden Gate contract expires January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014.

Marin Transit has the potential to expand service under both scenarios of a new private vendor or a re-negotiated Golden Gate contract.

Note that the impact on people with long-standing jobs in Golden Gate’s bus division needs to be mitigated to the maximum extent possible.

**Recommendation:**

**Authorize TAM Chair Alice Fredericks to transmit TAM transit assessment results, as outlined in the above staff report and including any recommended changes from the TAM Board, to Marin Transit for their consideration in deciding on a new vendor contract for local bus service in Marin County.**

Attachments:

1. Question list
2. Powerpoint presentation of results

TAM Assessment of Marin Transit / Golden Gate

1)	What are the risks to regional and local riders when deconstructing the existing system?
	Are there efficiencies in operation that will be lost or gained when under a new vendor contract?
	Will each regional ride cost more?
2)	What is the status of current assets including vehicles and facilities and how will that change under a new contract?
	Since additional buses may be required if Golden Gate Transit is no longer the vendor, how will they be purchased?
	Where will they be stored?
3)	What are the impacts to Golden Gate employees?
	Note union and labor issues are not the responsibility of Marin Transit
4)	Will there be less bus service or will there be an improvement in bus service?
	What are assumed labor costs of new vendor service?
	Do recent vendor contracts around the region support the cost assumptions used by Marin Transit with respect to labor costs?
5)	How will interconnectivity work between local and regional riders?
	Are there other changes in connectivity?
	Are there associated cost changes? Note that interconnectivity is important no matter how the relationship changes
6)	Are there opportunities for functional consolidation including administration planning, human resources, etc.?
	What are the best practices that will be included from MTC's sustainability study?
7)	What would a transition look like that is orderly, fair, and reasonable?
8)	With respect to our constituents, what is the best way to move this change in relationship forward?
	What will be the transit users experience in changing the relationship?
	Will the same customer service benefits occur under a new vendor relationship?
9)	What service improvements would be prioritized if funding was available due to the change in relationship?
10)	What can Marin Transit do to meet the Measure A goals ?
11)	Are there benefits from experienced staff that would be lost under a new vendor contract?
	Are there benefits from experienced operators including bus drivers that would be lost under a new vendor contract?

## **TAM Assessment of Vendor Changes in Local Bus Transit Service in Marin**

Partial funding for the analysis provided by  
the Metropolitan Transportation Commission

September 2012



- **As directed by the TAM Board during their regularly scheduled meeting in July 2012, the TAM team of staff and consultants have responded to 11 key questions from the TAM Board**
- **Introduction of team conducting the assessment**



## Team Members

- Nancy Whelan, Principal, Nancy Whelan Consulting
- Diana Dorinson, Principal, Transportation Analytics
- Russ Chisholm, President, Transportation Management and Design (TMD)
- Marie Lewis, Senior Manager, TMD
- Bruce Behncke, Senior Manager, TMD
- David McCrossan, Transportation Planning Manager, HDR



## Question 1





## Question 1

- What are the risks to regional and local riders when deconstructing the existing system?
- Are there efficiencies in operation that will be lost or gained when under a new vendor contract?
- Will each regional ride cost more?
  
- Data sources:
  - “Impacts of Separation” Memo 1/30/12
  - Letter from GGT to MT 3/8/12, “Follow Up To Our February 2, 2012 Meeting” Attachment B

DRAFT



## GGT Service in Marin County

- Routes 10, 70, and 80 provide regional (to San Francisco) and local (within Marin County) service
- Route 101(X) provides more limited-stop regional service into San Francisco
- All routes mainly serve the Hwy 101 trunk corridor

Route	Annual Local Boardings	Annual Regional Boardings	Total Annual Boardings	Annual Revenue Hours	Passengers per Revenue Hour	% Local Boardings
10	47,900	143,700	191,600	12,888	14.9	25%
70	398,360	276,820	675,180	25,710	26.3	59%
80	156,200	207,060	363,260	19,900	18.3	43%
<b>Total</b>	<b>602,460</b>	<b>627,580</b>	<b>1,230,040</b>	<b>58,498</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>49%</b>



# Assumptions

- If GGT and MT part ways:
  - GGT plans to:
    - Discontinue Routes 10, 70 and 80
    - Add service to Route 101
    - May add additional stop to 101 in Sausalito
  - MT would need to operate additional service hours (approx. 15-20,000 per year) in order to provide the local coverage that Routes 10, 70 and 80 currently provide. Note Golden Gate reports currently providing 39,000 hours of service for this coverage
  - The additional service hours are not accounted for in the current MT SRTP; MT plans to operate them with cost savings generated through new service contract

} Consider Title VI/EJ

DRAFT



# Destinations Served

Destination*	10	70	80	101	71 (MT)
N Santa Rosa			x	x	
Novato		x	x	x	x
Ignacio		x	x		x
San Rafael		x	x	x	x
Strawberry	x				
Marin City	x	x	x		x
Sausalito Ferry	x		x		
Spencer Ave (Sausalito)		x			
S San Francisco	x	x	x	x	

\* Simplified chart – not all destinations are shown



## Impacts to Regional Passengers

- Passengers **most highly impacted** are those regional non-peak-period riders who use stops which are not served by Route 101
- Customers would need to transfer from MT local service to Route 101, likely paying an additional fare
- Between Routes 10, 70, and 80, 5 key stops/areas would be affected: Ignacio Bus Pad, Marin City, Strawberry Village, Manzanita park-n-ride, Sausalito (All of these stops have other GGT service to San Francisco during peak periods)
- Not at this time able to determine how many regional riders use these stops; but the impacts will be significant for them

DRAFT



## Impacts to Local Passengers

- If MT operates the local service hours/alignment on Routes 10, 70 and 80 currently provided by GGT, there are minimal impacts to local riders
- MT already operates other transit routes which serve most of the 10, 70, and 80 service area – in order to cover the local portions of these routes, MT will likely add service to current Route 71
- Local passengers will still be able to ride 101 between stops in Marin County, but will pay yet-undetermined new GGT local fare
- MT's ability to operate additional service depends on the cost savings achieved with a private provider as well as local farebox revenue

DRAFT



## Impacts to MT

- Will need to provide 15 – 20,000 additional service hours to cover local portions of GGT service. Note GGT reports providing 39,000 service hours for this service currently.
- At a cost of \$105/hour (contractor worst case) vs. \$120/hour (GGT updated bid), MT can afford over 16,000 additional annual hours – more if fare revenue is accounted for
- Depending on route configuration, MT may need 2 or more additional vehicles



## Impacts on Operational Efficiency

- Currently service is scheduled with significant interlining between MT local and GGT regional routes
  - Scheduling scenario test indicates that MT would require between 50 and 57 weekday vehicles to deliver the service when school is in session (39 weekday vehicles when school is out) that GGT currently provides under contract. Vehicle count increases to 66 when adding in suitable spare ratio.
  - GGT service is likely to become less efficient (more peaked, less midday service) without MT contract

DRAFT



## Impacts to GGT Financial Effectiveness

- By discontinuing service on Routes 10, 70, and 80:
  - GGT saves approximately 58,500 annual service hours and reinvests an unknown portion in Route 101
  - GGT loses local fare revenue from at least 600,000 annual rides who can no longer use GGT service (at base fare of \$1.25)
  - Loss of revenue more than offset by savings in service hours;
  - However, total amount of service provided by GGT is reduced significantly
- GGT may require additional revenue to cover legacy costs

DRAFT



## Question 1 Key Findings

- If GGT discontinues Routes 10, 70, and 80:
  - Passengers most highly impacted are regional riders who use stops which are not served by Route 101; possible issue that may need mitigation
  - If MT provides service to cover the local service area of Routes 10, 70, and 80, there will be minimal impacts to local passengers
  - The latest MT SRTP does not account for additional service hours to cover these routes (15 – 20,000 additional hours); MT plans to use cost savings to operate this service and estimates show that this is feasible
  - Loss of fare revenue from these routes will be more than offset by savings in service hours; however, total service provided by GGT will be reduced. GGT resultant outstanding legacy costs may need new revenue source.



## Question 5



## Question 5

- How will interconnectivity work between local and regional riders?
- Are there other changes in connectivity?
- Are there associated cost changes? Note that interconnectivity is important no matter how the relationship changes

DRAFT



## Interconnectivity Background

- Areas of discussion
  - Schedule coordination
  - Fare coordination and revenue sharing
- The level of seamlessness between the regional and local transit services is subject to negotiation between participating agencies
- There are numerous examples of regional and local interconnectivity for transit customers both in the Bay Area and across the Country
  - SF Muni and BART
  - SF Muni and Samtrans
  - AC Transit and BART
  - LA Metro and numerous municipal systems

DRAFT



## Bay Area Experience

- Schedule coordination
  - Need to establish timed transfer for infrequent services (30-min or less frequent)
  - Challenges maintaining timed connections between freeway express (less reliable to predict) and local (more reliable) services
  - Scheduling timing conflicts need to be negotiated (local school times versus regional destination times)
- Fare coordination options
  - Fare barriers can have a major impact on interconnectivity regardless of schedule coordination (e.g. SamTrans/Muni)
  - Range from a) integrated fare payment media and revenue sharing (BART/Muni) to b) preferred transfer price to c) needing two separate fare instruments

DRAFT



## Current MT/GGT Interconnectivity

- Currently internal GGT schedule coordination between regional and local services
  - MT provides schedules; GGT produces operator runcuts
  - Conflicts between competing service needs (e.g., school times versus meeting regional freeway trips) are addressed in discussions between GGT and MT
  - Situation facilitated by having some integrated regional/local services (10, 70, 80)
- MT credited with all revenue collected on GGT-operated local routes; GGT retains fares collected on Routes 10, 70, 80, and 101

DRAFT



## MT Options – Service Scheduling

- MT plans to continue producing schedules and new contractor will provide operator runcut
- Connectivity between GGT and MT service (timed transfers) is dependent on the level of communication and cooperation between agencies, not the software programs used
- Consolidated intra-county service on MT Route 71 will simplify non-regional transfers
- Regional passengers who will now need to transfer from MT to Route 101 will be most affected by connectivity between agencies (schedule and fare)

DRAFT





## Question 5 Key Findings

- There are numerous examples of successful interconnectivity (schedule and fare) in the Bay Area and elsewhere
- Communication and cooperation between agencies is key to successful, seamless operation
- Interconnectivity issues will be most pressing for customers who need to transfer between MT local service and GGT regional service
- Interconnectivity for school pickups will need to be maintained under new vendor



## Question 2



## Question 2

- What is the status of current assets including vehicles and facilities and how will that change under a new contract?
- Since additional buses may be required if Golden Gate Transit is no longer the vendor, how will they be purchased?
- Where will they be stored?
- Data sources:
  - Draft FY 2012 Marin Transit SRTP
  - Email and interview with Barbara Duffy, Marin Transit
  - Meeting with Denis Mulligan, GGBHTD

DRAFT



## Marin Transit Fixed Route Fleet Plan

	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17
<b>Total Required Vehicles</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>
Transfer Vehicles from GGT to MT	17	17	17	17
MT Replaces GGT Vehicles	14	18	18	40
MT Uses Smaller Vehicles Available within Existing Fleet (including new purchases in FY 14)	16	16	16	16
MT Leases Vehicles or Additional Vehicles Available for Transfer from GGT	19	15	15	0
<b>Total Vehicles Available to MT</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>73</b>



## Cost Impacts of Fleet and Facilities

- Fleet and facilities currently owned by GGT.
- Maintenance and storage facilities MT would need for the contracted local service not yet identified.
- Indicative pricing (hourly rate) for contracted service does not include facilities.



## Cost Impacts of Fleet and Facilities (continued)

- Marin Transit currently pays GGT \$430,000 annually for facility and miscellaneous capital
- If local service is contracted through a private provider, Marin Transit would use these funds for:
  - Facility lease – \$225,000 +/- ( depending on location)
  - Vehicle lease or transfer – cost depends on number needed and availability in the market



## Other Issues to be Considered

- Marin Transit needs to become an FTA grantee to accept federally funded assets (vehicles, equipment, facilities).



## Question 4



## Question 4

- Will there be less bus service or will there be an improvement in bus service?
- What are assumed labor costs of new vendor service?
- Do recent vendor contracts around the region support the cost assumptions used by Marin Transit with respect to labor costs?
  
- Data sources:
  - Marin Transit service parameters provided to private transit service vendors
  - Marin Transit SRTP spreadsheet analysis
  - Email and interview with Barbara Duffy, Marin Transit
  - Interviews with 5 peer transit operators
  - MTC Statistical Summary of Bay Area Transit Operators, June 2012

DRAFT



## Contract Cost Peer Comparison

	Current Marin Transit -- GGT Contract	Marin Transit -- Outside Vendor*	SoTrans	Napa VINE	TriDelta	LAVTA	Westcat
Contractor	GGT	To Be Determined	MV	Veolia	First Transit	MV	MV
Revenue Svc Hours	114,638	130,149	111,680	60,232	153,000	121,000	79,346
Contract Cost/Hour	\$126.76	\$105.00	\$75.03	\$58.41	\$43.10	\$56.79	\$50.35
Driver Average Wage	\$24.96 (top rate)	\$23.00	\$21.25	\$17.66	\$20.00 (top rate)	\$24.00 (top rate)	\$16.99
Key Contract Difference	Includes fuel	Includes fuel		Fare revenue processing done by agency	All maintenance done by agency	Fare revenue processing & insurance provided by agency	
Total Cost/Hour	\$131.22	\$115.46	\$105.00	\$85.01	\$101.77	\$110.21	\$95.39

- MT Outside Vendor costs estimated for FY 13; all others are FY 12



## Contract Cost Findings

- Marin Transit assumed contractor hourly rate and labor rate is reasonable or somewhat conservative when compared to peers
- Marin Transit's current contracted shuttle rates are 20-30% lower than the assumed hourly rate for contracted local fixed route service
- Approximately \$1 million annually could be made available for additional or augmented service if all service is contracted through an outside vendor, based on the following key assumptions



## Cost Savings Assumptions

- MT contracts for current local service plus 16,000 hours for Routes 70 & 80 at \$105 per hour
- Current TDA and STA revenue sharing formula continues
- GGT local paratransit payment to MT is eliminated
- MT does not pay for shared costs of Customer Service Center at SRTC
- MT does not incur additional staffing costs
- No additional costs beyond the \$430,000 are incurred for facility and vehicle leases
- Facility location does not add more than 12% in deadhead to service hours



## Contract Cost Issues for Further Consideration

- Changes to TDA and STA revenue sharing formula may be appropriate and may require MTC participation



## Question 3



## Question 3

- What are the impacts to Golden Gate employees?
- Note union and labor issues are not the responsibility of Marin Transit



TAM invites Golden Gate to present key elements addressing this question

The team did not have sufficient expertise, nor were familiar enough with potential issues, to address the details of employee impacts

Note that a transition to a new vendor would ideally enable current GGT bus division employees to be re-employed with a new private vendor. Marin Transit has allowed for this in their assumed wage rates and treatment of seniority. Also note that another possible transition option is where the natural attrition of Golden Gate bus division employees matches the transition to a new vendor.





## Question 6



## Question 6

- Are there opportunities for functional consolidation including administration planning, human resources, etc.?
- What are the best practices that will be included from MTC's sustainability study?

DRAFT



## Findings from MTC TSP

- Small operators encouraged to focus on coordination, not consolidation:
  - Joint fare structure
  - Clipper roll-out
  - County-level SRTPs
  - Joint purchasing (e.g., consumables, services)
  - Joint call centers, marketing



## Functional Consolidation Best Practices from TSP

- Ideas from TSP peer examples:
  - Centralized business services (e.g., HR, accounting)
  - Alignment of capital project delivery
  - Formal structure for service planning coordination
  - Joint procurement (e.g., vehicles, equipment, facilities)
- Most potential for Marin County context:
  - **Service planning**
    - MT and GGT doing good job already; may need mechanism to ensure long-term alignment of service objectives
  - **Joint procurement:**
    - Some benefits already realized (e.g., NJ Transit, CalACT)



## TSP Summary

- Peer review did not uncover evidence of preferred organizational structure or any near-term impetus for consolidation
- Instead, study identified best practices that can improve customer experience and internal cost efficiencies
  - Marin operators already embrace many practices
  - Other suggestions should be considered, but do not depend on future service delivery model



## Question 7



## Question 7

- What would a transition look like that is orderly, fair, and reasonable?

DRAFT



## Seamless Transition

- To facilitate a smooth transition, the following elements need to be finalized or well underway:
  - Service Plans including service provider roles, service levels, fares and transfer protocols
  - Interagency agreements (asset transfer, schedule coordination for example)
  - Federal recipient designation process (Marin becomes new designee)
  - Marin Transit RFP tailored to client needs and based on industry best experience
  - Vendor responses need to be thoroughly vetted and evaluated during evaluation process; particularly, pricing (including start up costs and, wage rates for major job classifications) approach (all major operating processes and vehicles - if provided), experience and references
  - Selected vendor transition plan

DRAFT



## Start-Up Contingencies and Monitoring

- Formal start-up planning should address contingencies, pre-planned responses to likely scenarios, provision of extra “start-up” personnel, and monitoring program
- Key customer service attributes (safety, on-time performance, reliability, customer interactions) must be monitored, evaluated, and corrective actions implemented

DRAFT



## Question 7 Key Findings

- Items that will need to occur for a smooth transition:
  - Service Plans need to be finalized and communicated (GGT 10,70,80 most prominent example)
  - Interagency Agreements, Federal designation process and asset acquisition process
  - Vendor (provider) scope and selection process

Note: sufficient time must be allowed for these coordination efforts to occur



## Question 8



## Question 8

- With respect to our constituents, what is the best way to move this change in relationship forward?
- What will be the transit users experience in changing the relationship?
- Will the same customer service benefits occur under a new vendor relationship?

DRAFT



## User Experience & Customer Service Potential Focus Areas

- Marketing Support
  - Campaigns, promotions, events
- Customer Information
  - Printed materials, telephone line
- Schedule Reliability
  - Full pullout, on-time runs, vehicle road-calls
- Passenger Comfort
  - Passenger facility and vehicle condition, driver courtesy
- Safety
  - Accident rate
- Public Opinion
  - General appearance/impressions, complaint handling

DRAFT



## Detailed Requirements in MT's Rural & Seasonal Contract (2011)

- Marketing Support
  - Participate in events, attend public meetings
  - On-street logistics for promotions (signs, banners, decals)
- Personnel Responsibilities
  - Two key staff (Project Manager & Maintenance Manager)
  - Five functional areas, e.g., safety, customer service
- Maintenance & Repairs
  - Road calls, vehicle warranties, engine rebuilds, CHP inspections
  - Recordkeeping, preventative maintenance, quality assurance checks
  - Vehicle cleanliness & general appearance (graffiti, decals, paint)
  - Condition of accessory equipment (ADA lifts, head-signs, HVAC)

DRAFT



## MT Experience with Vendors

- Contract terms strengthened to allow sufficient MT oversight of operations
- Performance metrics in vendor contracts provide tool to set expectations & manage results
- Vendors are comfortable with performance-based approach:
  - Three responsive bidders on 2011 rural/seasonal RFP
  - MV exceeding targets, on pace to set ridership records
  - RFI for indicative pricing on local service generated substantial interest from vendors

DRAFT



## Comparing Functional Responsibilities

GGT currently provides some services that are not yet required in all vendor contracts; most are easy to add

Source:  
Attachment 3 to  
letter from MCTD  
to GGBHTD,  
dated 03/19/2012

Functional Area	All Contracts	GGT
Marketing		
Customer Information	X	X
Schedule Printing		X
On Street Material		X
Campaigns		X
Transit Events		X
Purchasing		
Parts	X	X
Fuel	X	X
Outside Repairs	X	X
Insurance	X	X
Vehicles		X
Operations		
Dispatch	X	X
Safety	X	X
Training	X	X
Road Supervision	X	X
Facilities		
Operating Facility	X	X
Bus Stops		X
Planning/Scheduling		
Blocking	X	X
Runcutting	X	X
School Coordination		X
Regulatory Compliance		
Drug & Alcohol Testing Program	X	X
NTD Data Collection	X	X
Title VI Reporting		X
CHP Inspections DRAFT	X	X
EEO Reporting	X	X



## List of Functional Responsibilities Covered by GGT Alone

- Schedule Printing
  - On Street Material
  - Campaigns
  - Transit Events
  - Vehicles
  - Bus Stops
  - School Coordination
  - Title VI Reporting
- MT staff now manage Printing & Materials
- Campaigns & Events both included in latest vendor scope of work
- Vehicle condition addressed in latest vendor scope
  - Vehicle acquisition covered elsewhere in this analysis

DRAFT



## List of Functional Responsibilities Covered by GGT Alone

- Bus Stops
  - School Coordination
  - Title VI Reporting
- Bus stops can be provided by GGT or new contract vendor
- School coordination would be staffed entirely within MT
- MT would need to support if they become direct Federal recipient

DRAFT



## Question 8 Key Findings

- Performance measures to ensure quality customer experience are standard part of vendor contracts
- Even where GGT is currently the only provider, many services are common vendor functions
- Service planning coordination will continue to be an important shared responsibility
- Current Golden Gate Customer Service Center should be maintained under future vendor relationship - costs and responsibilities to be determined

DRAF



## Question 9



## Question 9

What service improvements would be prioritized if funding was available due to the change in relationship?



- Marin Transit has recently completed planning efforts which suggest that both Tiburon and Novato could benefit from service increases
- Marin Transit has a number of service enhancement goals spelled out in their Short Range Transit Plan
- Any process for prioritization will include public input



## Question 10



## Question 10

- What can Marin Transit do to meet the Measure A goals ?



- At the time that the Measure A Expenditure Plan was being developed in 2003, the likely cuts in bus service necessitated by a significant decline in available revenues was the primary focus of Marin's transportation leaders
- With a loan from Marin County utilized to stave off any more significant cuts to local service, the passage of the ½ cent Measure A Transportation Sales Tax came just in time to prevent further significant cuts, such as all weekend and nite-time services. Candidate service improvements are listed in the Sales Tax Expenditure Plan.
- Additional service is needed and highly desirable at this time.



## Question 11



## Question 11

- Are there benefits from experienced staff that would be lost under a new vendor contract?
- Are there benefits from experienced operators including bus drivers that would be lost under a new vendor contract?

DRAFT



## Marin Transit 2011 RFP Approach

- RFP comprehensive – Identifies services to be provided and thoroughly outlines contractor responsibilities
- Requires contractors to provide:
  - Documented experience of the operation of similar specialized transit services
  - The Contractor must submit a proposed staffing plan, consisting of:
    - Organization chart
    - Resumes of Project Manager and Maintenance Manager
    - Proposed staffing levels (including full and part-time positions)\*
  - Management Plan, Operations Plan, Vehicle Maintenance Plan, Safety Program

\* Contractors are required to comply with all Federal and State safety programs. These include those pertaining to bus operator qualifications.

DRAFT



## Marin Transit 2011 RFP Approach (cont'd)

- RFP Requires Extensive Costing Information Be Provided
  - Bidder Price Summary Form – Base Years
  - Price Summary Form – Optional Years
  - Detailed Personnel Cost Form
    - Wage and Benefit detail for all job classifications
  - Detailed Total Cost Form

DRAFT



## Staffing Approach – Providing Experienced Personnel

- Key management positions and personnel identified in proposal, including detail on experience
  - Operations, Maintenance and Safety Leads
  - Selected based on RFP requirements for experience, size of organization, minimum years, etc.
- Front line personnel (operators, supervisors, mechanics, foremen, admin & support)
  - RFP creates favorable conditions for available staff transfers from GGT and other area transit providers (comparable wage rates, seniority recognition)
- In support of start-up activities, key management positions and front line personnel should be supplemented by contractor during 30-90 days after start-up

DRAFT



## Prepare, But Expect

### Prepare

- Communicate changes and plans to policy makers, stakeholders customers
- Monitor contractor start up plan – staffing and recruitment; facility; vehicle
- Identify contingency responses independently and with selected contractor
- Monitor contractor performance and response in key areas

### Expect

- Start-up transition issues
- 3-6 months “growing pains” or “learning curve”
- Some nervous or critical customers
- Staffing and turnover issues
- Issues not thought of will arise
- Issues will diminish over time

DRAFT



## Question 11 Key Findings

- Marin process built on agency experience and other successful regional/national examples
- Marin RFP and transition strategies recognize the importance of an experienced workforce
- Primary strategy to:
  - Implement thorough, well-vetted RFP and selection process to pick highly experienced contractor
  - Coordinate with GGT on transition planning
  - Create favorable conditions for staff transfers





## SUMMARY



### Letter to Marin Transit

- Transit Assessment results included in the recommended letter from TAM to Marin Transit
  - There are some risks in changing to a new private vendor for local bus service currently provided by Golden Gate
  - Savings will be realized that can be re-invested



End of Presentation





September 10, 2012

TO: Transportation Authority of Marin Board of Commissioners

FROM: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director

THROUGH: Li Zhang, Chief Financial Officer  
Bill Whitney, Principal Project Delivery Manager

RE: Office Relocation Review and Selection (Action), Agenda Item 10

Dear Commissioners:

### **Executive Summary**

As previously reported to the TAM Board, TAM's current office space lease at the San Rafael Corporate Center (SRCC) will terminate on November 30, 2012. Over the last few months, staff has evaluated both the purchase and lease options of a new office location that will best meet TAM's operating needs. The TAM Board reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of both the leasing and purchasing options in February 2012 and concluded both options have merit and should be explored further.

Under the direction of the Board and the Office Relocation Ad Hoc Committee, staff has been searching for potential purchase options since February. The Ad Hoc Committee members-Chair Fredericks, Vice Chair Arnold, and Commissioners Lucan, Kelly, and Hillmer have been reviewing potential purchase sites and guiding staff in making offers. Unfortunately, no property that meets TAM's office needs and financial capacity proved to be available for purchase during this time period. Given the lack of available and suitable properties to purchase, the lease option is the better option to pursue at this time. Using the guiding principles established by the Board during TAM's office search five years ago, two office locations were identified for further evaluation. One office location is in the same complex that TAM is in now, the San Rafael Corporate Center, and the other is located at 3950 Civic Center Drive, known as the Autodesk building in Terra Linda.

After thorough evaluation of all factors discussed below, including cost to the agency, staff recommends the San Rafael Corporate Center as the preferred lease location to house TAM's operations in the next few years. The new suite is in the 781 Lincoln building, and is an existing built-out suite that exactly meets TAM's needs, at a square footage price below TAM's current rate. The Corporate Center has worked with staff to allow flexibility in leaving the leased space if a purchase option becomes available. The Corporate Center has worked to match the discounted lease option made available by Autodesk. With its proximity to high quality transit and the walkability of the area, along with its excellent conference facilities that

TAM and its sister agencies can continue to utilize, the Corporate Center site will allow TAM to better serve its member agencies and constituents and also more effectively promote the mission of encouraging alternative modes of travel and reducing pollution and congestion.

**Recommendation: Staff recommends that the TAM Board approves the San Rafael Corporate Center location as the preferred office location and authorizes the Executive Director to negotiate and execute the final lease agreement with San Rafael Corporate Center.**

**Discussion:**

As previously reported to the TAM Board, TAM's current office space lease at the San Rafael Corporate Center (SRCC) will terminate on November 30, 2012. Over the last few months, staff has evaluated both the purchase and lease options of a new office location that will best meet TAM's operating needs. The TAM Board has reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of both the leasing and purchasing options and concluded both options have merit and should be explored further. The TAM Office Relocation Ad Hoc Committee, including Commissioners Lucan, Kelly, and Hillmer, along with Chair Fredericks and Vice-Chair Arnold, has guided staff on the process for determining the option that will best meet TAM's office needs. Under the direction of the Board and the Ad Hoc Committee, staff has been searching for potential purchase options since February. Unfortunately, no property that meets TAM's office needs and financial capacity was available for purchasing during this time period. Given the lack of available and suitable properties to purchase, the lease option is the better option to pursue at this time.

Prior to leasing the current site at the San Rafael Corporate Center the Board established a set of guiding principles that were used to evaluate potential sites. It was determined the office location needed to be in Central Marin with convenient transit and bike/pedestrian access in order to serve its constituency and Board members as well. As part of this analysis staff also presented its planned staffing levels and average office space needed. Based on the study presented, assuming the fulfillment of all 14 positions, TAM needs about 5000-6000 square feet to satisfy its office space requirements.

Using the guiding principles, along with other important evaluation criteria such as cost of the space, access to a large conference room space suitable for committee meetings, project meetings, and special events, available parking, access to the highways, and overall work environment, two office locations were identified for further evaluation. One office location is in the same complex as TAM is in now and the other is located at 3950 Civic Center Drive known as the Autodesk building in Terra Linda.

**San Rafael Corporate Center**

The SRCC office has a number of positive attributes such as the proximity to the San Rafael Transportation Center, readily accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities, access to suitable conference rooms, access to the nearby future SMART station site, access to Highway 101 and Interstate I-580, and the overall desirable working environment that includes walkable access to local amenities such as restaurants, coffee shops, and banking services.

The suite has been previously occupied and will require no major tenant improvements. This allows credit to be given back to TAM. Overall, this location can better service TAM's daily operations and its mission to promote alternative travel modes and congestion management.

### **Autodesk (3950 Civic Center Drive)**

The Autodesk location also has a number of positive attributes such as ability to design the office interior to adequately serve TAM's operations, available parking, and convenient access to highway 101. The Autodesk building also will also be served by passenger rail service once SMART starts its operation.

Bus transit service at the Autodesk location is not as abundant as compared to the SRCC. Of the thirty three bus routes in Marin, four provide service to Autodesk as compared to twenty serving SRCC. (See the attached bus transit route map for the area)

This space is current in shell condition and requires extensive build-out. TAM will have the ability to design this space to best meet TAM's office space needs.

### **Cost Comparison**

The financial comparison of the two locations requires consideration of various factors. Negotiations are currently underway with representatives from both locations. The AutoDesk location is offering an initial effective cost per square foot of \$2.50 with an incentive of the first four months of rent free. The SRCC is offering an initial effective cost of \$2.72 per square foot with an incentive of the first and last month rent free. Other factors considered include tenant improvement allowance, costs associated with ADA improvements and early access credits.

An important factor in the financial comparison is the duration of the lease agreement. Given the possibility of purchasing a building in the future it may be in TAM's best interest to have a shorter lease agreement. Autodesk offered both a three-year and five-year lease option with different monthly rent cost and tenant improvement credit. While the five-year option offers full coverage of basic tenant improvements, the three year option requires TAM reimburse Autodesk approximately \$100,000 for the tenant improvements, which results in a bit of uncertainty of actual costs. The SRCC offered the option of a five-year lease with a termination option at the end of year three. The early termination penalties are well defined in the proposal. The cost comparison of the two sites is based on the three-year lease option.

Based on the various comparison factors, cost of the AutoDesk office location is estimated to be \$501,000 and cost of the SRCC location is estimated to be \$556,000 over a three year period. Since negotiations associated with the Autodesk lease will continue over the next few weeks (note County Counsel has been working with TAM staff to shape the new Autodesk lease) and tenant improvements will very likely take over 60 days to complete, the difference in the three years costs could be as little as \$25,000. (See the attached cost comparison worksheet for a detailed breakdown)

### **Conclusion**

After evaluation of all factors discussed above, staff recommends the SRCC as the preferred location to house TAM's operations. With its proximity to transit, its adjacent walkable

community, and its available conference facilities staff believes the downtown San Rafael site will allow TAM to better serve its member agencies and constituents and also more effectively promote its mission of encouraging alternative modes of travel and reducing pollution and congestion.

**Recommendation: Staff recommends that the TAM Board approves the San Rafael Corporate Center location as the preferred office location and authorizes the Executive Director to negotiate and execute the final lease agreement with San Rafael Corporate Center.**

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1: Three Year Cost Comparison of Lease Options  
Attachment 2: Bus Transit Route Map

# Three Year Cost Comparison of Lease Options AutoDesk & San Rafael Corporate Center

Agenda Item 10

Attachment 1

September 10, 2012

Location	Autodesk (3950 Civic Center Drive)	San Rafael Corporate Center (781 Lincoln Ave. - Suite 160)	For Information SRCC (750 Lindero Suite 200)
Size	5,278	5,202	4,367
Condition	All new built-out.	As is w/ minor TI's	
First Year \$/sf *	2.50	2.72	
3-Year Lease Cost	\$ 436,633	\$ 501,629	
Potential for Early Departure from Suite 200	Not Possible, may need to pay full price monthly rent at Suite 200	\$ (14,400)	
Additional Cost Associated with Terminating Lease After 3 Years	\$ 100,000	\$ 92,612	
Up front TI's	\$ -	\$ 5,000	
ADA Improvements Credit		\$ (15,000)	
15 Day Early Access Credit Autodesk - One-month Early Access Credit SRCC \$14,149(SRCC) - \$6,466(AD) = \$7,683		\$ (7,683)	
Other Potential Cost Reduction/Credit Options (Broker Fee)		\$ 30,000	
<i>Lease one office @ \$1000 / month</i>	\$ (36,000)	\$ (36,000)	
<i>Total 3 Year Cost</i>	\$ 500,633	\$ 556,158	
Cost Difference		\$ 55,525	
Likely additional costs for rent at Suite 200 due to Autodesk negotiations and TI's timeline		\$ (30,023)	
Remaining Cost Difference		\$ 25,502	
Monthly Rental cost	\$ 13,906	\$ 15,449	\$ 14,400
Average Cost per Square Foot	\$ 2.58	\$ 2.84	\$ 3.30

	Autodesk Option	SRCC 781 Lincoln- Suite 160	
Year 1 **	105,560.00	155,643.84	
Year 2	163,090.20	176,035.68	
Year 3 **	167,982.91	169,949.34	
Total	436,633.11	501,628.86	
Annual Cost	87,326.62	100,325.77	
Rent Calculation	Autodesk Option	SRCC 781 Lincoln- Suite 160	
	3% Annual Increase	\$0.10/sf increase years 1 -\$0.15sf years 2-5	
Year 1	2.50	2.72	
Year 2	2.58	2.82	
Year 3	2.65	2.97	
Average	2.58	2.84	

\* SRCC is offering TAM a \$0.33 monthly rent credit, which is equivalent to a \$15 per sf tenant improvement credit.

\*\* SRCC free rent first and last month

\*\* 4-month of free rent in the first year is assumed for the Autodesk option as industry standard offer with new tenant to offset moving costs.



**Other Transit Systems** (For information, call 511)

<b>AC</b> AC Transit	<b>MU</b> San Francisco Muni
<b>AE</b> Airport Express (Sonoma Co.)	<b>PS</b> PresidioGo Shuttle
<b>AI</b> Angel Island-Tiburon	<b>PT</b> Petaluma Transit
<b>AM</b> Amtrak	<b>SM</b> SamTrans (San Mateo Co.)
<b>BA</b> BART	<b>SO</b> Sonoma Co. Transit
<b>BG</b> Blue and Gold Fleet	<b>SR</b> Santa Rosa CityBus
<b>GR</b> Greyhound	<b>VB</b> Vallejo Baylink Ferry
<b>MA</b> Marin Airporter	<b>VI</b> Napa VINE
<b>ME</b> Mendocino Transit Authority	<b>VT</b> Vallejo Transit
	<b>WC</b> WestCAT

**Autodesk Location**  
3950 Civic Center Drive

**Marin Civic Center**  
Hall of Justice Arch

45 45K  
49 49K  
233 259

**San Rafael Transit Center**  
3rd & Hetherton

17*	22	23*	27
29	35	36	40
42	44	45	45K
49	49K	68	
70	71	80	101
233	257	259	

AE GR MA SO

Note: A limited number of Route 70 and 80 trips serve Lincoln Ave. Check timetables.

\* Note: Not all Route 17 or 23 trips serve the San Rafael Transit Center. Check timetables.

\* Note: Route 29 serves Irene St bus stop and #3140/3160 Kerner bus stop on weekdays only.

\* Note: Some Route 35 and 36 trips begin at Golden Gate Transit. Check timetables.

Route 40 operates peak-hours only. Route 42 operates daily.