

San Jose State University
SJSU ScholarWorks

Mineta Transportation Institute Publications

4-1-2003

Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum Marin/ Sonoma 101 Corridor, MTI Report F-01-02

Mineta Transportation Institute

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/mti_publications

 Part of the [Transportation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mineta Transportation Institute. "Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum Marin/Sonoma 101 Corridor, MTI Report F-01-02"
Mineta Transportation Institute Publications (2003).

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mineta Transportation Institute Publications by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.



MTI

Norman Y. Mineta
International Institute for
Surface Transportation Policy Studies
Created by Congress in 1991

Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum Marin/ Sonoma 101 Corridor

Mineta Transportation Institute
San José State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0219

MTI Report F-01-02

**Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum
Marin/Sonoma 101 Corridor**

April 2003

a publication of the
Mineta Transportation Institute
College of Business
San José State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0219

Created by Congress in 1991

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. FHWA/CA/TO-2002-21	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum: Marin/Sonoma 101 Corridor		5. Report Date April 2003	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Authors Symposium		8. Performing Organization Report No. F-01-02	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Mineta Transportation Institute College of Business BT550, San José State University San Jose, CA 95192-0219		10. Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract or Grant No. 65W136	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address California Department of Transportation U.S. Department of Transportation Sacramento, CA 95819 Research and Special Programs Administration 400 7th Street, SW Washington, DC 20590-0001		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract <p>The entire Hwy. 101 corridor in Marin County and 10 miles in Sonoma County were at F service level as early as 1995. Tourists and recreational destinations make this a seven-day-a-week traffic hot spot. Three failed elections in the past revealed an electorate divided and unable to reach consensus on solutions. Recent work by public and private leaders in both counties was leading toward an election in November 2004.</p> <p>On April 11, 2002, the Mineta Transportation Institute cosponsored a regional transportation forum with The Commonwealth Club of California in Marin County, California. Several representatives from key Marin County and Sonoma County transportation-related agencies and community organizations joined to discuss the corridor and the many possible actions that could provide alternatives and relieve congestion. The forum concluded with a set of recommendations for next steps.</p> <p>This publication is an edited version of the April 11 Forum.</p>			
17. Key Words Commuter Rail Environmental effects High-occupancy vehicle lanes Transportation corridor Transportation planning Transportation policy		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 96	22. Price \$15.00

Copyright © 2003 by MTI
All rights reserved

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 2002113696

To order this publication, please contact the following:

Mineta Transportation Institute
College of Business BT-550
San José State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0219
Tel (408) 924-7560
Fax (408) 924-7565
E-mail: mti@mti.sjsu.edu
<http://transweb.sjsu.edu>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This transcript is prepared as part of the Mineta Transportation Institute's opening efforts to share the most up-to-date information available regarding the transportation industry and transportation issues. This forum, *Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum: Marin/Sonoma 101 Corridor*, is the second in three planned transportation hot spot forums.

The Mineta Transportation Institute would like to thank the following individuals for their assistance in bringing this forum to fruition on April 11, 2002.

- Liza Crosse, Administrative Aide to Supervisor Steve Kinsey
- Rod Diridon, Executive Director, Mineta Transportation Institute, and Chair, California High Speed Rail Authority
- George Dobbins, Program Director, The Commonwealth Club of California
- Saaïd Fakharzadeh, District Office Chief; Office of Design North Counties, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Rose Guilbault, Vice-President of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs, California State Automobile Association
- Steve Kinsey, Vice-Chair, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- Sharon Wright, Santa Rosa City Council

This event was sponsored by the United States Department of Transportation, Caltrans, California State Automobile Association, The Commonwealth Club of California, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Marin and Sonoma Counties, and the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District.

Special thanks to Dr. Dongsung Kong of San José State University for coordinating this forum and MTI Communications Director Leslee Hamilton for acting as forum contact.

MTI would also like to thank the following individuals for their work and dedication in publishing this forum, both on the Web and in hard copy: Research Director Trixie Johnson; Research and Publications Assistant Sonya Cardenas; Transcriber Noelle Celine Major; Graphic Designers Shun Nelson, Cedric Howard, Emily Kruger, and Tseggai Debretsion; Webmaster Barney Murray; and Editorial Associates Irene Rush and Catherine Frazier.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY3

PANEL PRESENTATION7

KEYNOTE SPEAKER53

RECOMMENDATIONS PANEL73

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS, AND TERMS ...95

FOREWORD

As part of the Mineta Transportation Institute's ongoing efforts to promote dialogue addressing surface transportation issues, it is my pleasure to share this edited transcript of *Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum: Marin/Sonoma 101 Corridor*. The corridor certainly qualifies as a hot spot, both in terms of the worsening congestion and as a description of the public disagreement on solutions.

After a series of failed transportation tax measure elections in Marin and Sonoma Counties, transportation policy leaders had started the long process that might lead to another transportation tax measure in the near future, beginning with a period of deliberations by advisory and government organizations. The importance of reaching local consensus before seeking funding in the upcoming federal authorization process had provided impetus to overcome the past disagreements and move forward with acceptable solutions. The time had arrived for a more public dialogue. The purpose of this forum was to begin that broader dialogue in a more public setting, accessible to all. The Mineta Transportation Institute acted as a neutral convener, which we were delighted to do.

An event of this nature is always the result of the work of many, and I thank all those individuals and organizations referenced in the Acknowledgements section. I do want to call special attention to the following advisory committee members for helping to set the agenda, sharing their expertise, and working to ensure that the discussion at this well-attended event remained civil and constructive:

- George Dobbins, Program Director, The Commonwealth Club of California
- Saaid Fakharzadeh, District Office, Office of Design North Counties, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Rose Guilbault, California State Automobile Association
- Steve Kinsey, Marin County Supervisor and Vice-Chair, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and his assistant, Liza Crosse
- Sharon Wright, Santa Rosa City Council and MTC Board Member

Special thanks to Caltrans Director Jeff Morales for delivering the afternoon keynote address and for his ongoing efforts to improve California's surface transportation system.

The Mineta Transportation Institute has three primary functions: research, education, and information transfer. It is in the latter role that we organized and presented this Hot Spot Forum. We hope that this edited transcript, and the full transcript available on our website at <http://transweb.sjsu.edu>, will contribute to an understanding of the issues and possible solutions and be

of use to communities everywhere that are attempting to address serious transportation needs in a constructive manner.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rod Diridon". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "R" and "D".

Rod Diridon

Executive Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On April 11, 2002, the Mineta Transportation Institute cosponsored a regional transportation forum with The Commonwealth Club of California in Marin County, California. Several representatives from key Marin County and Sonoma County transportation-related agencies and community organizations joined to discuss the corridor and the many possible actions that could provide alternatives and relieve congestion. The forum concluded with a set of recommendations for next steps.

Representatives from both the private and public sector were invited to participate as panelists and participants.

The forum included a question-and-answer session. The keynote speaker was Jeff Morales, Director of the California Department of Transportation. The moderators were Marin County Supervisor Steve Kinsey and Rod Diridon of the Mineta Transportation Institute.

This publication, an edited proceedings of the April 11 forum, is a continuation of the MTI effort to stimulate dialogue on this critical transportation issue.

The Mineta Transportation Institute brought together the following transportation and government authorities:

- Lenka Culik-Caro, Project Manager, California Department of Transportation
- Mike DeGiorgio, Marin County Congestion Management Agency
- Rod Diridon, Chair, California High-Speed Rail Authority, and MTI Executive Director
- Rose Guilbault, Vice-President of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs, California State Automobile Association
- Steve Heminger, Executive Director, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Supervisor Mike Kerns, Sonoma County
- Lynne Kidder, Executive Director, North Bay Council
- Supervisor Steve Kinsey, Marin County, MTC Vice-Chair
- Jake MacKenzie, Chair, Sonoma County Transportation Agency
- Jeff Morales, Director, California Department of Transportation
- Supervisor Cynthia Murray, Marin County
- Vic Revenko, Former President, The Commonwealth Club of California

- Marty Rosen, Director of Special Projects, Trust For Public Lands
- David Schonbrun, Marin Advocates for Transit and TRANSDEF
- Sharon Wright, Santa Rosa City Council, MTC Commissioner
- Alan Zahradnik, Director of Planning, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of the panel's recommendations. The final discussion of recommendations to be adopted, of which this list is a summary, begins on page 75.

Focus

- Develop a multimodal corridor, including rail, bus, highway, ferry, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements.
- Integrate Smart Growth planning principles, which includes getting changes in general plan updates.
- On the highway, add only one lane in each direction, do not include continuous frontage roads, and have a continuous bicycle and pedestrian route.
- Emphasize transit improvements, consistent with Sonoma County's 2010 Strategy and Marin's Integrated Transportation Plan.
- Improve coordination and balance development of the modal plans.
- As a community, embrace all the principles of Smart Growth, not just those that favor a particular bias.
- Achieve concurrency, that is, coordinated and balanced development of the modes at the same time.
- Work toward Transportation Demand Management.

Partnership

- Continue and expand the close coordination between Marin and Sonoma Counties.
- Improve community outreach to bring more participation.
- Encourage public-private partnerships.
- Expand public outreach efforts, including all communities and all social interests.
- Support the SMART legislation.

-
- Bring MTC into the effort to ensure that, from a regional perspective, these partnerships and coordinated plans go forward and work towards solidarity.

Funding

- Develop an integrated, prioritized funding plan for the corridor that includes housing investments as well as investments in the different transit modes and transportation improvements.
- Use performance measures to evaluate effectiveness and sequencing, with metrics such as commute times, vehicle-miles traveled, vehicle-miles avoided, and proximity of housing to transit.
- Recognize that performance measures involve more than a cost-effectiveness analysis.
- Explore a joint funding structure that benefits both counties.
- Investigate what can be done to fund these improvements in both counties, including, but not limited to, going forward with SMART (Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit).
- Explore the role of congestion pricing and alternative funding sources.
- Consider the structural reform needed in transportation planning and financing.
- Recognize the innovative capacity of the two communities and the yearning for a more progressive outcome that is holistic in resolving not just problems of transportation, but community problems from health, to education, to life quality, to environmental protection.

PANEL PRESENTATION

STEVE KINSEY:

Good morning, thank you for joining us. It's an especially positive moment to look out in the room and see so many of you here with us today to talk about this important issue. We're calling it a Regional Transportation Hot Spot Forum, with the light shining on the Marin-Sonoma Narrows. Just by looking at who's in the room, I can feel the heat building already. We'll loosen our ties and get into what I expect will be a very encouraging opportunity for us to think about the Marin-Sonoma Narrows, and what we can be doing so that the solution that we get happens as soon as possible, in the most responsible way that meets the needs of all or most of the people.

I want to start by thanking our technical folks who've been working quite a bit this morning. We're not only having the opportunity to hear each other better today, but we're connected into the Internet. Also, there will be a performance at lunch, with the keynote speaker Jeff Morales, that will be part of a larger radio broadcast—part of the Commonwealth Series, one of our sponsors.

I want to say that, as I look around the room, and thank all of you for being here, I see that there is a spectrum of interests, and it's appropriate that we would have that in this room for this discussion, because the Marin-Sonoma Narrows really is important. It's important to our businesses and workforce who find themselves delayed on a virtually daily basis, both coming to and going from Marin and Sonoma County. It's important for freight—it's a major arterial, perhaps the singular most important arterial for all of our North Coast counties, all the way to the state line. It's important for safety, in terms of flooding on the highway that we don't want to see and acceleration lanes that we need to see in certain areas—interchanges. It's important for the environment—it runs alongside our most important resources, our baylands. So as I think about this day, I'm excited because it feels like this is also the Marin County and the Sonoma County expression of sustainability—looking after our businesses, looking after our environment and our baylands, and looking after those who are dependent on transit because these improvements will certainly provide for that. It's a multimodal corridor, and I think today we'll be talking about not just highway improvements, but bus and rail and bicycle and pedestrian access through this corridor, so we're in for quite a range of things to talk about.

I do want to thank our sponsors. Several of the sponsors of our event are here today, and this morning we'll make a brief introduction, but throughout the day, I think we'll be able to recognize that their contribution is very helpful to our regional needs.

With that I would say, just before handing it off to Supervisor Murray, that I begin today quite optimistic. We have money in our pocket; we have an Environmental Impact Report underway.

We have the good work of Senator Burton in 1998 that got all of this going by coming up with the money for the original project study report. We have a HOT (Hot Occupancy Toll) Study that shows some provocative thinking about how you can get the private sector involved, and we can perhaps bring that into our discussion today. We're in the Regional Transportation Plan as a Track 1 project, which is sort of a breath of hope for something happening in our lifetimes. We had a successful negotiation with Caltrans at the highest levels, which resulted in a significant interregional funding this cycle—dramatically more than had been projected. All of these things build my confidence. But perhaps what most builds my confidence about this region and this effort to improve our transportation is that Marin County and Sonoma County have been working extremely well together for several years. We have supported the strategy that Sonoma County has for their Highway 101. Sonoma County and Marin County have passed identical resolutions recognizing the importance of this, but perhaps the most important thing we've done is to develop a Policy Advisory Group (PAG) made up of officials from each of our counties to work on what it is that we really want. So, I think the reality of it is...today we're going to find that it is less a question of what to do in the Narrows and more a question of how to get it done.

I can't think of a better person to speak about how to get it done than the Chair of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows PAG, Supervisor Murray. Cynthia Murray, good morning.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Good morning. Thank you Supervisor Kinsey, and good morning to all of you. First I want to take this opportunity to welcome you here on behalf of the Board of Supervisors. We are delighted to be hosting this event today and to see so many of you here who share our concern about getting this important transportation project completed. The Marin-Sonoma Narrows is actually one of our first victories in consensus building, because for many years, it was called the Novato Narrows, and I represent Novato, and we really wanted to get that name gone.

So we're thrilled that Marin and Sonoma have decided that it is called the Marin-Sonoma Narrows and not the Novato Narrows anymore. I think, in many other ways, we have made great progress toward consensus also in bringing the two counties into alignment on what should be done in this very important transportation corridor, and first and foremost is the recognition that this is just one of the transportation improvements that's needed to really reduce congestion, and that we need to certainly level the playing field and make the freeway have HOV (High-Occupancy Vehicle) lanes all the way from Cloverdale through Marin County, and that is something that is sorely missing.

I had the opportunity this morning to do something I think is probably unique amongst anyone else in the audience: I drove the Novato Narrows north and south. I had to go from my home in Novato up to Petaluma and back down here. It was very interesting as I drove along and saw the huge amounts of cars that were occupied by only one person, with no other transit choices. I also saw only one bus the entire time I was on the freeway and part of that is because, without HOV

lanes, it's very hard to use a lot of express buses and give people that as a real transit choice. As Steve pointed out, this is a very important corridor for us, because it provides all the workers—I shouldn't say all, most of the workers from Marin County have to come from the north, which is very important to us, especially our public employees who provide public safety; our teachers; and those people who provide our trades and commerce. I saw many tradespeople, many delivery trucks. All of that is certainly affected by having only one game in town, which is a very narrow highway. So I too am very excited and optimistic about us being able to continue to move forward. This is a project that we need to get done, and we need to get it done in a much shorter time frame than what has been considered in the past. I think it's something we can get done, and it's delightful to be able to work so closely with my counterparts in Sonoma County, and I think that we are in the right place at the right time to achieve great results. Thank you.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you, Supervisor. In terms of her counterpart from Sonoma County, also a member of the PAG, as we call it...that's one of the things that I mentioned, that this is a world of acronyms, so from time to time, some of us will slip into that...the Policy Advisory Group. I think that Supervisor Mike Kerns also is on the Sonoma County Transportation Agency, which is the Congestion Management and Transportation Planning Agency in Sonoma County. Welcome, Mike, and thank you for being here.

MIKE KERNS:

Thank you, Steve. It's my pleasure to be here this morning.

If ever there was a question in my mind about the need for these improvements, just trying to get here on time this morning certainly heightened my awareness that we need to make some improvements. I wanted to take a moment to thank the Mineta Transportation Institute and the other sponsors for this forum this morning, and to thank the County of Marin for hosting this forum. I think it's very important that we do these kinds of things, that the information is provided to everyone—those public agencies involved in this process and also the public. So, again, thank you for putting this on. I think it's going to be a very informative day for everyone.

In terms of what needs to be done, to those people in Marin County who would say, "Well, why should I support rail?" and also people in Sonoma County that say, "Why should I support rail? It's not going to really benefit us," I would say, take a look out there on the highway during commute hours, during the peak hours, with those cars bumper to bumper, stopped much of the time. We need to provide alternative modes of transportation for people. To those people who would say, "Well, if we improve this transportation infrastructure, it's going to mean more growth," well, look around folks. The growth is already here, both in Marin County and Sonoma County, and we're just playing catch-up at this time. These transportation improvements need to

be done. We are way behind. Our whole infrastructure is antiquated. We're probably 30 years past due in getting these things done, so I'm happy to be part of this process. In addition to what's been mentioned, I'm also on the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) Commission, and moving forward with trying to get a passenger rail system for both counties. We need to do this. We need to do this for now and we need to do it for the future, and that includes expanding our buses; it includes expanding the ferry system on the bay. I think these are all viable alternatives for people. We can't just keep adding lanes to the highway. I'm very excited today that all these alternatives are going to be discussed. It's not an easy process to find the funding to get all of this done, of course—all of you know it is very difficult—but, hopefully, we'll be able to talk a little bit about that and what funding sources are available to get these needed improvements done.

So, thank you for inviting me here this morning. It's a pleasure to be here, and thanks again for sponsoring this forum.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you, Mike. One thing I would say before introducing our next guest is that I appreciate when policy folks like you are willing to take on not just one mode of transportation in your thinking. Being involved in SMART, being involved in your transportation agency, is how we're going to help to build these bridges between the transportation modes as we think about an integrated future. So, thanks again for all the hard work.

MIKE KERNS:

Well Steve, thank you, and I should have pointed out that our Board of Supervisors has also made a commitment, along with the Marin County Board of Supervisors, to work together, and we've been doing that for some time now and we've made the commitment to continue to work together. These problems are really a regional issue and we're going to do that. So, thank you.

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes, thanks. As we think about an ongoing commitment, our next guest is a representative of an organization that has had a long tradition of being interested in transportation issues in the Bay Area and helping communities resolve and understand the problems. With that, I would like to introduce Vic Revenko, on behalf of The Commonwealth Club of California.

VIC REVENKO:

Thanks Steve, and thanks to all the sponsoring organizations: The Mineta Transportation Institute, the California State Automobile Association, and the counties of Marin and Sonoma. The Commonwealth Club, if you may not know it, is a hundred-year-old organization that focuses on airing issues and bringing closure and consensus, and I would hope that we can do that today.

There's a lot of controversy and discussion going on and I think that coming together is important. I think Steve suggested this as an opportunity to take our ties off and maybe I'll do that during the day, but hopefully I can put it back on at the end of the day rather than leave it off. The Commonwealth Club has joined forces with our sponsors to look at other transportation issues over time—high-speed rail options or BART extensions—so we have a keen interest in these issues that are important to the two counties and the Bay Area, whether it's transportation or water or the economy or national security, and today's no exception. We look forward to learning more about the problems, about the gridlock issue and how we can resolve that, and hopefully, we can resolve them as much as possible today. Now, it's my pleasure to turn it back to Steve.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you very much. This is an opportunity for another one of our sponsors today, the California State Automobile Association, Rose Guilbault. Good morning, Rose.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here with you today.

We too are a hundred years old, as The Commonwealth Club is. The California State Automobile Association started as an auto club, and the club came together to solve some policy issues, and we wanted to create safer roads and better laws. Things haven't changed all that much in a hundred years. We still pursue safer roads and better laws for our members and for our communities. What has changed is there's a lot more automobiles and a lot more congested roads. So we look for solutions and for choices, and we support multimodal forms of transportation. We support different types of vehicles that can provide that, any kind of transportation from transit to ferries to bicycle paths to pedestrians. We look at all these different types of solutions and support choices for people to be more mobile, to provide more mobility throughout our territory. So we particularly like these kinds of forums because they give an opportunity for citizens to come together to participate in the spirited debate and pursue their democratic rights. I hope some of you are members, because that gives us even more reason to be here, to support our members and help you with choices and provide some solutions for transportation needs and problems. I look forward to a spirited debate and an informational debate, so that we can learn and come up with some solutions for our transportation problems today. Thank you.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you, Rose. Our next speaker is really the spark plug that ignited this opportunity, speaking on behalf of the Mineta Transportation Institute. I want to thank Rod personally for taking the time to work with us to bring the program that the Mineta Transportation Institute has successfully implemented in other communities to the North Bay. He either had to start before

dawn or find a great bed-and-breakfast in our region. I hope he did that, because we need the support these days for our hospitality industries, but he's come a long way to help us understand our issues.

There's no need for me or those of you who've been involved in transportation to explain, but for all in the room, Rod has spent his career looking after community interests, from city councils, to supervisor, to his current position as the Chair of the High-Speed Rail Authority, looking after transportation vision that goes well beyond the 21st century. So with that, I'd like to thank you for being here and bringing your show to town today, Rod. Rod Diridon.

ROD DIRIDON:

Steve, thank you very much. Spark plugs sound explosive and we want to be non-explosive today, so eliminate the sparks and have a little more light. Thanks, Steve and Cynthia for allowing us to use your beautiful facility here. It's motivational just being in this wonderful Frank Lloyd Wright-designed facility. And thanks to each of the other welcomers for being here, sharing your time, and for trying to bring together the consensus that's necessary in order to pursue a project.

It should be clear to all in this room, and it certainly is clear to others around the region, that in order to pursue a major-investment project, you have to have consensus. If you continue to have city against city, county against county, faction against faction, then not only will your problem not be solved, as it hasn't been for decades, but also those tax dollars that you're sending to the state and federal government for transportation programs are going to go to other areas. So, either in terms of the fiscal concern, or in terms of the quality-of-life concern that relates to your transportation gridlock, you need to come to a consensus and decide on a course of action that will, in the way that the majority in this area feels is appropriate, solve the problem, and that's represented now by the 101 Corridor in the Marin-Sonoma area.

I'd like to offer thanks before closing my welcome comments to all of those who helped put this program on. It's a little more complicated than just gathering some folks in the morning. Just balancing the panels is enough to add to my gray hair. But a special thanks to our sponsors, thanks especially to Liza Crosse from Supervisor Kinsey's office, who was a wonderful liaison in setting the program up here; to Trixie Johnson, who is the Research Director at the Mineta Transportation Institute, past vice-mayor of the City of San Jose; to her staff person Sonya Cardenas, who got up awfully early this morning and came up here to be with you; and to the many others who put together the resources and the energies to allow you to have this platform to show the world—literally show the world, because you are going to be broadcast on National Public Radio (NPR), thanks to The Commonwealth Club of California—that you can come to consensus and identify a course of action to solve the problems here in Marin and Sonoma Counties.

The program, as you have it before you, first convenes a panel that identifies the conditions here. After that, we will have a luncheon keynote address from Caltrans Director Jeff Morales, the

person at the state level who has the most control over and the ability to guide and fund your solutions. A final panel in the afternoon, made up of all those who have participated before, will craft a consensus statement. I hope that you're all able to stay through that process and contribute.

The morning panel will have extensive questions and answers. The panelists know that they're speaking for a relatively short period of time in order to give you, the audience, time to ask questions, to add to the information necessary to feed into the afternoon panel. The noon speech is tightly controlled in order to fit into the NPR format, and that will be guided by Vic Revenko and The Commonwealth Club folks. We'll have to be considerate in that period of time, being quiet and using the question forms that The Commonwealth Club has for you, so that Rose can sort through them and make sure we finish within the time period. The afternoon period will not have questions and answers, but will be a debate and discussion between the panelists, who will then prepare the consensus statement.

Steve, I think that covers it. Thank you again for being such a cordial host, and we'll look forward to a productive day.

STEVE KINSEY:

Great. Thank you all. I'm going to ask the first panel if they would come up and take seats here, thank those who've been with us—thank you Vic; Rose, thank you. I'm also going to ask those who are identified as being in the Resource Group if they could sort of negotiate, we'll see how we can build consensus, to be sitting up here, available during the question-and-answer period. If we need some additional chairs, we might look after how we can get chairs for the four folks.

Very good. Thank you all for your patience as we move into the heart of the program for this morning. This is an opportunity, as Rod said, to try to shape what are the issues, what are the challenges to reach consensus. In my optimism, when I say we have less a question of what to do and more a question of how to do it, I think that's because I see that there are many efforts that are well underway and the folks around me, for the most part, have been central in those efforts. So I want to thank them all for being here.

We're going to begin with 10 minutes for each speaker. Steve Heminger will be our first speaker. Steve is the Executive Director of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which looks after the nearly \$3 billion a year in investments in transportation in all modes for the Bay Area region. It's always fun for me to have a leash on him for 10 minutes, because we're always complaining that the staff has a leash on us when I'm over at MTC representing Marin County. So Steve can talk to us. I think he can give us the best idea of how this fits into the universe of transportation problems and potential solutions because of his great work in helping us develop a Regional Transportation Plan last year, a transit expansion policy which sets the tone for the next 20 years in important new transit projects, including the SMART program; and for the leadership

he's providing currently on a project that's really a multiple-agency project that recognizes an important aspect of transportation: that transportation isn't an island. It's linked to land use. What an amazing thing to find out! As one of the agencies that's overseeing what we're calling the Smart Growth Livability Footprint Project, with partners at ABAG, BCDC, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Steve has his hands full. I hope in his 10 minutes he can share some of that with us. Thank you. Good morning.

STEVE HEMINGER:

Good morning, Steve, and thank you. I definitely don't like the speaking order here, because rule number one when you work for a commission is, "Don't contradict the Commissioners," and unfortunately, I'm going first, so I will do my best and swivel my head and try to gauge facial reaction.

I'm also pleased to be here with Rod Diridon, who's a former Chair of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and Steve, believe me, "spark plug," for any of us who know Rod, is far too mild a term for his ability to serve as a catalyst, and to look at the accomplishments that he's achieved in Santa Clara County is really to be amazed.

I want to spend my few minutes talking about our Regional Transportation Plan and our Rail and Bus Expansion Program, which is known by its Commission Resolution Number 3434, which these two commissioners and their colleagues adopted just a few months ago with great fanfare. And I want to talk about what's in it for the 101 Corridor: three \$200 million-plus projects—the 101 widening throughout Sonoma County; the Marin-Sonoma Narrows; and in the rail package, the SMART Train.

Now, before you start to celebrate, what does that mean? I think there is some confusion about being in the plan and what that might entail. It's really, in my view, like getting a fishing license: It doesn't mean you've got the fish. You still have to go out and catch them to feed the family. The other thing to keep in mind is that our Regional Transportation Plan is a 25-year blueprint, so if you wait until year 24 to catch the fish, your family is going to starve. So I think the challenge before us, and I think Steve had it right—it's not so much what to do, but how to get it done. It's "How do we catch the fish as soon as possible?" I think Marin and Sonoma Counties are on the cutting edge of several issues in that respect. For example, in Sonoma County, where the 101 widening project is, funding is available over the 25 years to widen the road for a carpool lane the length of the county. If you want to wait until year 24, we can get it all done. I don't think the folks in Sonoma County are willing to wait, nor should they. They are now trying to borrow some of that money from the future, through a process called Garvey Bonding, to bring the money forward and accomplish that improvement more quickly for commuters in that corridor. They'll be one of the first areas of the state of California to take advantage of that new federal program.

In Marin County, they're being just as innovative, with the Gap Closure Project on 101, which is underway, by trying to squeeze two lanes into one, with a reversible facility, which will also be one of the first of its kind in California.

The Narrows is a different story. The Narrows is included in the plan, but it's included with a large assumption: that most of the money will come from the state, through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program. That is going to require a commitment from the state to that project, which we think should be forthcoming. And you've got a chance today to talk to the head of Caltrans and reinforce that pledge. We also have an opportunity coming up in a year or so in Washington, with the reauthorization of the TEA-21 Statute, to perhaps secure some federal support for the project, and I know that will be sought by leaders in both counties

Finally, the SMART train is included in our Rail and Bus Expansion Program, but like several other projects, fortunately the minority of the projects, it's not fully funded. It's short of not only capital money, but even more important, of the operating funds that would be needed to run the service. For that, literally the only place that counties in our region and throughout California have been able to turn is to a local sales tax measure, because that's where the operating money can come from. A sales tax, since it's continuous, can provide that money over time.

I also should emphasize the great news that we received just a few weeks ago from the voters of California—this county, other counties throughout the state—in passing Proposition 42. It passed in every county in the state of California, which is pretty unusual. That measure, as you know, will dedicate the sales tax on gasoline to transportation purposes in perpetuity and protect it in the Constitution. What that means in Marin and Sonoma Counties, for example, is about a 50 to 60 percent increase in the State Transportation Improvement Program resources that are available. We had assumed, for example, a certain level of funding in our Regional Transportation Plan. With the passage of Proposition 42 over that 25-year period, Marin County will have an extra \$80 million to spend; Sonoma County will have an extra \$150 million to spend. That clearly can help close some funding gaps, as well as bring some funding forward, not only for the projects I've mentioned, but for other priorities in the counties. There are other options as well. I've mentioned the local sales tax already. MTC has the authority to ask the voters of our region to approve a regional gasoline tax, and one of these days I think we'll work up the courage to ask them. The Golden Gate Bridge District is now debating a toll increase. I'm looking at one of their illustrious staff members, and who knows where that money might go in this corridor. In the Bay Bridge Corridor, in the state-owned bridge corridors, the funds are used as they are in the Golden Gate Bridge Corridor—not only for bridge operation and maintenance, but also to run transit service to try to relieve congestion in the corridors. We think that's a good model that could be expanded.

I'd like to close by echoing the remark that Rod made at the outset about consensus, because that is clearly what we have seen to be the key to success, not only for local sales tax measures, but for

toll bridge bills in the Legislature. It took us two or three tries to get bridge tolls raised for the state-owned bridges, because we kept going up there and fighting among ourselves about what the money ought to be spent for—should it be BART, should it be AC Transit, should it be something else entirely? It was only when we got our act together that we could persuade the legislature to authorize the increase. I think it's really only when consensus within these two counties, and between these two counties, exists that progress can be made. My two commissioners are leaders in that effort and I am certainly proud of that, and proud also of the role that Rod played and continues to play through the Mineta Transportation Institute in trying to help that consensus along. Anything I can do and the commission can do, we will certainly be pleased to help. I look forward to your questions later on and appreciate your attention so far.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thanks very much, Steve. We're going to move next to Lynne Kidder, who's the Executive Director of the North Bay Council. I think in all matters in both Marin and Sonoma Counties, there can be no spokesperson for any particular perspective, but the North Bay Council has become and is emerging as one of the most important voices for the employers of our region. We've already seen firsthand the ability that our larger businesses have to make an impact, to help us in our efforts toward consensus and to be effective, if they put their minds to it. I'm referring to a recent situation where I was able to join folks from Sonoma and Marin, including representatives from the North Bay Council, to plead our case directly to Caltrans Director Jeff Morales for investing in the regional aspect of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows. We were successful in creating a fivefold increase in the state's commitment to this current Interregional Transportation Improvement Program cycle. I think that shows the effectiveness of the business community in conveying a unified message. I also think that the business community has needs and at the same time, it has responsibilities. They have shown that in a number of innovative programs. I would hope Lynn might touch on this in terms of taking responsibility for their employees. Finally, I would note that the North Bay Council understood the importance of working as a region, even before we and the region in local government stepped up to establish the expectations there. The council expanded from being a Marin-only council to representing both communities, and is doing very well at that, and thank you Lynne for being here.

LYNNE KIDDER:

Thank you so much. I am very pleased and grateful for the opportunity to participate on this panel. I think it's an important forum that we're having today. With that pleasure, I feel a great sense of responsibility, because I've been asked to come and represent a business perspective as it pertains to the 101 Corridor and the changes that we're going to see in the coming years. So I have a responsibility to convey that to you, but I also hope that I can help dispel what has been a long-held stereotype about "big business," and share with you some of the things that employers bring to the table, and some of the desires that we have to work in this community.

For the first 20 years of my professional life, I was in public service. I was on the other side of the table, on the receiving end of local government and business people and organizations that were coming to lobby for funds. When I left public service and joined the private sector some years ago, I had the same kind of skepticism about what private business would be like. Since moving to the North Bay and having the pleasure of working with a number of folks, executives of North Bay employers, people that I commonly refer to as the best and the brightest in the North Bay, I would like to convey to you the sincere commitment they have to giving back to their community, to accepting their responsibility in the community for making it a wonderful place to live, as well as a place to employ people and to work.

North Bay employers have a huge stake in the 101 Corridor. The ability to move goods, services, and employees is absolutely critical, as are employers' decisions to establish themselves in the North Bay and, just as important, to stay in the North Bay. Business leaders recognize that the single most important element of their companies' success is their employees. It is in that vein that they make a commitment to give back to the community and ensure that it stays a good place to live. Employers share a commitment to take a leadership role in making the community a better place to live and work. The quality of life in any given community, and particularly in the North Bay, the educational facilities, the level of public services provided and basic infrastructure, are all critical factors for employers' ability to recruit and maintain a quality workforce. For just a few moments, I'm going to give you a brief sketch of what some of our strategies are to make these contributions, and some of the priorities that we have as a business community.

First of all, as we sat back three or four years ago and took a look at how we could impact the improvement of transportation, and particularly 101 Corridor infrastructure, we saw a clear need to take a regional focus. We also saw the need to increase intercounty communication and cooperation. I'm pleased to say that we are delighted with the level of collaboration that we see occurring between the counties now. There's been dramatic improvement, even in the last couple of years, and we give congratulations to all the elected officials and the groups who have contributed and recognized the importance of that collaboration.

Something that we've done as an organization, and I see it throughout the business community, is set aside the boundaries that exist and reached out to try to foster regional collaboration between groups in the community as well as with elected officials. We believe it's very important to strengthen the dialogue that employers have with elected officials and with local government, as well as working to support their efforts on the regional, state, and federal levels.

We also have tried to be there to support legislation and proposals, such as Prop. 42, that help to maximize transportation resources. Obviously, we're in a much better position with a pot of money sitting on the table, to make wise choices and to make things happen. The business community at large recognizes the need for a multimodal approach to the 101 Corridor. I think there's no question whatsoever, as several folks have already alluded to, that there is no single

solution. We can improve the Narrows; we can improve Highway 101 throughout Sonoma County, and we'll still have an issue. We believe there's a place for rail; there's a place for water transit; there's definitely a place for express bus service and lots of other alternatives. At the same time, we believe that we won't be able to do it all at once, and that it's important that we not sit by and wait for the political environment or the economic conditions to allow us to do everything at once. We need to keep moving forward, and I think that the progress that's been made over the past three years clearly demonstrates that there's value to that.

For the North Bay Council, and I think for much of the business community, Highway 101 has been a priority. There are a number of reasons for this. No matter what comprehensive plan you look at, the highway has to be an important, integral part of that. For employees who are commuting back and forth, the improvement of Highway 101 allows the effective use of express bus service. It allows employers to encourage vanpooling and other alternatives means, to reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles. At the same time, we need that central artery to be safe, to be efficient, and we believe the time has come. We will work in partnership with local and state government to make sure that that moves forward as quickly as possible. Productivity of our employees is absolutely tied to the improvement of Highway 101.

Just as important, the environmental impact of not improving the highway is profound. As a North Bay community, we have come together, and we recognize the need to do these improvements carefully, thoughtfully, with consideration for all the different aspects of the North Bay and the quality of life that we want to preserve. Business leadership will be at the table in partnership with local government, to help lobby state and federal governments for funding, for the Narrows in particular and for transportation in general.

In addition to the hard construction that needs to happen, there are many things that employers can and are doing to help mitigate peak demand on the 101 Corridor. Three or four years ago, we started lobbying and encouraging the Golden Gate Bridge District in their implementation of FastTrak. As employers, we are engaged in all kinds of programs, from telecommuting to flex-time to onsite services, anything to reduce the peak hour demand on that corridor. If you take any one factor it may seem small, but when you put them together, they can have a profound impact on the demand at peak hours.

Lastly, we are supporting and would like to be partners in helping to manage and integrate existing transit services so that they fit the needs of employees, of school kids, of others that are placing great demands on the system right now.

In summary, the progress that the North Bay has made over the last three years is absolutely remarkable. We have an incredible job ahead of us, in terms of securing funding, but as a representative of major employers, we certainly pledge our commitment to continue working as part of the community to bring those dollars and get those solutions to the North Bay. We look forward to the rest of this program today and pledge our continued cooperation.

STEVE KINSEY:

Very good. Thank you very much, Lynne. Thanks for being with us.

Our next speaker, Marty Rosen, is someone who, as you can see by the program, is currently the Director of Special Projects for the Trust for Public Lands. I think Marty has earned the opportunity to be the Special Projects guy, from years of service as the Executive Director of the Trust for Public Lands. He has been at the center of the fulcrum of supporting so many environmental success stories that often bring together public and private interests. He has a tremendous experience that he can share with us about how we reach consensus. More important, I think of Marty's work as being in the grandest terms of environmentalism, in that it is not simply a view of preservation or conservation, but also of consideration of the role of accommodating and integrating our built environment and our human community into our environment. I look forward to his joining us today. I appreciate the fact that, for many of us—and the faces I see frequently—Marty's is a face we don't see as often in this discussion, which I think is helpful because, sometimes those of us who grind away in the trenches lose sight of the horizon. And Marty has a grand view of the horizon, and I hope he shares it with us today. Thank you, Marty.

MARTY ROSEN:

I think most of us can agree with almost everything which has been said by our speakers. I know I feel encouraged that we're talking about bikes, we're talking about children, we're talking about rail, we're talking about water, which are essential in dealing with a complex issue such as congestion on Highway 101. Recognizing, as I must, that even though I've been with the Trust for Public Lands since we started at Marin, just down the road, some years ago, the county has changed in some ways, but in other ways, it has not changed at all.

The problems of 101 and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area are exceedingly interconnected. By that I mean there are problems, certainly of congestion, but there are also much larger functions of mindless growth and excessive consumption, which is the hallmark of our county and perhaps, to some degree, Sonoma. I don't necessarily think we are here to disagree with that, as well as issues of social equity and who we are as communities. We're talking, when we talk about transportation corridors, about linkages between communities—the places where we choose to settle and how we are living. Clearly, what we see every day on Highway 101, not just in the Narrows, but on Highway 101, is our daily mammogram for women, and our daily PSA test for men. It's not a symptom; this is a test that we look at every day as we sit on this highway, on this operating table, and ask ourselves, "Is this the only way we live?" Five times a day getting our bulletins from CBS about what's gone wrong, what truck overturned, who's been pulled over to the left or the right, who has enraged himself or herself on the highway, because the way we have chosen to settle in our various communities is more than dysfunctional—it's dangerous to our health. It's dangerous to our children, and it's certainly dangerous to our future. So instead of

talking about global warming, wherever that is on the ice caps, we get a chance to have that mammogram and that PSA test every day when we try to go from Santa Rosa to Novato or from Cloverdale to the San Joaquin Bridge. I think congestion, for that reason, is extremely important to recognize for what it is: namely, a failure to grow SMART.

Everybody says, and I think a supervisor from Sonoma said, “Growth is all around us.” It certainly is. It represents the choices we have made that brought us to this position. Now the question is: How we are going to grow in the future? I suggest we don’t have to go back to the dark ages. It’s a simple enough kind of bumper sticker, and it’s called Smart Growth. It serves to help us understand that it’s easier said than done. We’re talking about development which serves the economy, our employers, our productivity; it serves our communities, and I mean the young, the old, the rich, the poor, the disabled, and the bike riders and backpackers; but it also means, obviously, it serves our environment. We all breathe the same air. When we have patterns of development that consume the land, as we are consuming our land and our air, we’re talking about failing that daily mammogram, failing that daily PSA. With the object of improving our communities, where are we now? We’re trying to isolate the problem of congestion from other problems that create the congestion. I would suggest that some of our time will be looking at what other communities are doing, especially in the state of Oregon. We’re linking congestion to vehicle-miles traveled. Measurable objectives: How many miles have we reduced by automobiles and trucks from Highway 101 that have contributed to the reduction of congestion? Or what we’ll really have done is just moved the bottleneck a few meters up the road or a few miles down the road. We’ve got to link congestion with reduction of vehicle-miles traveled and also to air quality and land consumption.

We’ve talked about the land-use settlement patterns. They’re tough, but they are very much interconnected. I’m happy to see that our own Metropolitan Transportation Commission has, I think it’s called an HIP Program, that recognizes that affordable housing is connected to congestion. Therefore, part of the budget, presumably underfunded, of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee recognizes that some of our funding has to go into affordable housing or we’re just going to move the bubble of congestion from one place to another.

What I’m here to say is, yes, I’m encouraged. Yes, we want to be part of discussing congestion, but we want to be sure we get the problems right, so we can get the solutions right. Mention has been made of Proposition 42, I think it was by Steve, which is a tremendous source of rejoicing. We are going to redirect some of the cash-flow into other kinds of transportation options. But speaking as one of the people who was active in Proposition 40 as well, when people understand, meaningfully, that their daily choices with that PSA test and that mammogram can involve open space and endangered species and safe neighborhoods, they’ll vote Yes. Even though we have a huge deficit, in the billions—would you believe Governor Davis that it’s only \$17 billion, or much more, if you believe the fiscal people? It’s a big deficit, and the people still said, “Yes, we’ll vote.” And they did—\$2.6 billion for conservation purposes, at the same time they passed Proposition 42. That’s why I am here and encouraged that we integrate our best thinking. As I’ve

indicated today, we can move forward by alleviating the problems of congestion and land consumption and vehicle-miles traveled, at the same time we improve the opportunities to travel by rail, by ferry, by foot, and by bicycle.

I want to conclude my remarks by saying that this has to be, at least for me, a learning experience, and I hope with you too. I'm going to give you numbers therefore, or the descriptions of a few websites that I hope you'll take with you and surf. Because I think there's a lot of good information that helps us understand what Smart Growth is all about. The first one is called SMARTgrowthamerica.org. The next is called fundersnetwork.org. The third one is called—one word—transact.org. Finally, paying due respect to the EPA, they have an excellent website—EPA.gov/livability. Why is this important? Because each of these operations understands cash flow. And we've learned in our work over the years that money doesn't just talk—it sings and dances.

STEVE KINSEY:

I did put a star by fundersnetwork.org.

We're going to be looking at some models and trying to develop a consensus over the next six months within the region of how we might organize our transportation, our land use, and our social principles in order to create that better future.

I will turn now to my own colleague on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, another one of these policy leaders who has chosen to subject herself to the transportation world in multiple forms. She serves on the Sonoma County Transportation Agency; she co-chairs the very important Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group; and as I mentioned, she serves with me on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Thank you very much to City Councilmember from Santa Rosa, Sharon Wright, for joining us.

SHARON WRIGHT:

Thanks, Steve. I will add for those of you who don't want to get caught up in the 101, excuse me, Narrows congestion, you can come to the Smart Growth Seminar in Sonoma County on Saturday the 20th at Findlay Community Center...are they all listed on that flyer?

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes, they are.

SHARON WRIGHT:

Both for Sonoma and Marin counties, great.

As one of the two elected officials up here, what I wanted to do is kind of bring this down. I was glad that the speakers went in the order that they did, because I'm an elected official, and I think most of what we're talking about is people. It is people serving people; it is how we have made our investments and how we make our money work for us and how we access that money. In that, I think the majority of the audience here is from Marin County.

I wanted to give you a bit of a profile of what we're talking about and what we look like in Sonoma County, and then, as Rod and his colleagues asked us to do, talk about some of the issues and some of the constraints that I see in moving forward in building consensus, although I think we've come miles and miles in the last 10 years.

Sonoma County is the northernmost county in the Bay Area region that MTC serves. Our county population is just a little over 500,000. It's grown from 300,000 in 1980, and ABAG projects that by the year 2020, magic word, we will grow by another 120,000 people. Our job growth has grown from 103,000 in 1980 to an estimated 300,000 jobs by the year 2020. Our housing has increased from 114,000 to a projected 216,000 in the next 18 years. Registered vehicles in Sonoma County have steadily increased from 80,000 in 1960, when Highway 101 was completed, to 240,000 in 1980 and to 400,000 in the year 2000, and we have made little if any improvements on the highway, or to the intersections that were built to rural standards at that time. We have over 2,300 miles of city streets and roads with a total reconstruct value of \$2.3 billion. I'm going to refer to that again in a few minutes. We have six transit providers who provide 56 different routes, and they have a free pass system that coordinates between the systems. So that's what we look like.

In 2001, Sonoma County Transportation Authority adopted a countywide transportation plan that identified projects in all modes that total \$1.5 billion. Road maintenance is an additional \$25 million. We have adopted a 2010 construction strategy which implements that and the key to that is the Novato Narrows, and I'll get to that in just a moment.

Someone talked about a self-help county and needing to pass a sales tax. We were recently in Sacramento and also in Washington visiting with our legislators and other members of our delegation from MTC, and our comment was always, "We're not a self-help county; we're a wannabe county." We have had three unsuccessful attempts. We tried first in 1990 to pass a sales tax and received less than 50 percent on a half-cent sales tax. In '98, we split the measure into two: one was an advisory list of projects; the other was a half-cent sales tax. The advisory measure passed by 72 percent. We fell short on the tax measure by 47 percent. In the year 2000, we went at it again. We don't give up easily in Sonoma County, we keep trying. This time, we separated the two taxes. We had a special tax for highways, which received 58 percent, and another tax for

transit, which received 59 percent. What that tells us, as we knew all along, is that we're an extremely diverse community. We're probably more diverse than any of the counties in the Bay Area. We have a strong agricultural community, we have a strong environmental community, and we have a strong business community. The conversation has gone back and forth. I'm sure it's not news to anyone that we had talked about going in 2002 for another sales tax. It just doesn't seem feasible, and both boards have decided that 2004 is probably the most likely chance to go for another sales tax.

Between now and then, we've got a lot of work to do. We have to work on the projects; we have to identify the funding sources; we have to do a lot of voter education. In Sonoma County, we'll focus on transit and on the operating funds for the rail. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on the projects, per se, because we have these experts here. Suffice it to say, in our 2010 Construction Strategy, we have identified the 101 Corridor in six segments, two of which are funded. One is under construction; the "environmentals" are being done on the other. The others, we're working on—the PSR, Project Study Report, and the environmental, still need funding. If you watch television, which I don't very much, the missing link or the weakest link is the Novato Narrows link.

Let me just talk a little bit about what I think are the critical issues and the issues that are going to get in the way of us moving forward with a successful consensus discussion and that have come up repeatedly in our discussions and been instrumental in defeating our sales tax measures. When we first started meeting with Sonoma County, one of the things that we found in Sonoma County when we put our sales tax forward was, "What's Marin County going to do? Are we going to build a train to nowhere?" We had not entered successfully into the debate and the conversation with Marin County. One of the first meetings that we had, it was interesting to me because Sonoma County has always said, "We're providing the houses for Marin jobs." When we got into the first meeting with the Marin County Supervisors, we heard that their attitude is, "We're employing the people that live in Sonoma County." We need to broaden the conversation. I think that's one of the obstacles. The conversation that we've had over trying to build a consensus is focused on elected officials and environmentalists. We have not brought in the business community. I'm glad that the North Bay Council is here.

There's another group in Sonoma County called the Sonoma County Manufacturers' Group that's doing a separate effort. Until we begin to work together and bring all of those forces aligned and singing on the same page, I think we're going to have a great deal of difficulty in convincing Caltrans and our elected officials that we are in agreement. One of the things that I think is particularly bothersome in today's period is not only the downturn in the economy, but also deferred maintenance. MTC did a report card, I believe last year, on the condition of streets and roads in the Bay Area. Petaluma was ranked as having the worst streets in the Bay Area. From my city's perspective, we have a backlog of needed repairs of our city streets that grows by \$5.5 million annually. We invest \$1.8 million annually into our city streets, but that is declining;

the need is increasing by \$7 million annually. I think that when we go to the voters and talk to the voters, they think in terms of, “How is this going to affect me? You want a sales tax, you want us to agree to support rail, you want us to agree to support other modes of transportation which are critical, but what about the pothole in front of my house?” I think any survey that we do will tell you that there is a significant distrust with government. So as we communicate, I think that the credibility that we have as elected officials is really critical. We tend to cry wolf a lot. We have to be able to prove that there is the need and that there is a partnership, that we’re not doing this alone.

When we looked at the Novato Narrows through the PAG, there were a couple of key issues that came up, and most of them have been mentioned. We need to look at the environmental side of it. Smart Growth policies are critical, and it’s a change in the way that we’re thinking and how we approach the subject. We have to link land-use and transportation. They do not stand alone, and the policies and criteria for funding echo that. The key word, of course, is “regional.” We have to have a regional link. It is a regional issue. Sonoma County has invested 100 percent of our RTIP dollars into the 101 widening. Marin County has done much the same. The one piece that’s missing is the Novato Narrows. It is critical that we communicate collectively to Caltrans, to our legislators, and that we come up with the funding mechanism that’s going to allow us to move forward.

STEVE KINSEY:

That’s right. Thank you very much, Sharon. You know, I’m going to take advantage of my position as facilitator to add a few comments before we open it up. You know, I’m sitting here watching all of this go by me, and I want to acknowledge all of you who are here, but especially, I will just point out a few.

As I mentioned earlier, we wouldn’t even have the opportunity to be here if, back in 1998, with a little bit of work between Sonoma and Marin to express our shared will, Senator Burton, John Burton, stepped up to the plate and got the initial monies for us. I notice that both Margie Goodman and Judy Arnold from his office are here today. So, we’ve got lots of brainpower from Senator Burton to help us. In addition, we have representation from Congresswoman Woolsey’s office. Anita Franzi is here. Also with us today, the Chair of the Sonoma County Transportation Agency, Jake MacKenzie, an elected official in Rohnert Park. We met with Anita and the congresswoman, and she made it clear that her commitment to this corridor is great. She is a multimodal advocate and wants to make sure that we don’t take care of one part of the problem without thinking about the entire problem. I also want to recognize that, at least in Marin County, and I may need to have some other names pointed out to me, we do our business with a Congestion Management Agency. It meets monthly. There have been times when we’ve met more frequently. In the last couple of years, we’ve been working incredibly hard, and I see two, three of my colleagues on the Congestion Management Agency—Mike DiGiorgio, along with Peter Breen from San Anselmo and Alice Fredericks. Thank you very much for being here because it’s

important that our Congestion Management Agencies and our policy leaders understand the challenges and hear from all the interests that are in the room today. In addition, we have from Marin County Mayor John Mani from Novato—and I appreciate you being here today—and Paul Cohen, Vice-Mayor of the City of San Rafael. I thank you for being here. My comments will be brief and just say that this is a multimodal corridor, and I want to recognize that. I think we all need to recognize that as we go forward.

I also want to say that it's clear to me that transportation and land use are connected. As we look at this multimodal corridor, as we talk about this, we need to recognize that in the Marin and Sonoma Narrows, it's more important that we protect the existing community separator aspects—the agricultural uses. So we design a solution that does not allow for the irresponsible use of land between the two communities, but we also figure out how, with some of the other transit investments such as rail, we can intensify, in the vicinities of the rail stations, those community uses, mixed uses for retail and housing and businesses, so that we can make those cost-effective investments. Marin County, working with Sonoma, has been developing an integrated plan that recognizes all these elements: that it is a multimodal corridor; that it has to have a transportation and land-use relationship; that we have an express bus program that we're looking at in addition to the rail, and in addition to the bicycle and pedestrian ways. It's very important that we fulfill the North-South Bikeway, which is also part of our county's transportation vision and should be included in and coordinated with any of the regional projects that we're doing between Sonoma and Marin. At the behest of Sharon Wright and myself, the MTC staff put together a study in 2000 on HOT Lanes. I don't know if we can turn this "Hot" forum into HOT Lanes. The reality is voters have historically said, "No, thank you," in a very significant way to the idea of users paying. But studies showed that in the Narrows, we could save 12 to 15 minutes just by getting the HOV lanes in. By charging those who are not in high-occupancy vehicles, we could raise some \$50 million over the period of time that the study looked at. Not a lot of money, but certainly an important potential contribution. It's a provocative thought. I don't know that it's one that will go very far today.

The other thing to emphasize again is that the Policy Advisory Group has been doing outstanding work, and I want to acknowledge Supervisor Murray and Vice-Chair Sharon Wright for helping to bring this clarity to this. I think it's identified a number of things. For those of you who haven't been following it, I want to encourage you to follow the work of the Policy Advisory Group. It's moving beyond "We need something" down to the real details, including the design exceptions we need, making a strong statement to Caltrans that we want a modest solution, not an ultimate build-out solution that looks like other communities with frontage roads on either sides and multiple interchanges, but a modest solution that can be most protective of baylands. I think the Policy Advisory Group is giving guidance to that.

The last things I would say are that the big challenge here, on all the modes but especially on the highway and the rail, is "Where will we find the additional funding? What is the financing plan

for this corridor?” I think we have some work to do. We’ve already stepped up to the plate and said we’ll contribute some of our dollars locally from each county, but we’re looking for state and federal financing partners in a big way. The other thing is to stay on the deadlines. You know, one of the most difficult parts of transportation is getting anything done, and every year that goes by the costs go up and it just seems like we’re chasing our tail sometimes. I’ve made my own little card here that says, “EIR 2003 for Public Release.” I’m going to carry this around as the confidence grows that Caltrans will deliver a Public Release Document in 2003 for the Marin-Sonoma Narrows. Over the next two years, all of us and others will be able to join together to make sure that it becomes a final EIR and we can keep this project moving, because that is critical to keeping this momentum building. With that, I think that I’ve made such great comments about the Policy Advisory Group that I need to allow Supervisor Murray as the Chair to make a couple of comments.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

All I want to do is introductions of other members of the Policy Advisory Group that are here. Councilmember Mike Healy from Petaluma is here, and you didn’t mention that Councilmember John Mani from Novato is a member of the Policy Advisory Group, as well as Councilmember Peter Breen. And he isn’t a member of the group, but he is a Councilmember from Novato—Bernie Meyers is here.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you very much. With that as the prelude, we’re going to move to the question and answer, which is the opportunity for each of you to express your thoughts, the challenges that we face, the questions that you have. We have, as a resource group to help us or to turn the tough questions toward, from the Department of Transportation, Deputy Director Lenka Culik-Caro. Thank you for being with us. We also have a major transit provider for both counties, Marin and Sonoma, Alan Zahradnik from the Golden Gate Bridge. Thank you for being here. The Bridge District, obviously, is a multimodal agency. Suzanne Wilford will step in for Supervisor Kerns to represent the Sonoma County needs. Thanks, each of you. And Rod, of course, you’re going to take care of the talk-show aspects of this, being able to provide the microphone to those who wish to speak. Who would like to be the first speaker? Yes?

PARTICIPANT:

Supervisor Kinsey, may I just make one comment? I want to acknowledge Cynthia Murray’s leadership on the PAG. It struck a chord when you held up your note—“EIR 2003 or Bust.” It will be her leadership and her tenacity that gets us there. If you want to see leadership in action, and you want to see what it’s like, attend our next PAG meeting—which is next week, it is the 19th in Petaluma—because she is a taskmaster, and if we are fortunate enough to keep her in that role, I have no doubt we’ll make that goal.

STEVE KINSEY:

Good. That's excellent, thank you.

ROD DIRIDON:

Steve, may I say one thing before we allow questions?

STEVE HEMINGER:

Yes, please do.

ROD DIRIDON:

There would be a tendency in this phase of things, for people in the audience who have been almost bursting with a desire to share in the comments to speak for a long time. Please stifle that if you can. Make your comments a question, as much as you can, so that a lot of people can speak during the hour we have left before we have to go into the luncheon break.

STEVE KINSEY:

Great. Thanks, Rod. I'll help those who need help with the time.

DAVID SCHONNBRUNN:

David Schonnbrunn, Marin Advocates for Transit and TRANSDEF.

You can't build a consensus when you exclude the people that disagree with you. It obviates the entire purpose of consensus building. I'm struck that the closest thing that this corridor has to a legitimate Major Investment Study indicated that the best use of scarce funds was to build a rail line. The projected cost of this project is equivalent to buying an entire rail line from Cloverdale down to a ferry terminal. The question that I want to pose to you is, "If this project is so good, why is it that you exclude opponents from this debate, and have excluded from scoping this project a multimodal study?" We believe, speaking parenthetically, that that exclusion is illegal under NEPA and CEQA.

STEVE KINSEY:

My initial comments, and then I would ask any others who wish to respond to do so, first of all, I think we're here today recognizing that it's a corridor we're talking about, not a highway. I've heard many of the speakers talking about many modes. Second, your thoughts were just shared, so

I think the intention of this time period is to allow for debate and dissent to be presented, so, on both counts, I think we're trying very hard to allow for all voices. I would point out that the HOT Study done in 2000 did take a cursory look at the issue of shared use—of both HOV improvements on the highway and a rail program. It concluded that the HOV lane would not have a significant impact on the rail ridership. Many other studies will have to be done to further verify that. Some may be going on right now. But it appears to me that it is not an either/or proposition.

ROD DIRIDON:

Mr. Chairman, may I make a little sensitizing comment? The Mineta Institute has recently done some studies for the state and federal government in regard to growth and what growth does to an area. The state of California, according to the Department of Finance of the state, which has always underestimated growth dramatically, is projected to grow from 33 million people in the year 2000 to 59 million people in the year 2040. In less than 40 years, we're going to nearly double in this state. And that's from the Finance Department of the state, which always underestimates growth, because they estimate financing based on growth, and they want to be conservative on their financial estimates. We've got to accommodate growth, because it's going to come here whether you like it or not, and if you let it just come here anywhere, it's going to be in sprawl. If you develop devices to help focus that growth, then you have an opportunity to first, control it to some extent; and second, have it focused instead of building on all of your farmland. I'm a pro-transit, no-growth type, but I can show you Santa Clara County if you'd like to see it, where there have been people who have tried to control growth by other means, and it doesn't work. You've got to figure out other ways of stimulating Smart Growth. Maybe this is one.

MARIO GHILOTTI:

Mario Ghilotti from San Rafael. My question is—is there any possibility, because we voted it down a long time ago—that we possibly could get BART, the BART system, into Marin-Sonoma?

STEVE KINSEY:

Steve, or Sharon...?

SHARON WRIGHT:

It's an issue of density in population.

STEVE HEMINGER:

First you'd have to get it to the southern end of the Golden Gate Bridge, and then you'd have to get it over it. There were some studies done many years ago about the Bridge accommodating

BART. BART is a very expensive undertaking. It's going about 8 miles to the San Francisco Airport from the Colma BART station on the Peninsula, and that's costing \$1.5 billion. Based on the estimates I've seen of what a sales tax, for example, could produce in these two counties, I don't think the match is there financially to make that happen, and I think looking at lower-cost options would make a lot more sense. Admittedly, what BART does provide is connectivity, so that you don't have to transfer within the BART system once you're on it. But I think the gap between where BART is and where Marin and Sonoma are is probably closed with other modes.

PARTICIPANT:

Thank you.

CRAIG YATES:

Hi, my name is Craig Yates. In conjunction with Mario Ghilotti there, they're doing a seismic upgrade to the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. In conjunction to SMART, why can't there be an upgrade of money put into the San Rafael-Richmond Bridge, to accommodate a track system to go over the bridge, to correlate with the El Cerrito BART station and Marin, that's going to take place with SMART, eventually when San Quentin is closed? There will be a station there with SMART. Thank you.

STEVE KINSEY:

I'm going to give a quick answer and say that no system was ever built all at once, and the challenges to take advantage of where the workforce lives and where they work is our first priority. But there's been a commitment of SMART to recognize that it needs to have connectivity to transit systems throughout the region. The first goal is to develop it and make it happen in higher employment areas, move it to the Bay. The vision of ringing the Bay is something that our children may be given the burden of completing. But I think that thinking of our region as a system is an appropriate way to think.

MIKE DIGIORGIO:

Good morning, Mike DiGiorgio, Mayor Pro Tem of Novato, also a member of the PAG. I think the issue of passing a ballot measure to fund this stuff is going to run into the buzzsaw that you heard a little bit about this morning, which is the perception that if we have a transportation system, we're inducing growth. Do you think we're going to overcome that perception? I think it is the reason people are voting against the improvements. Also, as you heard this morning, some people say, "Let's put a toll gate at San Andreas Creek and keep people out of Marin."

JACK McKENZIE:

Steve, can I start?

I think that's an accurate perception. There are a lot of people who do not believe that this is only a transportation system, but that this essentially is a vehicle to accelerate growth. This is one opportunity to both learn from and learn about the alternatives. I mentioned quickly the idea of Smart Growth. It's not a bumper sticker. Many communities are adopting the principles and applying them, hopefully here in Marin and Sonoma as well. It starts with land use, so if we go to the ballot, and we convince people that it's not a gimmick to accelerate the growth opportunities for Rohnert Park, but show how these linkages between sustainable communities require a vital arterial system, the credibility, it seems to me, can be demonstrated. But it has to be credible and it has to be genuine. That's why we talked about, while we agree with each other in large measure, there has to be the same intense commitment to the connective tissue, which includes housing, real estate speculation, safe schools, and a host of other issues that are related to voters taking that leap of faith and saying, "Yes, I will vote my tax dollars." I don't think that transportation alone is believable any more, quite frankly, than conservation. We didn't pass Prop. 40 as a conservation measure. We passed it as a Safe Neighborhoods and Water Quality issue, which was included, but it shows the connective tissue. I think that's the challenge here.

STEVE KINSEY:

Any other thoughts to offer? I'll offer just a couple other things before the next speaker. I think that many of the elements to address that are in place. Sonoma County made extensive efforts to control the land use along the 101 Corridor back in 1998, and those are in place. The City of Novato should be given great credit for the Urban Growth Boundaries put together to protect that opportunity. I think that we have very strong zoning for our agricultural lands and we, at the County I think, should be looking at ways that we can add increasing strength to those to assure the voters that we won't be losing our agricultural lands in the Corridor. At the same time, we have a growing publicly committed dedication to our baylands in the region. Many of the elements are in place and as much as anything, we need to educate about that as we go forward. Next person?

WALTER STRAKOSH:

On December 12, 1999...

STEVE KINSEY:

Introduce yourself, please? Let me mention something. The proceedings are being recorded. The Mineta Transportation Institute will publish the proceedings in a summary form, so we need to have you introduce yourself and mention your organization, if you would please.

WALTER STRAKOSH:

Yes, Walter Strakosh, resident of Marin and living in Mill Valley, and I was on the A&B Committee that failed to pass the tax in 1998. On December the 12th of 1999, in an article I wrote that appeared in the *Marin IJ* on the rail project, the population figures for Marin and Sonoma Counties were shown in 1995 and the projected population for 2015. The 1995 population for both counties was 656,500: Marin 238,500; Sonoma 418,000. Projected to be in 2015 802,400; Marin at 268,400; Sonoma at 534,000, or a 12.2 percent increase in Marin and a 21.8 percent increase in Sonoma. Population for the county in the year 2000 was projected to be 272,000. It actually turned out to be 281,000. Could the same mistake have been made for the projections in Marin and Sonoma Counties? On March 14 of 2000, *Marin IJ* printed a poll showing that 50 percent in Sonoma-Marín favored a carpool on 101, yet rail was favored by 68 percent. Why then does the North Bay Council favor widening of 101 first? Shouldn't we consider moving people first, as opposed to moving cars first?

SHARON WRIGHT:

We think that a very important component of moving the highway would be the enabling of other kinds of transit services, such as express bus and carpooling. It's more than just an empirical situation to look at. It's a cultural change that will need to take place for people to get out of their cars and to use transit. I know that there's a lot of controversy surrounding the projected ridership of a train. Our position is we need both, but I think that clearly, from addressing immediate need, the highway should have a priority.

STEVE KINSEY:

I would just add that SMART, with \$37 million from Transportation Congestion Relief funds, \$7 million of which it has secured, the Project Manager of whom sits behind you, is moving forward on a regular basis, moving the agenda forward in the legislature. Senator Chesbro and Assembly Member Nation have cosponsored legislation that would create a governance structure and a financing ability for the rail, so I don't see any delay. I think that all systems are go on the rail as far as moving forward with understanding what it could be and what it would cost, at the same time that the highway projects are moving forward with about \$50 million in program funding. So from my perspective, it's a multimodal region. We're looking at both portions of the corridor. They each have funding for the foreseeable future with a sense of full-speed ahead, and we need to merge the thinking, refine the details. But I don't see one moving at the expense of the other.

LYNNE KIDDER:

Can I just enforce the fact that the North Bay Council is supportive of the development of rail? It's not either/or, and I think that while our immediate priority might be the highway, it's not intended to be to the exclusion of the development of rail.

JOY DAHLGREN:

I'm Joy Dahlgren with the Marin Citizens for Effective Transportation. I have three questions about the highway project. First, I haven't been following it, so I don't know what alternatives are still under consideration, but I wondered what performance measures were being used to evaluate the various alternatives; if you were doing any modeling to estimate the performance of the various alternatives; and then finally, if HOT Lanes were still under consideration?

STEVE KINSEY:

We'll turn to our resource experts to get it right the first time.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

Yes, good morning. We are still looking at different alternatives. As part of the environmental process, we are currently preparing traffic projections. Before I came, I checked where we are with those projections. I've received preliminary projections for average daily traffic, which means for both directions, that by 2020, there's going to be an increase of 43 percent, from 78,000 average daily traffic now to 116,000. So it's a dramatic increase. Currently, we are doing environmental studies. We are trying to inventory all the resources there are within the corridor—environmental, archeology and so forth, biology, and we have some preliminary designs. But keep in mind the idea is to do the 3 A's—what I call Avoid, Avoid, and Avoid. So it's really important to lay out what's out there, what resources are out there, and then try to fit the design so we have minimized the impacts and so forth, and we are still looking at all the alternatives. We have not taken anyone out. Again, it's the HOV, the HOT Lanes, reversible lane, and also the traffic system management alternative, which is required when we go through the federal process.

STEVE KINSEY:

The question about performance measurements: Are there any performance measurements being evaluated?

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

Performance measures are going to be done when we move to the operation analysis, where we run different scenarios and then we're going to present them in the environmental document. We

are not there yet. We are preparing the traffic projection—that's the first step. That's kind of unconstrained demand. Then we have to take in account how many lanes there will be, and then we do the operational analysis. It will be done for each alternative.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. Yes, Marty?

MARTY ROSEN:

Using your metric system, what is the role of the reduction of vehicle-miles traveled on that corridor, if this gap is closed?

STEVE KINSEY:

A 20 percent increase.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

I don't quite understand the role. The way we measure is by the speed.

STEVE KINSEY:

By speed? That's one.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

Also by delays that are occurring to each person.

STEVE KINSEY:

Time? Right.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

Those are the two major performance measures.

MARTY ROSEN:

Again, what is the metric of vehicle-miles traveled that you're using? That's not rocket science. That's what almost every other major transportation agency in Oregon is required to demonstrate.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

I think you're looking at how long the congestion would be. Perhaps that's what you're looking for? As far as the queue, how many miles? Of course, we still use miles. We don't use kilometers. I'm going to ask, can somebody help me?

RON DIRIDON:

Mr. Chairman? This is one of the nexus points that comes up. You're in a rapidly growing area, and as much as I know some of you want to avoid this, it is. It is going to be a rapidly growing area one way or another, and I wish, for your sake, that it could be avoided for California, but it can't be. When you're in a rapidly growing area, Marty, it's more vehicle-miles avoided in growth than a reduction in vehicle-miles traveled that you want to try to measure. I think Lenka's study will do that measurement as she gets into the Alternative Analysis portion of her Major Investment Study, or what is now called Program Environmental Clearance. So it becomes vehicle-miles avoided, in terms of future growth, rather than a reduction in current vehicle-miles traveled, which will never occur. You'll never get a reduction in current vehicle-miles traveled on your transportation systems. I wish that wasn't the case, but it's true.

MARTY ROSEN:

Thank you.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

I believe I have the microphone now, which is a very dangerous thing. Jake MacKenzie. Let me put on my Board of Directors hat—I'm on the Board of Directors of GreenBelt Alliance—and come back to a point that our facilitator made. In Sonoma County, eight of the nine jurisdictions have Urban Growth Boundaries. We also have clear limitations in water supply, clear limitations on waste-water treatment capacity, a county General Plan that's under serious review. All of these are going to impact the public's view of this growth question because I'm not one of these people who believe that growth is inevitable at the rates of the past. I would argue that in the next 20 years in Sonoma County, the growth rates will be considerably less than they were in the 1980s and the 1990s for the reasons stated. My question for the panel is, "How do we educate?" We've all talked about going out to educate, but you can't pull people in by the scruff of their necks to scintillating Town Hall meetings at 7:30 on a Wednesday night. You get the usual suspects, most of whom are in this room today. That's my question: How do we educate all the other folks?

STEVE KINSEY:

It's a great question. In Marin County, and I assume the same is true in Sonoma County, we're doing it by developing a draft Integrated Transportation Plan that looks at all the modes, then

we're going to put that forth to the entire community once again in a communitywide mailing, and invite probably six months of discussion from all the different groups. We're also on that remarkable circuit, not always on Wednesday night, not always with scruffy necks, but always with a sense that we need to get more people involved. I would also point out a successful program in Marin County that's inspired us. It is the Marin Safe Routes to School Program, which we have some of the leaders of here today. That gets the community that doesn't come to meetings involved. Because when my 6-year-old son is having a hard time getting to his school safely or someone else's 12-year-old daughter, then you get the parents involved, and they start to look at the curb cuts, the bike lanes, the pathways, the crosswalks, the opportunities for buses—that gets the community engaged. So our challenge is to engage all the different users—the folks who miss a bus because of poor connectivity between systems, the folks who actually miss a bus because it's too full, in the canal, who have a vested interest in our community in getting more service. Our job is to go to those different interest groups and get them engaged. I think it's something that we all have a responsibility for. Those of us who consider ourselves usual suspects here today have a shared responsibility to reach out ourselves, and it isn't about saying one thing, it's about getting more voices into the discussion.

Any other thoughts on that? Please, Steve.

STEVE HEMINGER:

Well, if I haven't ticked off my Commissioners, maybe this one will. I'm always on the lookout for a good line, and Marty gave me a new one today—"Money just doesn't talk—it sings and dances." He mentioned our housing incentive program, which is too small perhaps. But it is one attempt to try to influence and reward the decisions of local government about where to site land use and where to build housing, and we need to build more housing in the region, period. If it can be built near public transit facilities that we have invested in with a great amount of resources, we can kill two birds with one stone. Because the studies clearly show that the more people live near transit, they will use it.

Another one is to try to reveal to users the cost of the system that they use. This is the idea that Steve was, I think, rightly gauging the barometer of the public about. The fact is, no road project is going to reduce vehicle-miles traveled, unless it's priced. When the price is revealed, you see that it can influence behavior. That's, I guess, a form of education.

LYNNE KIDDER:

I'll speak just to the North Bay Council at this point, although I know the same is true of a number of other business organizations. The executives who belong to the North Bay Council make a concerted effort to educate their employees about both the potential options that they have and the things that they can do in the near term to help make their commutes easier, to make their quality

of life better. Our executives do take a leadership role and try to get the word out there that, number one, the employees have a huge stake in local policy on transportation, and number two, there are tangible things that they can do to contribute to a solution.

STEVE KINSEY:

Good. Next question.

HEIDI MACHEN:

Heidi Machen from the San Francisco Bay Area Water Transit Authority. I'm going to, after a group of very savvy questions, ask a "nuts-and-boltsy" question: Wow—population 500,000; to what do you attribute that great popularity, number one? Then, what special planning provisions are you undergoing to accommodate the growth that you've experienced and also future growth?

I know that you mentioned your transit measures separated the transit and highway tax. I'm also curious to know whether you've learned from the mistakes of other cities that have grown at a tremendous rate like that.

SHARON WRIGHT:

You hope so, huh? Let me speak for Santa Rosa. I think Santa Rosa fairly clearly mirrors Sonoma County in our growth rate, and that's a little bit under a 2 percent annual growth. In Sonoma County, in adopting a vision that we did through our Transportation Authority, we did some outreach. That speaks to Jake's earlier question. We went out and asked people what they wanted, and what they wanted was urban growth boundaries. They wanted to see city-centered growth; they put a high value as a community on open space and protecting agriculture and clean air and all of the things that I think we all hold dear. What perhaps sets our two counties apart, especially Sonoma County, is that we have adopted a value system, and the value system says that any project that we have is going to be environmentally sensitive; we're going to adopt the Smart Growth policies, etc.

So what are we doing? Jake mentioned that the county is going through an aggressive General Plan update. So is the city. I think most of the other cities within the county are. We're looking at densities; we're faced with some critical housing issues. Those are the types of things that we're doing—to increase densities, look at ways to have the development around our transit corridors. We have one of the few opportunities, a couple of opportunities in Santa Rosa in particular, to have some transit-oriented developments. Those are the goals that we have to deal with it.

STEVE KINSEY:

Next question.

MARGARET ZIGARD:

Margaret Zigard, I live in southern Marin, and I've lived here long enough to know that 30 years ago, we did in Marin have agricultural lands that since have been changed. Their zoning has been changed, as introduced by one of the speakers, real estate speculation. No one else has talked about that, but it's strange how changes can be made to accommodate new housing and housing developments in areas that we had once thought were potential open space because they were agricultural lands.

A second thing is, when you do the Narrows, you're going to increase vehicle use 20 percent, so we have to have a way to accommodate the projected, I think it's 78,000 people, 78,000 more people. These people will be needing transit, and there are going to be more people like myself that, in another 10 years, will still want to get around the county, but won't be able to drive. We have a very inadequate transit system. So I wonder why you're not putting an emphasis on rapid rail as the spine, then having transit going to the rapid rail. Certainly, everyone agrees with the Smart Growth land-housing issue.

STEVE KINSEY:

I'll start, but I think there's room for a number of responses to those questions, Margaret. First of all, I would say that Marin County has an incredibly strong commitment to our agricultural lands. Those lands that are zoned for agriculture have not faced subdivision. There may be portions of our countywide plan where zoning has occurred historically that's changed agricultural to other purposes. But on our agricultural lands in Marin County, with the exception of one density transfer that saved a very productive ranch, we have not seen that, with minor exception.

As to your vision of a high-speed rail with transit access, one of the things that we're trying to do with the Marin County Integrated Transportation Plan is to recognize that it is many modes. We do include not a high-speed rail, but a commuter rail, between Cloverdale and ferry access to the Bay. We do speak to and have studied significant improvements to our bus transit system that recognize the connectivity between buses and ferries, between buses and rail, between bikes and ferries, bikes and rail. We recognize that we need to provide access to transit as well. What this larger integrated plan is attempting to do is to recognize that we plan for all modes and how they relate to each other. Please, Sharon.

SHARON WRIGHT:

Several people have mentioned the desire or preference of doing rail before highway, and I don't want to talk about the value of doing highway before rail, or any of that. I want to talk about a more technical point that constrains us, and that is what funds can be used for. We are constrained by the state as to what we can use STIP funds for, which is the primary funding source for our

highway projects. We cannot use those to operate a train. We could upgrade the track, we could build stations, we could buy trains and they would sit there, because we don't have funds to operate them. That's an important element for us all to accept and do our best to change, so that when we look at sales tax measures, we recognize that that is the only way that we will be able to really improve transit and provide a lot of what I think everybody's talking about as desirable.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. Any other responses? Okay, next question.

ALAN WELCH:

I'm Alan Welch from Rohnert Park. It appears that one of the major usages is commuting from home to the workplace and vice-versa. One comment made was that Sonoma provides the homes and Marin provides the work. Is any encouragement being given to Marin employers to move to Sonoma?

LYNNE KIDDER:

I don't think they need any more encouragement. Increasingly, Sonoma County is a job center in its own right. I would predict a growing trend toward reverse commutes and a growing number of Marin people that live in Marin going to Sonoma County. I think that underscores the need for us to come together as a region and implement public policy that is regional in focus, that can serve the residents and the economic interests that we share. Clearly, it's a hot issue. Where is it good to do business? Where is it good to have an employment center? It's a problem not just between Marin and Sonoma County, it's a problem that we need to look at from a regional perspective as employers try to justify to their corporate headquarters or to their stockholders why they have chosen the most expensive place in the country to locate their facilities.

SHARON WRIGHT:

If I may add, I think in a recent Marin survey—perception's reality, and we deal with perception. I congratulate the Marin Congestion Management Authority for doing this survey, and they were believing that to be the case. As I recall, the statistics are that in Marin County, 77 percent of the trips are from home to work and vice-versa. There is not the in-and-out commute that we've believed to be for so long. For Santa Rosa, our out-commute is only about 18 percent or less, so I think as it relates to what are we doing to address the growth, how are we trying to balance it, is we're all looking at a healthy jobs-housing balance. That's the challenge that we have, and that's what we'll be dealing with in our general plans.

STEVE KINSEY:

Next comment?

WES STARRATT:

My name is Wes Starratt. I'm an engineer and a writer. I'd like to respond to Mr. Ghilotti about BART coming to Marin County. I've been involved in various studies over the years about bringing BART across the Golden Gate Bridge. It's feasible across the bridge, but you have the cost of bringing BART up through, along Van Ness Avenue, all across San Francisco. The costs are enormous. We have studied the possibility of putting a second level on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. That's not feasible from a physical standpoint. We've looked at putting a tunnel, a subterranean BART connection under the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. That's also not feasible. We also looked at running a tunnel across, under the Golden Gate and through Angel Island. That was also not feasible. There is no way of getting BART, either financially or physically, to Marin County. I think that issue should be put to bed. Thank you.

STEVE KINSEY:

That's an easy one to answer, isn't it? Yes, thank you, Wes. Next.

DEBBIE HUBSMITH:

Hello, my name is Debbie Hubsmith. I'm the Executive Director of the Marin County Bicycle Coalition, and we have been implementing the National Model Safe Routes to School Program for the last two years with much success. In our first year, we increased the number of kids walking and biking to school from 21 percent to 33 percent, a 57 percent increase. While infrastructure is an important component of that, the way we did that in that first year was simply from marketing and talking about how the problem is us—we are causing the congestion and that, if we're going to get people out of our cars, we have to change our behavior. Picking up on the thread from Lynne Kidder, this is a cultural change that we need to make and also, if we build it, they will come. When we build the Sonoma-Marín Narrows, they will come; when we build the SMART Train, they will come; when we build the North-South Bikeway, they will come. We're also going to be increasing the population, apparently, by about double in the next 40 years. My question is: If we can catch the low-lying fruit now, what is being done in terms of marketing to get people out of their cars? And recognize that it's going to take 10, 15 years to build all these improvements, but we're stuck in gridlock now. I rode my bike today, from Fairfax to San Rafael, much faster than all the people who were sitting in their cars. Forty percent of trips are two miles or less. What are we doing for marketing?

STEVE KINSEY:

We're thanking you, for one thing. You are an outstanding example, and your organization has done remarkable things in Marin County and on a national level to raise awareness. I'd be open to other speakers. I know the Bridge District must have their own outreach programs; Steve may want to speak about it, but the point is absolutely correct: Education is the key, and marketing is just one form of that education. Steve?

STEVE HEMINGER:

I think, Steve, you have to have a good product to sell. What we need are alternatives. I don't think we can market people out of their automobiles if there's nowhere for them to go. In many corridors, we do. One of the challenges in this corridor is those alternatives aren't good enough yet, which is what the consensus is trying to drive toward, so that those alternatives exist. Elsewhere in the Bay Area, and here as well, we do have programs. For example, there's a single telephone number you can call—817-1717—that gets you real-time traffic information on the highway, so that folks can make a better decision. If they know that the road in front of them is clogged, maybe they can delay their departure; maybe they can take transit if it's a good alternative. Those kinds of programs are something that we can do quickly, while we're going to wait for some time for the major capital improvements to be built, so that we can get around a little bit better.

The point was made earlier about the role that employers and each of us can play. It's not as if you have to park the car in the garage from now until the end of time. It's a case of—are there some trips you don't have to take during the peak? The studies we've found suggest, for example, even on the Bay Bridge, which is one of the most congested places in our region, there are plenty of people every morning using that bridge who aren't going to work. It's beyond me to know what they're doing out there at that time of day. If you can delay trips, if you can take another mode to the trip, especially in that corridor where you've got great transit options, I think it's on all of us to be a little smarter about how we get around and to take advantage of the alternatives that do exist.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. Alan, do you want to add some thoughts...please?

ALAN ZAHRADNIK:

Our marketing people often come to me and say, "You know, we're trying to get more people on public transit." But as Steve said, it's difficult to get people excited about using a system that is inferior to the way they're used to traveling, and that's by automobile. I've been in business for 25-plus years and in the 70s, there was a program that I think was sponsored by the federal government to bring mass transit to the classroom through classroom tools, to teach the kids about

it. There have been varying opinions on how to educate the public, but it really gets down to, can you give them a better means of travel than they have now? You have, in the North Bay, a number of transit service providers—locally, regionally, ourselves. You have an up-and-coming rail transit operator. We also operate ferry. The modes are there, or the people to provide the transportation are here. The number one constraint is funding. The non-automobile transportation system that you see today, and will probably continue to see in the foreseeable future, is constrained by its technical limitations: You can only walk so far; you can only carry so much on a bicycle; you can only take rail where the rail goes; you can only take a ferry where the ferry goes; bus service is limited in where it can travel. All mass transit options are only effective if they serve masses of people. But we can put as much service out there as you can afford. If you give us the funding, we'll give you the service.

STEVE KINSEY:

I would just add to your question of how can we market better to make cultural change. Social change requires an enormous effort. It doesn't happen easily. Think of campaigns like litter awareness and smoking prevention. It requires concerted effort on the part of many, and I think that we can do a better job, but we have resources to work with on that aspect. Caltrans, through their environmental process on the Narrows, has intentions and has already begun public outreach and has offered to meet with organizations. The CMA has offered to meet with organizations. We've met with many policy advisory leaders in all the cities and towns. We're interested in going out to service organizations. Key policy leaders at the state and federal level is another part of marketing, because we need them to step up to the plate with legislative incentive programs to encourage people to do the right things with regard to transit and land-use issues. Finally, we want to have our press partners, the media. We need to get more media involvement in this. We have made a number of efforts, both in Sonoma and in Marin to do that, but we'll have to continue that. So, it's a broad effort. Marty?

MARTY ROSEN:

I'm glad to hear you say that. The capacity is there, if the funding were there. We have a cultural problem, which we talked about: mindset. There are communities that understand pricing in transportation that I think we could learn from. If you take the bus in Seattle, it's free. If you take the bus in Austin, it's free. We're not looking on this as a subsidy; we're looking on this as an investment that will enable us to provide the critical masses, the numbers, the jobs, the economic activity. If employers can provide free parking, maybe there are other ways, recognizing it's not really free, that we can reprice and recalibrate. Part of it is what Steve said—showing the true costs of automobile conduct. It's enormous, but it's so compartmentalized and so diluted, none of us really think of it, except when we go to the gas pump or when we pay our insurance. We don't realize the cost of law enforcement; we don't realize the cost of medical care and safety and many other things because it's divorced. I hope that some of our thinking would address, with the point

that you just made, that if there were a public commitment and a will to truly expand public transportation to meet the identifiable needs and identify the match of different pricing mechanisms and vehicles, we might see some contributions from employers; we might see some contributions from nonprofit and other kinds of organizations as well as government. When people begin to realize that these alternatives are available, but are only constrained by antiquated financing methods, we might begin to see some of these things take off.

STEVE KINSEY:

If I could try to nip two threads together, Marty, because cost clearly is a powerful driver. One of those other old phrases is “Time is money.” Golden Gate runs a very good bus service into San Francisco that will be a lot more time-competitive with the HOV Gap Closure in San Rafael, and the service from Sonoma will be even more time-competitive with an HOV lane running the length of the stretch. It’s not just cost—a lower fare would probably attract more passengers, but if those folks have to sit in the same traffic, it’s not going to attract enough, in my opinion, unless they’ve got that time advantage over the automobile. Next speaker.

LIONEL GAMBILL:

My name is Lionel Gambill. I’m President of Friends of the Coast, and I’m not only one of the usual suspects, I’m a battle-scarred veteran. I’m glad this process is happening.

I want to start with an aside about BART. Aside from all the other problems, BART is not a standard-gauge railroad. It can’t share track with any other railroad, which means if we get BART, we lose a 316-mile railroad that we desperately need.

But I want to focus a little bit on what’s happened since 1990, because this is where I got really involved in transportation, and, at that time, there were deep divisions between the environmental community and the business community. There were deep divisions between Marin and Sonoma. I’m deliriously happy that we have this kind of harmony. I have worked with the business community. I’ve been to many meetings of SMART and other two-county agencies, and I’m doing a reality check right now. Because in 1990, when all this began, one of the big issues that was dividing us was not whether we support a multimodal system, but when do we get each component. When I hear people say the priority is highway now and rail later, the sense of déjà vu I have is in the pit of my stomach. That’s why I’m hoping for some words of reassurance, because this is the second time in the last week that I’ve heard that familiar division. I hope we can continue to work together, because I much prefer that, but I’m a bit scared at the moment.

UNKNOWN:

Mr. Gambill, I want to clarify. I would refer to the comments of Suzanne Wilford, who’s the Executive Director of the Sonoma County Transportation Agency. There are constraints. It’s not

like we have a universal pool of money, and we can make everything go at the same time. There are constraints that make the highway more viable right now to go forward, at the same time that we're doing environmental and design studies for rail. I'm being open and straightforward by saying that yes, the highway is a high priority for us. But I emphasize that it is not to the exclusion of other modes. We are involved at all different levels, trying to look for a multimodal solution. But there are those in the community who have said, "Do not improve the highway until we have everything else lined up." I guess that's where the employer community probably parts ways. Our philosophy is, let's get done the pieces that we can do, as the funds become available, as we can go forward, because there will never be a time that we can do all the modes simultaneously. We have to start moving, and it is not to the exclusion of rail or any of the modes that we improve the highway.

STEVE KINSEY:

I will reiterate that I don't see anything suggesting that there is any impediment whatsoever to rail moving forward as quickly as possible. The funding is there to go all the way through the environmental review and the design and engineering. What we need to build is a community will. If rail is supposed to happen first, in the relatively near future we need to find the operating funds to make rail go forward. There is no impediment; there is no institutional preference of highway over rail. There's a reality that both projects are moving forward and when I say both, I could be more inclusive—the bicycle and pedestrian alongside of each. It's a matter of developing a consensus on where we want to make our priority investments in the region, as to which of those will actually be first. But under the current estimates—and I'm going to turn to Suzanne Wilford to clarify this—I believe that the current estimates suggest that the SMART Rail program would be operational before the Narrows would be constructed. That depends upon finding operating funding. If you just extrapolate out the timelines of the two, I think that the rail is anticipated at this time to begin before the highway would be complete.

SHARON WRIGHT:

I think that's a fair point. If you look at the stages of the various modes of these projects, most of the highway projects in Sonoma County are in the same phase that the rail project is in. We're under construction for Phase 1 of 6 in Sonoma County, and we're looking at a 2004 ballot measure. Even if we had a 2002 ballot measure that passed with rail, we still wouldn't have rail up and going, likely, until 2006. With the 2004 election, I think my board members in Sonoma County are optimistic that we'll still be able to keep that timeframe of a 2006-2007 startup for rail. We're not looking at highway construction on the Narrows Project until '07-'08-'09. It's going to be a phased project, so I think we need to get a bit of an adjustment on how we're viewing this. We don't have capital funds or construction funds for the highway project, for the Narrows project either. We're pursuing them just as we're pursuing a sales tax measure, ultimately, for the rail service.

STEVE KINSEY:

We're going to pursue them extra hard at lunch, but...yes?

ELISSA GIAMBASTIANI:

I'm Elissa Giambastiani, the President of the San Rafael Chamber of Commerce, also a veteran of the transportation measure wars. As a matter of fact, I just served on the VAC—the Vehicle Advisory Committee for the train—which was a very interesting experience.

My question is for Mr. Rosen. We are supportive of Smart Growth principles. We were one of the first business organizations in the state of California to advocate for the creation of workforce housing. The problem that we're encountering is this: We have a City Council that is supportive of workforce housing and in-fill development. What we have discovered, however, is that our residents don't want sprawl; they also don't want in-fill development. So, with your studies of Smart Growth communities, what strategies have you learned that might be helpful to us?

MARTY ROSEN:

I think that's a very powerful question. It's not only NIMBYs now, it's also BANANAs—Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anyone.

So we've gone a step further up the tropical fruit feeding chain. There are many examples. On a variety of websites, there are communities that recognize the tremendous disconnect between what people say and what they're willing to do. It's as real on Portrero Hill in San Francisco as it is in Ross and in San Anselmo. Primarily, it's word of mouth and it's neighbor-to-neighbor. You can have a variety of messages; you can have a variety of markets. It takes some funding, but it also takes a demonstrated will where people say, "This is my neighborhood and it's not going to be degraded by having workforce housing." There are groups right here in the Bay Area that have proven that again and again. Vocabulary is important. You don't talk about it being "affordable housing," because that has a certain resonance, but [the Bridge District] has had a lot of terrific experience, as has Mary right here in Marin County. It's a struggle everywhere. It's always uphill, and it's always slippery, but there are examples of success. I would encourage dealing with some of our people already here—Ecumenical Housing in Marin and Bridge in other parts of the Bay Area, as well as looking at some of these websites and seeing how we can engage our neighbors in talking to each other about the importance of having our communities be more stable, more sustainable, and less congested.

BOB ANDERSON:

Back here, Bob Anderson, Healdsburg. I'm tempted to talk about where I was a week ago—Tokyo. Leaving the Tokyo Station I noticed the headways on the Bullet Train were 6 minutes, and

200 miles later, it occurred to me that nobody had stopped for us, and we hadn't stopped for anybody. The entire line is elevated for the distance we were riding, in excess of 200 miles. My question is, to this morning's issue—can we build a multimodal funding facility? I heard Supervisor Kinsey put his hand out and hope that maybe the Golden Gate Bridge, when it's raising its fare, could add some monies to the pot. If we were to build a toll facility at San Antonio Creek, would Caltrans allow some of it to be used for Caltrans, some of it used for the train, some of it used for buses, some of it used for affordable housing? It's my view that, currently, we're looking at congestion as the means by which we're expecting people to get into transit. It is my belief that once you solve some problems, the congestion issue then goes away, and you'd better be looking at finding a pricing mechanism to get people; therefore, increase the toll at San Antonio Creek to get people to ride the rail.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. I have a couple of comments, and I'm sure others may want to offer something to you as well, Bob.

First, it takes a couple of weeks to come back from any trip across any ocean, in which we get to see the future and then bring it home and pine for it. Also, the densities in nations like Japan, in Europe, are really at a level to support transit. There's also the will to do it. As to the issue of, "Can we create a multimodal financing plan?", Supervisor Murray and I, a couple of years ago with Farhad Mansouri and our Executive Director of CMA and Suzanne Wilford, traveled to San Diego, where they're doing exactly that. In that particular example of HOT Lanes, on I-215, they take the monies that are received from the toll users, who also use the high-occupancy vehicle lane, and they use it to fund an express bus service in the same corridor, and if we could build the public will to do that here, that opportunity would also exist. So the examples exist. What doesn't exist is the public will to move in that direction at this time. But, there is no better corridor to take a look at that than one like the Marin-Sonoma Narrows, where you have controlled access points. To some extent—and I don't want to take too much credit for all of us—a community that understands that there are relationships between the use of the automobile and the impacts on the earth; congestion pricing may have a better opportunity there. Still, polls have not shown that in this area in any way, to date. Marty?

MARTY ROSEN:

Can I be specific now, because I didn't anticipate your question. As important as Tokyo is and the high-speed train in France, we have things we could do right here. We have the Marin Community Foundation, which is committed to a housing plan. They also have an everyday fund; it's not a lot of money, but they fund projects for improvement of our everyday activity. Housing is certainly a component of traffic and congestion relief. I would hope to have, under your leadership and some of your other chambers, recognition that these agencies, these funding vehicles, are available, if

you frame your request to address the issues of transportation, quality of life, health, and safety for children. My guess is you will find funding that can be matched and multiplied.

BOB ANDERSON:

We've done that.

MARTY ROSEN:

And how has that worked?

ELISSA GIAMBASTIANI:

It's been very successful. Our group coined the term "workforce housing," so we've been doing this for a long time. But it's gotten worse because people don't want density, and they don't want in-fill. We have worked with the Marin Community Foundation as well, so I'm looking for something new that we haven't tapped yet.

STEVE KINSEY:

Good, thank you. Okay, Alan, and then we'll have time for maybe just one or two more, so if somebody's got that urge in the next few minutes, this is your opportunity to stretch your arm. Alan?

ALAN ZAHRADNIK:

The last speaker mentioned the magic word, bridge tolls, and I perked up when I heard that. Let me explain something about Golden Gate Bridge tolls. We collect annually about \$60 million in tolls over the Golden Gate Bridge. Half of that money goes into the Golden Gate Transit bus and ferry system—\$30 million a year we invest back into the public transit system. That is enough, at this time, to maintain what we have out there. It doesn't provide for an expansion of service. We are currently considering a toll increase as high as \$5. That's \$3 more than the other bridges in the Bay Area. The purpose of this toll increase is to meet the needs of the Golden Gate Bridge. The bridge is 65 years old, and, besides seismic retrofit, it requires considerable rehabilitation at this point in its life. A \$5 bridge toll will not provide additional funds for public transit. We're going to be struggling to continue to provide the levels of public transit service that we have now over the next 10 years and into the future.

STEVE KINSEY:

You know, Proposition 42 will provide additional funds for transit expansion. All our efforts in both counties have included imagining that any sales tax would also include a significant

investment for public transit—bus transit—in addition to whatever may happen for rail. So we want very much to be able to expand our bus services in our two counties. Thank you. Yes?

CRAIG YATES:

Hi, this is Craig Yates again. I've been a general contractor here for Marin for 25 years, so I understand the definition of a traffic impact report. On the same basis, I think that MTC should also have to authorize a development, so that they know what the orders of transportation will be, presently and in the future. They should make MTC an avenue of traffic impact reports for a developer.

STEVE HEMINGER:

You know, it's an interesting question, and we all talk about the transportation/land-use linkage, but often, some of us are talking about it going from one way, and some of us are talking about it going from another. In my view, we don't live our lives to have a good transportation system—the transportation system is sort of the balancing point that reflects other values we have. One value that business has, is that they want most of their workers working at the same time, so that they can all call each other up and they're there. That means you've got a lot of people crowding on a limited system at the same time.

Another value we have is that we want our kids to go to good schools, and we have to have affordable housing. That tends to influence where we live and that's not necessarily where we work, and certainly not in the case of two-worker families, where one might be close to the job but the other is two hours away. So in my view, the transportation debate has to be a lot broader than just, "Is our system functioning well?" Our system, in many respects, is not functioning well at all. But in large part, that's because we've decided to maximize other values. So the debate really is: Are those other values more important? The current state of our system, in many respects, would seem to suggest that they are. Are we willing to give more on some of those other values to make the system work better? You can't have your cake and eat it too, many times.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you.

DAVID SCHONBRUNN:

I want to speak about a piece that hasn't come up—David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF—and that is the increment of future growth and what kind of growth that's going to be in Marin and Sonoma Counties. The development patterns there are suburban sprawl. Most places you can't get to unless you own a car. Particularly for elderly people and children, that's a huge impact to

mobility. My concern is that the system of suburban development and highway development has stopped working. Yet our governmental units have not recognized that, and the next increment of growth that comes here, if they will also be dependent on the automobile, basically crashes the transportation system. That's what the modeling shows in the Regional Transportation Plan—vast increases in delays.

The question is, what kind of growth is going to happen? If that growth were around transit centers, that would have a dramatically lower impact on us in the future. This is not value-free, as you heard Mr. Heminger just say, because our governmental institutions have clearly sided on the side of highway. Contrary to what you heard a few minutes ago from Supervisor Kinsey, there have been definite commitments made in each county's transportation plan and in the Regional Transportation Plan to attempt to use interregional transportation funding from Caltrans for a highway. That funding could go to provide all the capital costs for a railroad. The decision has been made, and unfortunately, it's the wrong decision, and it's one that traps us in the past rather than moving us into the future. If we wanted to move into a transit future, we would be committing that money for the capital costs of a transit system, which would then make it much easier to pass a sales tax for operating funds. In particular, you wouldn't be encouraging that much more sprawl. So, this project equals sprawl.

STEVE KINSEY:

Since my name was mentioned, although there wasn't a question embedded in that, I want to say I appreciate the comments, and I think that what Mr. Schonbrunn is actually advocating is a one-transit commitment in the Narrows. That's probably a fundamental question that we all need to be working toward as we think about reaching consensus. Is the Marin-Sonoma Narrows a gateway that should be focused on only a rail alternative, or is there value in having a combination of rail, bicycle, pedestrian, highway, and express bus? I think that's something, as we continue this discussion, perhaps with Director Morales and even beyond, that's a fundamental question I'd like to see us address. As we look at this region, as we look not at the next five years, but at the next 50 to 100 years, are we going to be satisfied with, are we going to be better served by, a singular mode commitment or a multimode commitment? I'm looking forward to seeing where the group as a whole will be on that. Thank you.

Yes? I think this is going to be our final speaker for this period of time. Then we'll talk a little bit about housekeeping as we prepare for the lunch speaker.

DON WILHELM:

Thank you. My name is Don Wilhelm; I'm with Marin Citizens for Effective Transportation. What we've been talking about here is the hundreds of millions of dollars being invested in highways, HOV lanes, for the Narrows, but also through the San Rafael Gap Closure. The only way that this investment is going to be properly utilized is if we can get people to properly use the

HOV lanes. I'm reasonably confident that our local employers will encourage employees to carpool through financial enhancements, but I'm not so confident about getting the HOV lanes fully utilized with express buses. What we've seen so far is that the express bus is not a popular issue for utilizing local funds. It's being considered as a regional effort, and we've just heard from Mr. Zahradnik that presently there is no hope of improving on or expanding the express bus services from funds through Golden Gate Transit.

My question to the panel is—how can we proceed with planning and operating an express bus system that would be consistent with the plans described in the Transportation Blueprint for the 21st Century or a North Bay express bus service that will encourage people to use the HOV lanes so that we can reduce or avoid vehicle-miles, increase travel speed, and reduce delays? Thank you.

STEVE KINSEY:

Maybe I'll call on Steve to talk a little bit about the regional effort, then Alan could speak to the Golden Gate Bridge District's role in that.

STEVE HEMINGER:

Hope is alive here, and I don't think Al meant to say that there wasn't any. The rail and bus expansion program that the commission adopted in December was just that, both rail and bus. The one we did a dozen years ago was rail-only, and it includes expansion on the HOV system around the region, including in this part of the region, as well as some rapid-bus demonstration in the East Bay. That's where you run express bus service on arterial streets, and AC Transit will be doing that. We were successful a couple of years ago in the Governor's Traffic Congestion Relief Program in securing \$40 million for the Bay Area to expand express bus service. One of our best express bus services today is in the Golden Gate Corridor. I think Al could probably give you a better sense about what the expansion will look like and when it will come.

ALAN ZAHRADNIK:

Yes, Don, you're right. The bridge district doesn't have, in the foreseeable future, funds to invest in expanding express bus service, but, through creative financing, we hope to be able to expand express bus service. That creative financing is through a partnership with MTC and with North Bay employers, so that they will help supply the operating subsidy needed for the service. The governor of California, through MTC, has made available funds to buy express bus services. We're proceeding with buying six that we're hoping will be deployed between Sonoma-Marin and San Francisco probably in a little over a year and at MTC, through some funds that it collects. Prop. 42 is going to help continue that funding; SCTA will be providing a subsidy to operate those buses, and we've been meeting over the past year with several of the larger North Bay

employers—I won't name them for fear of not naming all of them—and they've expressed interest in providing direct operating subsidy for their employees' use. I'm hoping that others will step forward, like MTC and the employers, and meet that funding need to provide additional express bus service.

STEVE KINSEY:

I don't feel compelled to limit the discussion, and I know that the County of Marin is one of those employers that is working closely with the Bridge District. We are looking at ways to take advantage of the express bus program in the region. I hope we can be a partner in that.

We talk about the future, we talk about where are we going with all of this, but there is a success story related to the point that Mr. Wilhelm was making about improving express bus service, and that's the Route 40 bus service that goes between Marin County and Contra Costa County, connecting to the El Cerrito BART station. Working closely with our partners in the San Rafael Chamber, the business community, our partners in welfare-to-work efforts, our partners including the Golden Gate Bridge District, BART, AC Transit, and MTC, and using general funds and HUD funding in both counties, we've been able to expand Route 40 service to include expanded express bus service between San Rafael and the BART station to provide localized service, so that people living in the Richmond and Point Richmond areas can get to jobs in Marin County. So we are not just talking about this, we've got some success under our belt.

PARTICIPANT:

This new equipment that you're going to buy, is it going to be more diesel? Are you going to be 21st century?

ALAN ZAHRADNIK:

The 21st century is here, but 21st-century technology isn't here yet. The future of clean-operating or emission-free buses lies with fuel-cell technology, and that isn't available yet for heavy-duty, diesel, intercity bus service that we operate. So we'll be buying diesel buses for this six-bus order.

STEVE KINSEY:

But clean diesel—required to have the new smog device?

ALAN ZAHRADNIK:

Yes, the CARB, the California Air Resources Board, regulates emissions for automobiles as well as heavy-duty buses and most certainly those vehicles. We can't buy buses that don't meet the CARB regulations.

PARTICIPANT:

I will add that, through MTC, we have a \$5 million request into Congress for low-emission buses — about 20 of them.

ALAN ZAHRADNIK:

For this reason, specifically, for Golden Gate Bridge District to try to keep moving more quickly, the way to get more quickly into economic viability is to have demonstration projects so we can get the technology bugs worked out and get into production mode.

STEVE KINSEY:

I think we've taken care of a number of questions and comments. I want to thank all of you for participating with us. This is by no means the end of the discussion or even the end of the day. We're getting close to a stimulating conversation with Jeff Morales, the director of the statewide Department of Transportation. I'm going to ask Rod if he wants to briefly take us through the next 20 minutes and then maybe a little more about the afternoon and how that will go.

ROD DIRIDON:

Thank you, Steve. Trixie is saying, please make sure you've signed the roll sheet. If you haven't signed, we aren't going to be able to get the summary statement to you, and we want to make sure we get it out to everybody that has interest, so make sure you sign this and fill in all the blanks, including your e-mail. We'll also turn this over to the folks who are doing the studies, so that you're included in all the notices and procedures for the studies.

The second thing is to thank the panel. I think they did a wonderful job, a balanced job at presenting the information to you from the various perspectives, and I think that was important. We attempted to make sure that the different perspectives were presented to you up here, and I think that was accomplished.

The next elements of this discussion are very important. If there is a big frog in the pond in regard to transportation in the state of California, he's going to be here to speak to you at lunch. That's the director of the California Department of Transportation, Jeff Morales. This director of the Department of Transportation has never run a highway department; he's always headed a transit department in the past. So please have that in mind as we attempt to strike a multimodal conclusion for you in this context. Mr. Morales is trying to create a true Department of Transportation, not a Highway Department for the State of California. Give him that understanding and support as he speaks, and then ask the tough questions after he speaks. By The Commonwealth Club context and procedures, we're going to break now for 20 minutes.

STEVE KINSEY:

Excuse me, Rod? In order to keep things moving in a timely way, aren't we asking the questioners to write their questions down and hand them in during the course of the speech, so that they can be presented to him, and one of us will organize those?

ROD DIRIDON:

Rose Guilbault, who is Vice-President of the California State Automobile Association, among other responsibilities, will present the questions to Jeff. So please fill out the cards, and thank you Steve for making that clear. You can fill those out now if you have a pressing question that you want him to answer, or you can wait until he's pretty well done with his speech and ask something in the context of the speech. That seems to be the better approach.

We have about 20 minutes now to grab a box lunch, sit down and eat, so that you're ready to go at 12:00 when we begin the presentation. Can I stress one more thing? Once the presentation begins, even though you might feel strongly positively or negatively about an element of it, it is better not to make background noise once the recording begins, so provide that courtesy. The important part of the day—the payoff—is the crafting of the consensus statement that occurs between 1:00 and 2:00. You folks that have points of view that you've expressed need to be down there looking them in the eye, making sure that they include your point of view in that process. So don't wander off after lunch and not be here for the payoff. Thank you very much.

KEYNOTE SPEAKER

SUPERVISOR CYNTHIA MURRAY:

On behalf of the president, as President of the Marin County Board of Supervisors, I welcome you here today. We have a very exciting presentation by Jeff Morales, who is the director of the California Department of Transportation, more commonly known as Caltrans. I will now introduce Vic Revenko, who's the former president of The Commonwealth Club of California.

VIC REVENKO:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to this special program of The Commonwealth Club of California, Mineta Transportation Institute, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Marin County Board of Supervisors, California Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Transportation, and AAA California State Automobile Association. I am Vic Revenko, a past president of The Commonwealth Club of California. We also welcome the listeners of KALW-FM in San Francisco, joining us on radio, and we invite all of our listeners, here and on the airways, to visit The Commonwealth Club at commonwealthclub.org.

Now for today's program. Our program this afternoon is part of a longer seminar that has taken place today, examining the topic of transportation hot spots—the Marin-Sonoma Corridor. If you have questions, please be sure to fill out those cards and have them picked up by the people coming through. Now I will turn the microphone over to Rod Diridon, Executive Director of the Mineta Institute of Transportation at San José State University, who will introduce today's guest speaker. Rod?

ROD DIRIDON:

Vic, thank you very much and thank you very much to The Commonwealth Club for being such a cordial cosponsor to this important program.

It's my pleasure to introduce you now to a unique person, a very different kind of director of the California Department of Transportation. Jeff Morales was appointed by the governor of the state of California to be the Caltrans Director at the beginning of his term in May of 2000. Jeff manages a \$10 billion annual budget, 23,000 employees, and he's working hard to build, maintain, and operate the largest state Department of Transportation in the United States.

Director Morales has duties that span all modes of transportation, all portions of the state of California. He has tremendous responsibility for the success of the state in the long-term future, both economically and environmentally. He has served, prior to assuming the responsibility of

director of the State Department of Transportation, as the executive vice-president and manager of operations at the Chicago Transit Authority. Prior to that, he was a senior staff member of Vice-President Gore's Taskforce for Reinventing the Federal Government, and he saved the taxpayers more than \$130 billion in efficiency improvements in that responsibility. Before that, he was responsible in a major way for the Federal Aviation Administration as a deputy administrator, under the Secretary of Transportation. He had responsibility for procurement, in '96 and '97, for the Federal Aviation Administration. He also was the director of the White House Commission on Aviation Safety and Security and developed a blueprint for National Aviation Policy for the 21st Century, something that's very timely now after 9/11. Prior to that, he was in a senior staff position with the U.S. Department of Transportation, and a staff member of a U.S. Senator's office. There, he was one of the principal authors of the landmark Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. He's married and has two children.

He is here to share with you today a perspective from the state of California regarding these kinds of hot spots, these kinds of difficult corridors, and to share his general thoughts on creating a sustainable transportation system for the state. Please welcome Director Jeff Morales.

JEFF MORALES:

Thank you, Rod, for that introduction and thank you, Vic, for hosting this and everyone for being here. I want to apologize, before I start, if I get distracted, it's because of the view out the window here, which is pretty amazing. It just reinforces how special this region is and how important it is to find the right sorts of solutions to the transportation challenges that we face here.

As Rod mentioned, before I came to California to take this job, I had the opportunity to work in transportation elsewhere in the country—in Chicago and at the federal level in Washington. That experience gives me some insights that many lifelong Californians may not have. One of my most profound insights in coming to California is that this is a really, really big state with an awful lot of people. If we took California and superimposed it on the East Coast, we'd stretch from roughly Boston, Massachusetts, to Charleston, South Carolina. With 34.5 million people, we more than equal the entire population of all seven New England states, and that includes New York.

Today, one out of every eight Americans is a Californian, and it just emphasizes the challenge we face. I say all of this because our size and our diversity is both our strength and our major source of challenge as we go forward. At the California Department of Transportation, we certainly see the diversity and deal with it and work with it every day. Let me just give you a sampling, given the diversity of this state, of some of the things we're doing throughout the state today.

We have people in San Diego working on improving the safety and security and efficiency of our border crossings, getting people and goods across safer and more securely. We've got crews out clearing 40 feet of snow from mountain passes that are 11,000 feet up in the Sierras. We've got crews doing maintenance on roads that are below sea level, in Death Valley. Down in the L.A.

region, we're building HOV lanes, adding train tracks. In the Bay Area, we're building three new bridges, buying clean buses, and expanding transit options. Right here in Marin and Sonoma, we're working with regional and local officials.

Today being part of the effort to tackle a problem that we face throughout the state: How do we provide greater mobility for a growing population at the same time that we preserve the environment and the qualities of life and the factors that make this such a desirable place to begin with?

I know that today we're supposed to come out of this session in the next hour or so with specific answers to all the challenges that we face. I'm sure you might appreciate it if I just handed you the answers right now, but that wouldn't be fair. I'm not going to do that. What I would like to do is talk about the areas I see as keys for us as a department and keys for us working in partnership with all of you to tackle our challenges and then talk about some of the progress we are making.

When I talk about keys to success, I'll point to three in particular, and three words that I'd like to stress. The three are focus, partnership, and, maybe most important, money. By focus, I mean having a clear sense of what our mission is and having specific goals in mind and in place to help achieve that mission. We have recently redefined our mission, and it's unlike the previous version, which was about a page long and read like a technical engineering manual to some people. It's elegantly simple, and I think, gets at the point of what we're supposed to be doing, which is to improve mobility across California. To provide that mobility, we have to take a more balanced view of transportation. We must use all the alternatives available to us—highways, transit, ferries, bike, pedestrian, and traffic management techniques—that help us maximize and get the best, most optimum use of all our facilities, whatever they may be. We cannot be bound by jurisdictional boundaries. Our mission, as stated in our mission statement, isn't to provide mobility just on the state highway system or just within one particular region or area. Our reach covers all of California, and that means working across the many political and jurisdictional boundaries that exist.

That brings me to my second point, which is cooperation. For all of us to succeed, we must find new ways to work together, to define common goals, set priorities together, and leverage each other's talents and leverage each other's resources. Things haven't always worked that way, and like any relationship, there are going to be bumps and diversions along the way. But we're clearly and strongly committed to partnership, and, in this region, we have some great examples, and we've got people working with you. Lenka is here. She understands partnership, and, from the feedback I get from people in the region, I think they sense that and appreciate that we are working with you more closely and trying to work in sync with the region. I commit to you that, from the state level, we will continue to build our partnerships with you as we go forward.

The third point, in some respects, is, at least traditionally, maybe the toughest, and that's money. Fortunately, we are in the midst of an unprecedented period. In the last three years, since taking office, Governor Davis has placed unprecedented focus on transportation and on making transportation improvements in the state system. He's grown our budget by 50 percent in the last three years. Today, California's transportation budget is about twice the size of Texas, twice the size of Florida, and twice the size of New York, our next closest competitors. We have almost \$7 billion worth of work under construction statewide. That's a 60 percent increase in the last three years, and, on a constant dollar basis, it's 25 percent more than ever before in the state's history. The governor has invested \$500 million in the last three years in rail, and, in one action, invested as much state money in local transit projects as had been spent in the previous decade and that was through the Congestion Relief Program. All of that translates not only to making progress and improving mobility but also into over 180,000 jobs in the state and some \$20 billion in economic activity, and it's going to keep going. Last month, voters across the state approved, by an overwhelming margin, Proposition 42. What Proposition 42 does is make the governor's program permanent, by dedicating a sales tax on gasoline to transportation improvements. That will make about \$36 billion available over the next 20 years. Central to the discussion we're having here today, 40 percent of that money will go directly to meet local needs and be under the control of local authorities.

The centerpiece of the governor's program has been the Traffic Congestion Relief Program, or TCRP, which is the single largest investment in transportation in the state's history. A total of 141 projects are being funded directly out of that program. Today we're focusing on this area and the hot spot of the 101. Among the governor's projects are extensive improvements to the 101 in both counties, as well as implementation of commuter rail from the North Bay urban centers to ferries along the bay on the SMART corridor, and the potential rehab of the North Coast Railroad for passenger traffic. The governor has not only provided us with necessary resources, but he's also set a clear tone and direction in terms of policy through his program. He's called for a mixture of transportation modes to help reduce congestion and to improve the movement of goods and connect highways to public transportation. This is important because we've come to realize that one size does not fit all. What works in Los Angeles doesn't work in Fresno, which doesn't work in San Francisco and may not work here in Marin or Sonoma, given the differences that we face throughout the state. We need to ensure that transportation continues to meet the needs of this region and serves as a vital resource to move commercial goods, commuters, tourists, to help create jobs, and to help drive the state's, the region's, and the local economies.

We also recognize that we need to be part of the planning and land-use debate that is so important as we look forward to the type of growth we see coming to California. The decisions that we make today can help ensure the health and survival of one of the most beautiful parts of our state.

Again, as I look out the window, I'm reminded of that. All of this brings me to a fundamental point in terms of our approach and that is, as we look at planning for mobility needs in this region, here north of the Golden Gate Bridge, we need a mixture of improvements, some of which tend to

the traditional commuter patterns and modes, and others that employ alternatives to highways and single-occupant vehicles. Highway 101, which has as its historical route the Camino Real, has long been a crucial main street through much of California, and it will continue to be the backbone of transportation in this region. The governor's program recognizes that and calls for important improvements along the corridor. We're working on a project in the Novato Narrows to create widening there. We're also redesigning the Steel Lane interchange in Santa Rosa, but adding lanes and interchanges can't be the only answer to improving mobility. It's an important part, but it's not the end of it. Caltrans and its regional partners are encouraging the more efficient use of vehicles, and existing highways is one element of that. Just a few weeks ago, we had the groundbreaking for reversible carpool lanes on the 101 through San Rafael. This is an important project and representative of a lot of what we're doing around the state because HOV lanes can move substantially more people than traditional mixed-flow lanes, and they're a good example of how we can manage our resources more efficiently and get a better return on the investment that we're making.

We're also moving toward other nonhighway techniques. The TCRP includes funds for commuter rail passenger service from Cloverdale south to San Rafael and Larkspur, and that train would ultimately connect to ferry boats carrying people into San Francisco. We understand that trains and transit must work in tandem with highways if we are to solve the state's and the region's mobility problems, and I'm encouraged that we've seen a trend in California which a lot of people wouldn't believe, certainly people in other parts of the country wouldn't, which is growth in transit ridership. Last year, transit ridership in California grew 40 percent faster than the national rate of growth. That's a good sign, and it's telling us that as we provide people with good options—not just options, but good options—they will start to take them and start to use it, and we can get better use out of our systems.

A TCRP-funded report due out later this summer will reexamine the feasibility of restoring the North Coast Railroad [NCR] that runs through Marin and Sonoma, and part of this study will look at using \$43 million in unallocated funds for repairing and upgrading the track. Restoring this historic line presents huge challenges, and it's not going to be easy, but if those problems can be solved, the NCR may someday help us relieve freight traffic movement along the 101 and provide relief on the 101 for people using it. We're also looking to employ technology in our efforts. It's an area that we've not taken full advantage of in the past and need to keep going forward, and it will let us take the next big step in traffic management, which is to help travelers help manage the system themselves. Providing travelers with reliable, real-time information can be one of the most valuable advances that we can make. There's a lot of discussion all over the state about Smart Growth, and that's certainly going on here. Although the term may mean different things to different people, it clearly includes the concepts of livability and sustainability in talking about communities, and, for us as a department and looking at what our role in that is, much of it boils down to providing choice and giving people real options of how they get around. That has to include things that make communities real communities—making them walkable, making them

livable, giving people the ability, instead of having to get into their car to drive down to the store, to hop on their bike and do it, or to walk and be able to do it safely, without having to worry about auto traffic.

Whether we're considering this "Hot" spot along the 101 here in Marin and Sonoma, or other parts of the state, we have to employ a wide spectrum of transportation options. Otherwise, we're facing an uphill and potentially unwinnable battle in clearing congestion, enhancing goods movement, helping to create jobs, and spurring economic growth. Our job is to make intelligent decisions about transportation investments as our population grows. The challenge and the demand is that we begin to make those choices now—make wise decisions and prudent investments in the state's transportation systems. The issues we're facing didn't spring up overnight, and the solutions aren't going to present themselves or take place overnight, but we can't wait. We can't put off making good decisions now that are going to pay off in the future, and we're not. Many of those decisions are taking place, as they should, at the local level, and they are happening every day. The answers include building better, smarter transportation projects. They include sound planning and decision-making that result in real congestion relief. They include transportation planners demanding sound return on the public's investment. The time has come to ask for nothing less, and we have to respond to the challenge.

Let me conclude this part of our discussion by saying this—at Caltrans, we have a renewed and clear focus on our mission. We are determined to be good partners with you in tackling the problems that we face. Thanks to Governor Davis and thanks to the voters of California, we have tremendous resources available to us, and together we can put them to good use for the people of California, and together we will do that. So, thank you.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Thank you, Jeff Morales, Director of the California Department of Transportation, for your remarks today. I am Rose Guilbault, and I'm the Vice-President of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs for the California State Automobile Association.

Now, it's my pleasure to begin the question-and-answer session. We have a number of questions submitted by the audience, so I'll begin.

The first question: Your background is in transportation agencies. What, in your opinion, are the keys to getting people out of their cars and onto the public transportation systems?

JEFF MORALES:

One of the great advantages we have, as transportation professionals, is that we're the customers of our own service, and we shouldn't have to go out and guess at why people are doing what they're doing and why they're not doing things that we may want them to do. We see it in our own

travel patterns, and it boils down to basics. If something is convenient, if there's an option that's convenient and practical to people, people will take it. If it's not, they won't. The challenge for us becomes, in looking at how we can increase transit ridership, figuring out how to make it a more viable option for people—how to create the connections between the freeway system and public transit; how we can create parking facilities, for instance, to get people out of their cars and into transit; how we can make sure transit is going where people are going—those types of things. It really is a simple concept. It's harder to execute, but it starts from the premise that we have to make it a viable option; we can't just build a system and expect that people will use it.

One of the strategic goals that we are adopting as a department, that will guide us over the coming years, is specifically for the state to take a strong role in making transit a more viable option. That's going to have us working much more closely with the MTC in this region, with the counties and others, to look at how we can help, through the state resources and talents, make transit more viable so that it can become a more widely used option.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Is it true that Caltrans plans to build no new freeways in the Bay Area?

JEFF MORALES:

I think the MTC is doing that. The great era of freeway building is coming to a close in the state, and there were decisions made 20, 30 years ago that dictate what's happening today. We're in the mode now of closing gaps, widening in some cases, but I think the era of extensive new construction is coming to a close. What we're looking at now is: How do we make the system function more efficiently? How do we add capacity where it makes sense, where it's sustainable? How do we provide complementary services that will make the whole system function better?

ROSE GUILBAULT:

How adequately are we funding transportation in this state? How much of our transportation funding originates with the state, and how much with the federal government, and how much with local agencies?

JEFF MORALES:

In the last few years, California has made huge strides in terms of funding transportation needs. We're making up for lost time in a lot of respects. The type of growth that I talked about—60 percent growth in the amount of work we have underway in the state—is a tremendous accomplishment, but it also tells you that three years ago, we were 60 percent lower than we are today. That's where we were for a long time, so we're playing catch-up in a lot of respects. But

there's a tremendous amount of resources available to us now, and when we look at the state resources, combined with county measures and various local abilities to raise money, I don't think any of us in transportation can cry poor right now. It doesn't mean there's enough there, but there's an awful lot available to us if we make the right types of decisions, the right types of investments, and we can make improvements. We have to rely on a significant contribution from the federal government. We're very disturbed by the president's budget, which would reduce federal funding to California by over \$600 million next year, if it goes through. The governor and the delegation, and I think just about anyone who can do so, has voiced concern and is fighting that cut, but that would have put a real dent in our program. I think it is exactly the wrong kind of thing to be doing at a time when the state is gearing up its program and focusing on getting people moving.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

We have learned today that by 2040, the projected population of California will increase from the current 31 million to almost 60 million. What programs or plans does Caltrans have to cope with this increase?

JEFF MORALES:

We're projected to grow, and I guess those numbers add up to about half a million people a year going forward. That places tremendous demand. It's also going to force, I think, the state to look at things differently in terms of land-use planning, how we integrate that with transportation planning. I think, too often, transportation has been put at the back end of the process, and we're playing catch-up with population growth. You look at so many of the problems, and we see it certainly in the Bay Area, people making 60-, 70-, 80-mile commutes. That manifests itself as a transportation problem. Underlying that is a jobs-housing imbalance, and it's going to have to be dealt with if we're going to make improvements in transportation. Part of what we're doing is getting more involved in those issues, becoming actively engaged in the planning processes, making sure that transportation impacts are understood when land-use decisions are made. We are becoming more engaged in that process because, I think, as we go forward, we don't have a choice but to be more engaged in that.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

What is the position of the Davis administration with regards to the linkage of transportation and land-use planning statewide?

JEFF MORALES:

As I said, we are getting more engaged. California has a strong history of local control over land use, and I don't think anyone's suggesting changing that. It's a matter of being engaged in it and

also helping make sure that the people who are making decisions have the best information available to them. We've not always played as active a role as we should in that process. We've seen signs recently, in different places around the state, that by stepping up to the plate and making sure that the local decision-makers understood the implications of some of the decisions and some of the issues they were facing, that they've changed their decisions, or at least taken into account transportation impacts and growth issues as they go forward. So we're going to look at them more closely together, while recognizing the rights of local governments to make land-use decisions.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

We have many, many overlapping jurisdictions. How can we deal with the fact that the first jurisdiction that gets its plan and its funding together can make long-term decisions on partial transit that preempts more rational, larger, better-coordinated, more regional solutions that may take longer?

JEFF MORALES:

That gets back in part to the size issue I talked about at the beginning. When you look at what we are trying to do, take the greater Bay Area—a huge region that functions as a region in terms of commuting patterns, goods movement, and other issues. We've got all sorts of jurisdictional lines breaking that region up, and one of the biggest challenges that we have as a state is looking at how we try to bring those together, and it's something we're working on very hard. We've been spending a lot of time with the MTC here in this region, with the other regional transportation authorities, looking at how we can align our plans with the region's plans because they're facing the same issues within a region—how to coordinate all the county plans. All of it adds up and at the end of the day, the average person has no idea whose boundaries they're driving across or riding across, and they don't care, and they shouldn't have to. It's up to us to figure out how to create those connections. Right now, that means all of us trying to find common ground, define our priorities, come up with common goals, and know that we don't have the ability to force decisions. I'm not sure that we should. But we can certainly get better decisions by sitting down at the table together.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

What is the role of performance measures in selecting transit and highway projects?

JEFF MORALES:

That gets at the issue again of return on investment, which is the notion that we are increasingly injecting into our programs. How do we maximize the return on the public investment? How do

we make sure, if we're building light rail systems, that we're building them in a way that is going to promote ridership? Not simply by putting it out there and hoping people will use it, but what can we do in terms of creating and incentivizing mixed-use development around stations, for instance, to help promote usage? When we build an HOV lane, what are we doing to promote the use of the HOV lanes—simply putting down the pavement and sticking up a sign can't be the end of it. We have to look at ways we can work with the local agencies, with the local governments, at creating more incentives, better opportunities for people to use those facilities. The use of performance measurements and systems is increasingly important for us, and we're talking about it increasingly as a focus of getting a return out of an investment that we're making. It goes hand in hand with the increasing difficulty of adding capacity, which means we have to get better use out of the capacity that we have, as we build it or out of existing capacity.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

We have heard a great deal about freeways and railroads, but there is another mode of transportation in the Bay Area, and that's ferries. What do you see as the role of high-speed ferries in the Bay Area's transportation future?

JEFF MORALES:

The bay and the various waterways are clearly an opportunity available to us. The ferries out of Vallejo are packed every morning and every evening coming back. There was connecting bus service through Sacramento, from Sacramento into Vallejo, that had to be discontinued about a year ago because there wasn't the ability to get people on the ferries. They wanted to connect and there wasn't the capacity. The governor's program has money to buy a new ferry, so we will be adding one there, and we've been supportive of expanded ferry use as part of a balanced system.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

How is Caltrans integrating and encouraging bicycle and pedestrian transportation?

JEFF MORALES:

We took a major step about a year ago with the adoption of a new standard, which says that all our designs need to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian access into them. We had a lot of encouragement and support from the advocates of bicyclists and the walking community. We think it's an important step forward in terms of creating those opportunities and the idea of creating choice for people and helping make communities more livable. I would love to be able to take my kids to school by bike, go to the store by bike. It's not a real option for me right now, and it's not an option for most people. We can create that option and do it safely, and we need to do it. Our policy is that we are incorporating those into all our designs and are working with local governments to see that they do the same.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Construction of transportation systems, particularly rail, is very costly. Can these systems be made cost-effective?

JEFF MORALES:

Every investment has to be looked at individually, but yes, they can. It's part of the idea of making sure that we're doing the things as we design, as we plan for, and as we build a system, that we're focusing on how it's going to operate, and that we're doing collateral things to help improve the prospects of its performance and, therefore, its cost efficiency. So we can, absolutely. I think it's a matter of making the right sorts of decisions and making them from the right perspective.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

I have another rail question. When discussing rail, can the tracks be upgraded for rapid transit?

JEFF MORALES:

Depending on the case, yes. Most of the high-speed rail systems throughout the world are steel-wheel technology, and speed is largely a function of straight track and no grade crossings. We are looking at those types of options around the state. We're upgrading a number of rail facilities on the intercity system throughout the state. Also, the state is funding the High-Speed Rail Authority, which is looking at the development of a true high-speed rail network throughout the state. Tracks can be upgraded in some cases; in other cases, we may need to put in new structure, but it is something we are looking at.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Can and will Caltrans provide operational funds for the SMART Railroad?

JEFF MORALES:

Who asked that question? We have limitations from the state perspective, in what we can do in terms of operational funding. Our role is limited mostly to capital improvements, but we're looking increasingly at ways we can work creatively with rail systems to ensure that the systems function and maybe by picking up some capital costs that free up operating dollars for another entity, who can provide them under existing structure. But by and large, we are not an operator of systems. We can participate on the capital side.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

What is the state doing to prevent the demise of Amtrak?

JEFF MORALES:

We're funding it is the main thing we're doing. California is unique among states in that the Amtrak service that's provided in California is state service. Amtrak's providing it under contract to us, but we fund it virtually 100 percent. All the rail cars are owned by the state of California, which is different than the case elsewhere in the country. And we provide virtually all the operating support for intercity rail service. We are watching the national debate on Amtrak very closely and have concerns that whatever is decided ultimately by Congress does not jeopardize the investments that California has made and, in fact, helps us continue the growth in rail service.

We have a great story on intercity rail. In the last three years, ridership is up 25 percent on our systems. Our three lines—the Capitol Corridor, running from Sacramento to San Jose, the San Joaquin, running down the Central Valley, and the Surfliner running from San Diego to L.A.—those three lines are in the top five lines nationally in terms of ridership. The Capitol Corridor is the highest-growth line in the country. It's a good story we can tell. In the last few years, we've essentially doubled service in intercity rail, and people are responding by riding. We want to continue that, and we want to make sure that Amtrak is in a position to continue that with us.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

A few years ago, Caltrans said they couldn't design highway projects with their staffs, then got approval to use outside firms. Did that help projects get out faster?

JEFF MORALES:

Through various means, we're putting projects out faster than ever, and we're using a combination of internal and external resources, and both sides are growing. There's so much work going on right now that we can keep our people more than fully employed at the same time that we take advantage of outside resources, and we're doing both aggressively.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Given the critical value of wetlands and remaining natural habitat, how can freeway improvements and rail be used to reduce traffic and prevent more environmental damage?

JEFF MORALES:

There are a number of things we can do there. Coming out here, I came along the 37 and was reminded we did a groundbreaking about a month ago there. An important element of the improvements along 37 was the creation of wetlands, the restoration of wetlands along the project. Fiftysome-odd acres, if I recall correctly, of new wetlands are being created as a part of the transportation improvement. We are doing that sort of thing increasingly throughout the state and increasingly well. We've begun construction on the new east span of the Bay Bridge. That has, as part of its environmental aspects, some tremendous things being done for the East Bay, in terms of setting aside property, improving some things in the bay. We have an opportunity with each of these projects to make sure that we are enhancing the environment as we go through, and we're getting better and better at that.

As we get into the planning stage of our work, obviously we need to look at how we can avoid impacts in the first place, where possible. That may not always be possible, in order to make the improvement. Where it's not, we need to mitigate in the best way we can or else move on to a different project. Our responsibility as stewards of the environment is something we take very seriously, and I think we are doing some good and creative things all over the state.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

I have a number of local questions that just deal with Marin and Sonoma County that I'll ask. The first one is—can you speed up the Caltrans study on sound wall materials and cost in San Rafael?

JEFF MORALES:

I'll turn to Lenka to give me a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

We are trying to find the resources at this point. I think we are referring to the absorptive material. It has to do with the reflection noise, and we are setting up a meeting—a meeting may have already been scheduled—to discuss it with the community. We want to give them options and see what the community prefers. Then we're going to go together and look for funding. So that's ongoing as we speak.

JEFF MORALES:

We're doing a number of different things to address noise issues, and one of the problems we face in that there are federal restrictions on what we can do with federal dollars. We think, for instance, that in some cases at least, in lieu of building sound walls, we can do things with pavement that

will produce an equivalent reduction in noise. We've demonstrated that to be the case. Right now, the federal government's not letting us use federal dollars to do that, so it's difficult for us to do it since we mix federal dollars on a lot of our projects. We are constantly looking for new and better ways to do things and working within the constraints of what we have and the resources we're given. As Lenka said, we're trying to present people with good choices and also with designs that will reflect and enhance what the community wants, rather than be a cookie-cutter approach to building our systems.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

This person wants to know if you've considered a monorail on Highway 101 from Santa Rosa to San Francisco...guess not.

JEFF MORALES:

I don't know. I will ask the question, certainly.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

I'm not aware of it, but today's the forum for a lot of things.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Will you direct Caltrans railroad engineering resources to expedite and assist immediate repairs in rebuild of the tracking parallel to Highway 101 throughout the Narrows? That's a local question.

JEFF MORALES:

Okay, on some of these I'm going to have to get back.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Too specific.

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

Could you repeat the question? I was not exactly tuned in. I apologize.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

It regards—if Caltrans would direct the railroad engineering resource to expedite and assist with repairs and the rebuilding of track parallel to Highway 101 through the Narrows?

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

I think we are all involved in the part of the solution, and I think we need to talk to the transit operators and see what's needed.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Can the Golden Gate Bridge toll increase funds be used for SMART, to support SMART?

JEFF MORALES:

We've got the SMART advocates out there looking for money from any source. The issue of tolls is under the control of the Golden Gate Bridge District, and I know they're looking at the whole question of tolls and what they may use out of any increase. That's not a state decision. It's not one that we influence or take part in, but I know that is being looked at, so I'd have to defer that one to the Bridge District.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

What can you do to assist our two counties in expeditiously obtaining the important design exceptions that our Policy Advisory Group have identified as safe and necessary to proceed with a project that is affordable and respectful of our community values?

LENKA CULIK-CARO:

I assume that's a general question, as opposed to a specific question?

JEFF MORALES:

Several things. We're doing a number of things to make sure we're serving the communities in these two counties better, and Lenka's presence underscores that. I'm sure she's familiar to most of the people in the room. We're also looking at how we can provide a greater presence up in this part of the region so that we have more people on hand dealing with issues locally. That's part of a broader effort to work in better partnership with local governments. We've sat down with the two counties and had extensive discussions on specific projects, in terms of how we can work together to expedite pieces of the projects, how we can leverage each other's resources, whether they be money, or engineering, or other talents. We need to move projects faster. We're committed to doing that, and we're making real progress in doing that. We're making sure that we get the local input, understand what local governments and the citizens are looking for; you asked about exceptions, and we're making sure we understand those and then trying to find ways to say, "Yes." It's a real area of emphasis for us.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

What can be done to speed up the restoration of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad?

JEFF MORALES:

We have the governor's program, \$60 million for the North Coast Railroad to look at rehabilitating that line. We have a study coming out this summer that's going to look at issues, I think, more focused down in this region. It is something we're interested in. Where you have rail already existing, right-of-way existing, where you've had service running in the past, it's an option that ought to be looked at, and we are doing that. I think we'll have much better answers this summer when that study comes out.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Will Prop. 42, with its permanent division of gas tax dollars that favors highways, have a negative impact on the future of multimodal transportation planning?

JEFF MORALES:

I'm not sure I'd agree with the notion that it's skewed toward highways. Twenty percent of the money from Prop. 42 would go directly into the public transportation account—40 percent for locals and 40 percent into the state Transportation Improvement Program, out of which we fund both highways and transit and rail programs. So I think it's really going to be a matter of decision making. The opportunities are there to use the money either for highways or for nonhighway uses. It's a function of what are the decisions, what are the projects selected down the road, both locally, regionally, and then at the state level.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Why can't we learn from best practices on transportation from elsewhere, in terms of focus, cooperation, funding, etc.?

JEFF MORALES:

It's interesting—I met yesterday, along with the governor, with the transportation reporter from the *Washington Post*, who was spending a week here looking at things. The premise of his story is basically that we're light-years ahead of the East Coast in how we're tackling problems, which is interesting because for many of us in the middle of it, it doesn't always feel that way. But I think we can learn from other people. For me personally, having been in different positions in different places around the country, I certainly bring those lessons to bear.

I'm sure if we went around and surveyed around the room here, we'd find out that a lot of people came from different places to California and have different experiences that they bring with them and have seen different things that work. We need to put all of that into play and into practice as we look at how we meet our needs as we go forward.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

You mentioned the size of California. How divergent are the interests of Northern and Southern California, and are there common concerns that have similar solutions?

JEFF MORALES:

Yes, yes, yes. There are many common issues. There are also some very different things. For instance, in Southern California, freight traffic, truck traffic in particular, is the dominant factor in growth on the transportation system. In Northern California, it's the personal automobile that has the greater impact, and there are striking differences in terms of where the trends are going.

Having said that, there are a lot of common things. One thing we're doing and looking to—the federal reauthorization of transportation programs, which will be coming up next year—is looking at how we can tie together the state's interests, north and south, to come up with a common set of principles so that California is fighting as effectively as it can in the Congress to get more money or flexibility, more help in meeting our transportation challenges. I think, unfortunately, the history has been that Northern California and Southern California have tended to end up fighting each other for resources and not complementing each other. That's not surprising when you look at our size. What we are trying to do here is basically, say, Boston and New York and Washington—you all have to pull together for the common good to come up with a single agenda. That's not very likely to happen, but that's the challenge we face. That's what we're trying to do, and I think we can; we've seen some promising signs. It's critical that we do it because federal programs can have a huge impact on what we can do in the state, and it's critical that we are all trying to work toward the same goals.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

September 11th has forced the United States to rethink our national transportation system. What solutions will the Davis administration propose?

JEFF MORALES:

We have done a number of things. Immediately in the aftermath of the attacks, literally within hours of them happening, and then in the months succeeding, we have done a number of things to strengthen, both through infrastructure and through enforcement and monitoring and other steps,

the security of the bridges in the Bay Area, which was obviously a high priority for us from a security perspective. There are many things being done, and I know Rod is Chair of the High-Speed Rail Authority, which we didn't mention. You may have talked about it earlier. He's very aware that airport security and the increased travel times at airports, among other things, gives a boost to, if nothing else, looking at the viability of rail as a competitor—as a complement, I should say, not as a competitor—to some of the airline service in the state. I think that's going to get an increasing focus for us as we go forward. The state is being very aggressive in looking at how to ensure the security of all our infrastructure and of the people of California, and we are a part of that process.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

What is the single most important step that either government or people could take to alleviate traffic congestion?

JEFF MORALES:

Guess I shouldn't say "Stay home"—right? We do need to, as we go forward, engage the traveling public directly in the management of the system. Right now, we have limited ability to manage ourselves in terms of looking at the system, understanding what's happening out there. We have tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of people traveling every day, making decisions about where they're going, how they're going, and when they're going. The better job we can do in helping all of us as individuals make better decisions, more informed decisions, it's going to help improve traffic tremendously. If you can, before you leave the house in the morning, understand on a real-time basis what your best option that day may be—do you take this route or that route, do you take a bus, do you take a train, do you wait 15 minutes, do you go ahead now? Whatever the choice may be, that can help tremendously because right now, we leave the house in the morning and pretty much head out blind in terms of what's waiting for us out there. Putting information in people's hands is going to be a huge step, and I think it's going to allow individuals to have much greater control over their travel and their travel experience.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

All right, we have time for a final question. So, Jeff Morales, it is 2020. What legacy have you left California transportation?

JEFF MORALES:

I've got two minutes, you said? We're working in that direction, not from the perspective of my legacy, but of what we're trying to do with the department, which is to be and act like a department of transportation, responsible for mobility, bringing better options to people in California. I think the thing that you will see in 2020 is a transportation system that is much more

balanced, much more environmentally sensitive, and much more efficient than the system that's been in place to date.

ROSE GUILBAULT:

Thank you, Jeff Morales, Director of the California Department of Transportation, for your remarks today. I am Rose Guilbault, Vice-President of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs for AAA California. Our thanks to everyone who joined us today. We also thank our cosponsors, The Commonwealth Club of California, Mineta Transportation Institute, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Marin County Board of Supervisors, the California Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Transportation, and AAA, California State Automobile Association. Now this meeting is adjourned.

RECOMMENDATIONS PANEL

STEVE KINSEY:

This is going to be the real test of whether there is a value beyond just the enjoyment of food and the opportunity to hear a remarkably visionary leader of the important Department of Transportation. I speak for myself to say that it is encouraging and does give me a sense of optimism in an otherwise sometimes fatiguing challenge, to solve transportation problems, when I hear a Director of Transportation speak with the clarity that he does, about mobility and about making the Department of Transportation a mobility agent, not just a road-building agency. I think that in our own corridor here between Sonoma and Marin, that's going to be so important.

This portion of the session is an opportunity for those of us on this side of the panel to speak among ourselves about what we've heard today, as well as the collective experience that we bring. That is quite substantial from outside of today, and what we believe to be those elements of concern in the community, some of which have been expressed today, and others that have been expressed along the way.

Joining me this afternoon in this panel, in place of Lenka Culik-Caro, is Saaid Fakharzadeh. Saaid has been involved in Marin County projects for many years and will be an excellent replacement for Lenka this afternoon. Filling in for my colleague, Sharon Wright, is fellow Sonoma County Transportation Agency member and Chair of the Sonoma County Transportation Agency, Jake MacKenzie. Supervisor Cynthia Murray, who is the Chair of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group, will also be joining us, as will the morning guests, Lynne Kidder and Marty Rosen. I assume that Rod is here. Rod said that he would act as the moderator for this.

ROD DIRIDON:

Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that you folks moderate yourself. If you get into trouble or something happens and you get stuck, I'll stand up and growl, but you've got to keep it going.

STEVE KINSEY:

Our challenge, in the next 45 minutes to an hour, is to try to capture what we have come to understand and where we want to be going. It's just a suggestion, building on the comments of Jeff Morales, the Director of the Department of Transportation; he talked about three points: focus, partnership, and funding. I think that that provides us a pretty good lattice to build our comments on today.

So although I would encourage you to speak freely, I think that by the time we wrap it up and try to create a consensus statement, that we may want to organize it under those three principles. Thank you, and I will begin with Supervisor Cynthia Murray.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

That's exactly where I wanted to go. To reiterate how closely the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project has met the three criteria mentioned by Jeff Morales, certainly we have narrowed the focus. We are working closely within the two counties to ensure that this project stays within the median, the existing right-of-way, to the greatest degree possible. It is a scaled-down project—we don't want more than one lane added in each direction; we don't want continuous service roads; we do want continuous bike lanes included. We are working very closely to make sure that there is a multimodal element to it by considering where park-and-ride lots should be, where there should be special entry ramps for buses to have immediate access to the carpool lanes, and to really look at this as a project that begins the seamless connectivity to the other modes of transportation. In many ways, we feel that this is sort of a chicken and egg, and that you have to have the freeway improvements in place to be able to have the buses get the people to the rail, to the ferry, and to the park-and-ride lots, and so to catch other buses. We look at this as the linchpin of our future transportation improvements. They all have to be integrated; they all have to go together.

We also, of course, are working in partnership, not only between the two counties, but between the different counties' congestion agencies, our environmental groups, our state and federal agencies who provide the funding. I think because we have been able to have such a high degree of consensus at this time, we've been able to attract the money, and we've been able to reduce the cost by looking at a project that's much more refined in scale and hopefully increase the speediness with which we can bring forward the environmental documents and get the approvals so we can get the implementation done in a much closer time frame.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. That was a good, concise description of where the Policy Advisory Group is on the 101 corridor, as it relates to the highway portion. Jake?

JAKE MACKENZIE:

Yes, focus. If I would focus on one thing, it would be to make sure, as we're looking at this hot spot, that we're looking at it in the context of Sonoma County's transportation plan that we adopted last year and to make sure that that is in total harmony with what is happening with the Narrows and what you in Marin County are doing with your County Transportation Plan, so that we're looking at a transportation system. What struck me about Director Morales' statement was the simplified vision of mobility for the people. That's what this is about, and we should be looking at it from that perspective.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. I'm going to mix it up. We heard a variety of comments about mode preferences—whether it should be rail first, highway first, rail only/ highway never, highway only/rail never—for us as a group, is there a sense that this is a gateway between our two communities that would benefit from selecting one mode over other modes? Or, do we believe that there should be a multimodal commitment to this gateway, as it relates to the mobility that we're seeking? I'm opening the discussion up.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

I'll begin by reinforcing the commitment of most businesspeople that it does need to be multimodal. In no way, shape, or form will one mode of transportation address the regional problem that we have.

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes.

LYNNE KIDDER:

Definitely multimodal because it's not just people that we're moving, it's also goods and services. Doing only one lane is not going to be the only possible solution to reducing congestion. One lane would never do it all. We need to give people choices, and we need to make sure those choices are reflective of things like Morales said, as far as convenience, cost, timing, all those things that add up to getting people to exercise those choices.

STEVE KINSEY:

Okay. Jake?

JAKE MACKENZIE:

I'm on the Board of Directors of the North Coast Railroad Authority, as well as being Chair of SCTA. I think it's absolutely essential that this be looked at as a multimodal transportation system. I rest my case.

STEVE KINSEY:

Okay. So, at least on this side of the panel, and Marty, is there anything you want to add on how we deal with this important issue of whether this gateway can accommodate, should accommodate, multiple modes—what are your thoughts?

MARTY ROSEN:

I'm happy to learn as well as listen. But I must say that credibility is important here, that it's not just more of the same; that if we are talking about multimodal, we mean multimodal, and not as a subterfuge for "highway first and then we'll see what happens." I think there is an issue there of linkage; some of us have to be convinced that the same intensity will be given to the other elements of the multimodal that there is to the highway, and that has yet to be demonstrated.

That brings me back to the issue of metrics. What are we measuring? I heard our colleague here say that vehicle-miles traveled and traffic avoidance is not as clear to me as it should be, and that raises some questions about what are the metrics. It's more than the time of the commute; it's more than the usual engineering standards. I think there are other transportation agencies that are quite advanced in this kind of thinking of multimodalism delivery.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. What I hear is there is a broad consensus that this is a region that could accommodate a multimodal approach. In order for that to be effective, it needs to be analyzed on a performance basis to look at what are the environmental and the financial efficiencies of these different mode choices. And it should be moved forward in a joint way, as opposed to competing or pitting one interest group against the other to see who can get to the finish line first, if there is such a thing as a finish line. Supervisor Murray?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

I think there's another aspect that we cannot neglect, and that is that, in Marin County especially, we have a rapidly aging population, and for them, using a car is not a choice. They need other choices in order to be able to remain independent and have their mobility. Marin is aging about 10 years ahead of all the other counties. So this is a problem that we have to address right now, and we must give them transit choices if we expect them to maintain a quality of life.

At the same time, we know that much of our traffic in the morning is generated from people taking their kids to school, so we have to address that aspect too. Our children don't have the ability to drive cars, and we should give them and their parents choices to be able to get to school without having to get into a car.

STEVE KINSEY:

Very good. I think that, as we take this, we're talking about focus. We're talking about some specific characteristics here, related to the comments that were first made by Supervisor Murray, that are a reflection of the work that's gone on for a year and a half between the two communities on the highway portion. We're also hearing that there needs to be integration of the other modes in the mobile effort, and that they need to be developed in a balanced way.

One of the other aspects that we've talked about is under Focus, Partnership, and Funding. Under the Partnership aspect of that, I believe—and I would encourage us as a group to commit to this, and perhaps Saaid could respond to this as well. We have SMART going forward; they've got \$7 million in environmental studies and engineering going on; we've got the highway project moving forward on its studies; we've got the Golden Gate Bridge District that does its studies; we've got CMAs in each county that have been doing a lot of work thinking about all of this, but I don't get the feeling that there's that seamless connection that we talk about in transportation between the agencies in the studies that we're doing. One of the things I think could come out of today would be to strongly encourage a greater coordination—not that it's not happening—but a greater coordination between the things that are being evaluated—the study, the proposals that are being evaluated—modality-wise, independently, and see if we can get a more integrated modal approach, even to the studies that we're doing, going forward. I would suggest that improving coordination between the existing efforts within this corridor would be useful under our partnership. Saaid?

SAAID FAKARSADEH:

I think the department is very committed to working in partnership with all the agencies. The example of that is the formation of the Policy Advisory Group, and the reason for that was to build consensus to work in partnership. We are working closely with all the transit agencies. In fact, we'll be meeting with all the transit agencies, both Marin and Sonoma County, to talk about the study that we're doing and what we can do in our Marin-Sonoma Narrows to improve the usage of transit. Both SMART and Caltrans will be meeting with Debbie Hubsmith, sitting here, to discuss bicycle-pedestrian usage in the corridor and SMART corridor. Just before I came up here, I was talking to Lillian Haynes, who is project manager for the SMART corridor, to sit down and have close coordination in terms of what we are doing and what they are doing. I think the commitment to be multimodal is there for Caltrans, and, as Supervisor Murray mentioned, we are looking at including features in the Marin-Sonoma Corridor to improve transit, to improve the usage of the HOV lane. We're looking at building a Caltrans park-and-ride lot facility as part of the corridor; we're looking at special entrances at feasible locations to enhance the usage of HOV. So I think that partnership is there; coordination is there. The coordination can always be improved, and we are willing and committed to do that.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Steve, you mentioned coordination. It seems that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, which has the overview of a lot of these different modes, might be a good place to do some more of that integration among the various agencies and have them do some peer review of the studies and see how they are integrated for consistency and connectivity. The Water Transit Authority is also doing a lot of studies right now for our ferry system expansion.

STEVE KINSEY:

Excellent point, thank you. Another thing that I think we can pat ourselves on the back about is the relationship between Marin and Sonoma over the last few years in trying to understand the challenges together. I would acknowledge, if we were making a statement here during this hour, that those efforts have been useful and that they should be continued. So, unless I see folks suggesting that we've done enough... Jake, you have any thoughts?

JAKE MACKENZIE:

No, we've not done enough. We need to continue to do it. We need to, I think, make it a regular joint meeting of CMAs. The one we had in Petaluma last November was the first time, I believe, that the two congestion management agencies had ever met together in joint session. I think it's essential, Chair Kinsey, that we continue that, and you have my commitment. The interesting thing is that, while you improve communications in one place, the next thing you know—and we found this out in the SMART legislation just now—if we're not talking properly to the people in Mendocino and Humboldt counties, they're upset because we didn't spend enough time talking to them about what they see as their interests. While we're looking at the "Hot Spots" of the Narrows, as I said earlier, this is part of a transportation system that goes all the way up the coast. Things that we may be talking about nicely with one another, we need to be mindful of some of the concerns of people to the north who also use this as their means of going north and south. That's what I'm trying to remember.

The other thing is, we had been accused back in '98 in Sonoma County, as elected officials, of not taking a leadership role. So, we have a commitment. We were told to kind of "Butt out, we—the coalition of enviros and business—are going to work this thing out." Well, we butted back in, as elected officials in Sonoma County. I see you doing the same thing here in Marin. I think, now that we've gone back and forth on that, the truth is that we now have to figure out some mechanism of having this conversation and debates among all the members of the community. To make sure that we come to the consensus we're striving for this afternoon, we've got to have everybody at the table.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

I think Jake is absolutely right. Once you begin the dialogue, you realize who else needs to be at the table. As we've experienced in Marin County, we have two other counties that have a lot of people commuting to us—Solano and Contra Costa. As we start to look at the change in the job growth patterns, there's going to be probably an increase in people from Marin going north to Sonoma. So we're going to need to be working with you because we're going to be sending more people to Sonoma.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

We have Mendocino and Lake and Napa.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Exactly. It continues to point out this is a regional problem requiring regional solutions and that we have to keep building those bridges. It's incumbent upon us as the leaders to do that outreach and to bring the people to the table that need to be there.

STEVE KINSEY:

Very good. Thank you. Any other comments related to these partnership ideas?

LYNNE KIDDER:

I think that the single most important factor that will influence our success in addressing this issue is the ability to come together as a community—to come together from very divergent backgrounds and interests and constituencies within that community. You heard Director Morales talk about it. There was a question pertaining to the competition for funds between Northern and Southern California. There's also competition at the regional level that Steve can attest to, in terms of other Bay Area projects that are looking for money. In Washington, when they reauthorize the Surface Transportation Bill next year, there will be intense competition among the states. We will never get anywhere if we can't come together and put aside some of our differences, so that we can represent a single, strong voice in the battle for federal funds. The first excuse that politicians will use for not awarding the North Bay transportation funds is a lack of consensus. We need to decide now on what we can agree on and then take that unity and go forward and lobby for our region and do so effectively.

MARTY ROSEN:

I'm happy to hear that because, unless we mobilize and show some solidarity, we're going to get picked apart in the future, as we have in the past. But when we talk about partnership, it's important to talk about genuine partnership, not just token partnership. Not just putting aside our

differences, but really understanding and respecting our differences. I am being more inclusionary. I alluded earlier to the need for housing as a legitimate transportation constituency. We had earlier talked about the disabled and certainly include the other modalities —the bicycles, the pedestrian, the rail, the transit. I hope that in looking for partners, we're genuinely reaching for, not just consensus, but lasting partnerships based upon the communities that we want to live in. Therefore, I hope we'll have not only a mobilization strategy, but also a long-term commitment, assuming we are successful in this short-term project, to where that will lead us, and we don't fall heir to the law of unanticipated consequences when we say—"Oh my God, how did we let that happen?" and we let it happen because we weren't looking, that we're setting in play a series of essentially investment opportunities that somebody is going to reap. Whether it is the land speculator, or whether it's going to be the purposes that we don't pay sufficient attention to, I hope we'll have, Steve, a "learning hat" on as well as a "delivery hat." Clearly, we've got smart people in this room. We do have resources, which I never expected to hear; we're awash in cash.

STEVE KINSEY:

Hardly, hardly.

MARTY ROSEN:

Well, how long that will last is really a function of how intensely our people feel that they're part of this partnership.

STEVE KINSEY:

Let me take up a specific example of that to see if there's a consensus on this panel as well. I mentioned that there's legislation currently before the state regarding the governance of SMART, that would bring together three separate agencies that currently have control of the right-of-way and provide a structure for its governance, including its ability to raise funds. Does that feel like an expression of partnership that is appropriate? Could we include that?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Yes.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

I'll give you the real answer in Sonoma County after tonight's marathon Councilmember meeting, when they're going to have a wee discussion on how the city reps should be selected. If you remove that little side argument, I think it does represent a real effort. Of course, when the Board of Directors of NCRA next Wednesday say why they should be at the table or not at the table, I

think that the people involved with SMART in crafting this legislation have been making an effort to bring the parties together and the governance mechanism.

STEVE KINSEY:

Good. Other partnership issues that we want to bring forward? I know that we had talked about, Lynne spent some time speaking about, the commitment of the business community; Alan Zahradnik spoke about the idea of creative financing that tries to bring the private partners into helping us expand our bus services. Do we want to be encouraging these public-private partnerships at the same time and not simply look at this as a public agency effort?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

I definitely think we should be encouraging the public-private partnerships because that's essentially what it is, whether we call it that or not. The people we are serving are coming from the private sector, for the most part, and they are certainly doing a lot to make sure that we have a strong economy, that our children are being educated in schools, that our public safety is being maintained. All of those partnerships need to be addressed, and I think we also need to look at some of the assets that we have. We're really lucky when we look at this corridor that there was some foresight, that we bought the rail right-of-way, that we own that. Many other transportation solutions don't have that kind of investment already made.

The same way along the 101 Corridor. We do own the majority of the right-of-way that would be needed to do the kind of improvement we're looking at. In some ways we have many advantages over other types of problems in that we have made appropriate investments, and some headway has already been made in getting us to where we need to go.

MARTY ROSEN:

Partnerships, like other marriages, are very labor-intensive. They take a lot of work and continuous work, and that's how you demonstrate respect. It seems to me that we have to recognize this is not only a commute-shed problem, but it's a community problem or a multicomunity problem. For that reason, I think outreach for the partnership has to include people who live in the Canal District, who live in Marin City, who live on the other side of the hill, not as an afterthought, but as primary players. That's how you demonstrate respect. You don't say "Oh, yes, where's Bob Berner of MALT—why isn't he here?" Well, as David indicated, maybe somebody didn't think of it in advance. I hope our partnership will resonate the truthfulness of our intention to be a community-building enterprise and not just a congestion-solving problem.

STEVE KINSEY:

Thank you. As a member of MALT, I've been given instructions from Bob to say we are here today, but I look after agriculture as best I can along with many others. But I think the point is well taken.

I also think that your point about involving all aspects of our community is extremely well taken, and we spent some time today talking, and some of the speakers raised the importance of a more holistic outreach effort—that public education effort. I think we probably should encourage not only public-private partnerships but continue to expand our outreach efforts to create more partners as we go forward.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

When we were working on the land-use component for Marin County's Multimodal Transportation Plan, when we started to look at transportation hubs, in addition to wanting to locate housing near transit, we also looked at things like, in the Canal Area, some of the services that would be located there, such as medical or stores or things like that, that would encourage people to use transit and make it more convenient and accessible, so that more people would want to take advantage of it. I think those are important things to bring forward. The social aspects of getting people to use transit—you have to give them the goods and services that they need, colocated with the transit.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

Steve?

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes, Jake.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

I'll say one thing about the Sonoma County Housing Coalition that is looking in Sonoma County at the question of provision of housing, and they're a natural sort of outreach place to go. I know that this was talked about in the context of Marin. I always carry around with me the General Plan of the City of Rohnert Park 2020. It's always handy to have it. It has transportation policies and all sorts of good stuff. The reason I bring it up is that Santa Rosa is updating its general plan, Petaluma is updating its general plan, the County of Sonoma is updating its general plan. In terms of partnerships and reaching out and making sure we're connected, I know that Suzanne Wilford has been working with our PRMD people in Sonoma County, but we have to make a major effort in Sonoma County as we go forward to ensure that these connections are maintained. I suspect in

Marin you have a slightly different coordinating mechanism, and maybe you take care of that business already. But I'm concerned that as the two largest cities in Sonoma County and the county itself are all updating their circulation elements, we have to be sure that we're all moving in the same direction.

STEVE KINSEY:

That's a good point and that brings back some of the points that Marty has been making through the day—that this relationship between general plans and transportation connects to more than just roads and transit. Why don't we tackle this back in our focus arena? Where are we, as a group, on the relationship between transportation and land use in this gateway? Do we feel as strongly as Marty, as a group, that Smart Growth principles need to be incorporated in our thinking, that we need to take a look at those areas within walking distance of transit hubs, that we need to be getting our general plans updated to accommodate a different pattern in the vicinity of our transit, or does that seem as though that's going beyond the community values?

JAKE MACKENZIE:

Land-use issues in the southern end of Sonoma County, along the corridor, have somewhat been taken care of by the Board of Supervisors and by actions of our Preservation and Open Space District. I think between Petaluma and San Antonio Creek, protection of the vistas and agricultural land is in pretty good shape.

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes, Marty?

MARTY ROSEN:

It's not just a bumper sticker. If I could just take 30 seconds and tell you what we mean by Smart Growth. It's not a grocery cart on Amazon.com. There's a lot of content that is readily available and a lot of good, intellectual effort that's gone into it.

Number one, first principle: Address the land-use issues.

Two: Take advantage of compact building design.

Three: Create a range of housing opportunity and choices.

Four: Create walkable neighborhoods that are safe.

Five: Foster distinctive, attractive communities.

Six: Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas.

Seven: Strengthen and direct development towards the existing communities.

Eight: Develop meaningful transportation choices.

Nine: Make development decisions predictable and cost-effective.

Finally: Continuously encourage and involve community and stakeholders in the development decisions.

There's a lot of information. I hope those of you who are ahead of me will share some of your websites with me. There's a lot of good information that we can build on, and leapfrogging, if that was the term, leapfrogging into the next session when it is clear that we can do this. We can do this. We're not talking about Bangladesh; we're not talking about Kosovo. We're talking about Marin County, that only needs, as you've indicated, focus, partnership, and a sense of commitment.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

I give you, www.lgc.org, website of the Local Government Commission and the home of the Ahwanee Principles. That's my paid political announcement from LGC.

STEVE KINSEY:

LGC?

JAKE MACKENZIE:

LGC, Local Government Commission—www.lgc.org.

STEVE KINSEY:

Great. What I'm hearing this group say is that more work needs to be done to integrate the Smart Growth principles into our modal efforts. I think that's an important thing to say, and we need to recognize that if we're going to turn this into consensus. That would be directing the congestion management agencies, the specific mode studies such as SMART. I look at Lillian Haynes, the bus studies in this county that have identified important transit hubs and say, don't forget the land-use in vicinity of those—that's just one piece. Then talk to the general plan issues of directing your future development into your already developed areas. Elissa Giambastiani talked about the pushback—communities don't want sprawl, and they don't want in-fill. This means we have to take some leadership in helping to suggest where it goes. This isn't one of the easy ones to put in here, but, if we feel that strongly, if we're across the board prepared to do that, we can certainly include it.

We have a little bit more time, and I think we always save funding for the end. I see Rod wants to offer another hundred million bucks out of the Santa Clara Measure, perhaps.

ROD DIRIDON:

You bet, sure. But it's all been spent.

What I was going to say is that you have about 20 minutes left before we have to stop, and you have all the ingredients that have been nicely matured by your conversation and your fine leadership, Steve. You have the ingredients to create a resolution indicating where you want to go. You've talked about multimodal solutions that would be developed simultaneously, as quickly as possible. Multimodal, I think, is referring now to transit, rail, and highways, and bikeways developed simultaneously and as quickly as possible. That might be where you want to go. How you get there, you have Marty's principles that he offered. You've developed several other good concepts; those might be whatever you'd like to call them.

STEVE KINSEY:

That sounds great. I think we have the challenge to finalize it into consensus statement, but let's spend five minutes of that twenty to talk about the funding aspects.

One thing I think that we're going to want is to overcome those concerns of people who've been involved for so long that one mode is going to take the prize and leave the others behind. My sense of it is that we need to do a better job of creating an integrated financing plan for all the modes. On the funding side, I would talk about that—that the funding plan has to be for the corridor, not for the mode. We need to encourage our funding agencies to describe it and think of it and act in that way. That would be something I would put forward.

Another one I would ask for us to have some conversation about is the idea of performance measures, and performance measures can evaluate many things. They can evaluate quality-of-life issues; they can evaluate air quality issues; they can evaluate cost-effectiveness issues. I'm wondering if, in our funding plan, we want to encourage performance measures being brought in, not only to define which investments we should make, but perhaps the sequencing of investments. So I'll open for discussion.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

I think that performance measures are essential. It's always good to build in your assessment tools before you begin, so that you are truly measuring what is real. Probably we should come to consensus about what those measures should be, from commute time to vehicle-miles to housing. Certainly in the funding part of it, one thing that's becoming quite apparent is, because of the land

use and livability issues going hand in hand with transportation, there needs to be some concurrency in the creation of the housing with the creation of the transportation improvements, and I think that's something that needs to get captured too in our funding.

STEVE KINSEY:

Do I see heads nodding on some of that, on that idea?

LYNNE KIDDER:

I would just call to your attention that the Bay Area Council has created and hosted a group of transportation and employer representatives from each of the nine Bay Area counties. Their mission was to come up with a comprehensive list of Bay Area transportation projects and prioritize those. Their work is not complete, but in doing so, they have pulled together from Berkeley and other places a set of criteria by which to judge transportation investment. I would encourage you to pursue that; let's take a look at it at least so that we're not reinventing the wheel.

STEVE KINSEY:

Do you have some examples of that with you?

SUNNE WOLKE:

Those that you talked about—proximity to housing, transit, land use, employment centers, a whole range of factors—then when you judge, as Marty was saying, pick carefully how you judge what is a prudent investment. You need to look at the environmental factors and the land-use factors as well as how many people can you move from A to B and in what amount of time.

ROD DIRIDON:

Supervisor Murray, would you tell us what you mean by concurrency? That's a powerful notion, and I hope everybody here understands that that's what credibility is based on. Tell us what you mean by concurrency.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

It is my understanding that people are hesitant to approve housing without the transportation improvements being in place. If we're going to create transit-oriented development, you have to make sure that it is coming in at the same time that the transportation improvements are being done.

ROD DIRIDON:

Chairman, may I make a comment? Regarding performance measures, the Bay Area Council is doing good work in that regard. There may be one weak spot, and it may have been corrected since the last time I talked to Sunne about this. But be careful that we don't think about performance measures only in terms of dollars and cents, because you're really buying social programs when you're building virtually all modes of transportation; no modes of transportation break even, except high-speed rail, internationally.

ROD DIRIDON:

All our local modes of transportation have operating deficits, so they have to be subsidized, some more than others. We subsidize some modes more heavily because they have more social value. So be careful when we create our performance measures that we don't get caught looking only at cost-effectiveness, because sometimes the best mode of transportation is the least cost-effective because it buys you more social value.

STEVE KINSEY:

Okay, I think we can hold that point.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

Steve?

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes, Jake? And then, Marty.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

Three points, quickly. In Sonoma County, Suzanne Wilford put together some excellent fact sheets to let people know where the money comes from, where their money is, what they pay in taxes, to what specific programs. Time and again, we've come up against this. We need to have sort of truth-telling sessions to the people who we are going to ask, when we are going to ask them to pay for things and be specific about what they are going to get.

Second, AB 2224, the legislation which hopefully will establish SMART as a transit district, has a funding mechanism in there. We have had discussions already at our Transportation Authority with members of the public, such as Bill Kortum, talking about what we could anticipate doing in a two-county transit district in terms of funding. Could we use that funding mechanism to pay for

bus linkages and bicycle linkages? I think, Chair Kinsey, you suggested that that would be possible. Over the next few years, as we look at funding options, I think we'll be paying a lot of attention to what we're going to be able to do, hopefully, under AB 2224.

The final thought is, and this is looking down, I was going to say the road, looking into the future, the whole question of pricing and how the public would pay in terms of a disincentive to the automobile. While it might be the kiss of death for an elected official to suggest this when running for reelection, I think all of us should be taking a hard look at the experiences of other jurisdictions of traffic pricing mechanisms since we'll never get an increase in gas tax in the United States in our collective lifetimes.

STEVE KINSEY:

Okay, thank you, Jake.

MARTY ROSEN:

Rod said to be careful what we measure, and the current buzzword is "metrics." It's just not financial measurements. We've got to figure out what the criteria are that are most meaningful for this mode, and then endeavor to get the best tools of measurement to apply to them. Road rage may not show up in the bottom line of Autodesk or Hewlett-Packard, but if one or two of their employees have the consequences of that at work, we know it's going to be on the Channel 5 News. We ought to at least labor hard. I agree with you on what measurements we want to make and not making them exclusively financial.

The second thing I want to make my pitch about is getting the vocabulary right. We are not subsidizing anything in transportation. The only question is: Who pays, and how do we pay? When we have the vocabulary, as my friends at Southern Pacific used to say about parlor cars—if you only talk about parlor cars, guess what, you're talking about stagecoaches. When we're talking about making public investments with public dollars, we're talking about how and where we choose to make those investments, how equitably they're priced, and how equitably they're collected. I don't think we have to labor on the notion of who's subsidizing whom. If we have an efficient transportation system and it serves our community needs, and these are better places to live, they're going to be basically fungible dollars. We have to step up to the plate and not apologize for the fact that certain features of our society require a different kind of public investment. We ought to be willing to say that it's worth it or it's not worth it, and if it is worth it, figure out the ways to pay for it. That's my final comment.

While we're dealing with the short-term solutions, I think we also have, hopefully, in our learning experience, some opportunity to do some longer-range structural thinking. A lot of our tax policies, which are not going to be solved on the Narrows, feed into the congestion problem. Whether we're talking about big-box subsidies or other ways that we collect our taxes, I hope that

somewhere we have a linkage, either to a website or to a group of people that recognize that some of the problems are structural.

STEVE KINSEY:

Great.

MARTY ROSEN:

Sales taxes are not the only answer. Neither are property taxes the only answer. There are a variety of financial vehicles today. Jack Welch and others have said, if it weren't for the venture capitalists—who currently have a bad name, but had a very good name about transforming a society—if we use the same creative attention to the velocity and variety of other financing vehicles, not necessarily in this context of mobilization, but linked to our common future, I think we'll see that we're not just getting out of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows problem into the Windsor-Cloverdale-Sonoma Corridor problem.

STEVE KINSEY:

Very good. We're pretty much at a point of closure on the funding piece, and we need to wrap it up. I wanted to throw one more thing in the mix, and that is my perception that, in both counties, voters recognize transportation problems are regional problems with the need for regional solutions, but when it comes to investing precious local sales tax dollars, they're not prepared to see those sales tax dollars spent in regional improvements for highways. I want to see if anyone has a different read on what the focus of our two counties' voters would be for sales taxes because I think that's important as we talk about financing approaches. Is there anyone who thinks that there is a mechanism or a will on the part of our voters to support sales tax investments into our regional highway system?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Not necessarily our highway system, but, if they are averse to looking at regional solutions, where does that leave the train?

STEVE KINSEY:

I wanted to emphasize the highway. I think the train is working to build a consensus within the region that it's worthy of it. We've heard that for operating funds, or the missing element for the rail, there is no source other than self-help to bring that along. But I was focusing my attention on the highway portion because I think that it's important to know whether that's a resource for us to look at or not.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

I think you could say easily that the Marin County voters do not support putting their sales tax money into fixing the Marin-Sonoma Narrows.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

By the same token, I think it's fair to say in Sonoma County that we have been successful in educating our voters to be in that same place, and I believe that they believe as does Supervisor Murray.

STEVE KINSEY:

What we're really talking about here is that Marin and Sonoma need to develop a financing strategy that looks for funding sources other than sales tax to accomplish our highway goals.

Let's step back now and see if we've captured this. I'm going to run through these comments that I think I've captured and as I state them, if they need to be wordsmithed; God bless us, if we can agree that we've got them generally right. We'll leave it to our editors to make them read great.

JAKE MACKENZIE:

And we'll be able to make our way back to the north through the Narrows successfully.

STEVE KINSEY:

Right. Exactly.

The problem might be solved if we tried to wordsmith it.

ROD DIRIDON:

Mr. Chairman? Trixie was not only a vice-mayor of a major city, but has a Master's degree in English.

STEVE KINSEY:

Great. Here's what I'm going to do. Under the focus, we talked about the fact that this should be a multimodal corridor, including rail, bus, highway, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. We also said that we should integrate Smart Growth planning principles into the thinking for this region, which involves stretching out and getting changes in general plan updates. We talked about the fact—there were some specific details—that we're looking for, on the highway side,

only one lane in each direction, no continuous frontage roads; we want a continuous bicycle and pedestrian route along that way; and we want a transit emphasis in the improvements that we make. And we want the improvements to be consistent with Sonoma County's 2010 Strategy and Marin's Integrated Transportation Plan. Any resistance? We're on track still?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Addition. At the beginning of all the modes, you didn't say ferry.

STEVE KINSEY:

We got a ferry in the Marin-Sonoma Narrows, okay?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

You said "corridor."

STEVE KINSEY:

Right, okay. Ferry. Thank you.

The other things that we said on the focus side were that we wanted to have improved coordination and a balanced development of the modal plans. While we're still on focus, do we feel that for the amount of time we've given for today that we have had enough on our focus?

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

My only concern is that these broad principles not be used, for example, for the endorsement of Smart Growth, which we're wholeheartedly in favor of. It means that as a community we need to embrace all the principles of Smart Growth, not just the ones that suit our particular bias.

STEVE KINSEY:

Okay, thank you. Well, that's why we've got all those websites.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

Likewise for the simultaneous development of all the modes, that it not be used the wrong way.

STEVE KINSEY:

The only one I would have added, and I don't know if we can sneak one in here, is Transportation Demand Management. We talk about the modal studies, but I think we ought to include TDM, as we call it, so we'll squeeze that in somehow. Thank you.

ROD DIRIDON:

Did we get the concurrency that you mentioned in there?

STEVE KINSEY:

Concurrency? Expand a little bit for me.

CYNTHIA MURRAY:

What I said about...

ROD DIRIDON:

That it happens at the same time.

STEVE KINSEY:

Yes, absolutely. We talked about it—that they would need to have coordinated and balanced development of the modes at the same time, concurrently, so that's what you're referring to, yes.

ROD DIRIDON:

The time component.

STEVE KINSEY:

Right, concurrency. I'll get that word right down so the editor won't even have to worry.

On the partnership side, we talked about a number of things. We talked about starting where we are, that we want to continue the close coordination with Marin and Sonoma counties and even to expand it. We talked about improving our community outreach to bring more participation. We talked about encouraging public-private partnerships, recognizing that that involves hard work to do that. We talked about expanding our public outreach efforts, including all communities and all social interests, as we go forward with that.

Specifically, we wanted to support the SMART legislation, leaving room for this evening's rock 'n' roll over how representation occurs in the Sonoma cities. We talked about the idea of bringing MTC into the effort, to ensure that from a regional perspective, these partnerships and these coordinated plans are going forward and working towards solidarity.

Are there any other partnership aspects that were left off in that summary?

Here we come into the homestretch. On the funding side, we talked about wanting to develop an integrated, prioritized funding plan that includes housing investments as well as our investments in the different transit and transportation improvements. We wanted to utilize performance measures to evaluate effectiveness and sequencing, identifying examples of commute times, the vehicle-miles traveled, vehicle-miles avoided, and proximity of housing to transit, but also to recognize that it is not simply a cost-effectiveness analysis. For the wordsmith, somehow working in the term "metrics" would go a long way.

STEVE KINSEY:

Good. We're going to need plenty of funders.

We talked about exploring a joint funding strategy that would benefit both counties, excuse me, a joint funding structure, and this point was made by Jake. We want to look at whether there is anything we could do to fund these improvements in both counties. Certainly, that's going forward with SMART, but I think you were encouraging us to look even more broadly than that. Also, to continue to explore the role of congestion pricing and alternative funding sources. We were brave enough to encourage our teams to continue to look at that. I say brave because we know that, at the present time, that's an unpopular idea when it's tested in the local communities.

Then the idea that Marty brought out at the end, which was—and I think it's a great way to wrap up—that we should spend some of our policy time, as we go forward, thinking in a larger way about structural reform needed in transportation planning and financing. So that we don't keep working on the margins, but we recognize the innovative capacity of our two communities, and the yearning for a more progressive outcome that is holistic in resolving not just problems of transportation, but problems that span across our community, from health to education to life quality to environmental protection.

So, we set forward in an hour a consensus. I told you when we began this morning it wasn't a question of what to do, it was how to do it. I think this has been very useful in helping to shed light. You know, Jeff Morales enjoyed the view. The sun has left with him but only for a brief time. We will continue to work on this.

I want also to thank our sponsors for today. They helped to make this happen. I want to thank those of you who served on the panel, and I think Marty, soon enough you'll be one of those regulars that we talk about—the usual suspects.

STEVE KINSEY:

Right. Of course, I want to thank all of you for taking the time, especially those of you who have endured through the entire day.

Finally, to recognize that, spark plug or not, if it hadn't been for Rod Diridon and the Mineta Transportation Institute, we wouldn't have had this opportunity, and I think it's been a great one. Thank you all.

ROD DIRIDON:

I need to say the same kind of “thank you's,” especially to the Marin County Board of Supervisors, for allowing us to use these beautiful facilities. I apologize for needing to do it, but I didn't mention before the membership applications for our very good partner in this, The Commonwealth Club of California. Pick one up on the way out and make sure you become a member. That's how they continue to be able to do these kinds of things. Thank you very much for being with us.

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS, AND TERMS

ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit—A medium-rail system that operates throughout various locations in the Bay Area
BCDC	Bay Conservation Development Commission
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Policy Act
DOT	Department of Transportation
HIP	Housing Improvement Plan
HOV LANES	High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes—Lanes that can be used during commute hours only by carpools, vanpools, public transit vehicles, motorcycle riders, and certain clean-fuel vehicles.
LGC	Local Government Commission
MALT	Marin Agricultural Land Trust
MARIN IJ	<i>Marin Independent Journal</i> (local newspaper)
MARIN-SONOMA NARROWS	The Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project proposes to extend the existing HOV lane system in Marin County northward into southern Sonoma County.
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
NCRA	North Coast Railroad Authority
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
PAG	Policy Advisory Group
PRMD	Permit and Resource Management Department
PSA	Prostate Specific Antigen
SCTA	Sonoma County Transportation Agency

SMART	Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit
Smart Growth	A term for new planning approaches to reduce congestion; also known as sustainable growth or livable development.
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century
TCRP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (1998)
TRANSDEF	Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund
VAC	Vehicle Advisory Committee