

Plan Bay Area 2050: Amendment

October 2024

Project Staff

Matt Maloney

Deputy Executive Director, Metro Planning & Policy

Dave Vautin

Assistant Director

Adam Noelting

Principal Planner, Project Manager

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Transportation Element	1
Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2050	1
Comments & Responses to Comments	3
Approval of the Amendment.....	6
Appendix A: Summary of Comments.....	7

Table of Figures

Table 1. Transportation Project List Revision Summary (in billions of YOES\$)	2
Table 2. Comment Themes in Favor of the Amendment:	3
Table 3. Comment Themes in Opposition to the Amendment	5
Table 4. Comments Received through Online Comment Form (www.planbayarea.org/finalplan2050)	7
Table 5. Comments Received via Email (Plan Bay Area Info or MTC Email Inboxes)	15

Introduction

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) jointly adopted Plan Bay Area 2050 on October 21, 2021 (MTC Resolution No. 4485 and ABAG Resolution No. 09-2021). Plan Bay Area 2050 is the current long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

Plan Bay Area 2050 is a 30-year plan designed to chart a course to make the Bay Area affordable, connected, diverse, healthy, and vibrant for all residents through 2050 and beyond. It includes thirty-five strategies across four key elements: housing, the economy, transportation, and the environment. These strategies provide a blueprint for future growth, enhance regional equity and resilience, and aim to achieve regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board pursuant to Senate Bill 375. Plan Bay Area 2050 includes supplemental reports for more details. You can find these documents and the adopted final plan at <https://planbayarea.org/finalplan2050>.

MTC and ABAG have amended Plan Bay Area 2050, revising the fiscally-constrained transportation element to include the scope and cost of the Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District (SMART) passenger rail extension to Healdsburg in Sonoma County and to remove investments in US-101/Railroad Avenue interchange improvements as well as the Farmers Lane extension.

Transportation Element

The transportation element of Plan Bay Area 2050 includes 12 strategies with a total investment of \$578 billion, charting the course for the region's roads, highways, bridges, transit, and active transportation infrastructure. The list of projects and programs included in these strategies is fiscally constrained and is documented in the Plan Bay Area 2050 Transportation Project List.

The Plan Bay Area 2050 Transportation Project List categorizes transportation projects into two types: exempt projects and regionally significant capacity-increasing projects. Regionally significant capacity-increasing projects must be included in the regional transportation-air quality conformity determination and be listed with their scopes and costs in the Plan Bay Area 2050 Transportation Project List to progress from concept to construction.

Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2050

An amendment is a major revision to the plan's transportation project list for major changes in project costs or scope, including adding or deleting a project, changing project locations or the number of through traffic lanes. As stipulated in MTC's Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 4590), an amendment requires public review and comment, demonstration that the project can be completed based on expected funding, and/or a finding that the change is consistent with

federal transportation conformity mandates. Amendments that require an update to the air quality conformity analysis will be subject to the conformity and interagency consultation procedures described in MTC Resolution No. 3757.

In spring 2024, the California Department of Transportation District 4 requested an amendment to Plan Bay Area 2050. The request was to add a new regionally significant project to the plan by extending SMART passenger rail service northward from the Town of Windsor in Sonoma County.

The increased costs for the SMART rail extension project to the City of Healdsburg have been offset by equivalent reductions in the costs and scope of other Sonoma County projects and programs within the plan's fiscally constrained transportation project list. No additional funds have been added to the transportation revenue forecast. As a result, the amended plan remains fiscally constrained, as required by federal and state planning laws. Table 1 below outlines the revisions to the Plan Bay Area 2050 Transportation Project List.

The changes reflected in this amendment, as reflected in Table 1, have been incorporated into the latest planning assumptions for regionally significant capacity-increasing projects, as reflected in the regional emissions analysis for the Amended Plan Bay Area 2050 and 2025 Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 1. Transportation Project List Revision Summary (in billions of YOES\$)

RTP ID	Title	Scope	Open Period	Funding* (millions)
21-T11-202	Rail Service Expansion SMART to Healdsburg	This program includes funding to extend SMART rail service from Windsor to Healdsburg.	2021 – 2035	\$259
21-T11-113	Rail Service Expansion SMART to Windsor	This program includes funding to extend SMART rail service from the Sonoma County Airport in Santa Rosa to Windsor.	2021 – 2035	\$142 <u>\$70</u>
21-T06-029	Corridor & Interchange Improvements US-101 Sonoma County	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements at Arata Ln, Hearn Ave, Railroad Ave , and Rainier Ave and new HOV lanes through Petaluma ("Marin-Sonoma Narrows").	2021 – 2035	\$239 \$183
21-T07-056	Minor Roadway Improvements Regional	This program includes funding to implement minor roadway improvements. This program generally implements projects exempt from regional air quality conformity, but it does include non-exempt local	Various	\$5,700 \$5,569

		<p>roadway widenings or extensions. Improvements include local road extensions or new lanes, and intersection improvements such as channelization and signalization. Example projects include improvements to Oakland Army Base, Quarry Lakes Pkwy (East-West Connector), Decoto Rd, Dublin Blvd, El Charro Rd, and Auto Mall Pkwy (ALA); Newell Dr and Airport Junction (NAP); implementation of Envision Expressway program, Calaveras Blvd, and Mary Ave (SCL); Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point local roads, Alemany Rd, Treasure Island (SF); and Farmers Ln (SON).</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Note: Original entries are shown with a strikethrough, while revised entries are shown in italics and underlined.

No other changes or revisions are proposed with this amendment.

Comments & Responses to Comments

Following MTC’s Public Participation Plan, MTC and ABAG released the proposed amendment for a 30-day public review and comment period, which took place from August 12, 2024, to September 11, 2024. The public comment period generated just over fifty responses. The majority of comments supported the SMART extension to Healdsburg, while a smaller number raised concerns or opposition to aspects of the proposal. Below is a summary of the comment themes made by those in favor and those opposed to the amendment.

Table 2. Comment Themes in Favor of the Amendment:

Comment Theme	Response
<p>Support for SMART Extension to Healdsburg and Cloverdale:</p> <p>Many commenters expressed strong support for extending SMART to Healdsburg, with a significant number also urging further extension to Cloverdale. These supporters stated that</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>The final amendment only includes the extension of passenger rail service to Healdsburg. To add the Cloverdale extension, further analysis would be required to evaluate its impact on regional</p>

Cloverdale residents have been paying into the SMART tax without receiving rail service and that completing the extension would fulfill promises made to these communities. They highlighted the extension's potential to connect disadvantaged communities to jobs, education, and essential services, contributing to social and economic justice.

greenhouse gas emissions and criteria pollutants. Additionally, the plan must remain fiscally constrained. For the Healdsburg extension, other Sonoma County projects were reduced and removed to accommodate the costs. A similar approach would be needed for Cloverdale - but on a greater scale given its higher costs - meaning additional projects would need to be cut or scaled back.

A public comment period, in line with MTC's Public Participation Plan, would also be required. Lastly, before approving the Cloverdale extension, a more detailed analysis would be needed to determine if the extension would lead to any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts already identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Plan Bay Area 2050.

In coordination with Transit 2050+ partners, MTC/ABAG will continue considering whether to include SMART extension to Cloverdale as part of the next cycle of long-range planning, currently underway. The Transit 2050+ Final Network will be integrated into Plan Bay Area 2050+, with adoption currently slated in December 2025.

Economic and Environmental Benefits:

Many commenters stated that the SMART extension is essential for reducing traffic congestion, lowering greenhouse gas emissions, and helping the region meet its climate goals. They emphasized the environmental benefits of shifting more people from cars to public transit, which would reduce air pollution and help mitigate climate change. Supporters also noted the economic benefits, stating that the extension would enhance access to jobs and affordable housing, promoting sustainable growth in the North Bay.

Response:

The environmental impacts of implementing the amendment were assessed in the Addendum to the Final EIR for Plan Bay Area 2050. The conclusion in the addendum was that the amendment would not result in any new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of the previously identified significant effects disclosed in the Final EIR completed for the Plan.

Community Preparedness and Resilience:

Response:

Several commenters made the case that expanding SMART would increase the region's resilience to disasters such as wildfires and floods. They emphasized that having alternative transportation options in place is crucial for disaster preparedness and recovery. Additionally, supporters pointed out that the extension would contribute to the long-term recovery from recent wildfires and the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in rural areas like Cloverdale.

No response needed.

Table 3. Comment Themes in Opposition to the Amendment

Comment Theme	Response
<p>Concerns About Fiscal Sustainability:</p> <p>A smaller group of commenters raised concerns about the long-term financial sustainability of SMART, questioning whether the extension could be supported without additional taxes or funding. They expressed doubts about whether the system could maintain its level of service in the future, particularly if local tax measures fail to renew. These commenters questioned whether the costs of extending SMART were justified given the ongoing financial needs of other transportation projects in the region.</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>It is important to note that Plan Bay Area 2050 is not a funding document and does not guarantee project construction. Instead, it outlines a long-term vision for transportation and land use in the region. While concerns about fiscal sustainability are understandable, this amendment provides SMART with the opportunity to secure funding needed for construction. If local taxes or other funding sources do not materialize, the project would need to identify other fund sources before moving forward. Plan Bay Area 2050 helps position projects like SMART for future funding, but securing that funding remains a critical next step.</p>
<p>Environmental and Infrastructure Concerns:</p> <p>Some commenters expressed skepticism about the environmental impact of the SMART extension, stating that it might not significantly reduce car trips or greenhouse gas emissions. They suggested that the environmental benefits of the extension might be overstated, especially if the project leads to induced demand for travel, particularly to tourism-heavy areas. These commenters called for more robust environmental analysis to ensure the project aligns with sustainability goals.</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the SMART extension were thoroughly assessed in the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Plan Bay Area 2050. The addendum concluded that the amendment would not result in any new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of the impacts previously identified in the Final EIR. Additionally, the Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis provides a detailed forecast of</p>

the project's effects, ensuring it complies with federal and state air quality standards.

Preference for Other Transit Investments:

Some commenters stated that regional resources would be better spent on other transit services, such as buses or ferries, which could serve a broader population more effectively. They expressed concerns that prioritizing SMART over these services may neglect other pressing transportation needs in the region. These commenters suggested that improving existing transit infrastructure could provide more immediate benefits to Bay Area residents.

Response:

Plan Bay Area 2050 includes a wide range of transportation investments in Sonoma County beyond the SMART extension. This includes increased bus service, HOV lane expansion along US-101, and a complete streets network including the SMART pathway for cyclists and pedestrians. The plan also funds important street and highway improvements to improve mobility.

A full summary of comments received is provided in **Appendix A**.

Approval of the Amendment

This amendment to Plan Bay Area 2050, combined with the final Plan Bay Area 2050, now constitutes the complete and revised plan. This amendment is supported by two key technical documents: (1) the Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the Amended Plan Bay Area 2050 and the 2025 Transportation Improvement Program, and (2) the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Plan Bay Area 2050. Both the amendment and these technical documents have been reviewed and approved by MTC and ABAG in October 2024, through the adoption of MTC Resolution No. 4667 and ABAG Resolution No. 10-2024.

MTC and ABAG reviewed all relevant information and data in the administrative record, including the Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis (MTC Resolution No. 4665), the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (MTC Resolution No. 4666 and ABAG Resolution No. 09-2024), as well as all oral and written evidence presented during public meetings prior to final approval.

Appendix A: Summary of Comments

Table 4. Comments Received through Online Comment Form (www.planbayarea.org/finalplan2050)

#	Commentor	Comment(s)
1	Jo Ann Mandinach	Stop the insanity of replacing parking on BOTH sides of El Camino Real with bike lanes for its entire length. How many TENS of thousands of businesses will this destroy
2	Bill Hough	I'll believe global warming is a problem when the rich people telling me it is as a problem start ACTING like it is a problem. They can start by selling their private jets.
3	Victor	PLEASE DO NOT ADD MORE TAXES. More jobs and population will go to other states. Please propose plans to use the already VERY HIGH taxes being paid by the people of California. Parcel tax, Sales Tax, State Tax, County tax.... are all by definition taxes! Do NOT drive businesses and people away from this State.
4	Elliott P	I am in strong support of including the Healdsburg extension in this plan. I would also support inclusion of the Cloverdale extension. SMART needs as much support as it can get.
5	Gavin Waters	Why doesn't the amendment address the planned SMART extension to Cloverdale? The real thing that should be in the plan is the need for increased frequency of service and the fact that the smart train does not connect directly to other transportation in the area (STS, Larkspur ferry terminal, SFO). Plan 2050 does not have enough detail about specific actions that will be taken to integrate transit schedules and increase frequency to make regional transit realistic. I need to go to Hayward and SFO on transit and there are no realistic options from Sonoma County. These regional transit standards should have been in place since the 1970s, not maybe by 2050!
6	Bill Mayben	To what extent is a sustainable community autonomous? Should it include food production, commerce, energy sufficiency, digital as well as transportation connectivity? Previously I suggested that PBA2050 encompasses only the "toes" of 9 Bay Area counties; yet the Plan avoids the realities of sea level rise by setting in motion extraordinary expenditures on sea walls to safely maintain a centralized commercial and residential footprint; essentially concentrating rather than decentralizing future growth.

		<p>The costs to maintain a concentrated commercial and residential Bay Area within the available land area going forward in time are incalculable; extending far beyond 2050.</p> <p>The original decision to permanently adhere to existing city, county, and open space boundaries; given the realities of sea level rise, place all infrastructure; civic, commercial, and private and improvements at risk in the future.</p> <p>We are setting the precedent for development options far beyond 2050; meanwhile global warming, sea level rise, and severe climate events will become more costly and time-consuming in a deteriorating environment. Our belief that the features we have planned will endure exponential global warming does not match up with the science.</p> <p>A coastal solution has greater true sustainability only if it does not require constant major public cash infusions and infrastructure disruption to maintain it. The higher the proposed sea walls must be raised over time, the more vulnerable and uninsurable we become.</p> <p>Beyond sea level rise; we are vulnerable to earthquakes. This plan places an unmanageable burden on future generations.</p> <p>Decentralization follows a strategy of spending each public dollar towards the longest possible, safest, most affordable applications. There are areas in the rest the nine counties that can assure the safety and continuity of public investment.</p> <p>The UN has particular concerns regarding the effects of extreme climate events on cities with populations of 10 million or more. There are now 42 of these worldwide. Public safety, at a time when we can choose, requires stable, long-range solutions. 2050 is only 26 years away.</p>
7	Donald Robertson	I fully support adding SMART Train (which I ride regularly) to Healdsburg (and beyond) to the Plan Bay Area 2050.
8	Vincent Hoagland	I believe that in the long run the extension of SMART to Healdsburg will be used frequently by people wanting to go to shops and especially wineries were they will not have to drive perhaps after imbibing in too much wine.
9	Adina Flores	<p>The current plan does not appear to mention that if the SMART Tiny Tax fails renewal over the next 5 years, SMART will cease operations entirely. The measure failed miserably in 2020 and is predicted to fail once more.</p> <p>The transition to EV is utilizing enslaved children in the Congo to mine the precious materials powering these batteries. Black lives don't matter to the colonizers leading these efforts.</p> <p>When referencing 'affordable housing', the market rates have not yet been determined. What is considered affordable to whites from outside of our area</p>

		<p>(Sonoma County)? They appear to be utilizing CBO's such as Gen H which benefit the developers serving on their board. The average person of color will not be able to afford the rental prices, and our neighborhoods are being gentrified (E.g. Tierra de Rosas, Roseland).</p> <p>The Potter Valley Dam is being removed and will drastically reduce the water supply over multiple counties, therefore negatively impacting agriculture by means of water usage restrictions. If Measure J passes on the November '24 ballot, virtually all large Sonoma County farms will be banned. How can we claim that the housing projects in Roseland and other BIPOC communities are being built for the underserved? If there are no farms, where will the farmworkers be working? They will be forced to relocate outside of the area.</p> <p>These initiatives fall in alignment with the U.N.'s 17 Goals for Sustainable Development. My grandmother is an immigrant from Rangoon, Burma, and the byproduct of a communist takeover. These plans mirror communism witnessed within Asian countries, and I will make sure that all people of color are well aware of your intentions.</p>
10	Bill Mayben	<p>In contemplating the proposed TIP improvements, I have previously written about the extent to which these improvements depend on the proposed sea walls in many locations for their endurance.</p> <p>It also occurred that in building sea walls, PBA 2050 may assume flood liability for private property in the event of a sea wall system breach or failure; liability presently resting solely on individuals, families or commercial owners of real property.</p> <p>If civic structures such as the proposed sea walls were to fail; overwhelmed or undermined by Bay water; it is assured that those affected, and their insurance companies would turn to the municipal entities for restitution. If so; this liability then becomes a public cost; representing a new, enduring liability associated with the costs of the sea walls. Actually beyond 2050.</p> <p>While it is budgeted that the sea walls are currently captured to 2050 as a cost; subsequent development over the next 25 years will rely on the sea wall strategy as a permanent solution, encouraging any privately financed development to rely on them for the projected life of their approved construction.</p> <p>The likely public liability associated with sea wall failure or inadequacy resulting in private or corporate property losses, should be treated as a valid, related public liability, associated with all elements of the sea wall engineering and construction; for the duration of improvements built to depend on them. This represents a set of additional specific, long-range budgetary line items.</p>

11	Dani Sheehan-Meyer	As a community advocate for the Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit I urge the MTC to adapt the amendment to: Plan Bay Area 2050 to include Healdsburg Station. With SMART's growing ridership, surpassing all other transit post-covid, in the Bay Area, they are poised to increase ridership even more with the opening of North Petaluma Station and Windsor. Thank you, Dani Sheehan-Meyer Sebastopol, CA 95472
12	Mary Alice Fisher	Will the SMART train go to Cloverdale? We are paying taxes to support SMART here. We have a depot. Please include the northernmost Sonoma County city on the 101 corridor in the 2050 planning.
13	Victor Aiuto	I am a resident of Cloverdale, California, located in Northern Sonoma County. We have been paying a SMARTrain tax for nearly two decades, and our city has already completed its train depot. We have been long awaiting the train's arrival in Cloverdale, yet your 2050 plan, does NOT include the final SMARTrain leg - from Healdsburg to Cloverdale...why not? My expectation is that the "2050 plan" includes the extension to Cloverdale. We may be a small community, but we will mobilize to ensure that our community is not ignored.
14	Neena Hanchett	Extending & expanding the existing SMART system to Healdsburg and then to Cloverdale would give our residents, businesses, and visitors access to viable thru-county transportation options, thereby expanding their access to educational and medical facilities, as well as access to jobs and hiring employers throughout Sonoma County. The current situation is untenable with very few practical options existing to move people from Cloverdale to other areas of the county without the use of cars streaming up and down Hwy. 101.
15	Duane Bellinger	As a resident of Petaluma, I enjoy the opportunities the SMART train provides for alternative transportation. My destinations have included ball games in San Francisco (by ferry connection), shopping and dinner in San Rafael, visits to a Kaiser medical facility on Third Street, north to Santa Rosa and also to the Sonoma County airport (via last-mile SMART shuttle). The proximity of the Petaluma North Station to Lagunitas Brewery will no doubt be enjoyed by many. I hope to enjoy trips on SMART to Healdsburg soon, if for no other reason than to enjoy music on the plaza, visits to wineries and a ball game with the Prune Packers. Thank you for inviting comments.
16	Cloverdale Indivisible Steering Committee Pam Browning,	Cloverdale Indivisible represents 180 Cloverdale residents who are concerned with significant social, economic, and environmental justice issues that impact us at the local level, as well as at the state and national levels. With these concerns in mind, we have been reviewing the Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Association of Bay Area Governments (MTC/ABAG) Draft Amended Transportation Plan for the Bay Area 2050.

	<p>Brooke Green, Virginia Greenwald, and Vicky Groom</p>	<p>We were shocked and dismayed to see that the 2024 draft omits Cloverdale from the 2050 plans. As early as 1997, Cloverdale built a train station in preparation for transit coming to our community. This reflects how important SMART is to our residents. Moreover, this year we broke ground on building 75 affordable housing units — all within short walking distance from this station — in anticipation of this promised transit.</p> <p>Cloverdale has been Federally designated as a historically disadvantaged community for low income and low educational attainment. For us, SMART will be a Social and Economic Justice elevator. SMART will help level the playing field for disadvantaged students in Cloverdale by increasing access for our students to Jr. College, colleges and universities.</p> <p>Smart will open up many more job opportunities for our workforce, and it is essential for maximizing job opportunities and taking Cloverdale workers to jobs throughout the Bay Area. Buses from Cloverdale to Santa Rosa currently take 1.5 hours — too long for a reasonable commute for workers or students.</p> <p>Cloverdale’s economic growth has suffered greatly as a result of the Covid Pandemic. The anticipation of the SMART extension to Cloverdale will stimulate much needed development for our community.</p> <p>Dropping Cloverdale from the 2050 SMART Plans is not acceptable and is a betrayal of trust. Residents of Cloverdale and the surrounding areas have been paying the same sales taxes which support this project as the residents to our south who are already benefitting from SMART.</p> <p>Residents of our community have been big supporters of SMART. The only folks who have disapproved are residents who are anti-tax, anti-transit, and who have predicted that — while they would be taxed — SMART would never be built to Cloverdale in their lifetimes. Wow! Please don’t make them right and the rest of us stupid. What a horrible lesson that would be.</p>
17	<p>Lorrie Harnach</p>	<p>Cloverdale must be included in the 2050 SMART Plans! We are a part of Sonoma County so include us with the rest of the county!</p>
18	<p>Sheila Leighton</p>	<p>I was surprised and disappointed that extension of SMART rail service to Cloverdale was omitted from Plan Bay Area 2050. As I resident of Anderson Valley for 33 years, I saw how much enthusiasm the new rail service inspired when Sonoma County voted overwhelmingly to fund it through sales tax in 2008, with the goal of providing rail service to Cloverdale by 2014. It's now 2024, and all this time, Cloverdale citizens have been paying sales tax to support a transit system that doesn't serve us, and we are arguably the community that can least afford it. Please change the North Bay Near Term Project item that reads "SMART Rail Extension from Windsor to Healdsburg" to "SMART Rail Extension from Windsor to Cloverdale."</p>

19	Ann S. Medlin	Cloverdale must be included in the 2050 SMART Plans!
20	Linda Liebl	<p>I am a citizen living in Cloverdale since 2010 and I've been excited about the SMART TRAIN line coming to Cloverdale as promised in 2014. I am also a member of Cloverdale Indivisible. I agree with the comments submitted by Brooke Green as written below.</p> <p>"I was surprised and disappointed that extension of SMART rail service to Cloverdale was omitted from Plan Bay Area 2050. As I resident of 40 years, I saw how much enthusiasm the new rail service inspired when Sonoma County voted overwhelmingly to fund it through sales tax in 2008, with the goal of providing rail service to Cloverdale by 2014. It's now 2024, and all this time, Cloverdale citizens have been paying sales tax to support a transit system that doesn't serve us, and we are arguably the community that can least afford it. Please change the North Bay Near Term Project item that reads "SMART Rail Extension from Windsor to Healdsburg" to "SMART Rail Extension from Windsor to Cloverdale."</p>
21	Dennis Liebl	<p>Cloverdale MUST be included in the Plan Bay Area 2050!</p> <p>I was surprised and disappointed that extension of SMART rail service to Cloverdale was omitted from Plan Bay Area 2050. As I resident of 40 years, I saw how much enthusiasm the new rail service inspired when Sonoma County voted overwhelmingly to fund it through sales tax in 2008, with the goal of providing rail service to Cloverdale by 2014. It's now 2024, and all this time, Cloverdale citizens have been paying sales tax to support a transit system that doesn't serve us, and we are arguably the community that can least afford it. Please change the North Bay Near Term Project item that reads "SMART Rail Extension from Windsor to Healdsburg" to "SMART Rail Extension from Windsor to Cloverdale."</p>
22	Melinda Shaw	Please reinstate the town of Cloverdale in the 2050 Plan. We're a community that's trying to grow, increase our tax base and feel supported by our state. Smaller North Bay towns like ours need to thrive and participate and share in the economic powerhouse that is California.
23	Jeanne Miernyk	Cloverdale must be included in the 2050 SMART Plans!
24	Dobie Edmunds	Please don't forget your promise to the people of Cloverdale. We must be included in the plans for SMART. All of us are counting on you to live up to the promises made. Our future depends on it. Thank you. Dobie Edmunds, Cloverdale resident.

25	Ron and Malinda Thal	Cloverdale NEEDS to be included in the 2050 SMART Plan.
26	Jody Williams	Please, please include Cloverdale in the 2050 Plan! I have lived in Mendocino County for over 40 years and when I saw the construction begin (and be completed) of the RR stations on the edge of Cloverdale, I was so excited! At last an alternative to the long drive to SF! I grew old waiting for the train...and now I learn the darling stations are not included in your plan. Please include Cloverdale in your plan.
27	L. Diane Bartleson	I urge you to rectify your mistake of turning your back on the residents of Cloverdale who NEED the Smart Train to ensure our economic future. The good tax paying citizens here respectfully request an explanation of exactly why we have been paying taxes toward this promised benefit. If you renege on your promise, we will insist on remuneration for taxes paid and compensation for future lost benefit. We already have a train depot and exiting rail track. Thank you for your immediate action to rectify your committee's lack of commitment to promises already made to the 8500 citizens of the community of Cloverdale.
28	Marlene crane	I cannot believe you've left Cloverdale out of the updated SMART plan. We are always left out, yet we have to pay taxes for whatever comes down the pike. Shame on you! I'm voting no on every tax whatever it's for.
29	Candace Delgado	Cloverdale must be included in the SMART train extension. It's good for Sonoma County as well as the commuters and families who reside in Cloverdale. Please don't ignore Cloverdale just because we are at the very north end of Sonoma County and a small but growing community.
30	Sally C. Evans	Please reconsider and include the town of Cloverdale in the Smart train plan. We have been ready for the train here for years! Our stately terminal sits and waits for the expansion to our charming town.
31	Glenda Morgan	I was dismayed to hear that Cloverdale was not included in the SMART plans. This is a rather remote area of Sonoma in regard to medical and grocery stores. We have many seniors, some who cannot drive. Please reconsider adding Cloverdale to the plan as was in the original promise.
32	Tom Conlon	Mindful of our critical statewide and regional equity and climate action goals, any MTC/ABAG updates to Plan Bay Area 2050 (PBA 2050) must be securely anchored on clear objectives, factual data, and unambiguous findings linking the two. This is necessary so as to prevent local politicians (some simply under-informed, others

	<p>perhaps with conflicting more parochial objectives) from undermining the ambitious regionwide goals currently agreed upon and established in Plan Bay Area 2050.</p> <p>Because the transportation strategies are so fiscally constrained, MTC & ABAG must take special care to ensure that any regionally significant capacity-increasing projects are targeted first to addressing the needs of historically disadvantaged equity priority communities. This is particularly important to avoid replicating old patterns of ex-urban sprawl known to enable and facilitate white-flight, rural land conversion, and other harmful social and environmental consequences of poor planning.</p> <p>As noted in Alix Bockelman’s memo (July 12, 2024, Agenda Item 7b) on the proposed PBA Amendment: SMART to Healdsburg: “the analysis found that many of the region’s commuter rail projects, like the proposed northern extension of SMART, had low cost- effectiveness with limited ridership gains relative to their project costs. Furthermore, these projects often had equity concerns, given ridership forecasts skewed toward higher-income demographics.” These are facts that cannot be simply wished away because “it is clear there is strong local support for... the Healdsburg extension project.”</p> <p>To the Statutory Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- RE Fiscal Constraint: The two projects Sonoma County offers to trade off in exchange for the Healdsburg extension are actually “ghost” projects (Table 1, DRAFT Amendment, Aug. 2024). Although these projects (Farmers Lane, Railroad Ave.) have long been identified in County transportation plans and the old Measure M sales tax project list, for several years it has been widely acknowledged by Sonoma County planning staff that these projects cannot secure the necessary state and/or federal funding needed to ever be built. As such, they fail to meet the requirement of fiscal constraint.- RE GHG Target: Because the SMART train already induces more tourism-related trips than probably any other Bay Area rail system, the “small magnitude” claim should not be accepted without more evidence and findings. This region is highly tourism dependent, and air travel by visitors to destinations in Sonoma County are likely to be significant (as was successfully litigated in 2016 when Sonoma County’s Climate Action Plan was found to be inadequate under CEQA). Adding additional transportation capacity to Healdsburg is likely to induce greater air travel, which has not previously been calculated in PBA 2050 GHG estimates. <p>I strongly recommend rejecting the Amendment unless these requirements have been fully vetted and fixed.</p>
--	---

33	Sandy Erickson	Please include Cloverdale in your Smart plans. We have been anxiously waiting and supportive of the smart train for many years. Do not forget us! You must include us in your plans. It's imperative for our community. Thank you.
34	Tom Conlon	<p>Addendum to my previously submitted comment:</p> <p>SB 904 (Dodd), recently passed by the CA legislature, removed vital anti-sprawl protections originally contained in CA law. The following sentence was deleted from Section 105096 of the Public Utilities Code:</p> <p>"(c) In Sonoma County, north of Healdsburg, the district shall locate commuter stations only within incorporated areas."</p> <p>This suggests that if this Amendment to PBA 2050 is approved without additional conditions or fiscal constraints, SMART does not intend to simply stop in Healdsburg. Instead, SMART will likely seek to add additional new stations in Geyserville and elsewhere along the existing right-of-way all the way to Cloverdale and beyond. These as yet unanalyzed remote growth-inducing impacts of the Amendment must be fully assessed, and recirculated for public comment, before it is adopted by MTC/ABAG.</p>
35	Karen Davis	The Plan Bay Area 2050 must include Cloverdale in the plan for Smart Train Service. This is what we voted on originally in order to tax ourselves in Sonoma County to improve transportation to the northern edge of Sonoma County.

Table 5. Comments Received via Email (Plan Bay Area Info or MTC Email Inboxes)

#	Agency/Organization	Signatory	Comment(s)
1	Public	no signoff provided	See attached
2	Public	Adina Flores	See attached
3	Sonoma County Board of Supervisors	Supervisor David Rabbitt	See attached
4	Cloverdale Indivisible Steering Committee	Pam Browning, Brooke Greene, Virginia Greenwald, and Vicky Groom	See attached
5	Public	Roz Katz	See attached
6	Public	Rob Davis	See attached
7	Public	Joaquin & Audrey Espinosa	See attached
	Public	Carol Russell	See attached
8	City of Cloverdale	Mayor Todd Land	See attached

9	Public	Carol Russell	See attached
10	City of Healdsburg	Jeff Kay	See attached
11	Friends of SMART	Jack Swearingen, PhD	See attached
12	Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit District (SMART)	Eddy Cumins	See attached
13	Town of Windsor	Mayor Rosa Reynoza	See attached
14	Cloverdale Indivisible Steering Committee	Pam Browning, Brooke Green, Virginia Greenwald, and Vicky Groom	See attached
15	Sonoma County Transportation & Land-Use Coalition	Stephen Birdlebough	See attached
16	The Honorable Jared Huffman	Congressman Jared Huffman	See attached