

MARIN CONSERVATION LEAGUE

Minutes

Land Use, Transportation, Water, Agricultural Land Use: July 11, 2018, 1 to 3 PM

Present: Susan Stompe (chair), Priscilla Bull, Don Dickenson, Rick Fraites, Sandy Guldman, Bob Miller, Kate Powers, Judy Teichman, Jill Templeton, Doug Wilson, Greg Zitney. Guests: Dianne Steinhauser and Molly Graham of TAM.

Minutes of the June 6, 2018 Were approved as presented.

Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director of the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM), gave a PowerPoint presentation that covered the current Measure A funding from a half cent sales tax in Marin for transportation related projects. It generates \$27 million per year. She pointed out that the legislative approval of SB1, which increased the gas tax by 12 cents per gallon, is on the ballot this fall for repeal. This gas tax raises \$2 to \$3 million a year locally, vehicle registration generates \$2.3 million per year, and federal funds have contributed about \$2 million per year. If SB 1 is upheld, it would increase Marin's revenues to about \$4 mil per year. Current road and transit needs far exceed funds available. The current Measure A has helped finance the carpool lanes through central San Rafael and provided the local fund that enabled the feds to provide \$75 million to the project. Other things financed by the 2004 ballot measure include the sound wall, transit service, safe routes to schools, pothole repair and street rehabilitation. The new measure does not change the current sales tax level of one half cent, but provides funding for items not currently identified on the expenditure plan. These include financing bike lanes, school buses, completing the Marin-Sonoma Narrows in Marin, contributing to an interchange connector from Hwy 101 to eastbound 580, and transit for seniors and disabled.

A survey was done in January that showed that there is local support for extending the funding to new projects. The new measure would allow for review of projects every 6 years, adding flexibility that the current measure lacks. If this measure fails, the current tax would continue to 2025.

Action Items:

- A. Corte Madera Creek:** San Anselmo Flood Risk Reduction Project. Susan reviewed the previous actions MCL has taken regarding the project, such as a letter on EIR scoping and a letter commenting on adequacy of the Draft EIR. The purpose of taking action now is to enable MCL to have a voice in the anticipated certification of the Final EIR and decision on the project, which is scheduled to take place in August, in light of the fact that there will not be a MCL Board meeting in August. Sandy Guldman reviewed the preferred alternative and explained that there is an urgency to move this project along since the funding awarded by the state Dept. of Water Resources expires in 2020

M/S/C (Bull, Fraites) to recommend to the Board that it conditionally support certification of the Final EIR (subject to review when available) and the preferred alternative for the San Anselmo Flood Risk Reduction Project.

- B. TAM Measure A renewal: M/S/C (Wilson, Zitney) to recommend to the MCL Board that it support the extension of TAM Measure A.**

Water Updates . A letter was sent to the county on the adequacy of the DEIR for the San Anselmo Flood Risk Reduction project. A couple of inconsistencies were pointed out in the letter.

Transportation Issues. Kate and Susan attended the San Rafael transit center design options public meeting. Four alternatives were displayed. Susan distributed a flyer explaining the four options.

Ag issues. Judy Teichman reminded people that the next Ag Land Use Committee meeting is July 27 and will focus on the Walker Creek watershed. She suggested that members reach out to other people with interests in watersheds.

Court Decision. Greg Zitney reviewed the Marin County Superior court’s final decision on the San Geronimo Golf Course, which reversed the Court’s earlier preliminary decision that the County’s action to acquire the property did not require CEQA review. Greg pointed out that the County argued that acquisition of the property was not a project under CEQA and that, even if it was determined to be a project, it was exempt. However, the Court ruled against the County on both points. Therefore, the County violated CEQA by essentially “approving” a project that would involve clearly foreseeable changes to the physical environment that could have potentially significant effects. CEQA review must be completed prior to a lead agency’s approval of a project. The County will now have to either conduct the required CEQA review or appeal the local Superior Court’s ruling to the California Appellate Court.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15

Notes: SSS, w/GZ