



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING AGENDA
March 17, 2021 – 1:30 PM**

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDERS N-25-20 AND N-29-20
THE SMART BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING WILL BE HELD VIRTUALLY**

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY NOT ATTEND THIS MEETING IN PERSON

ZOOM TELECONFERENCE INSTRUCTIONS

PUBLIC COMMENT PRIOR TO MEETING:

If you wish to make a comment you are strongly encouraged to please submit your comment by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 16, 2021 at

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SMARTBoardComments>

PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THE MEETING:

The SMART Board Chair will open the floor for public comment during the Public Comment periods on the agenda. Please check and test your computer settings so that your audio speaker and microphones are functioning. Speakers are asked to limit their comments to two (2) minutes. The amount of time allocated for comments during the meeting may vary at the Chairperson’s discretion depending on the number of speakers and length of the agenda.

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the March 3, 2021 Board Minutes
3. Board Member Announcements
4. General Manager’s Report
5. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items
6. Consent Calendar
 - a. Accept Monthly Ridership Report – February 2021

Regular Calendar

7. Authorize the General Manager to execute Contract No. OP-IS-20-002 with Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC (ITS) to provide IBM Maximo Software as a Service (SaaS) and associated support services for an amount not-to-exceed \$783,000 for the term of the Agreement
8. Review of Listening Session Comments/Suggestions (*Discussion/Provide Feedback*)
9. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel regarding significant exposure to litigation (anticipated litigation) pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9(d) – 54956.9(e)
10. Report out Closed Session
11. Next Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors, April 7, 2021 – 1:30 PM
12. Adjournment

DISABLED ACCOMODATIONS:

Upon request, SMART will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in and provide comments at/related to public meetings. Please submit a request, including your name, phone number and/or email address, and a description of the modification, accommodation, service or alternative format requested at least two (2) days before the meeting. Requests should be emailed to Leticia Rosas-Mendoza, Clerk of the Board at lrosas-mendoza@sonomamarintrain.org or submitted by phone at (707) 794-3072. Requests made by mail SMART's, 5401 Old Redwood Highway, Suite 200, Petaluma, CA 94954 must be received at least two days before the meeting. Requests will be granted whenever possible and resolved in favor of accessibility.



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
March 3, 2021 - 1:30 PM**

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS N-25-20 AND N-29-20
THE SMART BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING WILL BE HELD VIRTUALLY
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY NOT ATTEND THIS MEETING IN PERSON**

1. Call to Order

Chair Rabbitt called the meeting to order at 1:30pm. Directors Bagby, Colin, Connolly, Fudge, Garbarino, Gorin, Hillmer, Lucan, and Rogers were present; Directors Arnold and Pahre joined later.

2. Approval of the February 17, 2021 Board Minutes

Vice Chair Pahre joined at 1:33pm

MOTION: Director Garbarino moved approval of February 17, 2021 Board Minutes as corrected. Director Rogers second. The motion carried 11-0 (Director Arnold absent)

3. Board Members Announcements

Director Garbarino stated she will need to step away from the meeting when Kaiser's staff arrives at her office

4. General Manager's Report

General Manager Mansourian reported that since the start of passenger service in August 2017, SMART has carried 1,948,000 passengers, 201,000 bicycles, and over 7,200 wheelchairs. He continues to provide weekly ridership data that is also available on SMART's website.

Mr. Mansourian stated that the developer who had the contract with SMART to purchase the Downtown Petaluma property under certain conditions that were authorized by your Board failed to exercise its option on February 19th.

He announced that last week, SMART's Chief of Police McGill conducted a public safety training with over 46 firefighters, representing Petaluma, Rancho Adobe, Novato, Rohnert Park and Schell-Vista. They all participated in the safety drills involving one of SMART's trains.

Mr. Mansourian introduced Chief Financial Officer, Heather McKillop, who will provide an update on the Coronavirus Relief Fund. Ms. McKillop stated that an action item will be before the MTC Board in the next couple of weeks. Staff has reached out to our Metropolitan Transportation Commission representatives, Chair Rabbitt and Director Connolly, and wanted to make sure the Board is aware. The first round which was the CARES Act, SMART received two allocations; first allocation was \$10.4 million, and second allocation was \$4.6 million. Those funds were spent primarily on salary and benefits, which was the direction received and those funds were expended by November 2020. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has placed several recommendations on how to distribute the remaining funds of the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act (CRRSA) Funds. The first allocation was done around January or February for large operators and SMART did not receive any funds from this allocation. They are ready to distribute the remaining allocation and they have two options; the first option presented a few weeks ago would allocate \$1.8million to SMART. The second option would allocate \$174,217 to SMART, based on some complaints from the large operators; five of the seven were not happy with the allocation. The total loss for Sonoma County Transit between option one and two is \$872,000, Santa Rosa is \$756,000, SMART is \$1.6 million, and Marin Transit is \$1.3 million. Based on the information provided option 1 is the best option for all the North Bay operators. There have been conversations of an additional relief act that will go through Congress and discussions are happening on how those funds would be allocated. We would like conversations to start with both large and small operators to hear each other discussions since at this point those meetings have been segregated.

Director Lucan stated that is a very large difference in amount from option one and two and asked when the decision will be made.

Chair Rabbitt stated that he and Commissioner Connolly have been discussing the issue as well. The discussions are preliminary to some degree, although he can say that he had just received a phone call from the general manager of large operator who feels there is movement to get back to option one with some revised language and not revised dollars. There are a lot of negotiations going back and forth currently. Chair Rabbitt agrees that with Ms. McKillop that both small and large operators need to meet and hear each other to be on the same page. He said there's a worry of whatever happens in the future, about those that have eminent layoffs versus those that perhaps won't for at least a year or more, and making sure that there is a true up in the next round that can be an option.

Director Connolly stated that Chair Rabbitt summarized it very well. He said the matter will be coming before the MTC committees, this month.

Director Lucan stated that this is a big implication for the North Bay and if there is anything that the Board can do to gather the North Bay. He asked if the one vacant seat from Sonoma County on MTC's Commission is hurting us at this time. Chair Rabbitt said that if what the General Manager of the large operator stated is correct and option one is the best options that will be good for SMART. Everyone is worried about what the future holds obviously and how long the money will last as was mentioned, you know we were a month quicker than we had anticipated going forward, so I think it's this new normal of public transit through the pandemic is creating this anxiety and making sure that we can be as nimble as possible, but you know it's \$800 million, and that is being distributed and MTC is looking for a formula that makes sense because, as we mentioned before, everyone gets funded in a slightly different model and different funding sources and different scale of service. He

and Commissioner Connolly agree on the equity piece that the Transit dependent riders need to be taken care of whether they live in a rural area or urbanized area and it doesn't mean that the service in their rural areas is less important than it is in the more urbanized areas. These are the things that we're struggling with now. Without the dollars from the Federal Government we would be in an awful place for Transit in the Bay area and we probably would never be able to recover once we emerged from the pandemic.

Director Rogers stated that the City of Santa Rosa is sending a letter of concern related to this issue and will be happy to circulate to the Board. He had a chance to speak with our MTC representatives and they understand the issue, which is obviously multifaceted, and we understand supporting regional transit making sure that everybody can continue to operate and look at fairness. However, there are some concerns, particularly when two thirds of the Santa Rosa funds are being siphoned off outside of our jurisdiction.

Lastly, Chair Rabbitt thanked Chief of Police McGill for holding the safety training with all different groups to make sure everyone's well-being is being taken care of.

5. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Eris Weaver stated that she virtually attended the League of American Bicyclist's National Bike Summit this week. Today is lobby day which kicked off with a speech from Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg, the fact that we have an actual bicyclist in this role is really a big deal. We also met with Congressman Mike Thompson and Jared Hoffman and there is legislation in the works, and if passed it will significantly increase available funding for bike and pedestrian projects which we're very excited about. She looks forward to hearing today's presentations about capital projects and grants and legislation, especially as they relate to building out the pathway. She hopes staff allows enough time to seriously consider incorporating public input into the 2021-22 budget and the capital improvement program. The timeline has been listed with presenting both of those in May and approval in June, it seems a little tight. These documents are so lengthy and complicated and often released to the public with a very short time window before the meeting. She asked that if the documents can be released further in advance than you typically do, so that there can be robust public input and with time to then incorporate it.

Patrick Seidler voiced his concern about the SMART project being decoupled from the pathway. He stated that Chair Rabbitt asked at the February 3 meeting for the environmental clearances for the segments of the pathway that have not been built. He thought that was a good question, and in fact it leads to something that I think should be put in front of the Board and publicly available is that. The following documents should be available to the public on the segments that have not been built of the pathway. The 2006 CEQA clearances, the NEPA clearances and we're done as part of the Caltrain EIR. The 2003 from Parsons Brinckerhoff and HDR Engineering documents show very clearly what the pathway was going to be from Larkspur to Cloverdale. These documents can be very useful to the board and to the public, to be able to evaluate how to prioritize the pathway segments to be built. ALTA transportation consulting worked for SMART from 2008 to 2010 and they brought the engineering design for the pathway from 10 to 30% in some of those sections. He would like the entire project report to be available to the Board and the public as we go into the budgeting process. He asked when SMART will use the information in a Board process and before the capital expenditures are discussed, so the Board is aware of what's been environmentally cleared and what has partial engineering done. As stated on numerous occasions, those components are what will

make SMART eligible for other outside funding. It will give the Board the opportunity to focus on the issue of recoupling the pathway more clearly with the train.

Jack Swearengen stated that Friends of SMART signed two letters to Congress. One letter was to California Transit association regarding emergency funding and the second to Rail Positive Association. He informed the Board that the money does come to you for COVID relief have a direct result of our signatures on those letters.

Warren Wells stated he second the concerns expressed by Ms. Weaver regarding the schedule for public input on the budget and capital improvement program does seem abbreviated. Additionally, he encourages the Board to be open minded about the best use for the unexpected funding surplus described by SMART's Chief Financial Officer on the February 3rd meeting. A report recently commissioned by Marin County found that E-bike sales are skyrocketing increasingly by 20% per year. While there's light at the end of the tunnel due to COVID pandemic, it does remain to be seen what SMART's former ridership will return, and I think it's worth considering the role of the District has facilitating longer distance trips by bicycle, as well as by train. Historically, agencies will rely on outside grants to obtain funding to the multi-use pathway, but some of the remaining gaps are not likely to be competitive, for state and regional brands. He strongly encouraged in the District to consider some of its own spending some of its own Measure Q funding on completing those gaps, which would allow travelers to go by SMART on their own bicycles.

Lastly, Chair Rabbitt acknowledge public comment received by Richard Brand that was distributed to the Board.

6. Consent
 - a. Approval of Monthly Financial Report
 - b. Authorize the General Manager to execute Contract Amendment No. 1 with EMR, LLC to provide a 3-year extension of the software subscription for MaxAccel in the amount of \$68,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$118,260

Chair Rabbitt asked for Board and public comments on the proposed Consent Agenda.

Director Arnold joined at 1:53pm

MOTION: Director Fudge moved approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Director Rogers second. The motion carried 12-0.

7. Review of 2020 Activities and 2021 Goals and Challenges (*Discussion/Provide Feedback*)

General Manager Mansourian stated that the Board will be receiving presentations from Capital Projects, Grants, Planning and Legislation, and Community Outreach on their 2020 activities and 2021 goals and challenges. Highlights of presentation as follows:

Capital Projects

Chief Engineer, Bill Gamlen, who provided an overview on the following:

- Capital Projects – Overview
 - Plans and Managers the Expansion of the Rail and Pathway Systems
 - Manage the Existing Infrastructure

- Support Grant Applications
- Coordinated with Local Municipalities
- Large Infrastructure
- Pathway Construction
- Small Projects
- Unusual Projects
- Bridge Management Program (Mandate by FRA)
 - Annual Inspections
 - Inspect/Monitor 45 structures
 - 2 Tunnels
 - 1 Movable Bridge
 - 140 Drain Culvers
- Support Grant Applications
 - Develop scope
 - Prepare Cost Estimates
 - Investigate potential environmental impacts and possible permit issues
- Coordinate with Local Municipalities
 - Monthly Technical Advisory Meeting (TAC)
 - Construction Work for Others
- 2020 Challenges
 - COVID-19 - Overcoming remote work challenges and coordination (
 - Larkspur Extension Project - Fulfilling environmental permit mitigation requirements
 - Windsor Extension Project - Losing Bridge Toll Regional Measure 3 (RM-3) Funding and placing the project on hold until lawsuit is resolved
- 2020 Accomplishments
 - Initial Operating Segment (IOS) Contract Closeout
 - Larkspur Extension Project Closeout
 - Windsor Extension Project
 - Sonoma County Pathway Project
- 2021 Goals
 - Windsor Extension Project
 - Sonoma County Pathways Project
 - Black Point Bridge Repairs
 - Pedestrian Path of Travel Safety Enhancements
 - Timber Bridge Repairs
 - Organization Automation
 - Capital Improvement Plan
- 2021 Opportunities
 - Leverage Railroad Closures
 - Develop Capital Improvement Plan
 - Finalize Sonoma County Pathways Project
 - Freight Expansion

Comments

Chair Rabbitt thanked Chief Engineer Gamlen for the impressive amount of work. He thanked him personally for the coordination work with all the jurisdictions. The amount of work that you've performed under contract or contracts with all the different entities out there that's impressive.

Grants, Planning and Legislation Department

Grants and Planning Manager, Joanne Parker, who provided an overview on the following:

- Introduction to Grant Process
 - Grant Development
 - It takes a Village to Prepare a Grant
 - Grant Application can take 40-160 hours
 - Grant Management
- 2020 Grant Accomplishments
 - 13 New Grant Application Submitted in 2020
 - 42 Active Grants, valued at \$192 million
 - Grant Agreements/Grant Reports/Grant Closeout
- 2020 Planning Accomplishment
 - 107 Local Planning Notices Reviewed
 - 130+ MTC, State, SCTA, Transit/Rail technical committee coordination meeting participation
 - Ridership and Agency data developed to Federal National Transit Database standards and reports produced for board and public
 - Supported SMART's low-income/Clipper START implementation
 - State and Federal Legislative staff support
- 2020 Legislation Accomplishment
 - COVID-19 Relief – Federal and State Advocacy
 - North Coast Railroad Authority Dissolution
 - Ongoing review of State and Federal legislative activities to ensure SMART interests are represented and increase funding opportunities
 - State Legislative Support Services contract ended, resulting in limited expertise availability for State government relations
- 2020 Grants, Planning and Legislation Challenges
 - 2020 Two-person department resulted in insufficient coverage
 - Local development/planning activities around SMART often request substantial data support or time intensive documentation over controversial proposals that may compromise safety
 - Housing developers requesting specialized ridership data
 - Encroachments or new grade crossings of SMART's track
 - City of Healdsburg's North Entry Area Plan has resulted in 2 years of reviews and 5 letters from SMART opposing the creation of a new grade crossing for safety reasons
- 2021 Challenges and Growth
 - Building staff capacity – Hiring Principal and Assistant Planner
 - Local Development will increase, and Planning Notices numbers will grow with the return of the economy
 - Increased demand for new data analysis
 - Increased demand for First/Last Mile support with return of riders
 - Fare Policy and Clipper fare collection are staffed through this Department requiring more staff hours
 - Need increased coordination with MTC and partner transit agencies going forward
 - Post-COVID transit schedules will need to be launched and modified in collaboration with others
 - MTC Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force will require increased Regional coordination and staff support

- State Route 37 Corridor – State has requested additional SMART participation in planning activities
- 2021 Grant Opportunities
 - Grant opportunities – Federal, State, Regional and County

Comments

Chair Rabbitt thanked Ms. Parker for all the incredible amount of work that is performed. Other agencies would have three separate divisions: grants, planning and legislation. However, your division oversees all three and carry them out well. If it weren't for those grants, the capital improvements would not happen. Certainly, legislation and the planning taking place to make it happen at the state and federal level.

Director Fudge thanked Ms. Parker for all the work. She did not realize that one of the positions was vacant, which required a lot more work this year, that was the ridership information. She didn't realize the number of active grants, were 42. She is amazed of all the work and thanked her again.

Director Lucan thanked Ms. Parker for her work. He asked when certain grants become available there's always a question of who applies for it? Does SMART apply for it? Does the local jurisdiction applies for it. Is there anything that Board/SMART could be doing or should be doing better so were not necessarily competing amongst ourselves, but coordinating efforts. Many of us wear different hats in different places, how do Marin and Sonoma as a whole or North Bay really put our best foot forward and work together to be the most competitive, we can be. Ms. Parker responded that there is no set answer other than to continue communicating. Each process is a little bit different and at any given moment every jurisdiction is in a different place than they were during the last grant process, you have to make sure that you're staying in communication with your Community partners to know that you're all on the same page. She provided the following example: for the Quick Start Program we have received great support from the local jurisdictions, in which the two SMART pathway segments are proposed. Th City of Petaluma upon finding out that SMART was submitting a section of the pathway from Payran to Lakeville, felt it was so important that they agreed to not apply on their own but partner with SMART. This makes me feel very good about the prospects of that project being funded in a region wide competition. One thing is constant communication and we have we've had some great partnerships where you know whether it is a local resource being brought to the table, in addition to our resources to prioritize projects.

Chair Rabbitt said that it was an excellent question from Director Lucan, It goes back to what we started the conversation on today with the CRRSAA dollars finding those pathways forward that we're not necessarily trying to constantly outcompete one another but collaborate and be strategic to make sure that we can bring a disproportionate amount of money to the North Bay for all transportation projects being a rail entity; hopefully, we have some specific lines that we can go after and making sure that we're working with all our allies on the other items.

Communication, Marketing, and Customer Service Department

Manager, Matt Stevens, who provided an overview on the following:

- Communication
- Marketing
- Customer Service
- 2020 Accomplishments
 - Customer Service

- Marketing Success in January and February
- COVID-19 Community Outreach and Marketing
- Staying Apart Keeps Us Moving – Video/Illustrations
- Virtual Community Engagement
- 2020 Challenges
 - Decline in engagement and growth due to COVID-19
 - Communication and Marketing Staff reduction
 - Advertising Program
- 2021 Opportunities
 - Reintroduce SMART to our community
 - Regain and increase ridership as the COVID-19 pandemic recedes
- 2021 Goals
 - Increase Outreach to identified audiences
 - Listen to feedback and implement strategies to meet the needs of our riders
 - Double track crossing exists where two trains “meet” or pass one another
- 2021 Challenges
 - Train ridership
 - Budgeting for marketing materials and events
 - Ability to make in person presentations and attend events
 - Re-establishing our safety education program
 - Regional tourism, affecting weekend and leisure ridership
 - Department staffing needs
- SMART would like the input on the following:
 - Marketing Incentives
 - Partnerships
 - Train Schedule
 - Safety

Comments

Chair Rabbitt thanked Mr. Stevens and department for performing all the work and it is outstanding. We have board members who bring forward their own personal, professional expertise and want to be involved in some of those issues that were mentioned, specifically the marketing. General Manager Mansourian will bring forward the listening session presentation and can imagine that some of discussion about marketing will be influenced by what we take from those listening sessions going forward, as well as trying to get the right timing on the kind of a coming out of the pandemic. Director Colin is one of those professionals with the expertise.

Director Colin thanked Mr. Stevens for all the work that has been done with just two people. The customer service alone is an entire department and with All that happened with COVID your ability to pivot and do all those outputs and update people is incredibly impressive. Whenever talking about marketing, you are looking at increasing ridership. It's looking at outputs versus outcomes and obviously year 2020 was the year of outputs with the communication strategy. She is curious about the actual outcomes of the Sail and Rail program, as well as the Weekend program. She agrees with Chair Rabbitt that the information from the listing session will help inform what type of campaign going forward. She wants the Board to consider bringing in additional expertise to help figure out how to get people back on the train for existing riders and new riders. Those are two totally different campaigns that's not one campaign that's going to do both.

Chair Rabbitt said that David Chu is going to be introducing a Bill and he is a big champion of seamless transit in the Bay area. This was a conversation that we had on the Blue-Ribbon Committee for transit recovery. He is going to try to start with the non-controversial items within the seamless concept which, according to him, were: number one mapping and way finding so we may find ourselves in the midst of adjusting to some sort of coordination with what our peers are doing elsewhere. Transit priority lanes, fare integration, and real time data, which SMART has done a good job at.

Richard Brand complimented General Manager Mansourian and staff for the fabulous presentation. The public hopefully see some of the details and there's a real energy level. He said it's important that the members of our two counties understand that there's a lot going on. He is looking forward to the March 17 meeting where there will be a review of the listening session. With the new Administration we are going to see so many new grant opportunities. Ms. Parker really nailed it that climate change will get a huge focus, and as she mentioned we look at rail efficiency over those big 18 wheelers trucks going up and down the highway, those trucks will be further restricted. He asked if the Windsor Extension contract has price protection since the project is on hold due to the Regional Measure 3 lawsuit. He submitted his additional comment with a picture of all the lumber at Redwood Empire yard that's all going to come down on these heavy trucks.

Dani Sheehan said that the COVID rates are dropping the Governor may open more areas. She asked if there a vision for reopening weekend service.

Patrick Seidler thanked Mr. Gamlen for the tremendous job since he started SMART in 2010 with the rail and the pathway projects. He asked the following: 1) if SMART could identify the CIPS pathway projects in Marin for 2020 and 2021 that are planned; 2) for the pathway grants does the grant group access or use the 2006 CEQA EIR , 2016 NEPA Caltrans EIR and the ALTA Transportation Consulting Pathway and Alignment Engineering that they perform in 2008 to 2010; 3) does the grants group work with local developers when projects go in there and nearby, most particularly when a developer for the Hanna Ranch Road warehouse development went in. Did SMART try to work with a developer to complete the connection from Highway 37 pathway with Rowland that was set out in the 2019 SMART Strategic Plan; and 4) do you have any information about how many bicyclists or pedestrians use the SMART pathway currently, and pre-COVID.

Damon Connolly stated this is very comprehensive and well laid out report. On capital projects just to emphasize, he wants to see coordination with pathways inside and outside the right-of- way as priorities, this includes in design planning and implementation of projects. He would like to see new rail construction factor in a pathway when the project is designed, in other words, I don't want to see an afterthought or adding unnecessary costs because it wasn't part of the initial project. Is well understood, and it has been brought up, we need to emphasize collaboration with other transit agencies and not make it a SMART only campaign as we recover, but in North Bay Regional Transit Campaign taking lessons from seamless mobility. Meaningful partnerships should be pursued with transit agencies and employers' festivals, fairs, high schools, and other education institutions along the track. We are excited about the shared Bike Pilot program pursuing marketing around that, survey employers on when employees will be going back in person and what service they need for their work force. What does the tourism industry predict for tourism's return, for example, what does San Francisco Hotel say their patrons want in getting North what service or wineries they are looking for. We should survey previous riders on their expected schedule and when they expect to be in the office. When we return to full service, let's come back better and that could include a

caution against relying solely on prior ridership numbers for expanded train times. How exactly things will look different, but I think we all agree to some extent, they will be different, and of course tailoring our approach and our service around that going forward.

Chair Rabbitt thanked those who presented today. These series have been great to understand specifically what each division department have been doing, the challenges that they've had and the amount of work that has been done with a very lean operation. SMART has a lot of talented people who carrying out a lot of work, each day.

General Manager Mansourian thanked Members of public and board members, for your comments. Chair Rabbitt summarize it very well about the efficient, dedicated, and full of energy staff that SMART has. We run a very complicated operation, running a train on a single track where two trains must pass each other precisely at the same time due to turnouts or sightings is a critical operation. We don't get to be 5 or 15 minutes late and must be a very efficient operation. SMART had been building and operating for the last three years, so my hats to our staff since we're a 24/7/365 days operation and you saw the dedication of the staff.

He stated that as we review the listening session comments/suggestions, and capital projects and the budget review, it is very critical for the Board to remember the limited staff and resources available. SMART needs to be focused and methodical on what do we want to accomplish. On March 17, staff will present to the Board and members of the public all the notes, comments, and suggestions from the first group of our listening sessions. On April 7th staff will present the Capital Plan which will include what are the safety and security projects, the bicycle pedestrian pathway projects, the rail projects, the operation projects and cost and financial strategies. In addition, we will also be discussing the Transit Operating Services because we're getting into an area, as mentioned by Director Colin the post COVID recovery and what does that mean. One of those is the existing fare policy, should we touch our fare, should we double it triple it make it free go half what are some of the incentives. We will review the weekdays and weekend schedule and get your feedback. We will discuss service performance measures; how do we measure what we're doing a great job, and perhaps set a criteria plan for reporting. We will bring all these backs and start putting our strategy together for the April meeting. For the month of May and June, based on your directions, we will begin to prepare the budget, which you will have at least two separate sessions, if not more so we're looking forward to receiving all the feedback.

Chair Rabbitt stated that there was a question regarding the opening of weekend service, I know that Marin county is just this week got into the red tier, and I know my colleague Supervisor Gorin will concur that we've been talking about this quite a bit apparently that in California, the orange tier and the positivity side, plus a purple tier on the case rate side somehow it comes out to a red tier, but we are very close, from SMART's standpoint, we're going to be cautious and see how things were allowed and make sure that we launched at the correct time.

General Manager Mansourian stated that staff has been coordinating with our Larkspur Ferry partners and with San Francisco and, of course, the health officers, so we have put ourselves in a position that almost immediately, we can open the weekend service when the health officers allow movements on weekends and when Larkspur Ferry starts their service, and they have put themselves in a position to do it almost immediately. Stay tuned we are all looking very much forward to that, but we must do it methodically and, at the appropriate time, but we're all ready to go frankly we're very eager to go.

Chair Rabbitt appreciates and thinks the overriding concern also is that, as we get more and more vaccinated and we move into better times.

8. Next Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors, March 17, 2021 – 1:30pm
9. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:12pm

Respectfully submitted,

Leticia Rosas-Mendoza
Clerk of the Board

Approved on: _____



March 17, 2021

David Rabbitt, Chair
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Barbara Pahre, Vice Chair
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway/Transportation District

Judy Arnold
Marin County Board of Supervisors

Melanie Bagby
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Kate Colin
Transportation Authority of Marin

Damon Connolly
Marin County Board of Supervisors

Debora Fudge
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Patty Garbarino
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway/Transportation District

Susan Gorin
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Dan Hillmer
Marin County Council of Mayors and
Councilmembers

Eric Lucan
Transportation Authority of Marin

Chris Rogers
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Farhad Mansourian
General Manager

5401 Old Redwood Highway
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
Phone: 707-794-3330
Fax: 707-794-3037
www.sonomamarintrain.org

Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit Board of Directors
5401 Old Redwood Highway, Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954

SUBJECT: Monthly Ridership Report – February 2021

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATIONS: Information Item

SUMMARY:

We are presenting the monthly ridership report for activity for the month of February 2021. This report shows trends in ridership for SMART by tracking Totals, Average Weekday riders, and Average Weekend/Holiday riders via the two methods we employ to track riders on a daily basis: Onboard Counts and Clipper + Mobile App paid fares. The report details bicycles and wheelchairs counted as well. This monthly report begins to look at data related to the Pilot Clipper START Low Income Fare program, implemented on SMART starting on the holiday week beginning November 23, 2020, that provides eligible riders with a 50% discount off a single ride fares.

As discussed in prior presentations to Your Board, both methods of counting are necessary to track progress. Onboard Counts capture all riders, including the riders who are riding during the Free Fare Days or Free Fare Programs offered by Your Board, riders with passes who neglect to tag on or off, as well as categories of riders such as children under five years old. Therefore, Clipper + Mobile App paid fare reports do not capture all riders.

This and future reports will compare the most recent month to the same month during the prior year, as is standard industry practice for tracking trends over time. The report also shows progress so far in the Fiscal Year compared to the same time in the last Fiscal Year, to enable tracking of riders relative to budget expectations.

SMART's rider data for January 2021 was posted on the SMART Ridership website (<http://sonomamarintrain.org/RidershipReports>) and SMART's detailed February 2021 data will be posted once validated.

The report covers the slow increase of riders returning to SMART as Bay Area Counties lift their Shelter-In-Place restrictions and begin to phase the opening of restaurants, retail shops, offices, and other places of work. In response to the pandemic, SMART annulled service on weekends starting March 21, 2020, and reduced weekday services, first from 38 to 34 trips, then to 32 trips and, starting April 6, 2020, reduced weekday service to 16 trips.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

REVIEWED BY: [x] Finance /s/ [x] Counsel /s/

Very truly yours,

 /s/
Joanne Parker
Programming and Grants Manager

Attachment(s): February 2021 Monthly Ridership Report

FEBRUARY 2021 (COVID-19) SMART RIDERSHIP

SMART Ridership Report
Board of Directors,
March 17, 2021

COVID-19 related public health orders to Stay at Home were re-issued by Sonoma and Marin Counties in the third week of December 2020 and extended into January 2021, having previously been relaxed in Fall 2020 to allow for some restaurants, retail shops, offices, and other places of work to reopen. On January 25, 2021, The California Department of Public Health lifted the Regional Stay-Home Order for the 11-county Bay Area region; however, many counties, including Sonoma County, will remain in the purple tier under the Blueprint for a Safer Economy, meaning many restrictions will remain in place.

SMART modified services in March 2020 due to the pandemic, with weekend service annulled starting March 21/22 and weekday service reduced first by 4 trips (down to 34) on March 23rd, then by another 18 trips, (down to 16), on April 6th.

SMART's February 2021 ridership was down 90% overall compared to February 2020. The decrease is greater than in prior monthly reports due to the opening of the Larkspur extension and service schedule increases in January 2020 which resulted in dramatic ridership increases in January and February 2020 over the previous year. After the initial drop in ridership due to the initial onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic, average weekday ridership rose steadily from March until October 2020, as COVID rates improved, and then took a dip in the winter months as pandemic conditions worsened and the stay at home orders were renewed. February 2021 began to see another increase of 10% in average weekday ridership from the prior month.

Total ridership year-to-date is down 89%. Fare payments in February through the Clipper and SMART App systems were also down 85% from the previous year. The total number of bicycles is down 75%. However, the percentage of riders bringing bicycles onboard grew from 11% in February 2020 to 20% in February 2021.

MONTHLY TOTALS YEAR-OVER-YEAR	FEB 2020	FEB 2021	% Change
Total Ridership (Onboard Counts)	71,676	7,412	-90%
Total Paid Ridership (Clipper + App Only)	61,149	7,089	-88%
Average Weekday Ridership (Onboard Counts)	2,981	371	-88%
Average Weekday Paid Ridership (Clipper + App Only)	2,617	353	-87%
Average Weekend/Holiday Ridership (Onboard Counts)	1,339	0	-100%
Average Weekend/Holiday Paid Ridership (Clipper + App Only)	980	0	-100%
Total Bikes Onboard	7,656	1,483	-81%
Total Wheelchairs Onboard	275	6	-98%

FEBRUARY 2021 (COVID-19) SMART RIDERSHIP

SMART Ridership Report
Board of Directors,
March 17, 2021

FISCAL YEAR-TO-DATE (JUL - FEB)	Fiscal Year 2020	Fiscal Year 2021	% Change*
Total Ridership (Onboard Counts)	515,214	56,132	-89%
Total Paid Ridership (Clipper + App Only)	418,888	62,403	-85%
Average Weekday Ridership (Onboard Counts)	2,653	396	-85%
Average Weekday Paid Ridership (Clipper + App Only)	2,212	370	-83%
Average Weekend/Holiday Ridership (Onboard Counts)	1,002	0	-100%
Average Weekend/Holiday Paid Ridership (Clipper + App Only)	702	0	-100%
Total Bikes Onboard	56,132	13,961	-75%
Total Wheelchairs Onboard	1,893	200	-89%
<i>*NOTES: COVID-19 Stay at Home Orders issued third week of March 2020. SMART annulled services starting March 21. SMART experienced similar ridership reductions to other transit systems in the Bay Area and Nationally. Free fare days and free fare programs offered in Fiscal Year 2020 also contributed to lower Clipper + App numbers. Stay at Home Orders were re-issued in December 2020 and extended in January 2021.</i>			

Senior and youth ridership have fallen alongside general ridership. Pre-COVID, youth and senior ridership each constituted 10% of total boardings; since March 2020, the share of senior riders has fallen slightly, at 9% of total boardings, while youth has decreased to 5% of total boardings. The share of disabled passengers, as measured by the use of the Regional Transit Connection Discount ID Card (RTC), has increased from 2% of total riders pre-COVID, to 4% since March 2020.

SMART kicked off participation in the Clipper START program, which offers a 50% discounted fare to eligible adult riders, in November 2020. Riders using the Clipper SMART discount has nearly tripled between the first report month and February 2021 (December 2020 had 16 boardings, January 2021 had 24 boardings, and February 2021 had 46 boardings).



David Rabbitt, Chair
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

March 17, 2021

Barbara Pahre, Vice Chair
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway/Transportation District

Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit Board of Directors
5401 Old Redwood Highway, Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954

Judy Arnold
Marin County Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: Authorize the General Manager to execute Agreement No. OP-IS-20-002 with Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC (ITS).

Melanie Bagby
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Dear Board Members:

Kate Colin
Transportation Authority of Marin

RECOMMENDATION:

Damon Connolly
Marin County Board of Supervisors

Authorize the General Manager to execute an Agreement with Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC (ITS) to provide IBM Maximo Software as a Service (SaaS) and associated support services. for the not-to-exceed amount of \$783,000 for the term of the Agreement.

Debora Fudge
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Patty Garbarino
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway/Transportation District

SUMMARY:

On December 2, 2015, your board adopted a resolution to execute a 5-year agreement with ITS for providing and supporting a cloud-based Maximo system.

Susan Gorin
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Dan Hillmer
Marin County Council of Mayors and
Councilmembers

In anticipation of the existing Agreement's expiration date, a Request for Proposal was issued on December 29, 2020 under Solicitation No. OP-IS-20-002. SMART received a total of 5 responsive Proposals from the following service providers:

Eric Lucan
Transportation Authority of Marin

1. Electronic Data, Inc.
2. Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC
3. JFC & Associates, LLC
4. Starboard Consulting, LLC
5. Stellar Services, Inc.

Chris Rogers
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Farhad Mansourian
General Manager

SMART's evaluation committee reviewed the five proposals using the criteria identified in the Request for Proposal, which included: Prior history providing similar services, key personnel qualifications, project approach and understanding, client organization, and proposal organization thoroughness and clarity. Following the technical review of all proposals submitted, SMART's evaluation committee selected three service providers to be short-listed. The evaluation committee proceeded to review and evaluate the proposed fee schedules and conduct reference checks for each firm on the shortlist. SMART then opened negotiations with the top-ranked firm. Following successful negotiations, staff is recommending Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC as the firm that will provide the best value to District.

5401 Old Redwood Highway
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
Phone: 707-794-3330
Fax: 707-794-3037
www.sonomamarintrain.org

Contract Summary:

The Federal Railroad Administration ("FRA") requires each railroad to ensure compliance with maintenance of both fixed and mobile assets. SMART uses Maximo reports to help maintain compliance with these requirements. ITS, LLC will collaborate with SMART staff to procure, and maintain SMART's existing Maximo SaaS. ITS will perform system maintenance as well as make recommendations for continuous improvement. ITS will develop needed training materials for new processes, develop requested reports, and provide related services as needed.

Multiple SMART departments use Maximo. Below is a brief overview of how each department uses the system:

- Operations
 - FRA Required reports
 - Dispatch
- Operations Dispatch Log
 - Maintenance of Way and Vehicle Maintenance
- Preventive and corrective maintenance (Work Orders)
- Asset tracking
- Inventory
- IT
 - IT Ticket Service Requests.
- Finance and Procurement
 - Procurement approval process
 - Purchase orders
 - Inventory and asset financial reporting
 - Invoices

Staff recommends authorizing the General Manager to execute an Agreement with IBM Maximo Software as a Service and associated support services to Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC. The Agreement includes the initial 39-month contract total of \$783,000 which includes total initial costs of \$369,944, and an additional budget of \$413,056 for on call services, or additional licenses as needed. The Agreement also includes pricing for two option years at a licensing cost of \$113,829 per year which can be exercised at SMART's discretion.

FISCAL IMPACT: This contract is funded in the Fiscal Year 2020-21 budget.

Reviewed By: [x] Finance /s/ [x] Counsel /s/

Very truly yours,

/s/

Bryan Crowley
Information Systems Manager

Attachment(s): Agreement No. OP-IS-20-002

AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES

This agreement (“Agreement”), dated as of April 1, 2021 (“Effective Date”) is by and between the Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District (hereinafter “SMART”), and Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC (hereinafter “Consultant”).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Consultant represents that it is a duly qualified Maximo® and IT Consultant, experienced in the areas of Maximo SaaS development, implementation, and related services; and

WHEREAS, in the judgment of the Board of Directors of SMART or District, it is necessary and desirable to employ the services of Consultant for ongoing maintenance support and development of SMART’s existing Maximo maintenance management service.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

ARTICLE 1. RECITALS.

Section 1.01 The above Recitals are true and correct.

ARTICLE 2. LIST OF EXHIBITS.

Section 2.01 The following exhibits are attached hereto and incorporated herein:

- (a) Exhibit A: Scope of Work & Timeline
- (b) Exhibit B: Schedule of Rates
- (c) Exhibit C: Response Times and Severity Level Criteria

ARTICLE 3. REQUEST FOR SERVICES.

Section 3.01 Initiation Conference. SMART’s Information Systems Manager or designee (IS Manager), will initiate all requests for services through an Initiation Conference, which may be in person, by telephone, or by email. During the Initiation Conference, the IS Manager and Consultant will establish and agree on a specific task for the project.

Section 3.02 Amount of Work. SMART does not guarantee a minimum or maximum amount of work under this Agreement.

ARTICLE 4. SCOPE OF SERVICES.

Section 4.01 Scope of Work. Consultant shall perform services within the timeframe outlined in **Exhibit A** (cumulatively referred to as the “Scope of Work”).

Section 4.02 Cooperation With SMART. Consultant shall cooperate with the IS Manager or designee in the performance of all work hereunder.

Section 4.03 Performance Standard. Consultant shall perform all work hereunder in a manner consistent with the level of competency and standard of care normally observed by a person practicing in Consultant’s profession. If SMART determines that any of Consultant’s work is not in accordance with such level of competency and standard of care, SMART, in its sole discretion, shall have the right to do any or all of the following: (a) require Consultant to meet with SMART to review the quality of the work and resolve matters of concern; (b) require Consultant to repeat the work at no additional charge until it is satisfactory; (c) terminate this Agreement pursuant to the provisions of Article 7; or (d) pursue any and all other remedies at law or in equity.

Section 4.04 Assigned Personnel.

- (a) Consultant shall assign only competent personnel to perform work hereunder. In the event that at any time SMART, in its sole discretion, desires the removal of any person or persons assigned by Consultant to perform work hereunder, Consultant shall remove such person or persons immediately upon receiving written notice from SMART.
- (b) Any and all persons identified in this Agreement or any exhibit hereto as the project manager, project team, or other professional performing work hereunder on behalf of the Consultant are deemed by SMART to be key personnel whose services were a material inducement to SMART to enter into this Agreement, and without whose services SMART would not have entered into this Agreement. Consultant shall not remove, replace, substitute, or otherwise change any key personnel without the prior written consent of SMART. Key personnel shall be as listed in the applicable Task Order.
- (c) In the event that any of Consultant’s personnel assigned to perform services under this Agreement become unavailable due to resignation, sickness, or other factors outside of Consultant’s control, Consultant shall be responsible for timely provision of adequately qualified replacements.
- (d) Consultant shall assign the following key personnel for the term of this Agreement: Richard Minnigh, Richard Poorman, Daniel Brame, Tim Ferrill, Nathan Loveless, Sean O’Brien

ARTICLE 5. PAYMENT.

For all services required hereunder, Consultant shall be paid in accordance with the following terms:

Section 5.01 Consultant shall invoice SMART on a monthly basis, detailing the tasks performed pursuant to the Scope of Work requested by the SMART IS Manager and the hours worked. SMART shall pay Consultant within 30 days after submission of the invoices.

Section 5.02 Consultant shall be paid in accordance with the rates established in **Exhibit B**; provided, however, that total payments to Consultant shall not exceed \$783,000.00 without the prior written approval of SMART. Consultant shall submit its invoices in arrears on a monthly basis for hourly support services in a form approved by the Chief Financial Officer. The annual SaaS license fees shall be prepaid in advance for each licensing term. The invoices shall show or include: (i) the task(s) performed; (ii) the time in quarter hours devoted to the task(s); (iii) the hourly rate or rates of the persons performing the task(s); and (iv) copies of receipts for reimbursable materials/expenses, if any. All reimbursable expenses must comply with SMART's Travel Guidelines and must receive prior approval. Consultant's reimbursement for materials/expenses shall not include items already included in Consultant's overhead as may be billed as a part of its labor rates set forth in **Exhibit B**. SMART does not reimburse Consultant for travel time.

Section 5.03 Consultant must submit all invoices on a timely basis, but no later than thirty (30) days from the date the services/charges were incurred. District shall not accept invoices submitted by Consultant after the end of such thirty (30) day period without District pre-approval. Time is of the essence with respect to submission of invoices and failure by Consultant to abide by these requirements may delay or prevent payment of invoices or cause such invoices to be returned to the Consultant unpaid.

ARTICLE 6. TERM OF AGREEMENT.

Section 6.01 The term of this Agreement shall remain in effect until June 30, 2024 with one two-year option to extend at SMART's sole discretion unless terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions of **Article 7** below.

ARTICLE 7. TERMINATION.

Section 7.01 Termination Without Cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, at any time and without cause, both parties shall have the right, at their sole discretion, to terminate this Agreement by giving 30 days written notice to the other party.

Section 7.02 Termination for Cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, should Consultant fail to perform any of its obligations hereunder, within the time and in the manner herein provided, or otherwise violate any of the terms of this Agreement, SMART may immediately terminate this Agreement by giving Consultant written notice of such termination, stating the reason for termination.

Section 7.03 Delivery of Work Product and Final Payment Upon Termination. In the event of termination by either party, Consultant, within 14 days following the date of termination, shall deliver to SMART all materials and work product subject to **Section 12.08** and shall submit to SMART an invoice showing the services performed, hours worked, and copies of receipts for reimbursable expenses up to the date of termination.

Section 7.04 Payment Upon Termination. Upon termination of this Agreement by SMART, Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment for all services satisfactorily rendered and expenses incurred hereunder, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total payment specified in the Agreement as the services satisfactorily rendered hereunder by Consultant bear to the total services otherwise required to be performed for such total payment; provided, however, that if services are to be paid on an hourly or daily basis, then Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment an amount equal to the number of hours or days actually worked prior to termination times the applicable hourly or daily rate; provided further that if SMART terminates the Agreement for cause pursuant to **Section 7.02**, SMART shall deduct from such amount the amount of damage, if any, sustained by SMART by virtue of the breach of the Agreement by Consultant. In the event of termination without cause under Section 7.01, the annual SaaS license fee paid in advance shall not be subject to proration.

Section 7.05 Authority to Terminate. The Board of Directors has the authority to terminate this Agreement on behalf of SMART. In addition, the General Manager, in consultation with SMART Counsel, shall have the authority to terminate this Agreement on behalf of SMART.

ARTICLE 8. INDEMNIFICATION

Consultant agrees to accept all responsibility for loss or damage to any person or entity, including SMART, and to indemnify, hold harmless, and release SMART, its officers, agents, and employees, from and against any actions, claims, damages, liabilities, disabilities, or expenses, that may be asserted by any person or entity, including Consultant, to the extent caused by the Consultant's negligence, recklessness or willful misconduct in its performance or obligations under this Agreement. Consultant agrees to provide a complete defense for any claim or action brought against SMART based upon a claim relating to Consultant's performance or obligations under this Agreement. Consultant's obligations under this Section 8 apply whether or not there is concurrent negligence on SMART's part, but to the extent required by law, excluding liability due to SMART's conduct. SMART shall have the right to select its legal counsel at Consultant's expense, subject to Consultant's approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld. This indemnification obligation is not limited in any way by any limitation on the amount or type of damages or compensation payable to or for Consultant or its agents under workers' compensation acts, disability benefits acts, or other employee benefit acts.

Patent and Copyright Infringement. Consultant agrees to (a) defend against and hold SMART harmless from any claim by a third party that the Services infringe a valid U.S. patent (issued as of the Effective Date) of such third party and (b) indemnify SMART for settlement amounts or third party damages, liabilities, costs and expenses (including reasonable attorneys' fees) awarded and arising out of such claim. If any part of the Services become or, in Consultant's opinion, is likely to become the subject of any injunction preventing its use as contemplated herein, Consultant may, at its option (1) obtain for SMART the right to continue using the Services or (2) replace or modify the Services so that such Services become non-infringing. If (1) and (2) are not reasonably available to Consultant, Consultant may terminate this Agreement upon written notice to SMART and refund to SMART a pro-rated amount of any pre-paid but unearned fees, if any.

ARTICLE 9. INSURANCE.

With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its Subcontractors, Consultants, and other agents to maintain, insurance as described below. If the Consultant maintains broader coverage and/or higher limits than the minimums shown below, SMART requires and shall be entitled to the broader coverage and/or the higher limits maintained by the Consultant. Any available insurance proceeds in excess of the specified minimum limits of insurance and coverage shall be available to SMART.

Section 9.01 Workers' Compensation Insurance. Workers' Compensation as required by the State of California, with Statutory Limits, and Employer's Liability insurance with limit of no less than \$1,000,000 per accident for bodily injury or disease.

Section 9.02 General Liability Insurance. Commercial General Liability insurance covering products-completed and ongoing operations, property damage, bodily injury and personal injury using an occurrence policy form, in an amount no less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence, and \$2,000,000 aggregate.

Section 9.03 Automobile Insurance. Automobile Liability insurance covering bodily injury and property damage in an amount no less than \$1,000,000 combined single limit for each occurrence. Said insurance shall include coverage for owned, hired, and non-owned vehicles.

Section 9.04 Technology Professional Liability Errors and Omissions. Insurance shall be appropriate to the Consultant's profession and work hereunder, with limits not less than \$2,000,000 per occurrence. Coverage shall be sufficiently broad to respond to the duties and obligations as is undertaken by the Consultant in this agreement and shall include, but not be limited to, claims involving infringement of intellectual property, copyright, trademark, invasion of privacy violations, information theft, release of private information, extortion and network security. The policy shall provide coverage for breach response costs as well as regulatory fines and penalties as well as credit monitoring expenses with limits sufficient to respond to these obligations.

The Policy shall include, or be endorsed to include, property damage liability coverage for damage to, alteration of, loss of, or destruction of electronic data and/or information "property" of the Agency in the care, custody, or control of the Consultant. If not covered under the Consultant's liability policy, such "property" coverage of the Agency may be endorsed onto the Consultant's Cyber Liability Policy as covered property as follows:

Cyber Liability coverage in an amount sufficient to cover the full replacement value of damage to, alteration of, loss of, or destruction of electronic data and/or information "property" of the Agency that will be in the care, custody, or control of Consultant.

Section 9.05 Endorsements. Prior to commencing work, Consultant shall file Certificate(s) of Insurance with SMART evidencing the required coverage and endorsement(s)

and, upon request, a certified duplicate original of any of those policies. Said endorsements and Certificate(s) of Insurance shall stipulate:

- (a) SMART, its officers, and employees shall be named as additional insured on all policies listed above.
- (b) That the policy(ies) is Primary Insurance and the insurance company(ies) providing such policy(ies) shall be liable thereunder for the full amount of any loss or claim which Consultant is liable, up to and including the total limit of liability, without right of contribution from any other insurance effected or which may be effected by the Insureds.
- (c) Inclusion of the Insureds as additional insureds shall not in any way affect its rights either as respects any claim, demand, suit or judgment made, brought or recovered against Consultant. Said policy shall protect Consultant and the Insureds in the same manner as though a separate policy had been issued to each, but nothing in said policy shall operate to increase the insurance company's liability as set forth in its policy beyond the amount or amounts shown or to which the insurance company would have been liable if only one interest had been named as an insured.
- (d) Consultant hereby grants to SMART a waiver of any right to subrogation which any insurer of said Consultant may acquire against SMART by virtue of the payment of any loss under such insurance. Consultant agrees to obtain any endorsement that may be necessary to affect this waiver of subrogation, but this provision applies regardless of whether or not SMART has received a waiver of subrogation endorsement from the insurer.
- (e) The insurance policy(ies) shall be written by an insurance company or companies acceptable to SMART. Such insurance company shall be authorized to transact business in the state of California.

SMART reserves the right to modify these requirements, including limits, based on the nature of the risk, prior experience, insurer, coverage, or other circumstances.

Section 9.06 Deductibles and Retentions. Consultant shall be responsible for payment of any deductible or retention on Consultant's policies without right of contribution from SMART. Deductible and retention provisions shall not contain any restrictions as to how or by whom the deductible or retention is paid. Any deductible or retention provision limiting payment to the name insured is not acceptable.

Section 9.07 Claims Made Coverage. If any insurance specified above is written on a claims-made coverage form, Consultant shall:

- (a) Ensure that the retroactive date is shown on the policy, and such date must be before the date of this Agreement or beginning of any work under this Agreement;
- (b) Maintain and provide evidence of similar insurance for at least three (3) years following project completion, including the requirement of adding all additional insureds; and

- (c) If insurance is cancelled or non-renewed, and not replaced with another claims-made policy form with a retroactive date prior to Agreement effective date, Consultant shall purchase “extending reporting” coverage for a minimum of three (3) years after completion of the work.

Section 9.08 Documentation. The following documentation shall be submitted to SMART:

- (a) Properly executed Certificates of Insurance clearly evidencing all coverages and limits required above. Said Certificates shall be submitted prior to the execution of this Agreement. Consultant agrees to maintain current Certificates of Insurance evidencing the above-required coverages and limits on file with SMART for the duration of this Agreement.
- (b) Copies of properly executed endorsements required above for each policy. Said endorsement copies shall be submitted prior to the execution of this Agreement. Consultant agrees to maintain current endorsements evidencing the above-specified requirements on file with SMART for the duration of this Agreement.
- (c) Upon SMART’s written request, Consultant shall provide certified copies of the insurance policies to SMART. Said policy copies shall be submitted within thirty (30) days of SMART’s request. After the Agreement has been signed, signed Certificates of Insurance shall be submitted for any renewal or replacement of a policy that already exists, at least ten (10) days before expiration or other termination of the existing policy.

Section 9.09 Policy Obligations. Consultant’s indemnity and other obligations shall not be limited by the foregoing insurance requirements.

Section 9.10 Material Breach. If Consultant, for any reason, fails to maintain insurance coverage, which is required pursuant to this Agreement, the same shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement. SMART, in its sole option, may terminate this Agreement and obtain damages from Consultant resulting from said breach. Alternatively, SMART may purchase such required insurance coverage, and without further notice to Consultant, SMART may deduct from sums due to Consultant any premium costs advanced by SMART for such insurance. These remedies shall be in addition to any other remedies available to SMART.

ARTICLE 10. PROSECUTION OF WORK.

When work is requested of Consultant by SMART, all due diligence shall be exercised and the work accomplished without undue delay, within the performance time specified in the Task Order. Performance of the services hereunder shall be completed within the time required herein, provided, however, that if the performance is delayed by earthquake, flood, high water, or other Act of God, the time for Consultant’s performance of this Agreement shall be extended by a number of days equal to the number of days Consultant has been delayed.

ARTICLE 11. EXTRA OR CHANGED WORK.

Extra or changed work or other changes to the Agreement may be authorized only by written amendment to this Agreement, signed by both parties. Minor changes, which do not increase the amount paid under the Agreement, and which do not significantly change the scope of work or significantly lengthen time schedules may be executed by the General Manager in a form approved by SMART Counsel. The Board of Directors, General Manager or IS Manager must authorize all other extra or changed work. The parties expressly recognize that SMART personnel are without authorization to order extra or changed work or waive Agreement requirements. Failure of Consultant to secure such written authorization for extra or changed work shall constitute a waiver of any and all right to adjustment in the Agreement price or Agreement time due to such unauthorized work and thereafter Consultant shall be entitled to no compensation whatsoever for the performance of such work. Consultant further expressly waives any and all right or remedy by way of restitution and quantum meruit for any and all extra work performed without such express and prior written authorization of SMART.

ARTICLE 12. REPRESENTATIONS OF CONSULTANT.

Section 12.01 Standard of Care. SMART has relied upon the professional ability and training of Consultant as a material inducement to enter into this Agreement. Consultant hereby agrees that all its work will be performed and that its operations shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted and applicable professional practices and standards as well as the requirements of applicable federal, state and local laws, it being understood that acceptance of Consultant's work by SMART shall not operate as a waiver or release.

Section 12.02 Status of Consultant. The parties intend that Consultant, in performing the services specified herein, shall act as an independent contractor and shall control the work and the manner in which it is performed. Consultant is not to be considered an agent or employee of SMART and is not entitled to participate in any pension plan, worker's compensation plan, insurance, bonus, or similar benefits SMART provides its employees. In the event SMART exercises its right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to **Article 7**, above, Consultant expressly agrees that it shall have no recourse or right of appeal under rules, regulations, ordinances, or laws applicable to employees.

Section 12.03 Taxes. Consultant agrees to file federal and state tax returns and pay all applicable taxes on amounts paid pursuant to this Agreement and shall be solely liable and responsible to pay such taxes and other obligations, including but not limited to state and federal income and FICA taxes. Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold SMART harmless from any liability which it may incur to the United States or to the State of California as a consequence of Consultant's failure to pay, when due, all such taxes and obligations. In case SMART is audited for compliance regarding any withholding or other applicable taxes, Consultant agrees to furnish SMART with proof of payment of taxes on these earnings.

Section 12.04 Records Maintenance. Consultant shall keep and maintain full and complete documentation and accounting records concerning all services performed that are compensable under this Agreement and shall make such documents and records available to SMART for inspection at any reasonable time. Consultant shall maintain such records for a

period of four (4) years following completion of work hereunder. Consultant and Subconsultants shall permit access to all records of employment, employment advertisements, employment application forms, and other pertinent data and records by the State Fair Employment Practices and Housing Commission, or any other agency of the State of California designated by the State, for the purpose of any investigation to ascertain compliance with this document.

Section 12.05 Conflict of Interest. Consultant covenants that it presently has no interest and that it will not acquire any interest, direct or indirect, that represents a financial conflict of interest under state law or that would otherwise conflict in any manner or degree with the performance of its services hereunder. Consultant further covenants that in the performance of this Agreement no person having any such interests shall be employed. In addition, if requested to do so by SMART, Consultant shall complete and file and shall require any other person doing work under this Agreement to complete and file a "Statement of Economic Interest" with SMART disclosing Consultant's or such other person's financial interests.

Section 12.06 Nondiscrimination. Consultant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations in regard to nondiscrimination in employment because of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, marital status, age, medical condition, pregnancy, disability, sexual orientation or other prohibited basis, including without limitation, SMART's Non-Discrimination Policy. All nondiscrimination rules or regulations required by law to be included in this Agreement are incorporated herein by this reference

Section 12.07 Assignment of Rights. Consultant assigns to SMART all rights throughout the world in perpetuity in the nature of copyright, trademark, patent, right to ideas, in and to all versions of the plans and specifications, if any, now or later prepared by Consultant in connection with this Agreement. Consultant agrees to take such actions as are necessary to protect the rights assigned to SMART in this Agreement, and to refrain from taking any action which would impair those rights. Consultant's responsibilities under this provision include, but are not limited to, placing proper notice of copyright on all versions of the plans and specifications as SMART may direct, and refraining from disclosing any versions of the plans and specifications to any third party without first obtaining written permission of SMART. Consultant shall not use or permit another to use the plans and specifications in connection with this or any other project without first obtaining written permission of SMART.

Section 12.08 Ownership and Disclosure of Work Product. All reports, original drawings, graphics, plans, studies, and other data or documents ("documents"), in whatever form or format, assembled or prepared by Consultant and other agents in connection with this Agreement shall be the property of SMART. SMART shall be entitled to immediate possession of such documents upon completion of the work pursuant to this Agreement. Upon expiration or termination of this Agreement, Consultant shall promptly deliver to SMART all such documents, which have not already been provided to SMART in such form or format, as SMART deems appropriate. Such documents shall be and will remain the property of SMART without restriction or limitation. Consultant may retain copies of the above-described documents but agrees not to disclose or discuss any information gathered, discovered, or generated in any way through this Agreement without the express written permission of SMART.

ARTICLE 13. DEMAND FOR ASSURANCE.

Each party to this Agreement undertakes the obligation that the other's expectation of receiving due performance will not be impaired. When reasonable grounds for insecurity arise with respect to the performance of either party, the other may in writing demand adequate assurance of due performance and until such assurance is received may, if commercially reasonable, suspend any performance for which the agreed return has not been received. "Commercially reasonable" includes not only the conduct of a party with respect to performance under this Agreement, but also conduct with respect to other agreements with parties to this Agreement or others. After receipt of a justified demand, failure to provide within a reasonable time, but not exceeding thirty (30) days, such assurance of due performance as is adequate under the circumstances of the particular case is a repudiation of this Agreement. Acceptance of any improper delivery, service, or payment does not prejudice the aggrieved party's right to demand adequate assurance of future performance. Nothing in this **Article 13** limits SMART's right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to **Article 7**.

ARTICLE 14. ASSIGNMENT AND DELEGATION.

Neither party hereto shall assign, delegate, sublet, or transfer any interest in or duty under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no such transfer shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

ARTICLE 15. METHOD AND PLACE OF GIVING NOTICE, SUBMITTING INVOICES AND MAKING PAYMENTS.

All notices, invoices, and payments shall be made in writing and shall be given by personal delivery, U.S. Mail or email. Notices, invoices, and payments shall be addressed as follows:

If to SMART Project Manager:	Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District Attn: TiLiAnne Tanner 3748 Regional Parkway Santa Rosa, CA 95403 ttanner@sonomamarintrain.org 707-890-8615
------------------------------	---

If to SMART Billing:	Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District Attn: Accounts Payable 5401 Old Redwood Highway, Suite 200 Petaluma, CA 94954 billing@sonomamarintrain.org 707-794-3330
----------------------	--

If to Consultant:

Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC
Attn: Richard Minnigh
4116 Twin Leaf Court
Marietta GA 30062
RMinnigh@WeBuildITS.com
678-490-3800 x-102

If to Consultant Accounting

Intelligent Technology Solutions, LLC
Attn: Accounting
P.O. Box 681714
Marietta, GA 30068
Accounting@WeBuildITS.com
678-490-3800

When a notice, invoice or payment is given by a generally recognized overnight courier service, the notice, invoice or payment shall be deemed received on the next business day. When a copy of a notice, invoice or payment is sent by facsimile or email, the notice, invoice or payment shall be deemed received upon transmission as long as (1) the original copy of the notice, invoice or payment is promptly deposited in the U.S. mail and postmarked on the date of the facsimile or email (for a payment, on or before the due date), (2) the sender has a written confirmation of the facsimile transmission or email, and (3) the facsimile or email is transmitted before 5 p.m. (recipient's time). In all other instances, notices, invoices and payments shall be effective upon receipt by the recipient. Changes may be made in the names and addresses of the person to whom notices are to be given by giving notice pursuant to this paragraph.

ARTICLE 16. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

Section 16.01 No Waiver of Breach. The waiver by SMART of any breach of any term or promise contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver of such term or provision or any subsequent breach of the same or any other term or promise contained in this Agreement.

Section 16.02 Construction. To the fullest extent allowed by law, the provisions of this Agreement shall be construed and given effect in a manner that avoids any violation of statute, ordinance, regulation, or law. The parties covenant and agree that in the event that any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remainder of the provisions hereof shall remain in full force and effect and shall in no way be affected, impaired, or invalidated thereby. Consultant and SMART acknowledge that they have each contributed to the making of this Agreement and that, in the event of a dispute over the interpretation of this Agreement, the language of the Agreement will not be construed against one party in favor of the other. Consultant and SMART acknowledge that they have each had an adequate opportunity to consult with counsel in the negotiation and preparation of this Agreement.

Section 16.03 Consent. Wherever in this Agreement the consent or approval of one party is required to an act of the other party, such consent or approval shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.

Section 16.04 No Third-Party Beneficiaries. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to create and the parties do not intend to create any rights in third parties.

Section 16.05 Applicable Law and Forum. This Agreement shall be construed and interpreted according to the substantive law of California, regardless of the law of conflicts to the contrary in any jurisdiction. Venue for any action to enforce the terms of this Agreement or for the breach thereof shall be in the Superior Court of the State of California in the County of Marin.

Section 16.06 Captions. The captions in this Agreement are solely for convenience of reference. They are not a part of this Agreement and shall have no effect on its construction or interpretation.

Section 16.07 Merger. This writing is intended both as the final expression of the Agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1856. No modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless and until such modification is evidenced by a writing signed by both parties.

Section 16.08 Acceptance of Electronic Signatures and Counterparts. The parties agree that this Contract, Agreements ancillary to this Contract, and related documents to be entered into this Contract will be considered executed when all parties have signed this Agreement. Signatures delivered by scanned image as an attachment to electronic mail or delivered electronically through the use of programs such as DocuSign must be treated in all respects as having the same effect as an original signature. Each party further agrees that this Contract may be executed in two or more counterparts, all of which constitute one and the same instrument.

Section 16.09 Time of Essence. Time is and shall be of the essence of this Agreement and every provision hereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the Effective Date.

INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS, LLC

By: _____

Its: _____

Date: _____

SONOMA-MARIN AREA RAIL TRANSIT (SMART)

By: _____
Farhad Mansourian, General Manager

Date: _____

**CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE ON FILE WITH AND
APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE FOR SMART:**

By: _____
Ken Hendricks, Procurement Coordinator

Date: _____

APPROVED AS TO FORM FOR SMART:

By: _____
District Counsel

Date: _____

EXHIBIT A

SCOPE OF WORK & TIMELINE

I. Overview

SMART is responsible for the ongoing maintenance of many assets, both fixed and mobile. Maximo, a computerized maintenance management system, is used to track maintenance, labor, parts, and consumables. Maximo is also used for operator logs, IT service requests, and the procurement process. Reports are produced from the system to improve asset management decisions.

II. General Objective

Consultant will collaborate with SMART staff, procure, and maintain SMART's existing Maximo SaaS and related software, database environments, and licensing. Consultant will perform upgrades and configuration changes, troubleshoot system errors, make recommendations, and help procure and implement process add-ons or improvements. Consultant will develop needed training materials for new processes, develop requested reports, and provide related services as needed.

III. Project Manager

All work shall be initiated in writing, coordinated, and approved by SMART's IS Manager or IS Manager's designee.

IV. Detailed Scope of Work

Task 1 Provide Maximo Software as a Service Licenses.

Task 1 is subdivided into two sub tasks as described in this document below. These sub tasks are as follows:

Task 1A – Annual Base Licensing

Task 1B – Additional Licenses

Task 1A-Annual Base Licensing

SMART requires access to the following applications and databases:

- (1) IBM Maximo
- (2) IBM WebSphere
- (3) SQL Server
- (4) BIRT/Eclipse Reports

SMART's Maximo system is a Software as a Service (SaaS) system installed in the cloud. All access is provided via the web-hosted application as a packaged solution. Consultant's SaaS package shall include: (a) one secure, and confidential production database configuration; (b) Maximo Enterprise Asset Management applications

including, but not limited to, Assets, Contracts, Inventory, Planning, Preventative Maintenance, Purchasing, and Work Orders; (c) restricted End User access to the Administration, System Configuration, and Integration Maximo applications; (d) standard Maximo reports; (e) up to 50 GB of space for attachments and up to 50 GB database size (additional space may be added at an additional charge); (f) notification of planned downtime; and (g) tracking of Maximo revisions and upgrades (h) one additional Maximo instance for use in a testing, development, or training environment.

Consultant shall obtain licenses and provide continued access to SMART's Maximo applications in both production and development environments, provide related solutions and provide continued access to SMART's data. System software upgrades are included in the annual licensing cost. Consultant shall provide licenses of the software used with SaaS for the number of Named Users or Concurrent Users identified in the Table below. SMART's End User's use of such software is governed by the applicable IBM license agreement. Upon termination of this agreement, SMART has no continued right to the Licenses.

SMART's licensing is based upon the number and type of licenses requested. The Annual Base Licensing distribution shall be as follows:

License Type	License Count
Concurrent Transportation Authorized	8
Concurrent Transportation Express	15
Concurrent Calibration	1
Concurrent HSE	5
Concurrent Linear	9

SMART's license count is subject to change during the term of this agreement. Consultant will coordinate with SMART to determine the most advantageous license distribution to SMART's userbase.

Task 1 B - Additional Licenses

If SMART requires the addition or subtraction of individual license types, SMART's IS Manager shall request in writing that the Consultant add or subtract licenses as necessary. System software upgrades are included in the annual licensing cost. Additional licenses may be added at any time during the term of this agreement; however, reduction of licenses can only be made at beginning of each annual licensing term.

Additional licenses will be requested in writing by the IS Manager. The associated licensing fee will be prorated to the agreement annual term, and initially invoiced separately. Thereafter, the invoice shall reflect the annual licensing fee and any additional licenses approved by SMART's IS Manager. Any additional licenses shall be itemized on the invoice.

Task 2 – System Maintenance

System Maintenance is subdivided into three sub tasks as described in this document below. These sub tasks are as follows:

Task 2A – Ongoing Maintenance and Support

Task 2B – On Call Support

Task 2C – Emergency Maintenance

Task 2 A – Ongoing Scheduled Maintenance and Support

Consultant shall perform scheduled maintenance on SMART servers. Any scheduled system maintenance times shall be approved by SMART and be timed to create a minimum of disturbance to SMART Operations. Consultant shall ensure that security for all system-related hardware and software uses industry standard, best practices. System reliability level shall be maintained at an uptime of least 99.9%. At a minimum, Consultant shall perform the following tasks:

- a) Perform Backups
 - a. Database backup shall be performed weekly and shall be done on weekends
 - b. Differential backups that capture only the data that has changed since the last full backup will occur thereafter
 - c. Backup data retention shall include two weeks of data. This shall be a rolling backup where at least the previous two calendar weeks are available for restoration if needed
 - d. Virtual machines shall be backed up in full monthly
- b) Perform Security Maintenance
 - a. Daily antivirus updates
 - b. Nightly antivirus scans
 - c. Windows updates performed monthly
- c) Scheduled application patching as requested by SMART
- d) Participate in meetings (via phone, webinar, or other) to evaluate and prioritize projects. Provide complete and thorough summary of meetings via email
- e) Prepare monthly progress reports and provide to SMART. Progress reports shall include the following:
 - A detailed list of work performed under Task 1 and Task 2
 - Dates and subject of meetings conducted, meeting attendees, and summary of meeting results and action items. Meeting minutes shall be emailed to SMART within two business days of meetings
 - Monthly progress reports shall be provided to SMART by the 5th day of the next month
 - Other information as appropriate or as requested by SMART
- f) Transfer of services at end of Agreement term, as required by SMART.

- Work with potential successor firm as directed by SMART to transfer data during a scheduled time.
- Transfer a copy of deliverables including, but not limited to:
 - Notes of system configurations
 - Notes of upgrades
 - Copies of reports

Task 2 B - On Call Support

Consultant shall remain available for on call support requests throughout the duration of the contract. Consultant shall invoice SMART for actual time worked to the nearest 15 minutes. Rates billed to SMART shall be in accordance with the schedule of rates set forth in Exhibit B (Schedule of Rates).

- a) On Call support requests from SMART will be typically handled as follows:
 - (1) Log a service request into the Service Provider's ticket tracking system
 - (2) Acknowledge via email the receipt of the incident or change request from SMART
 - (3) Respond to the email request within the parameters and according to the severity of the incident or change indicated by SMART, as defined in Exhibit C (Response Times and Severity Level Criteria)
 - (4) Provide SMART with updates from the incident or change request
 - (5) Provide SMART with details about the resolution of the incident or change in accordance with the time frames listed in Exhibit C (Response Times and Severity Level Criteria)
- b) If an outage is required as part of completing a support task:
 - (1) Notify SMART when a resolution or request plan is identified
 - (2) Provide a schedule to SMART with a proposed start and completion date and time. If additional support services hours are needed to facilitate the request, notify SMART in writing for approval
 - (3) Request sign off acceptance of the resolution from SMART, once issue has been resolved, at which time the request will close

Task 2 C - Emergency Service Requests

In the event of a catastrophic incident that causes total system failure, initiate the following procedures:

- a) Log a service request into the Service Provider's ticket tracking system
- b) Alert SMART of the incident
- c) Estimate resolution time
- d) Start troubleshooting procedures
- e) Identify cause of incident
- f) Update SMART regarding the cause, solution, and estimated time of recovery

- g) Implement solution
- h) Prepare incident report and Root Cause Analysis
- i) Close request

Emergency Service Contacts

Notification to Consultant:

SMART@Maximo911.com

ITS Help Line – (678) 490-3800

Notification to SMART

ithelp@sonomamarintrain.org

ttanner@sonomamarintrain.org

TiLiAnne Tanner (707) 528-3416 (cell)

Task 3 - Other Hourly Rate Services

SMART may request additional services on time and materials basis as needed.

Services may include, but not be limited to:

- a) Conduct software training. Coordinate training location (webinar or in person).
Submit summary of each training
- b) Prepare written materials, such as standard or customized guides
- c) Perform upgrades as requested. Upon SMART request, Consultant shall assist SMART in upgrading their Maximo systems. Any additional labor needed to accomplish the system upgrade would be billed under this task
- d) Create new or modify existing report(s) to extract, improve, or evaluate information from Maximo
- e) Apply configuration changes to Maximo software to improve the functionality of Maximo
- f) Pilot and integrate potential add-ons or integrate compatible software (possible examples: Mobility, GIS, etc.), as requested by SMART

V) Deliverables

Submit one electronic copy in PDF format (emailed) of each final deliverable to SMART.

Deliverable	Due Date
Transfer of Service Deliverables	Upon Request by SMART
Training Materials	Upon request by SMART
Customized reports	Upon request by SMART
Log of configuration changes	Quarterly in Oct, Jan, Apr, and July
Integration of add on or compatible software	Upon request by SMART

Exhibit B

Schedule of Rates

Products and Services	Licensing Term	Cost*
Task 1 A – Annual Maximo SaaS Licensing	April 1, 2021 - June 30, 2021	\$28,457.25
	July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022	\$113,829.00
Task 2 A – Ongoing Scheduled Maintenance and Support	July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023	\$113,829.00
	July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024	\$113,829.00
Task 2 C – Emergency Service Requests	TWO-YEAR OPTIONAL TERM	
	Licensing Term	Cost*
	July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025	\$113,829.00
	July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026	\$113,829.00

* Payment is remitted in advance for each licensing term.

Task 1 B - Additional Licenses

License costs will be invoiced for the amount quoted and approved by SMART at the time of the additional license request.

Hourly Rates for Services

The below per hour rates apply to Task 2 B – On Call Support and Task 3 - Other Hourly Services

Classification	INITIAL TERM			TWO-YEAR OPTIONAL TERM	
	4/1/2021-6/30/2022	7/1/2022-6/30/2023	7/1/2023-6/30/2024	7/1/2024-6/30/2025	7/1/2025-6/30/2026
Principal Consultant (Process Definition, Technical Design)	\$162.70	\$166.77	\$170.94	\$175.21	\$179.59
Solution Consultant (Functional Configuration, Technical Adaptation)	\$146.50	\$150.16	\$153.92	\$157.76	\$161.71
Analyst (Reporting)	\$130.50	\$133.76	\$137.11	\$140.53	\$144.05
Support Consultant (Support)	\$122.50	\$125.56	\$128.70	\$131.92	\$135.22

Exhibit C

Response Times and Severity Level Criteria

Expected Response Times

Severity Level of Ticket	Response Interval for Initial Ticket	First Technical Response	Update Response Interval	Estimated Resolution Time
1	Immediate acceptance	Within 30 minutes	1 hour	Within 6 hours
2	Immediate acceptance	Within 1 hour	1 hour	Within 1 business day
3	Immediate acceptance	Within 4 hours	48 hours	Within 7 business days
4	Immediate acceptance	Within 8 hours	48 hours	Within 14 business days

Severity Levels and Associated Criteria (Indicators)

Severity and Impact	Indicators
1 - Critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High visibility • Large number of orders or customers affected • Affects online commitment • Major impact on revenue • Major component not available for use • Major loss of functionality • Problem cannot be bypassed • No viable or productive work around available
2- Serious	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate visibility • Moderate to large number of users or devices affected • Potentially affects online commitment • Serious slow response times • Serious loss of functionality • Moderate impact on revenue • Limited use of product or component • Component continues to fail -intermittently down for short periods, but repetitive • Few or small files lost • Major access down but a partial backup exists
3- Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low to medium visibility • Low order or customer or device impact • Low impact on revenue • Limited use of product or component • Minimal loss of functionality
4-Minimal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low or no visibility • Single client device affected • Few functions impaired • Preventative maintenance request



David Rabbitt, Chair
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Barbara Pahre, Vice Chair
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway/Transportation District

Judy Arnold
Marin County Board of Supervisors

Melanie Bagby
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Kate Colin
Transportation Authority of Marin

Damon Connolly
Marin County Board of Supervisors

Debora Fudge
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Patty Garbarino
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway/Transportation District

Susan Gorin
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Dan Hillmer
Marin County Council of Mayors and
Councilmembers

Eric Lucan
Transportation Authority of Marin

Chris Rogers
Sonoma County Mayors' and
Councilmembers Association

Farhad Mansourian
General Manager

5401 Old Redwood Highway
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
Phone: 707-794-3330
Fax: 707-794-3037
www.sonomamarintrain.org

March 17, 2021

Sonoma- Marin Area Rail Transit Board of Directors
5401 Old Redwood Highway, Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954

SUBJECT: Review of Listening Sessions Comments/Suggestions

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATIONS: Discussion and Provide Feedback

SUMMARY:

In the summer and fall of 2020, SMART held nine (9) listening sessions throughout our service area.

We began with the League of Women Voters, then City of Santa Rosa, Town of Windsor, City of Cloverdale, City of Healdsburg, City of Novato, City of Larkspur, and City of San Rafael. In December 2020, following the jurisdiction listening sessions, we conducted a special listening session devoted to receiving public comments on the topic of Pedestrian and Bicycle interests related to the SMART District.

These session were posted online and can be accessed on our website under SMART's Listening Forum Sessions in the front of our website at <https://sonomamarintrain.org/listeningForums>. Staff also created and posted an executive summary of each of the sessions.

We have spent the first couple of months of 2021 reviewing and organizing the feedback we received. The spreadsheet you are receiving contains over 300 comments organized into three different formats:

- Comments by listening session location
- Comments grouped by general category, and
- Comments grouped by type of comment

The intent is to address the public input received through the remaining presentations at the Board this Spring and going forward in SMART's work program. As a reminder in January, we presented a schedule of how we would address various topics over the next several months:

- February 17th and March 3rd – Departmental Overviews, Goals, and Challenges
- March 17th – Feedback from the Listening Sessions
- April 7th – Capital Plan, Transit Operating Services, and Performance Metrics
- April 21st – Welcome Back Campaign
- May 5th – Freight Update
- May 19th – 1st draft of Fiscal Year 2022 Budget
- June 2nd – Adoption of Fiscal Year 2022 Budget
- June 16th – Short Range Transit Plan

The meetings in February and March were designed to refresh the Board on what SMART is and does as requested as part of the feedback from the listening sessions. The meetings in April, May and June is where we continue presenting materials from the comments received in the listening sessions. For example, we heard from many of the listening sessions that constituents want completion of the pathway and rail service extended. In April, we will be discussing the Capital Plan and what funding is available. Another theme we heard; was how we were going to encourage people to come ride the SMART system again post pandemic. In April, we will be discussing operating services and the “Welcome Back” campaign. This is a very aggressive schedule and we know the Board would want to start addressing some of the feedback sooner rather than later. Some of the topics may take more than one meeting to address and several topics will be addressed over years and integrations of future SMART’s work program.

In this March 17th Board meeting, we will continue refining our process and develop additional steps that you and members of public identify to enhance SMART operations, making the service as efficient, predictable, safe and affordable to our passengers as possible.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

Very truly yours,

/s/

Farhad Mansourian
General Manager

Attachment(s): Listening Session Comments

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

Santa Rosa, September 2, 2020
On September 2, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors launched a community-wide Listening Tour, with the City of Santa Rosa hosting the first of several forums planned throughout the North Bay. Directors Chris Rogers and David Rabbitt facilitated the Listening Forum. Over 60 community members were in attendance, including several members of the SMART Board; Mayor of Santa Rosa, Tom Schwedhelm; Chris Coursey, who will soon join the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors; and Eris Weaver, Director of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition.
Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the Santa Rosa Listening Forum.
Fourteen participants spoke, and their comments touched on multiple areas:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART should focus on promoting tourism as a means of growing revenue by partnering with the Marin and Sonoma counties' tourism bureaus and working to capture the San Francisco tourist market. I was disappointed that SMART didn't run trains on Labor Day as this would have been a perfect opportunity to get tourists on the train.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART is providing transit service for essential workers and offers a healthy and safe mode of transportation during the pandemic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART needs to talk more about how rail transit helps shape growth. I know this is a sensitive topic for Marin, but SMART offers great advantages for development that will inevitably occur in the North Bay.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · When you build a project of this scale, SMART has done an excellent job of managing construction issues such as environmental permitting, and many other variables that emerge as the project is constructed. However, because SMART has been focused on the various elements of construction, there has been some collateral damage with some of the groups that supported SMART at the beginning, like the bicycle coalitions and The League of Women Voters.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART should endorse the east-west bicycle and pedestrian overpass on Highway 101 in Santa Rosa. This will help bike commuters who want to attend school at the Santa Rosa Junior College.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I am a resident of Novato who commutes to Windsor for work. I understand this is a very challenging time with the pandemic, but please maintain as much of the schedule as possible, especially maintaining the frequency of trips. This will help SMART to continue to a relevant and viable mode of transportation for people.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART can cultivate political support for future sales tax measures by reaching out to groups that may not seem directly connected to transit – like environmental, bicycle, or tourism groups. Also, connect to groups in the San Francisco Bay Area, as SMART will increasingly see ridership from outside the north bay.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART should also think about how to get people from the train to tourist destinations further away from the tracks and not directly served by buses. An example would be Annadel Park in Santa Rosa or the Sonoma Coast.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART should work towards promoting multimodal transportation involving walking, riding bicycles, integrated with bus and rail transit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I appreciate SMART's work to build out its pathway network that goes nearly the full length of Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, and Cotati – I'd love to see those pathways connect.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Electric bike sales are skyrocketing, so SMART better be prepared to accommodate electric bikes on the train.
<i>All participants in the forum who wished to speak were given ample time to share their views with the Board, including representatives from the campaign against the Measure I sale tax renewal that was on the March 3, 2020, ballot.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SMART Measure I (sales tax renewal) failed because of two things: transparency and accountability. Staff within this agency continues to operate in a non-transparent way and the board continues to not hold staff accountable for the mistakes that led to the failure of Measure I.

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transparency is about providing the public with regular information on the performance of SMART, including ridership. SMART did not respond, for some time, to requests for ridership and cost data. Many PRAs were filed by COST, and the lack of response, required COST to hire an attorney and go to court.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have an internal cost estimate of about \$4,000 to run a trip from Airport Blvd. to Larkspur. It would be better if staff provided that number so people understood that while the trains are very popular, they don't come for free.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purchase of NWP Co, without any financial information, just operating on a trust me basis, reflects a combination of obfuscation and lack of accountability on the board to ensure good governance practices by an agency that is now under threat.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the problems is that the SMART board is a rubber stamp organization for whatever staff puts in front of it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the inception of SMART in 2017, the agency has not worked economically. The challenge for SMART is to drive costs down and ridership up. And SMART has excessive headcount compared to other transit organizations. Given the uncertainty of the future and the severe budget crisis everyone is going through, wouldn't SMART try to tighten its belt?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see data showing ridership linked with specific stations and times. SMART should base its marketing on this type of analysis.
Town of Windsor, September 14, 2020
<p>On September 14, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its second community-wide Listening Tour with the Town of Windsor. Approximately 40 participants were in attendance, including several members of the SMART Board, including Directors Lucan, Rogers, Rabbitt, Hillmer, Fudge, and Connolly. Town of Windsor Mayor Domonic Foppoli, and council member Sam Salmon, along with 20 members of the public, were also in attendance.</p>
<p>Eight participants spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas, including:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking forward to having a SMART station in the Town of Windsor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make improvements to the train schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reinstating weekend service adding more weekday and evening runs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve integration with other transit services
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports bicycle and pedestrian overpass in Santa Rosa connecting the Guerneville station to Santa Rosa Junior College
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMART needs to support North Bay area tourism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wine country and breweries Later evening service Express trains for special events Focus on San Francisco market
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support transit equity by lowering fares for low-income riders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform a thorough analysis of the cost/benefit of extending the rail line to Cloverdale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use airflow graphics to promote the safety of riding SMART
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove train seats to increase floor space for electric bikes; to create additional space for bicycles, consider using a "C" or middle car for dedicated bike storage.
Cloverdale, September 21, 2020
<p>On September 21, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its third community-wide Listening Forum with the City of Cloverdale. Forty-three people were in attendance, including SMART Board Directors Lucan, Rogers, Rabbitt, Pahre, Fudge, and Connolly. Cloverdale Mayor Gus Wolter, and council member Melanie Bagby, along with twenty-eight members of the public, were also in attendance.</p>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the City of Cloverdale Listening Forum.
Fourteen members of the public spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas:
· SMART will have a positive impact on the economy of Cloverdale.
· About a year ago, we had a project - the Alexander Valley Resort, where there is an at-grade railroad crossing that the Alexander Valley Resort needs to work out with SMART.
o <i>SMART staff was asked to provide an update: As all railroad crossings are regulated by the State of California, SMART will work together with the developer and City of Cloverdale to obtain the necessary approvals for the crossing. SMART had a good meeting with the developer and discussed strategies for getting the necessary approvals for the crossing. SMART recognizes the importance of this development proposal to the City of Cloverdale and will work to ensure that the crossing complies with all state requirements.</i>
· What can the City of Cloverdale and its residents do to advocate for the SMART extension to Cloverdale?
o <i>Board member response: We'll make sure to communicate with you about what you can do as opportunities for additional regional, state, or federal funding becomes available.</i>
· I am concerned that the population of Cloverdale isn't perceived to be large enough to justify the rail extension.
· Cloverdale should work with Lake and Mendocino counties to determine potential ridership contributions to Cloverdale's ridership.
o <i>Board member response: This is something we can all work on together, and look at the potential ridership from Lake and Mendocino counties as a part of assessing overall ridership from Cloverdale.</i>
· Cloverdale is a great commuter town; I know many people who commute from Cloverdale to Marin County. Cloverdale should be marketed as a wonderful place to live and commute to work from.
· Cloverdale is as beautiful as Healdsburg and Windsor and is a great place to get away to, as well as live.
o <i>Board member response: Sonoma County is a strong tourist destination; it would be great to have tourism numbers for Cloverdale. Cloverdale should connect and work with the City of Windsor as they have done wonderful things to promote tourism. SMART Directors Fudge and Zane are strong advocates for tourism, who may be able to help.</i>
· I commute to Marin County regularly from Cloverdale and was very disappointed when Measure I failed to pass.
· Shipping by freight is more economical than by truck. Will freight service help SMART's bottom line?
o <i>Board member response: We are analyzing the potential for freight service; our goal is to make sure that it helps the bottom line for SMART.</i>
· What is the plan for replacing the Healdsburg Bridge?
o <i>SMART staff was asked to provide an update: We are using some of the funds leftover from the Windsor extension project to do a further analysis of cost factors for going north of Windsor, including exploring ways to reduce the cost of replacing the Healdsburg Bridge. I think we can reduce the cost of the bridge substantially, and in the near future, we will be coming out with an estimate of what it will take.</i>
· I sold my house recently, and a big selling point was the SMART train coming to Cloverdale. If this is not the case, it will be hard to support future sales tax measures. Can the city of Cloverdale look at applying for grants to help bring the train to Cloverdale?
o <i>Board member response: I was extremely disappointed when the recession forced SMART to shorten its initial segment, and we're all on the same page in terms of wanting to continue moving forward. Compared to three years ago, we've gone far beyond the initial segment, and it gives us great hope that we can continue in that vein.</i>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I'm excited about the train coming to Cloverdale; it will be an excellent way for students to travel to the Santa Rosa Junior College.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Cloverdale residents need to communicate to the other Sonoma County jurisdictions how important it is to get the rail extension.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · When the train gets to Healdsburg, and they already have robust tourism, it will be great for Healdsburg. If the train doesn't go any further, Cloverdale will suffer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The residents of Geyserville also want a train station.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Board member response: I appreciate that very much, and I do hear from Supervisor Gore on that matter. I can guarantee that people are planting seeds and advocating on your behalf.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I want someone from SMART to present to a Geyserville Planning Committee meeting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Board member response: I attended a planning committee meeting on behalf of SMART last year, the night before the Kincaid fire. SMART would be happy to participate in a future planning committee meeting.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I commute daily to Marin County, and it provides an amazing service. I get to spend 45 minutes on the train, checking my email before work instead of driving for 90 mins.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I think if the bike path becomes SMART's number one priority, you will regain support in Marin County.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Board member response: The pathway has always been a priority for SMART, and there is a map of all of the completed pathway segments on SMART's website.</i> https://www.sonomamarintrain.org/sites/default/files/Documents/SMART%20Progress%20Map-September2019-Web.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Cloverdale residents need to know what they can do to help SMART get the train to Cloverdale, and why is Cloverdale not in MTC's Plan Bay Area?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Board member response: MTC uses a cost-benefit analysis to make decisions for what goes into Plan Bay Area – which is a fiscally constrained plan. Cloverdale is challenged because of the amount of passengers the system would pick-up, and the cost of the infrastructure to get to Cloverdale. However, the North Bay Commissioners meet on a regular basis and we continue to drive home the point that this is a very important project and to make sure it's included.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The railroad crossings that North Coast Rail Authority is responsible for are in terrible condition. What is the status of SMART's takeover of the north county territory?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>SMART staff was asked to provide a response: We are in the process of working with NCRA and Senator McGuire on two major agreements that I expect will be signed-off on in the next month. We gave an estimated cost of \$10 million to do restorative maintenance, much of which has been deferred. Senator McGuire was able to raise \$2 million, and we'll receive that as soon as we sign the agreement. Then we'll seek his help to get the rest of the needed funds for maintaining the NCRA corridors. We're also going to be doing a lot of learning about what needs to be done, so if you have any specific locations or concerns, please contact my office so that we can put it on the list.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There is a crossing near a creek that has a log blocking the channel. I want to contact SMART to discuss this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>SMART staff were asked to provide a response: That crossing is still a part of NCRA's responsibility, but please call my office tomorrow so that I can get more information about the blocked channel.</i>
<p><i>A member of the public who could not make the September 21 Listening Forum, call SMART and left a comment to be included in the record.</i></p>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

· I am extremely disappointed that the SMART train did not fulfill its initial promise and decided to cut back the line at the start of the project. I'm also disappointed that the Board decided they were going to Larkspur and did not go to Cloverdale. Adding the extra stations between Santa Rosa and Larkspur took the funds that could be used for Cloverdale. I am disappointed with the bus connections in the North. I overheard a comment from a board member at an event that left me feeling concerned that the line will only extend to Windsor.

Healdsburg, September 23, 2020

On September 23, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its fourth community-wide Listening Forum with the City of Healdsburg. Sixty people were in attendance, including SMART Board Directors Lucan, Rogers, Rabbitt, Pahre, Fudge, Hillmer, and Naujokas. Healdsburg Mayor Evelyn Mitchel, and council member David Hagele, along with forty-three members of the public, were also in attendance.

Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the City of Healdsburg Listening Forum.

Eighteen members of the public spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas:

· As a way to reduce the cost of rebuilding the tracks and get to Healdsburg more quickly, would the SMART Board of Directors consider upgrading the tracks to Class 3 (50 mph) rather than Class 4 (79 mph)?

Staff was asked to provide an update: There are a lot of components that go into rehabilitating the railroad. While the track is an important element, it may not be the biggest cost driver. We have train control systems, communication systems, and duct banks to carry the wires. While it's attractive to think about doing a minimal rehab to the track itself, we have an opportunity to build the foundation right and replace things like old metal culverts that might be rusted out – because after we are in service, to go back and do that kind of work is very disruptive, and it can get very costly, quickly. This is a railroad that has a lot of deferred maintenance issues that haven't been addressed. So, we'd like to approach it as we have done with all our work – we spend our dollars carefully, and we don't throw away costs that we're going to end up having to redo in the future.

· If the arrival of SMART to Healdsburg is 5-10 years out, would the SMART Board consider utilizing electric buses on the same train schedule to serve Healdsburg and Cloverdale as an alternative to the train?

· I'd like to add that utilization of electric buses could also be considered as a permanent option for reaching Healdsburg and Cloverdale.

· Since there is no timeline and we don't know when finances will become available to enable SMART to get to downtown Healdsburg, consider locating an interim station at the south side of the bridge.

· Another interim solution should be to extend the Foss Creek pathway from its terminus near the bridge to the Windsor station (with assistance from the city and the county).

· The City of Healdsburg and SMART should build housing at the historic Healdsburg depot, including above the station building. It could be an aggressive solution to our housing issues.

· SMART should look at the planning that the City of Healdsburg has done over the past 25 years, which all have designated the depot as a multi-modal transit center.

· These plans also designated housing at the depot/multi-modal transit hub.

· Another station should be located near the Healdsburg Community Center at the north end of the city. The second station would put a train station within a 40-minute walk from everyone in the city of Healdsburg.

· When SMART does rebuild the bridge, a bicycle/pedestrian pathway must be a part of the design.

· Now that SMART is taking over freight service, SMART should go for a Caltrans grant to support the startup of freight service – to shift freight from trucks to trains, as a way to preserve the pavement on Highway 101.

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

· SMART should explore the possibility of hydrogen for powering its next-generation trains.
· How can we, as a community, along with the city council, advocate for SMART getting to Healdsburg?
o <i>Board Member response: We always appreciate your advocacy; you can continue to help by signing letters of support for grants we're going after at the state and federal levels. It's critical that people make themselves heard when funding opportunities arise.</i>
· How important is the rail yard in Healdsburg to the future of SMART; does it provide an incentive to SMART for expanding northward?
· Public/private partnership: Simi, Clos Du Bois, and other wineries Geyserville have facilities adjacent to the tracks, they would be willing to help fund a stop to support tourism at their wineries.
· The SMART Board needs to think about what the SMART paradigm is – is SMART simply a train operator or is SMART a government organization dedicated to clean, efficient inter-city travel linking the North Bay with the greater Bay Area. If SMART is a train operator, you'll never get to Healdsburg. If SMART is an organization dedicated to clean, efficient inter-city travel, you'll get to Healdsburg sooner because you won't be limited by thinking you have to do it with trains. Please consider using an electric bus to bridge from Windsor to points north.
· My concern with establishing a bus connection between Windsor and Healdsburg/Cloverdale is that every time you make people transfer between trains and buses, it reduces ridership.
· The population of northern Sonoma County is small compared to communities towards the Capital Corridor. It would make more sense for SMART to focus on building out the rail line to Suisun City and connect with the Capitol Corridor.
· I live in Novato and work for the Healdsburg School District, and I take the train daily. I love the train and I love the sense of community on the train. I would like for the train to go all the way to Healdsburg, but I make it work by taking other modes of transit. I realize that you've had to scale back service due to the pandemic, but I would like you to add more trains back onto the schedule.
· When a measure to extend the sales tax is put back on the ballot, SMART should do excursion trips to share with voters what a nice ride it is from Larkspur to Santa Rosa, and soon to be Windsor.
· I think the real future of rail remains between Santa Rosa and San Rafael. I think the SMART Board should look at taking the money that is going to be spent on getting to Healdsburg and Cloverdale, and spend it on double tracking between Santa Rosa and San Rafael.
· You need to focus on providing service every 15 minutes (no more than 30-minute headways) during commute hours. If you run trains at longer headways than 30 minutes, you'll never attract sufficient ridership, and double tracking will allow you to do that.
· There are a lot of conversations happening in Healdsburg about the future of housing, and the future of our local hospital – we need to know more about the location of the SMART station platform or perhaps two SMART station platforms to get a more clear picture, which will inform the planning conversations that need to happen for the future of Healdsburg.
· I think that having two stations will be ideal for the community of Healdsburg, and will serve a variety of needs.
· Does SMART GM have a surprise announcement regarding the construction costs for the Healdsburg Bridge?
o <i>Board Member response: We always start with an initial engineer's cost estimate, which often is a worst-case scenario, and then continually refine it as you get further down the design path. We are in this value-engineering process now, and are doing an investigation into the cost of replacing the bridge.</i>
· Is SMART planning of meeting with the Geyserville Planning Committee?
o <i>Board Member response: We talked about this this other night in Cloverdale. I or someone from SMART will be happy to come to the Geyserville Planning Committee and continue this conversation.</i>
· How do the fatal incidents that have occurred on the SMART tracks compare to other rail systems?

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

o *Board Member response: As far as I know, the incident rate is no higher than other rail systems. The system that SMART has built was designed to be as safe as possible, and all of the incidents to date have involved people making unsafe choices.*

· I grew up with trains in Switzerland, which were not meant to be profitable. Public transit is a public service, just like our roads are a public service and not meant to be profitable.

Novato, October 14, 2020

On October 14, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its fourth community-wide Listening Forum with the City of Novato. Thirty people were in attendance, including SMART Board Directors Lucan, Pahre, Connolly, Hillmer, Fudge, Phillips, Arnold, and Garbarino. Novato Mayor Denise Athas, and City Manager Adam McGill, along with thirteen members of the public, were also in attendance.

Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the City of Novato Listening Forum.

Seven members of the public spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas:

· I just wanted to share that I've really been enjoying my train trips to Marin County from Petaluma, especially my trips to Novato. I ride my bike around Novato – which has a wonderful downtown. I've gotten spoiled by the SMART train; I just want to praise the SMART Board, and Staff and everyone involved in the City of Novato for giving us one of the best places to visit.

· I am concerned by the lack of bus transit connections to and from SMART's Novato stations. Prior to Marin Transit extending route 49 to the San Marin station, none of the SMART stations in Novato had decent bus transit connections.

· With the current schedule, there is an opportunity to improve the transit connections between Marin Transit and SMART.

o *SMART staff was asked to respond: Before COVID-19, we coordinated with all seven transit agencies – GGT Transit, GGT Ferry, Marin Transit, Petaluma Transit, Santa Rosa City Bus, Sonoma County Transit, and Mendocino Transit. We coordinated with everybody before we put out our schedule. And after our first year of service, we adjusted our arrival and departure times as we learned more about our transit partners. We try to come up with the best schedule, but bus arrivals depend on the traffic conditions of Highway 101. When we come out of COVID-19, we will go back and continue to coordinate with all of our partners.*

· In terms of my personal experience, when taking route 49, the train departs about 90 seconds after I arrive at the platform. So, depending on the timing of my bus ride, I could miss my train connection. Conversely, on my return trip, I have wait 20+ minutes between the arrival of train and my return bus connection.

· If you want to attract more train riders, you need to ensure that the connectivity is good and the transfer process between modes is efficient and safe.

· I am a student, who lives in Novato, but goes to school in Santa Rosa. I also know a lot of schools in Sonoma County who have a sizable number of students from Marin County, and use the train like me to get to school. When the pandemic ends and we are able to return to the classroom, it will be important for the schedule to reflect our travel needs.

· Our schools may open with a reduced schedule – my school is considering half-days where half of the students will go in the AM and half will go in the PM. Right now, there are less trains on the afternoon, so it's uncertain how we can go to school without more service added to the afternoon schedule.

o *Board member response: We are very aware that students like yourself use the train to travel north. We adjusted the morning schedule to meet student needs, and we may have to look at the afternoon schedule when things open back up.*

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

o <i>SMART staff was asked to respond Charlie raises a good point. We will continue to coordinate with Dominican College, College of Marin, Santa Rosa JC and Sonoma State. I know we need earlier morning and later in the evening service, and we will certainly add more service when we come out of COVID-19.</i>
· Novato has “open weekends on the street with our downtown restaurants, and anytime anybody can get on SMART and get off downtown, it’s really fantastic. SMART provides a fantastic service and we know business will come back and become more robust when we have more people being able to move around more freely (after COVID-19).
· (As a senior citizen) I much prefer the train to driving on the freeway, especially in commute traffic, which has gotten terrible. So, I just want to add that you need to push senior citizens using the train when this (COVID-19) is over. Thank you for doing the train. I just love it.
· Regarding the potential connection (rail extension) to Fairfield (Suisun City) is there any feasibility to do the transit hub at Vintage Oaks in Novato?
o <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: At this point in our first feasibility study for going east, we are looking at the Hamilton station as a transfer point to the national system. Later on, when the project goes into more detail, we will be investigating other options.</i>
· I’ve had a continuing concern regarding the rail crossing at Olive Street, where there is not a pedestrian crossing. Will SMART be putting any pedestrian crossing arms at Olive?
· <i>SMART staff was asked to respond we typically don’t have pedestrian crossings at every railroad crossing. We do have them near station access points, like at the Grant Avenue station we opened in December. It’s certainly something we can look at; we’d want to get together with city staff and look at the condition of the roadway and sidewalk. If there is a need for safety improvements, we will certainly implement them.</i>
· There has been wonderful talk about the possibility of rebuilding the track out Highway 37 to near Vallejo, and is this project still on the burner or has it been pushed further out due to COVID-19?
o <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: That feasibility study was funded by the State of California, specifically by the Secretary of Transportation. We did an analysis and reported to the Secretary, as well as the public that the project is feasible. We have given the Secretary a budget for the next phase, which would consist of more engineering, design and environmental. I think the project has been pushed back due to fire, as well as COVID-19 – as soon as we get back to normal, I believe they will look into funding the next phase, as the Secretary’s office is very big on connecting us to the national railroad system, and this project is an important part of the statewide masterplan.</i>
· Regarding the Highway 37 connection, will SMART coordinate funding with GGT and MTC to provide a bus connection between Vallejo and Fairfield while the rail line is being constructed, as a preview of what’s to come?
o <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: There are two different efforts taking place at MTC as well as Caltrans and the congestion management agencies of the four counties that have been working on what to do about Highway 37. This project has its own meetings and agenda. What we have been doing regarding rail is separate from this and is parallel project.</i>
· How will SMART market itself as a faster transit connection between Vallejo and Novato via Sonoma County?
o <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: Congestion on Highway 37 will help with the marketing. When we get into operational analysis, we will look into this. We don’t think there is a single or a silver bullet to solving the Highway 37 congestion problem. The Highway 37 congestion problem needs a number of solutions and SMART will be one of the solutions.</i>
· Has SMART ever considered a southern extension to Corte Madera?
o <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: We own the ROW almost to Nordstrom, but there has not been a discussion in the last decade extending the rail line to Corte Madera. However, TAM is currently planning and doing design work to build a bicycle/pedestrian pathway using the corridor to connect with Ross Valley.</i>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there plans to increase train service on the weekends?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Board member response: The Board has provided direction to staff on this, right now there is no weekend service due to COVID-19. However, the board has provided direction that weekend should continue to exist once ridership returns and we open back up.</i>
Larkspur, October 19, 2020
<p>On October 19, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its fifth community-wide Listening Forum with the City of Larkspur. Thirty people were in attendance, including SMART Board Directors Lucan, Connolly, Hillmer, Garbarino, Rabbitt, and Fudge. Larkspur Vice-Mayor Kevin Haroff, along with 24 members of the public, were also in attendance.</p>
<p>Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the City of Larkspur Listening Forum.</p>
<p>Eleven members of the public spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I love the SMART train, and I think it's an important addition to our transportation options between Marin And Sonoma counties. I am also a proponent for the completion of the multi-use pathways along the SMART corridor, and I want to voice my support for continued focus on building more pathways.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmentalists in Marin and Sonoma counties recognized the potential of SMART to reorganize future development in the North Bay. The underlying reason so many of us worked all these years, over 30 years to get SMART, is because of what it could do for land use – as a counter to the continuation of sprawl development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A couple of years ago, the Friends of SMART used to have quarterly meetings with the SMART General Manager. At one of these meetings we discussed two critical things, one of which was the need to have a staff liaison with local governments, to make them aware of the possibilities of bringing development into station areas. This is critical, both for the planning of future development for the region, and for future development of SMART ridership. However, we were told at the time we raised this, there were no resources to provide for a liaison.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second Friends of SMART suggestion was to start a planning process to better connect the Larkspur station to the ferry, and shopping center, and we were told by SMART that it was not possible. We would like to see a public discussion what can be done to correct or improve upon what we see as a huge planning mistake regarding the location of the Larkspur station.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since Marin and Sonoma counties are committed to increasing residential density around stations, I am curious as to why we would want to put Costco at Northgate instead of residential housing?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SMART sales tax is a regressive tax that disproportionately falls on lower income people and parcel taxes are too aggressive; what are the other alternatives for long-term financing for SMART to take advantage of?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: SMART looked into all the options early on, and the sales tax was the one selected. Sales taxes tend to be the way a lot of new transit agencies have been funded in the past 20 years all over California. It would be a significant undertaking to try to figure out how to replace \$40 million in sales tax revenue every year.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I personally think the Larkspur station is reasonably close to the shopping center. But I have spent a lot of time thinking about how to get people from the train platform to the ferry. This is a very difficult, perhaps an impossible problem.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Board member response: Implementing a more direct connection to the ferry would involve getting a SMART right-of-way across a number of private properties, as well as getting across Sir Francis Drake Blvd. This is a problem I have been thinking about as well, and I share everyone's concern with respect to this connectivity problem.</i>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<p>· The Friends of SMART conducted a walk through at the Larkspur station area and came up with a plan for an aerial station that would be within the ferry parking lot. It would have a direct connection to the pedestrian overcrossing, so one could leave the platform and walk directly onto the pedestrian overcrossing and get to the ferry.</p>
<p>· My comments are related to the lack of the multi-modal nature of what the voters taxed themselves for. SMART has completely eliminated the pathway project from the public discussion, which might be because you've only built 2.3 miles of bicycle pathway in Marin County. I urge you to look at page 9 of your 2014 Strategic Plan. It identifies which pathways segments to build first – it says to build segments that provide critical access to station, access across geographic and physical boundaries, or bridge gaps between existing pathways segments. There is one pathway segment that fills those criteria better than any other segment: it's the segment from the top of the Puerto Suello Hill to North San Pedro Road. It connects north San Rafael with central San Rafael.</p>
<p>· There has been a divorce between the multimodal transportation supporters and the train supporters. What you've done is created opponents from your biggest supporters, and if your biggest supporters become your opponents, you'll never pass a sales tax extension that requires a two thirds majority.</p>
<p>· I'm a big fan of the train, and I live near the end at Larkspur. I have no problem walking to the ferry from the platform, and much to my surprise the vast majority of the people I see use the bike/ped bridge and seem comfortable with it.</p>
<p>· Regarding the pathway, there's always people from all economic strata using the path, including people who can't afford the train. Once you build the path, it takes little funding to maintain it as compared to the train. So, the pathway is much more recession proof. I urge the board to find the funding to keep moving forward on the pathway efforts.</p>
<p>· It's clear that the community did not want a parking garage located at the ferry landing. Every night, all the parking spaces are empty, yet I wonder why the TAM is continuing to pursue funding to build a multi-story parking garage at the Larkspur Ferry. I wonder if the train has anything to do with that.</p>
<p>o <i>Board member response: There have been several questions and comments regarding planning around the larkspur landing area. What I would suggest is that members of the public take note of what is happening at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the association of Bay Area Governments – Plan Bay Area. There's a process, and a very active conversation taking place regarding housing allocations and recommendations to local communities regarding development. I will say that the current proposals in the Plan Bay Area, identify the areas around the Larkspur ferry and the SMART station as both having significant land use opportunities.</i></p>
<p>· Planners working on Plan Bay Area are having a hard time because they are given Green House Gas emission reduction goals mandated by the state, so they have been focusing on more walking, cycling and more transit. They want to cut down on auto use and encourage telecommuting, but people living in cities don't want to telecommute. Then there is the issue of Autonomous Vehicles (AV) – they aren't in the news much due to COVID-19, but AVs are making real progress. So those doing land use and transportation planning are going to have to be flexible, and not be dogmatic about the parking garage in Larkspur.</p>
<p>· I'd like to provide a little more skeptical viewpoint on the train. I was not convinced when SMART first started, and I'm still not sure that it will be successful. But I would like to know what your projections are for increasing ridership. Now that we have put money into the train, I'd like to see it succeed. But it seems like a multi-model system where one must do multiple transfers to other transit systems to get anywhere. And now because of COVID-19, everyone is suspicious about traveling on transit. So, I'm wondering what your plans are for increasing ridership during the current pandemic.</p>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

o *SMART staff was asked to respond: Our planning for increasing ridership includes these listening forums, where we've been enriched by many good ideas. Before COVID-19 our ridership after we opened Larkspur and Downtown Novato had increased substantially – and even more so when we launched our Sail and Rail pass with Golden Gate Transit. So, we view the ridership decline during COVID-19 as temporary. The current reason people are not riding transit, isn't because they don't feel safe, it's because there's nowhere to go. For example, our schools are closed, and a big part of our ridership are teachers and students. So, for now, we are all waiting for COVID-19 to pass. We've been checking in with the other transit agencies and we're all waiting.*

· 40% of the people that use the ferry parking lot come from Ross Valley. If the North/South Greenway Gap Closure Project is built, people could ride to the ferry. However, there is a SMART owned fence and old railroad tracks that prevents people from using the ROW that goes over the section that is being built over Corte Madera Creek. SMART should take the fence down (located near some storage units) and let people use the corridor to get to and from Ross Valley and the Larkspur Ferry.

· From what I hear, a lot of the bike people are disappointed that SMART is not running a minimum level of service on the weekends. From my own train usage, I was struck by how many bicyclists used the train on the weekends.

· I suggest that you think about what happened with getting the East Petaluma station build and how you went from 76% yes vote in 2008 (Measure Q) to 48% yeas vote in March (Measure I). The solution is to see that people from the east side of Petaluma, who live beyond biking range, have parking at the east side station.

San Rafael, November 12, 2020

On November 12, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its seventh community-wide Listening Forum with the City of San Rafael. A total of 38 people attended the Listening Forum, including SMART Board Directors Connolly, Garbarino, Hillmer, Lucan, Pahre, Phillips, and Rabbitt. San Rafael Vice-Mayor Kate Colin, along with 20 members of the public, were also in attendance.

Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the forum participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the City of Larkspur Listening Forum.

Nine members of the public spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas:

· *To start the meeting off, SMART staff was asked to address the traffic situation at downtown San Rafael area near the San Rafael Train Station: We've been providing service to Larkspur now for several months and passing through two very busy arterials in San Rafael – 2nd and 3rd Streets. We have been working very closely with public works and San Rafael's traffic engineer to improve the timing of the meets of our trains to minimize the time the gates are down. The city has also looked at various treatments for the roadway and traffic signal timing to maximize efficiencies. So, I think the city and SMART are working with what they can to maximize the efficiencies through the downtown area. A good example of this is changing Francisco Blvd. from a two-way street to a one-way street and adding a bike lane.*

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

· *SMART staff was also asked to address the incidents that have occurred at the North San Pedro Road crossing: We've had three incidents at the North San Pedro Road crossing; one in July, one in September, and one in October. After each incident, SMART's General Manager convened an inspection team to review the site and look at all aspects of the railroad crossing. The inspection team includes SMART Operations, Train Control, Safety, Engineering, as well as City of San Rafael Public Works staff – including the traffic engineer and the Public Works Director. SMART also meets with staff from the California Public Utilities Commission, and the Federal Railroad Administration. Everyone brings a different lens through which to examine the railroad crossing. North San Pedro Road is a two-lane road divided by a median at the railroad crossing. There are also entry gates and warning devices consisting of approximately 15 flashing red lights, and bells that provide an audio warning that are activated prior to the gates coming down. From a SMART/railroad perspective, we found that in each case (of the three incidents), all of our safety equipment performed as designed and operated as intended. I think that the San Rafael Public Works Department noticed some things that they wanted to spruce up when we met on site. I think they have since refreshed the striping around the median, the centerline, and the side of the road. And they talked about reconstructing the median as well.*

After staff reported on the items above, the public began to comment:

· I think you know that I am a long-time opponent, and as a starting point, I think board members need to realize that when you compare votes for Measure I versus votes for Measure Q, you lost 100,000 votes – there were 88,000 fewer yes votes and 20,000 fewer no votes. This election result was largely about the lack of oversight exhibited by this board over staff. Here are a couple of straight forward examples: The first one has to do with the question of how much SMART is currently spending per passenger. It's a metric that all transit systems typically publish, and this agency never has. So, I did an estimate based on the last published numbers for operating expenses at the FTA National Transit Database from 2018/2019. These numbers are a year old and don't cover the cutbacks associated with operating 16 trains per day during COVID– so one has to do an estimate and use the budget, even though the budget has never been specified. I put that together with an estimate of ridership through October, which is about 36,000 riders over one third of your fiscal year and came up with over \$300/per passenger. Now I know Farhad and Erin are going to dispute that number and that's OK. My concern is that this board has never asked staff to produce that number and it's completely relevant to evaluate the performance of the train.

· A second example that's very recent and I doubt any of the board members realize – that when you approved the funding bond, you approved \$10 million in additional debt service costs more than you needed to. It's buried in the structural finance of that bond; I spent a good deal of time with a muni bond advisor to make sure that I got the calculations correct. The question I have, since this is soon going to be known to the public, is why didn't staff present you that alternative, because it is obvious once you understand the structure of what occurs in a refunding bond. There is no question that refunding saves you money, it's just that you save less money between fiscal year 2023 and fiscal year 2029 then you could have, had you just issued the refunding bond to the fees, the bond at the call date rather than the principle and the interest payments between now and then.

· The key issue for the voters wasn't the extension to Cloverdale, it was about transparency and accountability and when will this board step up and oversee staff.

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

- Twelve years ago, I was a train supporter and friend of Charles McGlashan. I did what I could to help him with getting Measure Q passed. As time went on, SMART's financial situation, which Mike Arnold has pointed out, has gotten worse. I think trying to extend the sales tax ten years ahead of time with Measure I was just a tax grab. I receive Mike's emails occasionally and I try to understand the numbers that SMART has; there is another way to look at how much money you're losing, and that is to go back before the pandemic and bask how much it costs to run the train from San Rafael to Larkspur and back. The number back then was outrageous, and now with 400 people per day, and that sounds high to me. The thing I'm most concerned about is what Mike say's – that we're dealing with estimates, because there are not any accurate figures. When you go back to the voters, you'll have the same issues. I would urge the board to be as transparent as possible, and make sure those numbers are translated into layman's terms.
- A lot of the tracks run along sea level water, especially in Novato and Petaluma. I think we'll have to raise the tracks to accommodate sea level rise and this will be a huge expense.
- I live in Petaluma and I've been to all of the listening sessions. I think they've been incredibly helpful. I was very heartened by the success of Measure DD, and I'm feeling good about the possibility of passing a sales tax extension in two or for years.
- I'm a member of the Marin Conservation League (MCL), who wrote a letter to the SMART Board in February 2020. I'm also on the San Rafael Bicycle Advisory Committee since 2011. I want to address a couple of issues from these perspectives. The MCL letter asked the SMART board as its policy setting authority to work with management of SMART to respond to the public's concerns that SMART address the promises in Measure Q – in particular the promise to relieve traffic congestion, fight global warming, increase transportation options, as well as provide a bicycle/pedestrian pathway linking stations and connecting to the ferry and bus service. At MCL we feel that SMART's greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions have been minimal given the costs of SMART. When you look at SMART's claim of reducing 8 million pounds of carbon dioxide, it equated to 2000 tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year. That's only 1/7th of 1% of Marin's annual GHG emissions.
- We're also concerned about the increased traffic congestion and air pollution from cars in cities like San Rafael. Regional planning agencies like the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and other planning organizations at the state level are increasing residential densities around transit stations. But if SMART doesn't increase its ridership, and connect with other supporting transit modes, it's not going to decrease GHGs, and it may add to congestion and air pollution.
- We also have a couple other concerns. The SMART railroad was rebuilt through large swaths of low-level marshland along Gallinas Creek and other areas like Novato Creek; in the future those portions of track are likely to be flooded during storms and king tides. We would like to know how SMART plans to provide for adaptation to sea level rise.
- And finally, in terms of the north/south greenway, there is a portion that really needs to be included – riding North San Pedro to the Puerto Suello tunnel is too hard to ride up, and a pathway needs to go along Los Ranchitos Road as it was originally planned.
- Before SMART begins to think about going back to the public with a sales tax renewal measure, you need to build the segment of pathway that connects North San Rafael and central San Rafael – building a pathway from the top of Puerto Suello hill to North San Pedro Rd. If you do this, you'll become one of the biggest transit providers in the county. One would be able to ride from Corte Madera all the way to the Civic Center.

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

· I know a number of you know of my work and my focus on forward planning. The fiscal crisis we find ourselves in is a result of the COVID crisis, and we're seeing this hit all public transportation. It's interesting to note that despite Caltrain ridership dropping precipitously, voters in San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara counties voted in favor of Measure RR, and I think that's encouraging. The reason I suspect they voted for Measure RR, is because there is a vision for Caltrain – corridor electrification, which suggests that there is a future when we finally see clear of the COVID crisis. One of the things I think we, as in SMART, need to do is to create a compelling vision as to what the future of SMART is – both from the standpoint of an operating rail line, but also from the standpoint of how it links to the region's core transportation network. If we look at this notion of a compelling vision, as Daniel Burnham said: "make no small plans for they have no magic to stir the blood," it is indeed the compelling vision that will, at the end of the day, get the support of the voters. One compelling vision would be to extend the rail line to a ferry terminal located at the western edge of the San Quentin property. This can be done without closing the prison, and it would reduce the daily round trip travel time by about 35 minutes – which would have the effect of increasing ridership by increasing the number of commuters and day excursions/tourists.

· Another thing in the spirit of big ideas, is the implementation of transit-oriented development withing walking distance of rail stations and the bike highway. A great model for this is Switzerland, which has compact towns and cities along the rail lines and preserves its agricultural land, forests and countryside like we want to do in the North Bay.

o Board Member response: Most of my family lives in Europe, and most of them don't even own a car. So, Mr. Rhodes' example of the community based around the clustering of homes near transit is spot on.

· When we eventually find ourselves looking towards a more positive future, we need to remember that if we don't demonstrate that SMART is a critical component in North Bay mobility, we will have difficulty attracting future investment to address issues like adapting to sea level rise.

· I am a big (SMART) fan and a big cyclist, and I try to get around San Rafael by cycling. I'm bummed that weekend service has been discontinued. I would love to see at least one or two morning and evening trips so I can get on the train and go up to Sonoma County and enjoy Petaluma and Santa Rosa by bike.

· I've seen the train go by 100 times throughout the pandemic and I've not seen more than one or two people on the train. And this is at different times of the day. You claim to be pro-environment and anti-climate change and stuff, but I question that your trains are not electric. I feel like that was just a flaw overall.

· I will always support the SMART train and we will come back after this COVID crisis is over – the idea is just too good.

· I also want to go back and talk about the Greenway – it is absolutely vital to us moving our population (students) from the canal to the middle school at Venetia Valley. We cannot build another school at the canal, there is no room. It critical that at least that portion of the Greenway, from North San Rafael over the Puerto Suello hill get built – come hell or high water.

· I want to back up Jeff Rhodes' notion that SMART will contribute to our housing solution. In North San Rafael in 2013, we ran the PDA out of town with torches and pitch forks. Everybody opposed any sense of housing. Now with steady work, this has completely flipped, and the neighborhood is demanding a PDA for Northgate and we are supporting 210 units at Northgate. Right now, we're finishing a promenade to the SMART station.

December 16, 2020 – Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway

On December 16, 2020, the SMART Board of Directors held its eighth community-wide Listening Forum for people interested in the Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway. A total of 122 people attended the Listening Forum, including SMART Board Directors Lucan, Pahre, Connolly, Hillmer, Rabbitt, and Fudge. 104 members of the public were in attendance.

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the forum participants. Please refer to the video for a complete record of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway Listening Forum.
Thirty members of the public spoke during the listening forum, touching on multiple areas:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To start the meeting off, SMART staff was asked to make a presentation updating the public on the planning, funding, and construction of the SMART pathway network (the presentation has been posted on the SMART website).</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The train and bike have always been a key mobility alternative for the North Bay, and the pathway is certainly a key element of that mobility alternative. SMART developed a road map in conjunction with municipalities in 2006 as a part of the development of the environmental impact report for the project. The pathway is a north-south network that utilizes the SMART right-of-way, existing pathways, planned pathways to be built by others, as well as some on-roadway segments.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In implementing this, SMART has utilized Measure Q dollars and leveraged those dollars – starting with \$21.7M from Measure Q and bringing in \$34.8M in outside funding.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Today, SMART and our partners have built about 24 miles of the north-south network for a \$107M investment.</i>
After staff reported on the items above, the public began to comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I worked very hard to get the train up and running – starting in 1990 and working on the 1998, 2006, and 2008 sales tax measure. I am interested to know how much of what is being spent on the pathway is SMART funding and how much is outside funding. There have been many instances with the pathway in San Rafael where we really had to push SMART, so as a result, I did not help with the last sales tax measure (Measure I), and I think a lot of people felt the same way. For many of us, what we’re looking for is not just going for outside money but committing SMART dollars and SMART design work to the pathway, and I mean with all the rail extensions at the same time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>SMART staff was asked to respond: On the PowerPoint, we have a high-level breakdown showing that we spent \$21.7M, which leveraged \$34.8M in additional funding.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am particularly interested in seeing that some segments near the SMART station in San Rafael, which don’t seem to be moving but are incredibly important, get built – specifically 2nd St. to Mission along Tamalpais Ave. I’ve also been told that the reason the [traffic control] light doesn’t work at Mission has something to do with the train signal system.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need bicycle/pedestrian gates at North San Pedro Rd. in San Rafael.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Novato is an island as far as biking is concerned. I have biked some of the new segments around San Antonio Rd. and the unimproved section there. When there is a traffic backup, it becomes extremely unsafe for cyclists and needs to be placed on a list for improvements. Either find an alternative route or widen the shoulders for a class 2 pathway. It’s totally unsafe now, with cars going 40 mph around blind corners and narrow roads.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am concerned about the north-south Greenway project and the proposal to have transportation along the route that would connect to the Highway 101 overpass over Corte Madera Creek – it is currently blocked by fencing that was put up a number of years ago when SMART leased the property [to a third party]. Those leases have been terminated, but the fence is still there.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I located my bike shop next to the train station eight years ago so my customers could get there by train. I just basically want to give you two thumbs up for all that you’ve accomplished up to this point. I know you can’t please all the people all the time, but you can please most of them. I understand the complexities of the regulatory framework you must work within. What I see is 24 miles of bike path built. My advice is to promote what we have now because I know there are a lot of people who don’t know about the bike path. There’s a huge marketing opportunity to celebrate what we do have.

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<p>· I want to talk about the area between North San Pedro Rd. and the SMART Civic Center station. The portion of pathway that SMART built a few years ago has been a great success and gets a lot of use. But, for those living along Merrydale Ave., there is no intuitive or safe way for people on living on the Merrydale side to get to the SMART platform. There is an undeveloped path of travel that could be developed into a paved path that would enable people to access the platform from that side of the tracks. I would like to see SMART help figure out who has jurisdiction over this little section of dirt under the freeway overpass and support its development into a viable connector to the Merrydale neighborhood.</p>
<p>· I am the executive director of the Marin Bicycle Coalition, and we represent 11,000 people who vote. We are invested in SMART's success, as a railway and pathway agency that shares a common interest in car-free mobility. But it's become apparent to us over the years that SMART is really a rail first agency and that the pathway is treated as an afterthought if thought of at all. SMART is making great progress in Sonoma County, and that is to be applauded. But the fact remains that in Marin County, SMART has just built nine miles of pathway, and while there are plans on paper for building the remaining seven miles, there is no funding to complete the project. The bike community feels betrayed and let down by SMART, and we are tired of waiting on the uncertainty and piecemeal nature of grant funding.</p>
<p>· We know that SMART has relied on grant funding for many of the pathway segments, but we don't feel that Marin County is competitive for these types of grants, so we need to find another way to get these pay funding to build pathway segments built.</p>
<p>· The estimated cost of building the remaining segments of pathway between Larkspur and Windsor is \$35-40M – we feel that's not a very big number for an agency that built a \$500M train system.</p>
<p>· When SMART decides to come back to the voters for a sales tax extension, to gain cyclist support, you will need to include funding for the pathway, and give voters some certainty that the pathway will finally be completed as promised.</p>
<p>· We have for other items that SMART needs to address before we consider supporting another ballot measure: 1) provide a regular report to the Board of Directors and the public on pathway progress, including all grant opportunities; 2) include pathway projects for board consideration during the budget cycle every year; 3) bring all pathway segments between Larkspur and Windsor to 30% design and environmental clearance; and 4) continue to fund, design, permit and build the rail and pathway project concurrently as you are doing on the Windsor Extension.</p>
<p>· The SMART Board has eliminated 40% of the pathway in Marin and 50% of the pathway in Sonoma, and the information that Bill presented tonight is misleading because it doesn't show that the pathway has actually been eliminated from your plans. You have decoupled the pathway project from the rail project.</p>
<p>· SMART has played a great role in activating the region's downtowns and people into employment areas from residential areas. One recent thing SMART has done is to put a pathway under the freeway in Petaluma, which is just a gem for getting people across town. However, the pathway stops just short at Payran St. and needs to get to Water and Washington streets. It's only 500 feet away from being perfect. We have to find a way to close that gap. All in all, SMART is a great system for me to go to work in Santa Rosa from Petaluma and biking to work.</p>
<p>· I am the HOA president on the Merrydale Road. I think we really need to focus on gap closure projects, big and small. You may be aware of Senate Bill 288, which exempts environmental review for green projects. These are green projects, and this is something I think can be leveraged to cut upfront soft costs for these projects. So, I have three suggestions or asks: 1) Connect the existing City of San Rafael path on the south fork of <i>Gallinas Creek</i> to McGinnis Parkway; 2) connect the Civic Center Station to Merrydale Road area under Highway 101; we feel totally disconnected on the Merrydale Road side of the tracks. And 3) SMART has had a recent death and some injuries on the North San Pedro Road crossing - this should be sounding the alarms for safety improvements. I've also heard from many people who do not want to bike over the Puerto Suello hill. We need to connect these projects at-grade.</p>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<p>· Marin County Bicycle Coalition has already stated what I wanted to say, so I will focus on a few other things. There are 45 miles of train tracks and 24 miles of pathway. This is about one half much path to tracks. This shows that the pathway is not as much of a priority. I've heard the General Manager say SMART can't build the train system in segments – that it has to build the train tracks all in one chunk. Alternatively, the GM has said that the pathway can be built in segments. But the pathway only works if it gets you to where you want to go, and when there are gaps in the pathway, it decreases the utility of the pathway network. The piecemeal nature of how the pathway system has been constructed is one of the points of upset within the cycling community.</p>
<p>· Every time a new grant is awarded for the pathway, I have bicycle coalition members calling to say they thought the Measure Q tax money was supposed to be paying for the pathway. I and our membership would like to see more Measure Q funds spent on the pathway.</p>
<p>· SMART needs to provide wayfinding signage around the stations. When cyclists get off the train, there's nothing to indicate where the bike paths are in relation to the train station. It could be as simple as information stenciled onto the street or path. Also, the pathway map on your website are not useful for navigational purposes for cyclists.</p>
<p>· I also echo what Terrell said – we would like to see a strategic plan with a timeline and funding plan for how the remaining pathway will get built.</p>
<p>· I have been working for years on integrating the Latino community with the rest of the city of San Rafael and Marin County, and bike path plays a crucial role in this process. I have supported SMART from the beginning and continue to advocate for the expansion and improving our public transportation system. The waves of COVID-19 and the resulting economic shutdowns have seen cycling as a resilient way to stay connected and to mobilize in low-income communities. I have been concerned how SMART has eliminated several sections of the greenway in the 2014 and 2019 strategic plans. I have heard that these sections have been removed for different reasons, including environmental impacts or conflicts with property owners. I want to encourage you to engage with the communities that will be disproportionately impacted by your decisions when you eliminate segments of pathway or change any pathway designs.</p>
<p>· SMART has drainage ditches that may not be recognized as riparian corridors, and there are species that utilize the waterways there. The pathway is also utilized by children and dogs, so I would like to see alternatives to toxic sprays utilized on the path if possible. For example, an alternative to spraying would be to mow.</p>
<p>· I serve on the MTC Policy Advisory Council, so I am concerned about equity issues. I think that bicycle paths are a really important transportation option for low-income people. Connectivity of these pathways is also very important for this transportation alternative to work for those using it. I also represent an environmental organization that promotes eco-tourism. We're trying to get people out of their cars when they recreate, and the bicycle combined with the train is an important way for eco-tourists to get to their recreation destinations, like the Russian River area. Because families may be reluctant to use bicycles with their children on paths that are located on-street or roadway shoulders, getting off-grade pathways to connect is critical.</p>
<p>· I love to ride my bike to Petaluma and take the train back home and I would like to see more information on your website about what pathways are completed and what other pathways they are connected to.</p>
<p>· I have been a strong supporter of SMART, but SMART has let us down. Measure Q passed because of bike support, and Measure I failed because of lack of bike support. This listening session is very important. We haven't felt that SMART has been listening to the bike community; I'm hoping things are changing.</p>
<p>· Hope for outside funding is not a strategy. It strikes me that SMART does not have a strategy or plan to build the pathway and rank which projects are ready to go. I'd like to see the SMART Board take a leadership role in how the bike paths are built.</p>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

· I'm going to talk about finances, and the bikers in this forum should listen to what I'm about to tell you: SMART finances this year are far better than anything they have reported to the public. They have a ton of revenues coming from sales taxes, and they have a ton of revenue coming from the CARES Act. They're also not spending as much on the trains because they're only operating 16 trains a day, and you have nothing in front of you telling you this explicitly. SMART is doing far better than what was revealed in their budget adopted last June – they have lots of money they could be spending and pledging to build bike paths this year.

· We love SMART, and my wife and I use it recreationally. We appreciate that you allow bikes on the trains and how easy it is to roll on and off the train with our bikes.

· I'm a cyclist and a member of the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and want to say that with the opening of SMART, my life profoundly changed for the better. My daily commute takes me from San Rafael to Rohnert Park. It's enabled me to live a car-free life. However, as hard as it is for me to say, I am disappointed with SMART and am not a supporter because I feel betrayed by SMART for the lack of follow-through on the pathway projects. When Measure I was on the ballot, I was tearing my hair out because I am a daily user of SMART but don't support SMART due to lack of progress on bike infrastructure.

· I voted for SMART because I thought we were getting a bike path, and I do use it for recreation and commuting. The most important gap to close from my perspective is between Vintage Way and Hannah Ranch, where you must go through a BMX dirt field to connect to the pathway. We really need good wayfinding signs. This can make or break a positive bike riding experience.

· I am a long-time supporter of SMART. We know from the Mill Valley experience that when you have a path that is only 8 or 12 feet wide, you're going to have conflicts amongst users - joggers, walkers, slow bikers, and fast bikers. If you give each of these users 4 feet, you've got 16 feet, with a 2-foot buffer in between, you end up with a 32-foot pathway, and that is what we need. I am not a construction manager, but I strongly feel that it would be better to put in 32-foot pathways now then to try to come back in a decade and put in wider pathways.

SMART staff was asked to respond to two questions Petaluma pathway segments that came up during the listening forum: The first question is about the status of the Payran St. to Lakeville Blvd. pathway. This segment is in design, we don't have construction funds yet, but it will be shovel ready when funding becomes available. The second question was about the closure of Payran St. to Southpoint Blvd. The close of this segment is due to the Caltrans Highway 101 widening project. They needed to close the path in order to build a new bridge over the railroad tracks. I believe this closure will last approximately two years, and we're about six months into the closure

League of Women Voters, August 7, 2020

On August 7, 2020, the SMART Board Chair and a number of Directors met with the League of Women Voters (LWV) to discuss the league's viewpoints on the results of the sales tax renewal Measure I. Representing the Marin LWV were President Ann Wakeley, John Eells, and Kevin Hagerty, and representing the Sonoma County LWV were President Deborah McKay and Willard Richards. Representing the SMART Board of Directors and staff were SMART Board Chair Eric Lucan, Vice-Chair Barbara Pahre, Directors Damon Connolly and Debora Fudge, and General Manager Farhad Mansourian and Chief Financial Officer Erin McGrath.

Please note that this is a high-level executive summary of comments made by the LWV forum participants.

Expand the Citizens Oversight Committee

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

<p>Both the Marin County and Sonoma County LWV have been long-time supporters of SMART. Unfortunately, in the last election, we felt that we could not actively support Measure I, which was very disappointing to us. But one of the things the league stands for is transparency; we believe it's very important for the public to be involved in their government and for government to be transparent and have a transparent process. We perceive that there have been some things that have eroded, and this has cost SMART the trust of the public. So, I think of this listening forum as beginning the initiative to win the public's trust back.</p>
<p>One opportunity to win back the public's trust is with the Citizens Oversight Committee (COC). The COC could be a real asset to SMART if you restructured it to provide the kind of public input that reflects transparency and public involvement. If you look at the transportation agencies in your own backyard, you'll see that they have community advisory boards that are structured differently than the SMART COC. Those community advisory boards are structured to have representation from various key stakeholder groups, such as someone from the taxpayer's associations, the bicycle coalitions, environmental organizations, and the LWV.</p>
<p>So, if you looked at your own COC a little differently, you could structure it so that you could automatically get public input from the constituency groups that care about SMART and care about what you are doing.</p>
<p>It is instructive to look at how the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) put its expenditure plan together for the renewal of their sales tax. They established a committee with broad representation consisting of 23 members representing various stakeholder groups from the community. They met for 6-9 months, putting the expenditure plan together. Stakeholders were intimately involved in every aspect of the expenditure plan development; every issue that came up was resolved, and by the time the ballot measure was up for the vote, there was no real organized opposition.</p>
<p>So, we believe that SMART should create a committee made up of a wide range of community stakeholders to prepare the expenditure plan for the next sales tax extension measure.</p>
<p>You could also form a subcommittee of the COC to go out on a quarterly basis and gather public input from groups that are not a part of the COC.</p>
<p>This can't be a one-shot deal. For people to feel heard, you have to find a way to build regular public input gathering into your governance process, and you need to let the public know that you hear them by taking their priorities into consideration.</p>
<p>Without the public's trust, you're not going to get the funding you need. We urge you to make this (Listening Forum exercise) an ongoing process rather than a one-shot effort and look to the successes of other agencies and how they structure and use their community advisory boards as a guide to what SMART does.</p>
<p><i>Public Information Requests</i></p>
<p>We know that public information requests were huge during the recent campaign. There needs to be a shift in thinking about the public and requests for information. When a member of the public makes a request for information, it's because they care about SMART, and they care about transportation. SMART should not automatically think that people who are critical of SMART are the enemy because they make a request for information. They are most often concerned about transportation or concerned about their tax dollars.</p>
<p>SMART needs to see everyone as a potential SMART supporter and think about how you can move them over to seeing things from SMART's point of view, and how you handle requests for information is a part of how you start getting people to shift their viewpoints on SMART.</p>
<p>I know you have a policy on responding to public requests for information. When you you're not able to handle requests for information routinely, then I think it needs to come to the attention to the SMART board.</p>
<p>The public needs to see that there is a process for handling public requests for information, and I think that the board needs to be seen as a part of that process.</p>

LISTENING SESSION BY LOCATION

· A good place to start on changing perceptions is to report out on public requests for information. You could say, “this is how many requests we received, and this is how many we responded to within 10-days.” You could post this information in the General Managers Report. This would be a good way to begin rebuilding trust.

Communication and Relationship Building

· There are a lot of people you need to win back to your side. It’s not just your riders; it’s people who never ride the train. Instead of building bridges over creeks and rivers, you now need to focus on rebuilding bridges to the community. I think it’s helpful to recognize how much work went into building these community bridges over the past 20 years. Think of the effort between the first sales tax in 1990 and when we passed the tax in 2008, we have to go back to that level of community bridge-building effort. You need to rebuild bridges with the chambers, city councils, and particularly the bicycle community.

· Unfortunately, a lot of public opinion is baked-in. You will have to change peoples minds to regain their trust and confidence, and you do that by engaging with them – collaborating with them.

· We think that the most important thing to do right now is to improve your communication with the community at large and with specific groups like the bicycle coalitions, and the cities along the rail line.

· Initiating dialogues with the cities along the rail line from Larkspur to Cloverdale is an important step to rebuilding relationships with the city councils. There are perhaps 55 or more city council members – less than one half actually endorsed Measure I – yet all the cities benefit from SMART stations in their cities. I was especially struck by the fact that only one council member each from San Rafael, Petaluma, and Santa Rosa endorsed Measure I. So, there is obviously work to be done in re-establishing partnerships and collaboration with these cities and council members.

· It’s also important that you let the public know about the things you’re working on, because SMART is doing many things that the public doesn’t know about. Because SMART is in a position where rebuilding confidence and trust a critical priority, I would start doing regular press releases. The media may not pick them all up, but if you start doing regular, brief press releases about the things you are doing, the press will start to pick some of them up – on a slow news day at first, but then the press will start to look for your press releases when they need to fill a hole.

Comments grouped by general category are as follow:

Suggestions are in green

Questions are in yellow

Comments are in blue



SUGGESTIONS:

Tourism

SMART should evaluate how to get people from the train to other tourism destination Spring Lake

SMART needs support tourism especially on weekends and evenings

Pathway /Bicycles

Suggested SMART to add signs on the pathways for guidance

Remove seats to provide more space for bicycles; having tags for bicycles (on/off train); During COVID use extra space for bicycles

The new segments around Novato recently are San Antonio road and the unimproved section there - When there is a backup of traffic on one on one that road becomes extremely unsafe for bicyclists and it needs to be put on a list on the list for improvement (very narrow road)

An ADA level path is suggested underneath Highway 101 overpass on the south side to the tracks - Suggested real cooperation between County, City and Caltrain to complete

Consider safety pedestrian crossings at San Pedro Road

Way findings at stations will be helpful

The maintenance of the pathway is very important – no toxins and more trash cans

The SMART owned fence needs to be removed so people can use the right of way that goes over the section that is being built over the Corte Madera Creek

SMART should consider taking the lead (bike path) of the ROW area at the end of Industrial Way (there is a

SMART should continue to focus on the completion of the multi-use pathway along SMART corridor, this will encourage people to get out of their vehicles

SMART shall complete the Pathway from Santa Rosa (Bellevue) to Rohnert Park (Golf Course)

Move ahead and construct trails and pathways toward Healdsburg

The following portion needs to be included North San Pedro to the Puerto Suello tunnel is very difficult to ride – need to go along Los Ranchitos Road as planned

SMART should consider bringing the 5 key pathway segments to 30% engineering design

SMART needs to you need to build the segment of pathway that connects North San Rafael and central San Rafael – building a pathway from the top of Puerto Suello hill to North San Pedro Rd prior to going back to the voters.

The portion of the Greenway (from North San Rafael over the Puerto Suello Hill) need to be completed

Focus on gap closure project big or small -makes it difficult for the path to be useful

Connect the existing city center on S Fort Collins creek to McGinnis Park

Connect Civic Center Station to Merryvale under Highway

Need connectivity from San Antonio Creek through Petaluma

South of Civic Center to Puerto Suello hill is very difficult segment

Gap closure between Hanna Ranch and Vintage Way

The Board need to find funding to keep building the pathway

Concern about completing the pathway when there is little use - Do not spend money to complete the pathway until ridership increases

In order to support the ballot, the following need to be included: 1) report the pathway progress to the Board and public including grant activities; 2) include pathway project in SMART's budget every year; 3) bring all pathway segments between Larkspur and Windsor to 30% design and environmental clearance; 4) fund design permit and build the rail and pathway project concurrently just like Windsor project

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Consider reading the 2010 Grand Jury report – it states what SMART should do
SMART needs to develop a plan, timeframe, funding for the pathway
Rank pathway projects and allocate funding
Numbers that use the pathway could be helpful
More information on SMART website and maps to be educated
Include pathway data to website

Crossings

Jennings Avenue Crossing off the table – should be put back on table
--

Development

Double track is needed to provide more service in areas before expanding to Healdsburg and Cloverdale
SMART should consider in participating in the City of Healdsburg Planning developments
SMART should include the vision of extending the rail line from the ferry terminal to San Quentin

Communications and Marketing

SMART shall reach out to the following groups: environmental, bicycle, and tourism to increase support
Connect with San Francisco Bay Area groups
SMART should consider promoting walking, bicycle riding
Promote/Market the safety of riding SMART during COVID
You need to rebuild bridges and improve communication with the chambers, city councils, and particularly the bicycle community.
It's also important that you let the public know about the things you're working on, because SMART is doing many things that the public doesn't know about. I would start doing regular press releases.
Create innovative ideas for the people to take the train

Cleaning

Promote the safety to ride SMART during COVID

Ridership

To attract more train riders, need to ensure connectivity between SMART and other transit transportation are safe and efficient with enough time
SMART should consider reaching out to the senior citizens to use the train when the pandemic is over. The train is safer than driving on the highway especially during commute hours
Conduct a random sample survey when people will come back to riding the train
Provide greater ridership opportunities

Board and Citizen's Oversight Committee

Board members need to listen to the oppositions of Measure I
SMART needs new Board members
SMART needs a new General Manager
The functions of the COC needs to establish to assist SMART
The Board has lack of oversight on SMART staff
The Board needs to oversee SMART staff

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

SMART needs to be transparent prior to going back to voters
Structure the COC so that you could automatically get public input from the constituency groups that care about SMART and care about what you are doing.
Form a subcommittee of the COC to go out on a quarterly basis and gather public input from groups that are not a part of the COC.
Find a way to build regular public input gathering into your governance process, and you need to let the public know that you hear them by taking their priorities into consideration.
Report out (to the Board) on public requests for information.
Member if the Marin Conservation Corp wrote a letter to the SMART Board in February 2020 addressing a few issues - 1) SMART board as its policy setting authority to work with management of SMART to respond to the public's concerns that SMART address the promises in Measure Q – in particular the promise to relieve traffic congestion, fight global warming, increase transportation options – 2) provide a bicycle/pedestrian pathway linking stations and connecting to the ferry and bus service.

Freight

Suggested contacting Caltrans to invest in freight to make highway last longer

Transit Agency Coordination

SMART should integrate with Buses and other transit model
Be proactive and prepare for Electric bicycles purchases are increasing
More integrations with transit service

Campaign/Measure

Evaluate the votes
Implementation of transit orientated development within walking distance of rail stations
Needs to develop and create a compelling vision for the future – this will help with the voter's support
SMART should create a committee made up of a wide range of community stakeholders to prepare the expenditure plan for the next sales tax extension measure.

Revenue/Fares

Consider reducing fares to increase ridership

Capital Projects Cost/Potential Projects

Board needs to analysis the cost/benefit of the extension to Cloverdale
Take the construction cost of the extension to Cloverdale and consider double tracking from Santa Rosa to Larkspur to provide more frequent service

Schedule

SMART should consider adding additional train times
Maintain the frequency of trips
Don't eliminate service, increase trip
Reinstate weekend service
Add more weekday trips
Add more weekend evening trips

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Add trains for Special Events (Thursday Market in Windsor)

SMART should consider having evening and weekend trips for Sport Events (Giants/Warriors games)

Need to consider having train service every 15 minutes with no more than 30 minutes headways

Consider adding additional trains during pandemic

Consider increasing train service in the afternoon during Pandemic

Consider adding weekend service

Stations

Residents of Geyserville would like a SMART Station

Station needed at Fulton

Extension North

The town of Geyserville has a planning committee and would like SMART to make a presentation. Ms. Fudge provided a SMART presentation at the Geyserville Fire Station prior to Kincade fire'

Last Mile Connectivity

Consider conducting analysis of an electric bus from Cloverdale to Windsor vs. train service

SMART should consider an alternate source of power for the trains

Consider evaluating Marin Transit Route 49 connections with SMART train service. Currently the train departs 90 seconds after arriving at the platforms

Misc

Better response for PRA

Friends of SMART suggested the start of a planning process to connect the Larkspur station to the ferry.

Future Listening Sessions

We urge you to make this (Listening Forum exercise) an ongoing process rather than a one-shot effort and look to the successes of other agencies and how they structure and use their community advisory boards as a guide to what SMART does.

QUESTIONS:

Pathway /Bicycles

Can the Board consider building the pathway from Foss Creek to Windsor Station prior to the extension to Healdsburg?

Can SMART provide the status of the bike path along Francisco Blvd.

What is the status for completion of the Lakeville segment and Oak street Segment

Of the \$21.7M spent of Measure Q – Where was it spent? Pathway?

How much is SMART Funding vs Outside funding – SMART funds need to be committed to the pathway

When will Payran to Southpoint be opened

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Crossings

What is the process of SMART repairing the crossing once the North Coast Authority transfer process is completed?

Concern at the Olive Ave crossing which does not have any pedestrian arms. Will SMART install pedestrian safety crossing at Olive

Development

How important is the rail yard in Healdsburg to the future of SMART, does it have an incentive?

Marketing

How does SMART plan to market itself as a quicker transit connection between Novato and Vallejo?

Ridership

Data cost per rider

How many additional riders will be on the train when Windsor Extension is completed?

Convinced that SMART train when it started that it will be successful. What are the projections to increase ridership, since money has been put into the train and would like it to be successful?

Now with COVID everyone is suspicious about traveling on transit – what are the plans to increase ridership during pandemic

How much is SMART currently spending per passenger – a metric that most transit system publish

Board

Cloverdale not having high population, what is the best method to inform the SMART Board of developments in Cloverdale

The Board approved the bond re-financing which added \$10 million in additional debt service – why did staff not present the alternative

Freight

Does SMART have adequate staff to perform new functions (ex. Freight)

Will the freight line help SMART?

Should SMART be a freight carrier

Campaign/Measure

The Friends of SMART, how can they make SMART succeed

As a potential council member what can be done to advocate to get SMART to Cloverdale

Revenue/Fares

Besides SMART sales tax, what other alternatives for long term financial planning can SMART take advantage

How does the train contribute to the economy of San Rafael

What is the cost to run the train from San Rafael to Larkspur roundtrip prior to pandemic – outrageous

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Capital Projects Cost/Potential Projects

Project schedule and the Cost of the project – How it's being done

Can the track be updated to FRA Class 3 standards (50 mph) instead of FRA Class 4 standards (80 mph) to make it cheaper cost

Is there a cost to replace/rebuilt the Healdsburg Bridge?

Has SMART consider an extension to Corte Madera

Has SMART consider a station near Vintage Oaks with the potential connection to Fairfield

What is the status of Highway 37 project?

Will SMART coordinate funding with Golden Gate Bridge and MTC to provide transit connectivity regarding Highway 38 project

Schedule

When does SMART plan to increase weekend service?

Stations

Can the Board consider alternate station solutions?

Larkspur Station is very close to the shopping area - How to get the riders from the larkspur station to the ferry

Extension North

What is SMART's plan to get the train service to Healdsburg over the bridge

Does SMART and the Board value the feedback of the Residents of Healdsburg

What are the plans to get to Healdsburg? It will be good for the residents of Healdsburg and Cloverdale to know a date.

Last Mile Connectivity

Can an electric bus be used on the same train schedule from Cloverdale to Windsor?

How can the community and councilmembers advocate the extension to Healdsburg?

Is there a way to improve transit connection between Marin Transit and SMART with the current train schedule?

Future Listening Sessions

Will there be a session with the Geyserville planning committee?

Is a listening session going to be scheduled for the pedestrian orientated community

Parking

The community did not want a parking garage at the ferry – Not sure why TAM continues to pursue funding for the structure when the parking spaces are empty at night. Does SMART have anything to with this?

COMMENTS:

Tourism

SMART should promote and support tourism

SMART can gain revenue by promoting tourism

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

There is bicycle tourism and it's important to connect to trails
Cloverdale is a great tourism location.
SMART Board has two members that are constantly advocating for tourism (Fudge and Zane)
Tourist traffic is very important to Healdsburg and Cloverdale. Simi, Clo Du Bois and many others have wineries near the tracks which can contribute for platforms and service to their wineries

Pathway /Bicycles

Pedestrian gate needed at Rancheria are crossing (San Pedro Road) just like at Anderson drive
Consider having the bridge wide enough for pedestrian/bicycle pathway
The Friends of SMART had alternative location for the Larkspur station which is closer to the ferry, and connections to the pedestrian over crossing
2nd Street to Mission (on Tamalpais Avenue) the light needs to function for bikes
Pedestrian gates are missing at San Pedro Road
A 32 feet wide pathway is needed where possible for all types of users (bike, joggers, strollers and walkers)
We would like to see habitat enhancement, as well as the ability for bicyclist and pedestrians to walk through that area – the levee is actually our flood barrier and it needs to be raised - with the aspect of sea level rise so that Larkspur Corte Madera and County of Marin properties are protected in that area
Between North San Pedro Road and SMART Civic Center Station – there is housing along Merryvale avenue on the south side of the tracks, there is not safe route for people that are on Merryvale Avenue to Civic Center
The current path forces people to ride on dangerous roads
There has been some collateral damage with groups that supported SMART in the beginning (ex. Bicycle Coalitions)
Bicycle community is very strong and vital
Many bicyclists are disappointed that SMART is not running a minimum train schedule on the weekends
Marin County Bicycle Coalition represents 11,000 people who vote and are invested in SMART's successes
The bike community feels betrayed and let down by SMART
Marin County Bicycle Coalition will support the campaign once funding is allocated to the pathway
It has been 5 years since the MOU signed by MCBC – where SMART agreed the creation of a plan outlining the pathway priorities
The pandemic and the economic shutdowns have emerged cycling to stay connected
Bicycle trails are important for transportation for those low income
More connectivity is needed from SMART train and trails and tourist sites
When the North/South Greenway Gap Closure Project is built it will get people to get to the ferry
SMART should endorse East-West Bicycle and Pedestrian overpass in Santa Rosa over Highway 101
Suggested that SMART continue to link Pathways
SMART should support the Eliot alignment
SMART should endorse the Eliot-Edwards route
Windsor is a great bicycle town
SMART has eliminated pathway projects – only 2.3 miles pf pathway have been built in Marin County
The 2014 Strategic Plan, Page 9 – identifies the pathways which will be built first – segments will be build that provide critical access to stations
The pathway segment from top of Puerto Suello Hill to North San Pedro Road connects north San Rafael to central San Rafael
Once the greenway is completed it will help pass the sales tax
SMART needs to promote what is available (Pathway) at this time

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

North South Greenway Project – Blocked by fencing when lease was active, there is no need for fence
SMART needs to construct what was promised to the voters
SMART has eliminated 40% of the pathway in Marin County
Last miles of pathway improvements need to be completed
SMART is making progress in Sonoma County - Not all the pathway segments in Marin County that were promised to have been completed
Looking forward for the completion of gap closure when I can ride my bicycle to Larkspur
SMART has not put priority on construction of pathway
The gap decreases the utility
Payran to Oak Street is an important gap
The pathway needs to be continuous to be a better use for people
Enjoy taking the train from Petaluma to Novato Downtown with my bicycle
Taking your bicycles on SMART train is more pleasant than the bus
Many people use the bike/pedestrian bridge
Good job to what has been completed at this time – can't make everyone happy
Purchased a bicycle shop 8 years ago to help people get to the train.
The SMART train link has helped me to get to the SF Airport
The pathway is a good way to get vehicles off the road
Rohnert Park has the best and most continuous section of path
Once SMART builds the path it takes very little funding to maintain – much more recession proof.
SMART staff continues to look for funding opportunities to continue to build the pathway
There is complexity and regulatory agencies to construct pathways
There are no plans in place for completing the seven remaining miles – there is no funding attached to the remaining pathway miles
Appears that SMART is a rail agency and the pathway is an afterthought
SMART has relied on grant funding for a lot of the pathway projects and Marin is usually competitive for grants and we need to find another way
The remaining pathway segments between Larkspur and Windsor are about \$35-40M and don't feel that is very big given that SMART spent \$590M for the train system
Funding needs to be included for the pathway for the voters to support the sales tax extension
2006 Measure R outlined funding for the pathway and failed
2008 measure Q says that it's to provide funding for the design, construction implementation operation financing maintenance management of a passenger rail system and a bicycle and pedestrian pathway - that's an important and connecting the 14 stations from Cloverdale to Larkspur
More of Measure Q funds should be spent on construction of the pathway
It's tough to build a train system and pathway they are two separate projects
When SMART eliminated or makes changes to segments of the pathway -it will be helpful to engage the community that will be impacted

Crossings

Crossing near a creek has a log blocking the channel and concern with coming rain (Cloverdale)
State of California needs to provide approval for any new crossing

Development

There have been campaigns against the parking structures at Larkspur Landing
--

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Cornerstone Developer is presenting development plan (SR Railroad Square) to the City of Santa Rosa
SMART has done an excellent job of managing and building a project of this scale
Economic Development driver for Cloverdale – Alexander Development – granted a crossing over his property
SMART staff recognize the importance of the Alexander development
City of Healdsburg is thinking of relocating their station
Continue to pay taxes for a train that has not reached Healdsburg
Conversations happening in Healdsburg about the future of the local hospital and future housing - need to know more about SMART station platforms and get a clear picture of the planning
There is a lot of development in Novato and has the best stations
Concern with not having enough trains and connections with new development near the Hamilton Station
Many environmentalists in Sonoma County and a few in Marin County recognized the potential of SMART to reorganize future development in the North Bay
Marin and Sonoma counties are committed to increase residential density near the stations – why would you want to put Costco at the Northgate area instead of housing
SMART does not get involved with local zoning developments -work closely with the city and developer near SMART stations
The SMART train can contribute to housing solution

Marketing

Transportation Equity discussion
SMART needs a Marketing department
We need to get people out of cars and use public transportation (train/bikes)
You will have to change peoples minds to regain their trust and confidence, and you do that by engaging with them – collaborating with them
There is obviously work to be done in re-establishing partnerships and collaboration with these cities and council members

Cleaning

COVID 19 is a temporary issue – the reason they are not riding the train is due to SIP orders (schools, work, stores, and restaurants are closed)
The president of the Train Riders Association complimented SMART for investigating and use of ultraviolet lights as part of sanitizing the air on the train
SMART trains are sanitized internal twice a day prior to service and the highest air filters are installed – SMART continues to use the best safety practices
The train is safe and clean all the time
SMART is an essential service that provides transit service for essential workers
COVID Pandemic has affected all transit agencies
Prior to COVID a commuter was taking the train from Novato to Windsor

Ridership

SMART is not working due to the following: Cost per passenger \$66, inception \$38; need to make viable
Ridership needs to increase to increase revenue
It is going to take time to establish riders
It required a political deal to provide Ridership data
SMART has not met the needs of commuters and low-income riders

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

City of Cloverdale needs to work with Mendocino County and Lake County to get ridership information. City of Cloverdale does not have staff to get information

SMART has not generated enough ridership

When the pandemic ends it will be important to evaluate the riders travel needs

SMART's monthly financial reports lack information that can't provide the cost per passenger

If SMART does not increase ridership and connect with other transportation modes it will not decrease GHG

Have noticed the ridership on the train during the pandemic has been very low (1 to 2 people)

Board and Citizen's Oversight Committee

The Board has decoupled the SMART train from the SMART pathway

SMART continues to operate non-transparent (does not provide regular information on the performance of Transparency and Accountability is needed to win the next tax measure

SMART Board is a rubber stamp organization

The key issue to voters is about transparency and accountability

The COC could be a real asset to SMART if you restructured it to provide the kind of public input that reflects transparency and public involvement.

When you're not able to handle requests for information routinely, then I think it needs to come to the attention to the SMART board.

Freight

North Coast Railroad Authority is not very responsive currently

Transit Agency Coordination

SMART coordinates with 7 transit agencies prior to train schedule is released

Campaign/Measure

SMART has a lot of work to win voters

The public needs to be reminded why SMART exist and how the vision was established

I commute to Marin County from Cloverdale and disappointed that SMART initiative failed

SMART has created opponents from the biggest supporters and now the biggest supporters are opponents - this will make hard to get 2/3rd majority vote

What happen with getting the East Petaluma residents has a 76% yes vote in 2008 – Measure Q to 48% yes in 2019 – Measure I – need a solution to increase the voter % back to a higher number than 2008

There is a lack of support by SMART for a pedestrian orientated community in East Petaluma

The tax measure in the future can potentially pass – Measure DD successfully passed

Initially was a supporter of the train 12 years when measure Q passed

Extending the sales tax 10 years ahead of expiration is a tax grab

The vision for Caltrain corridor helped pass Measure RR

Both the Marin County and Sonoma County LWV have been long-time supporters of SMART. Unfortunately, in the last election, we felt that we could not actively support Measure I, which was very disappointing to us. But one of the things the league stands for is transparency; we believe it's very important for the public to be involved in their government and for government to be transparent and have a transparent process.

Huge supporter of the train help in sales tax campaign in 90, 98, 04 and 06

Revenue/Fares

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

The following Extension (Windsor, Healdsburg, Cloverdale) will cost more than revenue received
16 trains running cost is \$66,000; approximately \$2300 revenue
All transportation agencies are affected financially due to COVID
The public needs to demonstrate that SMART is a critical component in North Bay mobility – to attract future investment

Capital Projects Cost/Potential Projects

Very challenging to get Infrastructure funds
The cost of the Healdsburg Bridge has decreased. The Petaluma Bridge was purchased in Texas
The recession caused the SMART line to be constructed in phases
Station north of the bridge is very important
Very important for the train to go over the bridge
A timeline and construction cost will be helpful for the resident of Healdsburg

Schedule

Currently, it's a 45 minute drive from Larkspur to Santa Rosa
Train service worked prior to COVID
Many residents take public transportation to Santa Rosa for medical appointments which take approximately 4 hours.

Stations

SMART legislation (AB 2224) states that there will be no SMART stations in unincorporated areas north of Healdsburg
The Healdsburg Station should be built at the Healdsburg Depot near housing (transit oriented)
Healdsburg Depot has been multi model transit hub area
Consider a second station near the Healdsburg Community Center north end of town
Having 3 stations in Novato does not make sense
There are mixed reviews if there should be a SMART station in Geyserville
Alternate station north of Healdsburg
How to justify a second station in Healdsburg with the small population
Residents in Novato are honored to have 3 stations in Novato
Looking forward to having a SMART station in Windsor
Public discussion should occur to fix a huge planning mistake for the Larkspur Station
Implementation of transit orientated development within walking distance of rail stations

Extension North

Cloverdale should be marked a good town to live and commute
Sold home in Cloverdale, selling point was SMART train
Residents have very little hope that SMART will get to Cloverdale, taxes being paid
Excited to hear the SMART train will get to Cloverdale at some point
The SMART train will attract young people to purchase a home in Cloverdale and an alternative transportation method to get to Sonoma State and Santa Rosa Junior College
City of Cloverdale Elected officials need to support SMART and believe that the extension will get to Cloverdale (end of line)
The train will benefit Cloverdale in an economic benefit

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Healdsburg has been doing a lot in anticipation of SMART arriving

Last Mile Connectivity

Having an electric bus service is cleaner and reduce gas emissions

There is a lack of transit (bus) connections in Novato to and from SMART. Prior to Marin Transit route 49 being extended to San Marin Station SMART stations did not have decent connection

Train service benefits each city along the corridor

It seems like a multi-modal system where one must do multiple transfers to get to the planned destination

Is important to have to have that multimodal connections to SMART into other transit services throughout

Future Listening Sessions

The listening sessions are helpful, and SMART should continue to have them

Misc

SMART brings a lot of opportunity

Is SMART a government organization dedicated to clean, efficient inter-city travel linking to the North Bay with the greater bay area. If SMART is a train company the City of Healdsburg and Cloverdale will have to wait a long time for a train

Enjoy taking the train from Marin to North, since I work in Healdsburg

SMART service is better than BART and Caltrain

SMART provides a fantastic service to Downtown business in Novato

The Friends of SMART would have quarterly meeting with SMART General Manager – critical points were discussed at those meetings - to have staff liaison with local governments to make them aware of development near station areas

SMART is a very important transportation for Sonoma and Marin County

The pandemic has been very hard for SMART and other public transportation

There has been a divorce between the multi-modal transportation supporters and SMART train supporters

Plan Bay Area 2050 are having a hard time because they are given Green House Gas emission reduction goals mandated by the state - they have been focusing on more walking, cycling and more transit.

The community needs to embrace the transit system

There needs to be a shift in thinking about the public and requests for information.

SMART needs to see everyone as a potential SMART supporter and think about how you can move them over to seeing things from SMART's point of view

The future generation will benefit from the investment

Parking

The parking structure shall be funded by the car drivers who will use it – pricing of parking should be double the cost of taking the bus

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

Tourism

- SMART should promote and support tourism
- SMART can gain revenue by promoting tourism
- There is bicycle tourism and it's important to connect to trails
- SMART should evaluate how to get people from the train to other tourism destination Spring Lake
- SMART needs support tourism especially on weekends and evenings
- Cloverdale is a great tourism location.
- SMART Board has two members that are constantly advocating for tourism (Fudge and Zane)
- Tourist traffic is very important to Healdsburg and Cloverdale. Simi, Clo Du Bois and many others have wineries near the tracks which can contribute for platforms and service to their wineries

Pathway /Bicycles

Facilities, Maintenance and Safety

- Suggested SMART to add signs on the pathways for guidance
- Pedestrian gate needed at Rancheria are crossing (San Pedro Road) just like at Anderson drive
- Remove seats to provide more space for bicycles; having tags for bicycles (on/off train); During COVID use extra space for bicycles
- Consider having the bridge wide enough for pedestrian/bicycle pathway
- The Friends of SMART had alternative location for the Larkspur station which is closer to the ferry, and connections to the pedestrian over crossing
- 2nd Street to Mission (on Tamalpais Avenue) the light needs to function for bikes
- Pedestrian gates are missing at San Pedro Road
- The new segments around Novato recently are San Antonio road and the unimproved section there - When there is a backup of traffic on one on one that road becomes extremely unsafe for bicyclists and it needs to be put on a list on the list for improvement (very narrow road)
- A 32 feet wide pathway is needed where possible for all types of users (bike, joggers, strollers and walkers)
- An ADA level path is suggested underneath Highway 101 overpass on the south side to the tracks - Suggested real cooperation between County, City and Caltrain to complete
- We would like to see habitat enhancement, as well as the ability for bicyclist and pedestrians to walk through that area – the levee is actually our flood barrier and it needs to be raised - with the aspect of sea level rise so that Larkspur Corte Madera and County of Marin properties are protected in that area
- Between North San Pedro Road and SMART Civic Center Station – there is housing along Merryvale avenue on the south side of the tracks, there is not safe route for people that are on Merryvale Avenue to Civic Center
- The current path forces people to ride on dangerous roads
- Consider safety pedestrian crossings at San Pedro Road
- Way findings at stations will be helpful
- The maintenance of the pathway is very important – no toxins and more trash cans

Community Groups and Organizations

- There has been some collateral damage with groups that supported SMART in the beginning (ex. Bicycle Coalitions)
- Bicycle community is very strong and vital

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

<ul style="list-style-type: none">Many bicyclists are disappointed that SMART is not running a minimum train schedule on the weekends
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Marin County Bicycle Coalition represents 11,000 people who vote and are invested in SMART's successes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The bike community feels betrayed and let down by SMART
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Marin County Bicycle Coalition will support the campaign once funding is allocated to the pathway
<ul style="list-style-type: none">It has been 5 years since the MOU signed by MCBC – where SMART agreed the creation of a plan outlining the pathway priorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The pandemic and the economic shutdowns have emerged cycling to stay connected
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Bicycle trails are important for transportation for those low income
<ul style="list-style-type: none">More connectivity is needed from SMART train and trails and tourist sites
<i>Existing or Planned SMART Pathway: Closing Gaps, Endorsing Routes and Creating New Connections</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">When the North/South Greenway Gap Closure Project is built it will get people to get to the ferry
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The SMART owned fence needs to be removed so people can use the right of way that goes over the section that is being built over the Corte Madera Creek
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART should endorse East-West Bicycle and Pedestrian overpass in Santa Rosa over Highway 101
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Suggested that SMART continue to link Pathways
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART should support the Eliot alignment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART should endorse the Eliot-Edwards route
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Can the Board consider building the pathway from Foss Creek to Windsor Station prior to the extension to Healdsburg?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART should consider taking the lead (bike path) of the ROW area at the end of Industrial Way (there is a fence)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART should continue to focus on the completion of the multi-use pathway along SMART corridor, this will encourage people to get out of their vehicles
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART shall complete the Pathway from Santa Rosa (Bellevue) to Rohnert Park (Golf Course)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Windsor is a great bicycle town
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Move ahead and construct trails and pathways toward Healdsburg
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART has eliminated pathway projects – only 2.3 miles pf pathway have been built in Marin County
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Can SMART provide the status of the bike path along Francisco Blvd.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The following portion needs to be included North San Pedro to the Puerto Suello tunnel is very difficult to ride – need to go along Los Ranchitos Road as planned
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The 2014 Strategic Plan, Page 9 – identifies the pathways which will be built first – segments will be build that provide critical access to stations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The pathway segment from top of Puerto Suello Hill to North San Pedro Road connects north San Rafael to central San Rafael
<ul style="list-style-type: none">SMART should consider bringing the 5 key pathway segments to 30% engineering design

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

- SMART needs to you need to build the segment of pathway that connects North San Rafael and central San Rafael – building a pathway from the top of Puerto Suello hill to North San Pedro Rd prior to going back to the voters.
- The portion of the Greenway (from North San Rafael over the Puerto Suello Hill) need to be completed
- Once the greenway is completed it will help pass the sales tax
- SMART needs to promote what is available (Pathway) at this time
- North South Greenway Project – Blocked by fencing when lease was active, there is no need for fence
- SMART needs to construct what was promised to the voters
- SMART has eliminated 40% of the pathway in Marin County
- Last miles of pathway improvements need to be completed
- Focus on gap closure project big or small -makes it difficult for the path to be useful
- Connect the existing city center on S Fort Collins creek to McGinnis Park
- Connect Civic Center Station to Merryvale under Highway
- SMART is making progress is Sonoma County - Not all the pathway segments in Marin County that were promised to have been completed
- Looking forward for the completion of gap closure when I can ride my bicycle to Larkspur
- SMART has not put priority on construction of pathway
- The gap decreases the utility
- Payran to Oak Street is an important gap
- The pathway needs to be continuous to be a better use for people
- What is the status for completion of the Lakeville segment and Oak street Segment
- Need connectivity from San Antonio Creek through Petaluma
- South of Civic Center to Puerto Suello hill is very difficult segment
- Gap closure between Hanna Ranch and Vintage Way

Positive Feedback

- Enjoy taking the train from Petaluma to Novato Downtown with my bicycle
- Taking your bicycles on SMART train is more pleasant than the bus
- Many people use the bike/pedestrian bridge
- Good job to what has been completed at this time – can't make everyone happy
- Purchased a bicycle shop 8 years ago to help people get to the train.
- The SMART train link has help me to get to the SF Airport
- The pathway is a good way to get vehicles of the road
- Rohnert Park has the best and most continuous section of path

Funding

- Once SMART builds the path it takes very little funding to maintain – much more recession proof.
- The Board need to find funding to keep building the pathway
- Concern about completing the pathway when there is little use - Do not spend money to complete the pathway until ridership increases
- SMART staff continues to look for funding opportunities to continue to build the pathway
- Of the \$21.7M spent of Measure Q – Where was it spent? Pathway?
- There is complexity and regulatory agencies to construct pathways

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

- There are no plans in place for completing the seven remaining miles – there is no funding attached to the remaining pathway miles
- How much is SMART Funding vs Outside funding – SMART funds need to be committed to the pathway
- Appears that SMART is a rail agency and the pathway is an afterthought
- SMART has relied on grant funding for a lot of the pathway projects and Marin is usually competitive for grants and we need to find another way
- The remaining pathway segments between Larkspur and Windsor are about \$35-40M and don't feel that is very big given that SMART spent \$590M for the train system
- Funding needs to be included for the pathway for the voters to support the sales tax extension
- In order to support the ballot, the following need to be included: 1) report the pathway progress to the Board and public including grant activities; 2) include pathway project in SMART's budget every year; 3) bring all pathway segments between Larkspur and Windsor to 30% design and environmental clearance; 4) fund design permit and build the rail and pathway project concurrently just like Windsor project
- 2006 Measure R outlined funding for the pathway and failed
- 2008 measure Q says that it's to provide funding for the design, construction implementation operation financing maintenance management of a passenger rail system and a bicycle and pedestrian pathway - that's an important and connecting the 14 stations from Cloverdale to Larkspur
- Consider reading the 2010 Grand Jury report – it states what SMART should do
- More of Measure Q funds should be spent on construction of the pathway
- SMART needs to develop a plan, timeframe, funding for the pathway
- Rank pathway projects and allocate funding
- It's tough to build a train system and pathway they are two separate projects

Data and Information Requests

- Numbers that use the pathway could be helpful
- More information on SMART website and maps to be educated
- Include pathway data to website
- When will Payran to Southpoint be opened
- When SMART eliminated or makes changes to segments of the pathway -it will be helpful to engage the community that will be impacted

Crossings

- Jennings Avenue Crossing off the table – should be put back on table
- What is the process of SMART repairing the crossing once the North Coast Authority transfer process is completed?
- Crossing near a creek has a log blocking the channel and concern with coming rain (Cloverdale)
- Concern at the Olive Ave crossing which does not have any pedestrian arms. Will SMART install pedestrian safety crossing at Olive
- There have been campaigns against the parking structures at Larkspur Landing
- Cornerstone Developer is presenting development plan (SR Railroad Square) to the City of Santa Rosa
- SMART has done an excellent job of managing and building a project of this scale
- Double track is needed to provide more service in areas before expanding to Healdsburg and Cloverdale

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

- Economic Development driver for Cloverdale – Alexander Development – granted a crossing over his property
- SMART staff recognize the importance of the Alexander development
- City of Healdsburg is thinking of relocating their station
- How important is the rail yard in Healdsburg to the future of SMART, does it have an incentive?
- SMART should consider in participating in the City of Healdsburg Planning developments
- Continue to pay taxes for a train that has not reached Healdsburg
- Conversations happening in Healdsburg about the future of the local hospital and future housing - need to know more about SMART station platforms and get a clear picture of the planning
- There is a lot of development in Novato and has the best stations
- Concern with not having enough trains and connections with new development near the Hamilton Station
- Many environmentalists in Sonoma County and a few in Marin County recognized the potential of SMART to reorganize future development in the North Bay
- Marin and Sonoma counties are committed to increase residential density near the stations – why would you want to put Costco at the Northgate area instead of housing
- SMART does not get involved with local zoning developments -work closely with the city and developer near SMART stations
- SMART should include the vision of extending the rail line from the ferry terminal to San Quentin
- The SMART train can contribute to housing solution

Communications and Marketing

- SMART shall reach out to the following groups: environmental, bicycle, and tourism to increase support
- Transportation Equity discussion
- Connect with San Francisco Bay Area groups
- SMART needs a Marketing department
- SMART should consider promoting walking, bicycle riding
- We need to get people out of cars and use public transportation (train/bikes)
- Promote/Market the safety of riding SMART during COVID
- How does SMART plan to market itself as a quicker transit connection between Novato and Vallejo?
- Create innovative ideas for the people to take the train
- You need to rebuild bridges and improve communication with the chambers, city councils, and particularly the bicycle community.
- You will have to change peoples minds to regain their trust and confidence, and you do that by engaging with them – collaborating with them
- There is obviously work to be done in re-establishing partnerships and collaboration with these cities and council members
- It's also important that you let the public know about the things you're working on, because SMART is doing many things that the public doesn't know about. I would start doing regular press releases.

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

Cleaning

- COVID 19 is a temporary issue – the reason they are not riding the train is due to SIP orders (schools, work, stores, and restaurants are closed)
- The president of the Train Riders Association complimented SMART for investigating and use of ultraviolet lights as part of sanitizing the air on the train
- SMART trains are sanitized internal twice a day prior to service and the highest air filters are installed – SMART continues to use the best safety practices
- The train is safe and clean all the time
- SMART is an essential service that provides transit service for essential workers
- COVID Pandemic has affected all transit agencies
- Prior to COVID a commuter was taking the train from Novato to Windsor
- State of California needs to provide approval for any new crossing
- Promote the safety to ride SMART during COVID

Ridership

- SMART is not working due to the following: Cost per passenger \$66, inception \$38; need to make viable
- Ridership needs to increase to increase revenue
- It is going to take time to establish riders
- It required a political deal to provide Ridership data
- Data cost per rider
- How many additional riders will be on the train when Windsor Extension is completed?
- SMART has not met the needs of commuters and low-income riders
- City of Cloverdale needs to work with Mendocino County and Lake County to get ridership information. The City of Cloverdale does not have staff to get information
- SMART has not generated enough ridership
- To attract more train riders, need to ensure connectivity between SMART and other transit transportation are safe and efficient with enough time
- SMART should consider reaching out to the senior citizens to use the train when the pandemic is over. The train is safer than driving on the highway especially during commute hours
- When the pandemic ends it will be important to evaluate the riders travel needs
- Convinced that SMART train when it started that it will be successful. What are the projections to increase ridership, since money has been put into the train and would like it to be successful?
- Now with COVID everyone is suspicious about traveling on transit – what are the plans to increase ridership during pandemic
- Conduct a random sample survey when people will come back to riding the train
- How much is SMART currently spending per passenger – a metric that most transit system publish

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART’s monthly financial reports lack information that can’t provide the cost per passenger
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ If SMART does not increase ridership and connect with other transportation modes it will not decrease GHG
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provide greater ridership opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Have noticed the ridership on the train during the pandemic has been very low (1 to 2 people
<h2>Board and Citizen's Oversight Committee</h2>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Board has decoupled the SMART train from the SMART pathway
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART continues to operate non-transparent (does not provide regular information on the performance of SMART)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Transparency and Accountability is needed to win the next tax measure
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART Board is a rubber stamp organization
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Board members need to listen to the oppositions of Measure I
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART needs new Board members
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Cloverdale not having high population, what is the best method to inform the SMART Board of developments in Cloverdale
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART needs a new General Manager
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The functions of the COC needs to establish to assist SMART
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Board has lack of oversight on SMART staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Board approved the bond re-financing which added \$10 million in additional debt service – why did staff not present the alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The key issue to voters is about transparency and accountability
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Board needs to oversee SMART staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART needs to be transparent prior to going back to voters
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Member if the Marin Conservation Corp wrote a letter to the SMART Board in February 2020 addressing a few issues - 1) SMART board as its policy setting authority to work with management of SMART to respond to the public’s concerns that SMART address the promises in Measure Q – in particular the promise to relieve traffic congestion, fight global warming, increase transportation options – 2) provide a bicycle/pedestrian pathway linking stations and connecting to the ferry and bus service.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The COC could be a real asset to SMART if you restructured it to provide the kind of public input that reflects transparency and public involvement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Structure the COC so that you could automatically get public input from the constituency groups that care about SMART and care about what you are doing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Form a subcommittee of the COC to go out on a quarterly basis and gather public input from groups that are not a part of the COC.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Find a way to build regular public input gathering into your governance process, and you need to let the public know that you hear them by taking their priorities into consideration.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• When you you’re not able to handle requests for information routinely, then I think it needs to come to the attention to the SMART board.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report out (to the Board) on public requests for information.

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

Freight

- Does SMART have adequate staff to perform new functions (ex. Freight)
- Will the freight line help SMART?
- North Coast Railroad Authority is not very responsive currently
- Suggested contacting Caltrans to invest in freight to make highway last longer
- Should SMART be a freight carrier

Transit Agency Coordination

- SMART should integrate with Buses and other transit model
- Be proactive and prepare for Electric bicycles purchases are increasing
- More integrations with transit service
- SMART coordinates with 7 transit agencies prior to train schedule is released

Campaign/Measure

- SMART has a lot of work to win voters
- Evaluate the votes
- The public needs to be reminded why SMART exist and how the vision was established
- The Friends of SMART, how can they make SMART succeed
- As a potential council member what can be done to advocate to get SMART to Cloverdale
- I commute to Marin County from Cloverdale and disappointed that SMART initiative failed
- SMART has created opponents from the biggest supporters and now the biggest supporters are opponents - this will make hard to get 2/3rd majority vote
- What happen with getting the East Petaluma residents has a 76% yes vote in 2008 – Measure Q to 48% yes in 2019 – Measure I – need a solution to increase the voter % back to a higher number than 2008
- There is a lack of support by SMART for a pedestrian orientated community in East Petaluma
- The tax measure in the future can potentially pass – Measure DD successfully passed
- Initially was a supporter of the train 12 years when Measure Q passed
- Extending the sales tax 10 years ahead of expiration is a tax grab
- The vision for Caltrain corridor helped pass Measure RR
- Implementation of transit orientated development within walking distance of rail stations
- needs to develop and create a compelling vision for the future – this will help with the voter's support
- Huge supporter of the train help in sales tax campaign in 90,98, 04 and 06
- Both the Marin County and Sonoma County LWV have been long-time supporters of SMART. Unfortunately, in the last election, we felt that we could not actively support Measure I, which was very disappointing to us. But one of the things the league stands for is transparency; we believe it's very important for the public to be involved in their government and for government to be transparent and have a transparent process.
- SMART should create a committee made up of a wide range of community stakeholders to prepare the expenditure plan for the next sales tax extension measure.

Revenue/Fares

- The following Extension (Windsor, Healdsburg, Cloverdale) will cost more that revenue received
- 16 trains running cost is \$66,000; approximately \$2300 revenue

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

▪ Consider reducing fares to increase ridership
▪ Besides SMART sales tax, what other alternatives for long term financial planning can SMART take advantage
▪ How does the train contribute to the economy of San Rafael
▪ What is the cost to run the train from San Rafael to Larkspur roundtrip prior to pandemic – outrageous
▪ All transportation agencies are affected financially due to COVID
▪ The public needs to demonstrate that SMART is a critical component in North Bay mobility – to attract future investment

Capital Projects Cost/Potential Projects

▪ Very challenging to get Infrastructure funds
▪ Project schedule and the Cost of the project – How it's being done
▪ Board needs to analysis the cost/benefit of the extension to Cloverdale
▪ The cost of the Healdsburg Bridge has decreased. The Petaluma Bridge was purchased in Texas
▪ The recession caused the SMART line to be constructed in phases
▪ Station north of the bridge is very important
▪ Very important for the train to go over the bridge
▪ Can the track be updated to FRA Class 3 standards (50 mph) instead of FRA Class 4 standards (80 mph) to make it cheaper cost
▪ A timeline and construction cost will be helpful for the resident of Healdsburg
▪ Is there a cost to replace/rebuilt the Healdsburg Bridge?
▪ Take the construction cost of the extension to Cloverdale and consider double tracking from Santa Rosa to Larkspur to provide more frequent service
▪ Has SMART consider an extension to Corte Madera
▪ Has SMART consider a station near Vintage Oaks with the potential connection to Fairfield
▪ What is the status of Highway 37 project?
▪ Will SMART coordinate funding with Golden Gate Bridge and MTC to provide transit connectivity regarding Highway 38 project

Schedule

▪ Currently, it's a 45 vehicle drive from Larkspur to Santa Rosa
▪ Train service worked prior to COVID
▪ SMART should consider adding additional train times
▪ Maintain the frequency of trips
▪ Don't eliminate service, increase trip
▪ Reinstate weekend service
▪ Add more weekday trips
▪ Add more weekend evening trips
▪ Add trains for Special Events (Thursday Market in Windsor)
▪ SMART should consider having evening and weekend trips for Sport Events (Giants/Warriors games)

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

- Many residents take public transportation to Santa Rosa for medical appointments which take approximately 4 hours.
- Need to consider having train service every 15 minutes with no more than 30 minutes headways
- Consider adding additional trains during pandemic
- Consider increasing train service in the afternoon during Pandemic
- When does SMART plan to increase weekend service?
- Consider adding weekend service

Stations

- Residents of Geyserville would like a SMART Station
- Station needed at Fulton
- SMART legislation (AB 2224) states that there will be no SMART stations in unincorporated areas north of Healdsburg
- The Healdsburg Station should be built at the Healdsburg Depot near housing (transit oriented)
- Can the Board consider alternate station solutions?
- Healdsburg Depot has been multi model transit hub area
- Consider a second station near the Healdsburg Community Center north end of town
- Having 3 stations in Novato does not make sense
- There are mixed reviews if there should be a SMART station in Geyserville
- Alternate station north of Healdsburg
- How to justify a second station in Healdsburg with the small population
- Residents in Novato are honored to have 3 stations in Novato
- Looking forward to having a SMART station in Windsor
- Larkspur Station is very close to the shopping area - How to get the riders from the larkspur station to the ferry
- Public discussion should occur to fix a huge planning mistake for the Larkspur Station
- Implementation of transit orientated development within walking distance of rail stations

Extension North

- Cloverdale should be marked a good town to live and commute
- What is SMART's plan to get the train service to Healdsburg over the bridge
- Sold home in Cloverdale, selling point was SMART train
- Residents have very little hope that SMART will get to Cloverdale, taxes being paid
- Excited to hear the SMART train will get to Cloverdale at some point
- The SMART train will attract young people to purchase a home in Cloverdale and an alternative transportation method to get to Sonoma State and Santa Rosa Junior College
- City of Cloverdale Elected officials need to support SMART and believe that the extension will get to Cloverdale (end of line)

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

- The train will benefit Cloverdale in an economic benefit
- The town of Geyserville has a planning committee and would like SMART to make a presentation. Ms. Fudge provided a SMART presentation at the Geyserville Fire Station prior to Kincadee fire'
- Does SMART and the Board value the feedback of the Residents of Healdsburg
- Healdsburg has been doing a lot in anticipation of SMART arriving
- What are the plans to get to Healdsburg? It will be good for the residents of Healdsburg and Cloverdale to know a date.

Last Mile Connectivity

- Consider conducting analysis of an electric bus from Cloverdale to Windsor vs. train service
- Having an electric bus service is cleaner and reduce gas emissions
- Can an electric bus be used on the same train schedule from Cloverdale to Windsor?
- SMART should consider an alternate source of power for the trains
- How can the community and councilmembers advocate the extension to Healdsburg?
- There is a lack of transit (bus) connections in Novato to and from SMART. Prior to Marin Transit route 49 being extended to San Marin Station SMART stations did not have decent connection
- Is there a way to improve transit connection between Marin Transit and SMART with the current train schedule?
- Consider evaluating Marin Transit Route 49 connections with SMART train service. currently the train departs 90 seconds after arriving at the platforms
- Train service benefits each city along the corridor
- It seems like a multi-modal system where one must do multiple transfers to get to the planned destination
- Is important to have to have that multimodal connections to SMART into other transit services throughout

Safety

- How do the fatal accidents that have occurred compare to other rail systems?
- Staff was asked to provide an update on the incidents that have occurred the North San Pedro Road – how does staff proceed after each incident
- Are there any outstanding issue that need to be resolved with the 2nd and 3rd street traffic in San Rafael
- What is the status/situation of the traffic in Downtown San Rafael near the station

Future Listening Sessions

- Will there be a session with the Geyserville planning committee?
- Is a listening session going to be scheduled for the pedestrian orientated community
- The listening sessions are helpful, and SMART should continue to have them
- We urge you to make this (Listening Forum exercise) an ongoing process rather than a one-shot effort and look to the successes of other agencies and how they structure and use their community advisory boards as a guide to what SMART does.

Alternative Transportation Modes

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ People who are up to date in transportation thinking are realizing they recognize that we need alternative modes which is one of the reasons that I worked for 30 years to bring SMART into existence
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Greenhouse emissions need to be reduced
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Busses take cars off the road and now SMART takes cars off the road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The train has safe a convenient way to commute
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Is there a formula that helps with traffic congestion for each town?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Public transportation is public service and meant not to be profitable just like our roads are public service
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions have been minimal given the costs of SMART. When you look at SMART’s claim of reducing 8 million pounds of carbon dioxide, it equated to 2000 tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year. That’s only 1/7th of 1% of Marin’s annual GHG emissions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ We’re also concerned about the increased traffic congestion and air pollution from cars in San Rafael
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The SMART train is not electric
Misc
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Better response for PRA
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART brings a lot of opportunity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Residents of Cloverdale need to know why SMART to Cloverdale is not included in MTC Plan Bay Area
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART should consider reviewing the Healdsburg Intercity Intermodal Transportation Plan that was prepared by Sonoma County Transit and all the planning studies over the last 25 yrs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Is SMART a government organization dedicated to clean, efficient inter-city travel linking to the North Bay with the greater bay area. If SMART is a train company the City of Healdsburg and Cloverdale will have to wait a long time for a train
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Enjoy taking the train from Marin to North, since I work in Healdsburg
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART service is better than BART and Caltrain
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART provides a fantastic service to Downtown business in Novato
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Friends of SMART would have quarterly meeting with SMART General Manager – critical points were discussed at those meetings - to have staff liaison with local governments to make them aware of development near station areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Friends of SMART suggested the start of a planning process to connect the Larkspur station to the ferry.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMART is a very important transportation for Sonoma and Marin County
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The pandemic has been very hard for SMART and other public transportation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ There has been a divorce between the multi-modal transportation supporters and SMART train supporters
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Plan Bay Area 2050 are having a hard time because they are given Green House Gas emission reduction goals mandated by the state - they have been focusing on more walking, cycling and more transit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The community needs to embrace the transit system
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The future generation will benefit from the investment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There needs to be a shift in thinking about the public and requests for information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SMART needs to see everyone as a potential SMART supporter and think about how you can move them over to seeing things from SMART’s point of view

LISTENING SESSION BY COMMENT

Parking

- The community did not want a parking garage at the ferry – Not sure why TAM continues to pursue funding for the structure when the parking spaces are empty at night. Does SMART have anything to with this?
- The parking structure shall be funded by the car drivers who will use it – pricing of parking should be