

MARIN COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS AND COUNCILMEMBERS

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2026

In-person and remote participation:

College of Marin Kentfield Campus – Center for Student Success
835 College Avenue, Kentfield, CA

Online participation:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87936605205>

To call in and join by phone: +16699009128,87936605205# US (San Jose) or
+16694449171,87936605205# US *and press *9 to provide verbal public comment. Zoom
Webinar ID 87936605205#*

Full Agenda Packet available here: <http://www.mccmc.org>

Public Comment:

Email written comments to the MCCMCSecretary@mccmc.org before 3:00 p.m. on the
day of the meeting.

You may also provide comments in-person and over Zoom during the meeting. For
Zoom, use the 'raise hand' feature to provide verbal public comment.

5:30 pm – Refreshments | 6:00 pm – Business Agenda | 6:30 pm – Program

6:00 PM Welcome and Introductions

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call:** MCCMC President Gabe Paulson
- 2. Public Comment** (Limit 3 minutes per person)
- 3. Welcome and Introduction of Guests:** President Gabe Paulson
- 4. Business Meeting:**

4.a. Action Item: Consideration and Approval of the Draft Minutes of the September 30,
2026, MCCMC Regular Meeting

Attachment 4a: Draft minutes for the September 30, 2026 meeting

4.b. Informational Item: President's Update

Attachment 4b: includes MCCMC FY2026-27 Budget

4.c. Marin County City Selection Committee

Attachment 4.c. Background and Administrative Framework

i. SMART Board of Directors –

Attachment 4.c.i Letter of interest, Gabe Paulson (Larkspur)

ii. League of California Cities Executive Board –

Attachments 4.c.ii Letters of interest Jill Hoffman (Sausalito), Eli Beckman (Corte Madera)

iii. Marin County Transit District Board of Directors -

Attachment 4.d.iii Letters of interest Fred Casissa (Corte Madera), 4.d.iii.a Maika Laurens Gulati (San Rafael), 4.d.iii.b Eli Hill for alternate (San Rafael), 4.d.iii.c Melissa Blaustein (Sausalito) for alternate

5. Committee Reports (written reports only – to be published in agenda packet and posted on website, <http://www.mccmc.org/>)

5.a. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC)

5.a. Written reports provided by Pat Eklund, Novato

5.b. Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District

5.b. Written report provided by Holli Thier, Tiburon

5.c. Marin Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)

5.c. No meeting held so no current report per Barbara Coler, Fairfax

5.d. MCCMC Legislative Committee

5.d. Written report provided by Alice Fredericks, Tiburon

5.e. Transportation Authority of Marin

5.e. Written report provided by Alice Fredericks, Tiburon

5.f. Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit (SMART) Board

5.f. Written report provided by Gabe Paulson, Larkspur

6. Program Presentation: Aging in Marin

Supporting Older Adults in Our Cities and Towns

Long-Term Strategies and Meeting the Moment

Marin has one of the oldest populations in the Bay Area. As federal and state changes reshape health coverage, food assistance, and behavioral health funding, our cities and towns are often the first place older residents and their families turn for help, system navigation support, and community connection. At this month's MCCMC meeting, we will discuss Marin's aging landscape, the pressure points older adults face, and practical steps we can take in our own

communities to support older residents. Panelists will also share available resources, so every member leaves with at least one concrete next step.

6.e. Questions and Answers, moderated by Gabe Paulson

7. ADJOURN: to the January 27, 2026 meeting, **to be held as a hybrid meeting at College of Marin, Kentfield Campus – Center for Student Success, 835 College Ave., Kentfield.**

Business item 4.a.

**MARIN COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS AND COUNCILMEMBERS
DRAFT MINUTES**

WEDNESDAY, September 30, 2026

Business Meeting: 6:05pm

Business Agenda will begin at 6:05pm or upon conclusion of the City Selection Committee meeting, whichever is later.

In-person and remote participation:

College of Marin (Center for Student Success)
835 College Ave, Kentfield, CA

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE OPTIONS FOR THIS MEETING: Members of the public had the option to attend the meeting in person, or view and participate in the meeting remotely through the following link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82397688147>

Attendees could also call in via: +1 (669) 900-9128 (Zoom webinar ID 82397688147) or iPhone onetap: +16699009128,,82397688147# Options for Submitting Public Comment for this meeting:

1. Emailing MCCMCSecretary@mccmc.org prior to 4:00 PM on the day of the meeting,
2. Attending the meeting in-person at the agendized meeting location meeting or dialing *9 if calling in to the meeting.

Full Agenda Packet available here: <http://www.mccmc.org>

Video of the meeting is available here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7P_3w0b4BeA&t=1940s

Members Present:

Belvedere: Councilmember Kevin Burke (virtual)

Corte Madera: Mayor Rosa Thomas (virtual), Councilmembers: Fred Casissa

Fairfax: Mayor Stephanie Hellman, Councilmember Barbara Coler

Larkspur: Vice Mayor Gabe Paulson, Councilmembers Sarah Margulies, Catherine Way
Mill Valley: Mayor Max Perrey, Councilmember Stephen Burke, Katherine Jones
Novato: Councilmembers Pat Eklund, Kevin Jacobs
Ross: Mayor Juile McMillan
San Anselmo: Vice Mayor Chantel Walker, Councilmember Tarrell Kullaway
San Rafael: Mayor Kate Colin, Councilmember Eli Hill
Tiburon: Councilmember Alice Fredericks, Mayor Holli Thier

Ex Officio: MCCMC Secretary Christine Parini, MCCMC Secretary Rebecca Vaughn

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

President Gabe Paulson called the meeting to order at 6:09p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers, for September 30, 2026.

A roll call of the Marin towns/cities was taken. There was a quorum of the 11 Marin cities/towns, with representatives from 10 Marin cities/towns in attendance.

2. Public comment:

Joe McGarry (San Anselmo) is member of DSA Abolition group requesting removal of automated license plate readers in Marin County. He commented that average citizens going about their lives should not be surveilled.

3. Welcome and Introduction of Guests

3.a. Introduction of Guests: President Gabe Paulson welcomed guests in attendance.

4. Business Meeting:

4.a. Action Item: Consideration and Approval of the Draft Minutes of the June 24, 2026, MCCMC Regular Meeting

There were no public comments received from in-person or online attendees regarding the draft minutes for the June 24, 2026 MCCMC Regular meeting. No emailed comments were received.

There was a motion and second (Coler / Kertz) to approve the minutes of the June 24, 2026 regular meeting. A vote was called, and the motion was approved unanimously by acclamation, 10-0.

No public comments were received from in-person or online attendees. No emailed comments were received.

4.b. Informational Item: President's Update

President Paulson presented the 2026-2027 budget, reminded that City of San Rafael was no longer MCCMC's fiscal sponsor, that City of Larkspur is now. Invoices for fiscal year 2026-2027 had been issued.

No public comments were received from in-person or online attendees. No emailed comments were received.

4.c. Action Item: Thanks to outgoing President Stephanie Hellman:

President Paulson presented outgoing President Hellman with a bottle of wine and a bouquet of flowers, thanking her for her dedicated service.

There were no public comments received from in-person or online attendees regarding the fiscal services agreement for June 24, 2026. No emailed comments were received.

4.d. Action item: Meeting calendar:

October meeting will be the last regular meeting of 2026.

There were no public comments received from in-person or online attendees regarding the meeting calendar for September 30, 2026. No emailed comments were received.

Review Of Draft Agenda items for the October 28, 2026 MCCMC Regular Meeting. The hybrid meeting will be held at College of Marin Kentfield Campus, Center for Student Success located at 835 College Ave., Kentfield, CA

There were no public comments received from in-person or online attendees regarding the draft agenda items for October 28, 2026. No emailed comments were received. It was noted that the meeting will be hybrid, held in person at the College of Marin Kentfield Campus, Center for Student Success, located at 835 College Ave., Kentfield, with remote participation available.

5. Committee Reports

President Paulson noted that written committee reports were included in the agenda packet and available on [the MCCMC website](#). She thanked those who submitted written reports and encouraged the membership to review the reports.

No action was taken under Committee Reports, and no further updates were provided. There were no public comments received from in-person or online attendees regarding Committee Reports, and no emailed comments were received.

The following Committee Reports were included in the agenda packet:

5.a. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC)

5.a. Written reports provided by Pat Eklund, Novato

5.b. Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District

5.b. Written report provided by Holli Thier, Tiburon

5.c. Marin Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)

5.c. Written report provided by Barbara Coler, Fairfax

5.d. MCCMC Legislative Committee

5.d. Written report provided by Alice Fredericks, Tiburon

5.e. Transportation Authority of Marin

5.e. Written report provided by Alice Fredericks, Tiburon

6. Presentations: MCCMC received the following presentations:

6.a. TAM Sea Level Rise Study and Program

Presentation provided by: Anne Richman, Transportation Authority of Marin, Executive Director, and Mikaela Hiatt Isono, Senior Transportation Planner

- TAM's countywide study identified 19 focus areas and conducted 7 deep dives; built on existing vulnerability assessments to produce concept-level adaptation solutions.
- Solutions bucketed by cost: low (0–10M), medium (10–100M), high (>\$100M).
- \$17B estimated need for Marin; \$96B Bay Area-wide.
- TAM's annual sea level rise funding: ~\$300K/year (1% of half-cent sales tax); sufficient for planning, not construction.
- TAM role: facilitator/partner — not producing its own sub-regional plan; supporting local RSAPs with data, grant leverage, and coordination.
- Voluntary adaptation policy and climate-resilient design principles in development; jurisdictions adopting the policy would gain access to TAM sea level rise funding.
- Aqua fences identified as viable near-term solution for intermittent flooding; temporary pump stations also under consideration.

Slides can be accessed here: <https://www.mccmc.org/wpcontent/uploads/TAM-SLR-Program-and-Study-Presentation-v2.pdf> Video of the presentation can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xvaL5q4s5Mo>

6.b. Redwood Bike Share – Program Update

Presentation provided by: Marc Azevedo - Operations Manager, Redwood Bike Share

- Redwood Bikeshare provides 300 bikes across 7 cities, Larkspur to Santa Rosa; 55 hubs at launch, grown by 120+ additional parking spots.
- 23,000+ trips have been logged; 75,000+ car miles avoided over ~18 months.
- Year-over-year trips re up 240%; utilization is up 250%.
- 65%+ of trips by monthly commuter members; peak day is Wednesday.

- Membership: \$20/month (60 min/day); equity program \$5/month for incomequalified users.
- Hub-to-hub model; field technicians deployed daily in each county for rebalancing and maintenance.
- Communities with local municipal subsidy are the ones that sustain long-term success.
- Expansion into additional Marin cities (e.g., San Anselmo, Fairfax) would route through TAM/SCTCA.

Slides of the presentation can be viewed here:

<https://www.mccmc.org/wpcontent/uploads/Redwood-Bikeshare-Presentation.pdf>

Video of the presentation can be viewed here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xvaL5q4s5Mo>

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for October 28, 2026, to be held as a hybrid meeting in person at the College of Marin Kentfield Campus, Center for Student Success (835 College Ave., Kentfield, CA)

Business item 4.b. Staff Report

4.c. Marin County City Selection Committee

Attachment 4.c. Background and Administrative Framework

i. SMART Board of Directors –

Attachment 4.c.i Letter of interest, Gabe Paulson (Larkspur)

ii. League of California Cities Executive Board –

Attachments 4.c.ii Letters of interest Jill Hoffman (Sausalito), 4.c.ii.a. Eli Beckman (Corte Madera)

iii. Marin County Transit District Board of Directors -

Attachment 4.c.iii Letters of interest Fred Casissa (Corte Madera), 4.c.iii.a Maika Laurens Gulati (San Rafael), 4.c.iii.b. Eli Hill for alternate (San Rafael), 4.c.iii.c. Melissa Blaustein (Sausalito) for alternate

Marin County City Selection Committee

Background and Administrative Framework

1. MCCMC and the City Selection Committee

The **Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers (MCCMC)** and the **Marin County City Selection Committee (CSC)** are related but distinct bodies.

- **MCCMC** is the regional association and coordinating forum for Marin’s cities and towns.
- **The City Selection Committee** is a statutory body established under California Government Code §§ 50270–50279.2 to make certain appointments and nominations on behalf of the cities.

Although many of the same elected officials participate in both bodies, their authority and functions are different.

Topic	MCCMC	City Selection Committee
Legal Basis	MCCMC bylaws and member-city participation	California Government Code §§ 50270–50279.2
Primary Purpose	Regional coordination, advocacy, discussion, and information sharing	Appointment or nomination of city representatives where authorized by law
Membership	Marin cities and towns through MCCMC structure	Mayor of each incorporated city or authorized councilmember designee
Authority	MCCMC bylaws and agreements	State law and agency-specific statutes
Clerk/Records Role	Determined locally	Statutory clerk and recording requirements apply

2. Legal Framework

California Government Code §§ 50270–50279.2 establish and govern City Selection Committees.

Key provisions include:

- **§ 50275:** Requires the Committee to adopt rules and regulations addressing officer terms, meeting time and place, nomination and selection procedures, and voting procedures.
- **§ 50276:** Establishes the clerk’s role as permanent secretary and recording officer and requires Committee actions and individual votes to be recorded in writing.

For purposes of these provisions, additional review with County Counsel is appropriate regarding how Marin’s current operating structure satisfies the statutory requirements.

3. Current Marin Practice

City Selection Committee business is currently integrated closely with MCCMC operations.

The existing MCCMC roster distinguishes among appointments made by MCCMC, appointments involving the Board of Supervisors, and appointments described as being ratified by the City Selection Committee. Appointment responsibilities involve regional and state bodies including LAFCo, ABAG, MTC, BCDC, and the California Coastal Commission.

The City Selection Committee will continue to operate under its existing governance and administrative structure while the County formalizes its role as custodian of Committee records.

4. Peer County Practices

Feedback received through the California Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Association indicates several common practices:

Area	Common Practice
Clerk Support	Clerk of the Board commonly provides records or administrative support
Meeting Frequency	Generally one to four meetings annually or as needed
Meeting Location	Usually a fixed or neutral public location
Meeting Format	Formal public business meeting rather than dinner or gala format
Scheduling	Frequently coordinated with another meeting already attended by mayors
Records	Clerk offices commonly maintain agendas, minutes, voting records, and appointment documentation

Napa County provides one example in which the Clerk of the Board serves as permanent secretary and recording officer and City Selection Committee meetings are coordinated with another meeting already attended by city representatives.

Sonoma County coordinates with the Sonoma City Clerk, who manages a similar monthly gathering for mayors and councilmembers throughout the county. As needed, the County coordinates with the City Clerk to incorporate City Selection Committee business into one of those existing meetings. City Selection business is not conducted at every monthly gathering.

5. Agreed Marin Administrative Approach

The County of Marin and the City Selection Committee will enter into a **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** designating the **County Executive/Clerk of the Board of Supervisors as custodian of the official records of the City Selection Committee.**

The City Selection Committee will otherwise continue operating under its existing structure and procedures.

6. Custodian of Records

Pursuant to an agreement between the City Selection Committee and the County of Marin, the County Executive/Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall serve as custodian of the official records of the Committee. The Committee's designated administrative staff shall transmit agendas, minutes, voting records, appointment records, and other official Committee documents to the Clerk of the Board for retention.

The designation of the County Executive/Clerk of the Board as custodian of records does not alter the Committee's governance structure, appointment authority, or responsibility for conducting its meetings and business.

7. Items for County Counsel / Administrative Review

1. Confirm how Government Code §§ 50275 and 50276 apply to Marin's existing City Selection Committee structure.
2. Determine whether existing City Selection Committee rules and regulations should be updated or separately adopted.
3. Clarify the distinction between actions taken by MCCMC and formal actions taken by the City Selection Committee.
4. Review the current appointment roster to identify the governing authority and whether each action constitutes an appointment, nomination, recommendation, or ratification.
5. Confirm the records and responsibilities to be included in the MOU between the City Selection Committee and County of Marin.

Implementation Levels and Key Takeaways

The proposed MOU may be implemented at different levels depending on how much administrative responsibility the County and MCCMC ultimately agree should be centralized. The current direction is most consistent with the **Low-Level Implementation** model, with the option to expand responsibilities in the future if desired.

Level	What It Means for MCCMC	What It Means for the County of Marin
Low – Records Custody Only	MCCMC and City Selection Committee staff continue operating meetings, preparing agendas and minutes, coordinating appointments, communicating with members, and maintaining existing procedures. Final official records are transmitted to the County after meetings or actions.	County Executive/Clerk of the Board serves as custodian of records; receives, retains, organizes, and provides access to official City Selection Committee records in County custody.

Medium – Records + Administrative Coordination	MCCMC continues to govern and conduct meetings but coordinates more closely with County staff on meeting calendars, appointment tracking, document standards, records transmission, and statutory deadlines.	Clerk of the Board maintains official records and may also maintain a centralized appointment calendar, roster, records checklist, and administrative procedures in coordination with MCCMC.
High – County Administrative Support Model	MCCMC retains policy and governance authority, but substantially more administrative functions are performed by County staff. MCCMC focuses primarily on convening members, policy discussion, nominations, and decision-making.	Clerk of the Board may provide meeting coordination, agenda preparation, minutes, appointment tracking, notices, records management, and other administrative support pursuant to a formal agreement and subject to staffing and legal review.

Low-Level Implementation – Current Direction

Under the current approach, the County's role would be intentionally limited.

For MCCMC / City Selection Committee:

- Existing meeting administration continues.
- Existing meeting locations and scheduling practices may continue.
- MCCMC/CSC staff continue preparing agendas, minutes, appointment materials, and member communications.
- Appointment and nomination processes remain with the City Selection Committee.
- Final official records are transmitted to the County for retention.
- Governance and policy authority remain unchanged.

For the County of Marin:

- The County Executive/Clerk of the Board becomes the designated custodian of official City Selection Committee records.
- County staff establish a standard records-transfer process.
- Records received from the Committee are maintained within the County's records-management system.
- The County serves as a reliable repository for historical and future Committee records.
- The County does not assume day-to-day operation of MCCMC or City Selection Committee meetings.

Key takeaway:

This approach formalizes the County's records role while creating the least disruption to MCCMC's existing operations.

Medium-Level Implementation – Future Administrative Coordination

A medium-level model could be considered if the County and MCCMC later determine that greater consistency and coordination are needed.

For MCCMC / City Selection Committee:

- MCCMC retains governance and meeting administration.
- MCCMC and County staff use standardized templates and document-transfer procedures.
- Appointment schedules and statutory deadlines are coordinated with COB.
- MCCMC may rely on County-maintained appointment rosters or tracking systems.

For the County of Marin:

- COB continues serving as records custodian.
- COB may maintain a master City Selection Committee appointment roster and expiration calendar.
- County staff may assist with procedural consistency, record completeness, and statutory tracking.
- County Counsel may provide periodic review of appointment authority or procedural questions as needed.

Key takeaway:

This model preserves MCCMC's operational independence while creating a more standardized administrative partnership with the County.

High-Level Implementation – County Administrative Support

A high-level model would represent a significant expansion of County administrative involvement and would require further agreement, staffing review, and County Counsel analysis.

For MCCMC / City Selection Committee:

- MCCMC retains governance, policy direction, and appointment authority.
- Administrative responsibilities could shift substantially to County staff.
- MCCMC leadership would continue directing substantive business but rely on COB for meeting administration.

For the County of Marin:

- COB could prepare and post agendas and notices.
- COB could clerk meetings and prepare minutes.
- COB could maintain appointment rosters and vacancy schedules.
- COB could coordinate appointment notices and documentation.
- County systems could become the primary administrative and records platform for the City Selection Committee.

Key takeaway:

This model creates the greatest administrative consistency but also requires the clearest delineation of authority, staffing responsibilities, costs, and legal obligations.

Recommended Near-Term Approach

The MOU is best characterized as a **Low-Level Implementation model.**

The immediate objective is to:

1. Formalize the County Executive/Clerk of the Board as custodian of City Selection Committee records.
2. Establish which records must be transmitted to the County.
3. Establish the process and timeline for transmitting those records.
4. Identify the official points of contact for MCCMC/CSC and the County.
5. Preserve MCCMC and City Selection Committee governance and existing meeting administration.
6. Allow the parties to revisit the administrative relationship in the future if additional County support would be beneficial.

This phased approach allows the County to address records continuity and accountability without unnecessarily changing the existing MCCMC or City Selection Committee operating structure.

4.d.i. Letter of Interest - SMART Board - Gabe Paulson (Larkspur)

LETTER OF INTEREST FOR SMART: GABE PAULSON

Dear Members of the City Selection Committee:

I want to express my interest in being considered for the position of SMART representative for the upcoming term starting 2027. I am currently serving as vice-mayor of the Larkspur City Council, representative to TAM and president of MCCMC. I was Larkspur mayor in 2023 and have served since 2019. Regionally, I have also served on MWPA, Flood Zone 9 and other boards and committees.

I am motivated to serve as SMART board member for several reasons:

First, I strongly believe SMART needs experienced and informed representation for Central and South Marin. I have been advocating for last mile solutions and commercial/shuttle opportunities that better serve our communities for 4 years

Second, since I began to serve, I have consistently asked for key metrics to ensure goals are being met within budget, served on some subcommittees (e.g. selection of Citizen's Oversight) and promoted the passage of the SMART ballot measure

Third, as a member of TAM and a councilmember in one of the densest transportation hubs with overlapping agencies, (Larkspur Ferry, 101/Sir Francis Drake, SMART, etc.) I have identified more partnership and funding opportunities to promote our local and regional interests.

I am honored to put my name forward and would welcome the opportunity to serve the cities and towns of Marin County in this capacity. I am available to address the Committee at its meeting on October 28, 2026.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Gabe Paulson
Vice Mayor, City of Larkspur
gpaulson@larkspur.ca.gov

4.d.ii. League of California Cities Executive Board - Jill Hoffman (Sausalito)

Please accept this email as my Letter of Interest in appointment as either the primary or secondary position on the League of California Cities, North Bay Division Executive Board. I served as President of the Division in 2025 and Past President/Chair, Nominating Committee in 2026. Prior to this I served on the Board as a member in 2023 and 2024.

We have created excellent working relationships with our California League of Cities partners as well as elected officials that have made our North Bay Division particularly effective and well respected within the League and at the state capital. This is true not just among Marin County elected officials, but broader North Bay elected officials from Sonoma, Napa and Solano. This is true due to the core working relationships we have built with our broader North Bay elected group, but also because of effective teamwork with our outstanding League representative Nancy Hall Bennett. Our group has been particularly effective lobbying directly with our elected officials for Marin and our region on such important legislation that includes recent state employee pension legislation, and wildfire safety legislation.

I would be honored to serve on the MCCMC North Bay Division Executive Board.

Best, Jill Hoffman,
Sausalito City Council

4.d.ii.a. League of California Cities Executive Board - Eli Beckman (Corte Madera)

Dear fellow Marin Mayors and Councilmembers,

I am honored to submit this letter of interest requesting your reappointment as MCCMC's representative to the League of California Cities, North Bay Division.

In addition to my years of service representing MCCMC at CalCities, during which I've developed relationships with legislators from across the North Bay that allow me to be an effective advocate for our cities' needs and interests, I also bring to the role insights and experience gained during my tenure as President of the North Bay Division.

As you know well, influence in Sacramento is all about relationships, and relationships are built over time. Together with my fellow North Bay Division Executive Committee members, we have notched real wins on issues of critical local importance, including housing and land use; wildfire and public safety; pension reform; and local control more broadly.

With your reappointment, I would be honored to continue that important work on behalf of our communities.

Thank you for your consideration, and please do not hesitate to reach out to me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Eli Beckman
Corte Madera

4.d.iii. Marin County Transit District Board of Directors - Fred Casissa (Corte Madera)

I am writing to express my interest in continuing to serve as the MCCMC representative to the Marin County Transit Board ("Board") for the upcoming term.

I've been a Board member since 2022, first as an alternate, then as a primary representative. In 2026, my leadership role was expanded, and I was selected to serve as Board Vice President, with an opportunity to move in the role of Board President (2027). During my tenure with Marin Transit, I have gained knowledge and insight into its operations, inner workings; and the upcoming challenges that Marin Transit faces (i.e. potential financial cliff). More importantly, I have come to understand the importance

and impact of one of Marin Transit's key core mission goals: mobility and accessibility, which includes continuing to provide local transit service to all within Marin County. As such, I am the ideal candidate for the position.

Currently, I am in my second term as a Corte Madera Town Council member (former mayor) and serve on several other boards (i.e. MWPA, RVPA, CMPA, etc.). Thus, I can (and have) worked collaboratively and in partnership with others on a variety of issues that have an impact on a local/regional level. Further, as the MCCMC representative to the Board, I will be representing the needs of all the local municipalities, as well as that of the county.

I would be honored to continue serving as the MCCMC representative to the Marin Transit District Board. Thank you for your consideration.

Fred Casissa
Vice Mayor
Town of Corte Madera

4.d.iii.a Marin County Transit District Board of Directors - Maika Laurens Gulati (San Rafael)

4.d.iii.b. Marin County Transit District Board of Directors Alternate
- Eli Hill (San Rafael)

ELI HILL
September 23, 2026

Dear MCCMC Colleagues, Councilmember City of San Rafael I am writing to express my interest in serving as the MCCMC alternate representative to the Marin Transit Board.

As a San Rafael Councilmember, I have focused much of my work on transportation, mobility, housing, sustainability, and the connections among them. I also bring experience working regionally through MCCMC and other intergovernmental roles, where I have seen the importance of approaching

transportation issues from the perspective of Marin as a whole rather than any one jurisdiction.

I would also bring the perspective of a regular transit rider. Transit is part of how I move around Marin and the region, not simply an issue I encounter through policy discussions. I regularly ride Marin Transit and Golden Gate Transit, including Routes 23 and 132, and logged roughly 2,000 miles on transit last year. That experience gives me direct exposure to what works well for riders and to the practical issues that affect whether people view transit as a reliable and useful option.

I am particularly interested in how Marin Transit can continue to improve service reliability, connections between local and regional systems, access for people who depend on transit, and the usefulness of transit for residents who have the option to drive but might choose another way to travel. These questions affect mobility, congestion, economic opportunity, climate goals, and the accessibility of our communities.

I would welcome the opportunity to learn from the Board and staff, support the primary MCCMC representative, and be prepared to participate fully whenever called upon as the alternate. I would be honored to represent Marin's cities and towns in this role. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Eli Hill

Eli Hill Councilmember, City of San Rafael

4.d.iii.c. Marin County Transit District Board of Directors Alternate - Melissa Blaustein (Sausalito)

October, 2026

Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers

Re: Letter of Interest – Marin County Transit District Board of Directors, Alternate Representative

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to express my interest in serving as the MCCMC's alternate representative to the Marin County Transit District Board of Directors for the two-year term beginning January 2027.

For the past four years I have represented Sausalito on the Transportation Authority of Marin. That work has given me a close understanding of how countywide transportation funding, planning, and project delivery fit together, and how those decisions affect the

service residents use every day. Serving as Marin Transit's alternate would let me connect the two boards directly. I could carry TAM's priorities and context into Marin Transit's discussions, and bring Marin Transit's operating realities back to TAM, so our agencies work in closer step.

Sausalito offers a useful vantage point for this role. Our city is a true transit hub where Golden Gate Ferry, Golden Gate Transit, and Marin Transit service all meet. Commuters, students, seniors, workers, and visitors all pass through on their way to San Francisco and throughout the county. Coordinating schedules, connections, and first- and last-mile access among these operators is a daily practical concern for us. I would welcome the chance to bring that perspective, along with a voice for Southern Marin, to the Marin Transit Board.

As an alternate, I would commit to staying fully informed on board business, attending meetings as needed, and being ready to step in and vote at any time. I would also report back regularly to MCCMC so all of our cities stay informed about transit decisions affecting their communities.

Thank you for your consideration. I would be honored to serve.

Respectfully,
Melissa Blaustein
Vice Mayor, City of Sausalito
Commissioner, Transportation Authority of Marin
MBlaustein@Sausalito.gov
415-425-1472

Committee Reports 5.a.

5.a. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Bay Conservation
Development
Commission (BCDC)

5.a. Written reports provided by Pat Eklund, Novato

ABAG Report to MCCMC
1 October 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: This report highlights: 1) Regional Housing Revenue Measure for 2028; 2) Joint MTC and ABAG Legislative Update; 3) Bay Adapt Project & Funding Navigator; and, 4) Plan Bay Area 2060 Kickoff.

POTENTIAL REGIONAL HOUSING REVENUE MEASURE: On October 14, 2026, the ABAG Housing Committee and the BAFHA Oversight and Advisory Committees continued our discussion on a potential regional housing revenue measure, as early as

2028. As reported in last months ABAG Report, Phase 1 focuses on stakeholder engagement to develop a policy framework that may inform amendments to BAHFA's enabling legislation; Phase 2 would consider legislative changes necessary to implement the policy framework; and Phase 3 would involve potential development of a regional revenue measure guided by any statutory revisions.

A Regional Housing Stakeholder Committee (RHSC) was formed composed of representatives from over 30 organizations across the region to help develop recommendations and identify areas of consensus on key policy issues. The RHSC is:

- 1) considering a potential statutory amendment to expand BAFHA's authority to pursue a differentiated parcel tax.
- 2) developing policy recommendations along with ABAG Housing Committee across four primary issue areas: (1) Revenue Mechanisms, (2) Eligible Uses, (3) Labor Standards, and (4) Revenue Distribution.

The Revenue Mechanisms and Eligible Uses Subcommittees are evaluating options and identifying potential recommendations. The Revenue Mechanisms Subcommittee policymakers indicated general alignment with the RHSC on the concept of considering a potential statutory amendment to expand BAFHA's authority to pursue a differentiated parcel tax. Details on how such a tax might be differentiated (for example by different types of land use) and what exemptions might be pursued (for example, for low-income seniors) remain open for discussion and refinement. The Eligible Uses Subcommittee is considering whether BAHFA's existing expenditure categories and funding requirements should be modified to address evolving housing needs and improve program flexibility.

The RHSC will be recommending amending the statute to add homeownership as an eligible use of BAHFA's regional production funds. This would mirror the existing statutory authority for local governments; and, expand eligibility for operating subsidies to make deeply affordable homes more financially feasible, in particular capitalized operating subsidy reserves (COSRs). Additional concepts under discussion include increased focus on extremely low-income households, support for innovative and mixed-income housing models, additional resources for homelessness prevention and tenant protections, requiring just cause eviction protections attached to units produced with funding from a regional measure, and enhanced public engagement requirements.

The RHSC has achieved consensus to recommend amending the statute to: 1. Add homeownership as an eligible use of BAHFA's regional production funds. This would mirror the existing statutory authority for local governments. 2. Expand eligibility for operating subsidies to make deeply affordable homes more financially feasible, in particular capitalized operating subsidy reserves (COSRs). Additional concepts under discussion include increased focus on extremely low-income households, support for innovative and mixed-income housing models, additional resources for homelessness

prevention and tenant protections, requiring just cause eviction protections attached to units produced with funding from a regional measure, and enhanced public engagement requirements.

All of these recommendations and more will be coming to the ABAG Executive Board for discussion in the future.

JOINT MTC AND ABAG LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:

The 2026 state legislative session was shaped by affordability concerns, continued budget constraints, and federal funding and policy uncertainty. MTC-ABAG's advocacy focused on securing a Bay Area transit loan to mitigate near-term service cuts at BART, SF Muni, AC transit and Caltrain, advancing our co-sponsored sustainable communities strategy (SCS) modernization bill, SB 1087 (Cabaldon), securing dedicated funding for the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA), protecting transit and housing funding amid unexpected changes to the state's Cap-and-Invest program and supporting policies and programs to advance Plan Bay Area 2050.

SB 1087 (Cabaldon):

MTC-ABAG co-sponsored SB 1087 (Cabaldon) with our Big 4 metropolitan planning organization (MPO) partners to modernize the Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) statute. The measure, which was signed by the Governor on September 30, advances multiple statutory changes to achieve the agencies' three objectives and garnered support from more than 80 organizations, including housing advocates, environmental organizations, business associations and county transportation agencies.

BAHFA Funding:

MTC-ABAG formed a coalition with the Los Angeles and San Diego regional housing finance authorities to advocate for \$32 million from the state's General Fund for the three regional housing funding agencies, with strong support from more than 90 organizations. The final budget appropriated \$17.25 million, with \$6.75 million provided for BAHFA to support its new mixed income financing loan program, expand the Doorway Housing Portal and generally support "large scale solutions" to the Bay Area's housing challenges.

State Housing Funding:

The MTC-ABAG-supported SB 417, the Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act placed an \$11.25 billion bond on the November 2026 ballot as Proposition 1. If approved by voters, BAHFA will be eligible to administer a portion of a new \$200 million Community Anti-Displacement and Preservation Program. In addition, BAHFA may also

be eligible to access the \$200 million Local Housing Trust Fund Matching Grant program. To fill the gap before bond funds may become available, the FY 2026-27 state budget appropriated \$500 million to the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program, \$200 million to the Multifamily Housing Program and \$100 million to a disaster rebuilding fund. The Homeless Housing, Prevention and Assistance Program (HHAP) also received \$900 million for grants to local agencies.

BAY ADAPT PROJECT & FUNDING NAVIGATOR:

Bay Adapt Project & Funding Navigator (Navigator) is, a living dashboard that tracks the cost of sea level rise adaptation and empowers San Francisco Bay Area residents to explore adaptation projects, project benefits, and funding opportunities.

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and MTC-ABAG have progressed through a series of sea level rise planning efforts over the past five years, each building on the findings of the last. This started with MTC-ABAG's Plan Bay Area 2050 and BCDC's Bay Adapt Joint Platform (2021), both of which identified the need to better understand regional adaptation costs and to develop a strategy for funding them.

MTC-ABAG and BCDC jointly launched the Sea Level Rise Adaptation Funding and Investment Framework (SLR Framework) in 2021 and completed the effort in 2023. The SLR Framework delivered a substantive update to the regional sea level rise adaptation cost estimate from Plan Bay Area 2050. The SLR Framework estimated an approximately \$110 billion need (in year of expenditure dollars) to adapt the shoreline through 2050, with more recent analyses as part of Plan Bay Area 2050+ in 2026 slightly lowering that estimate to approximately \$100 billion. With only \$6 billion in anticipated public revenue, a significant funding gap exists regardless. Without adaptation, the SLR Framework estimated the region's exposure in excess of \$230 billion in damages to property and transportation assets. In 2024, MTC, ABAG, BCDC, and other partner agencies formalized regional sea level rise collaboration through an Interagency Flooding and Sea Level Rise Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU describes that "BCDC, MTC and ABAG will partner, with BCDC as the lead project manager, on creating a San Francisco Bay Area Funding Sea Level Rise Funding and Investment Strategy (SLR Investment Strategy) by 2026 and every four years thereafter," and specifies that the SLR Investment Strategy will build on the SLR Framework and the Bay Adapt Joint Platform to identify and categorize regionally significant projects, develop estimated costs and timelines, and analyze funding sources to close the gap. ***As most jurisdictions know, sea level rise adaptation planning and project development are anticipated to accelerate, pursuant to SB 272 (Laird, 2023), which requires shoreline jurisdictions to develop subregional adaptation plans for submittal to BCDC for approval by January 1, 2034.***

Link to the website: [Bay Adapt Project and Funding Navigator – Bay Adapt](#)

PLAN BAY AREA 2060 KICKOFF: Plan Bay Area is the long-range regional plan for the San Francisco Bay Area, integrating transportation, land use, housing, environmental, and economic considerations into a single planning framework that focuses growth near transit to support complete, connected, and affordable communities. It fulfills multiple statutory and regulatory requirements, serving as the federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the state Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as required under Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg, 2008). It has been updated every four years, alternating between minor and major updates, since the adoption of the original Plan Bay Area in 2013.

The most recent iteration, Plan Bay Area 2050+, was a minor update and unanimously adopted by MTC and ABAG in March 2026. It has since secured final approvals from key regulatory partners, including Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Plan Bay Area 2060 will be developed around 4 phases:

- 1 **Foundations (2026-2027):** This phase will establish shared priorities and examine key components of past plans. Core questions to be explored include: What is our shared vision for the future of the Bay Area? How effective are the existing strategies, or policies and investments, included in Plan Bay Area 2050+? Where and how should we plan for growth as a region?
- 2 **Outlook (2026-2027):** This phase will assess emerging trends, examine uncertainties and update forecasts. Core questions include: How might future uncertainty and the choices we make affect the region's trajectory? How much population, jobs, and housing growth does the region need to plan for? What revenue can reasonably be anticipated for our transportation, housing and environmental needs?
- 3 **Blueprint (2027-2029):** This phase will update, analyze and refine the plan's core building blocks. Core questions include: How do we piece together the revised strategies, land use framework, and transportation and resilience projects into a Blueprint for the plan? How effective is the Blueprint at making progress toward regional goals?
- 4 **Final Plan (2029-2030):** This phase will formalize and translate the plan into a final set of materials ready for adoption. Core questions include: o How might we tell the story of the plan to Bay Area residents? What are the potential environmental impacts of the plan and its alternatives? What actions can MTC-ABAG advance in the following five years?

Plan Bay Area 2060 will pursue an engagement approach focused on creating meaningful opportunities for all stakeholders to share perspectives and shape the region's long-range plan. This approach will prioritize depth over breadth, favoring sustained conversations over large-scale, one-time engagement efforts. New avenues will be explored for educational engagement and reaching new audiences, including gamification, short-form video, and innovative web content. Also, we are discussing the role of community-based organizations, collaboratively designing engagement with the region's diverse communities. Engagement with technical partners and elected officials will similarly center relationship-building, showing up to existing networks and venues, delivering timely updates and coordination roadmaps, and convening at key decision points to discuss priorities and tradeoffs.

This early public engagement process will revolve around the following questions:

- How can diverse community experiences expand our understanding of the state of the region?
- What outcomes do stakeholders prioritize for the future of the Bay Area?
- How well do our guiding principles of an Affordable, Connected, Diverse, Healthy and Vibrant region reflect current realities and aspirations?
- Where and when can stakeholders expect to shape the plan over the coming years?

Plan Bay Area 2060 has been scoped to be flexible, given ongoing uncertainty in both state and federal regulations. New greenhouse gas targets and guidelines from CARB are anticipated in late 2028, well into the development of Plan Bay Area 2060, under the timeline established in Senate Bill 1087 (Cabaldon). Furthermore, Assembly Bill 2296 (Papan) accelerated the parallel RHNA Cycle 7 timeline by six months, which must be informed by Plan Bay Area. At the federal level, funding remains subject to change and a potential rulemaking on equity could affect plan analyses and more. Staff will continue to monitor these developments and adjust the plan's scope as necessary.

The Public Participation Plan was adopted by the Commission on September 23, 2026, enabling the public kickoff of Plan Bay Area 2060 with an initial round of engagement this fall, focusing on early areas of work like revisiting the plan's Vision and Guiding Principles in the context of today's Bay Area. These topics will also be the focus of a joint MTC-ABAG workshop on October 29, 2026. Later in the fall and winter, staff will return to the MTC Planning Committee and the ABAG Administrative Committee with updates on the Foundations and Outlook phases of work.

UPCOMING MEETINGS: Joint MTC-ABAG Workshop – October 29, 2026 (9:00- 3:00 pm); ABAG Housing Committee - November 4, 2026 (11:30 am); Joint ABAG

Administrative and MTC Planning Committee – November 13, 2026 (9:40 am); ABAG Legislation Committee – November 13, 2026 (9:45am); ABAG Executive Board and Finance Committee – November 19, 2026 (4:30 pm).

1 Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers (MCCMC). For questions, contact Councilmember Pat Eklund; City of Novato at: pateklund@comcast.net; and/or 415-336-9913 (cell).

Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) Report to MCCMC¹ October 2026

BCDC STAFF JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION PROCESS: On October 1, 2026, the Commission began discussion on a proposed re-evaluation of BCDC's jurisdictional determinations along various streams that appear in the field to be within BCDC jurisdiction. The jurisdictional status in these streams as Bay jurisdiction was confirmed by new data and tools created by regional partners.

Catalyzed by the release of new bayland habitat data developed by the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) and the Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program (WRMP), a comprehensive map of BCDC's jurisdiction, called the Jurisdiction Screening Map, was created for the first time. This data provides high-resolution information about shoreline conditions around the Bay at a scale previously unavailable without a site visit by a surveyor and an ecologist. The development of BCDC's Jurisdiction Screening Map confirmed some areas as within BCDC's Bay jurisdiction and revealed a number of locations where previous Staff Jurisdictional Determinations may be outdated or inconsistent, especially around streams and tributaries.

A prioritized list of streams have been developed where BCDC records and current "on the ground" conditions appear to diverge afterwhich updated Staff Jurisdictional

Top 25 Creeks for BCDC Jurisdiction Review September 2026

	Location	City	County
1	San Rafael Creek	San Rafael	Marin
2	Lake Merritt Channel	Oakland	Alameda
3	Colma Creek	South San Francisco	San Mateo
4	Coyote Creek South	Mill Valley	Marin
4	Coyote Creek North	Mill Valley	Marin
5	Guadalupe River, Alviso Slough	Alviso	Santa Clara
6	San Tomas Aquino Creek	Santa Clara	Santa Clara
7	Calabazas Retention Basin	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara
8	Green Valley Creek, Dan Wilson Creek, Cordelia Slough Branch	Fairfield	Solano
9	Stevens Creek	Mountain View	Santa Clara
10	McCoy Creek	Suisun City	Solano
11	Alameda Flood Control District, Channel E	Hayward	Alameda
12	Miller Creek	San Rafael	Marin
13	Suisun Slough	Suisun City	Solano
14	Sulphur Springs Creek	Benicia	Solano
15	Calabazas Creek	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara
16	Sunnyvale West Channel	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara
17	San Leandro Creek	San Leandro	Alameda
18	Mills Creek	Burlingame	San Mateo
19	San Clemente Creek	Corte Madera	Marin
20	Peyton Slough	Martinez	Contra Costa
21	Codornices Creek	Albany	Alameda
22	Sanchez Creek	Burlingame	San Mateo
23	Permanente Creek	Mountain View	Santa Clara
24	Easton Creek	Burlingame	San Mateo
25	Charleston Slough	Mountain View	Santa Clara

 San Francisco Bay
Conservation and Development
Commission

¹ Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers (MCCMC). For questions, contact Councilmember Pat Eklund; City of Novato at: pateklund@comcast.net; and/or 415-336-9913 (cell).

Determinations and materials were provided to stakeholders including jurisdictions and property owners. In Marin County, there are 3 locations (San Rafael and Mill Valley) where this process has begun. As the extent of jurisdiction in this and other tidal creeks and channels are re-evaluated and confirmed, BCDC will integrate this information and publish the Jurisdiction Screening Map as a public-facing resource in 2027.

APPROVAL OF BAY PLAN AMENDMENT FOR BENEFICIAL REUSE OF SEDIMENT AND SOIL FOR WETLAND RESTORATION AND RISING SEA LEVEL ADAPTATION:

On May 7, 2026, the Commission voted to initiate San Francisco Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-26 (BPA 1-26) to address beneficial reuse of sediment and soil for wetland restoration and adaptation to rising sea level.

On October 15, 2026, BCDC Commission conducted a public hearing and agreed that BPA 1-26 will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. The preferred alternative and most environmentally beneficial and feasible option is adoption of BPA 1-26. The Bay Plan must better address the threat of inundation and loss posed to tidal marshes, tidal flats, and shallow subtidal areas by sea level rise and insufficient sediment supply. Restoring and adapting the wetlands that fringe San Francisco Bay is critical to protecting the region from increased shoreline flooding.

The BCDC Commission adopted BPA 1-26 and determined this amendment will promote beneficial reuse of dredged sediment for wetlands and habitat restoration projects, increase sediment and soil supply to re-establish wetlands across the San Francisco Bay region, and assist in shoreline adaptation to rising sea levels. Thus, this Bay Plan amendment is intended to mitigate the adverse impacts of rising sea level to the San Francisco Bay shoreline and the future impacts are likely to be beneficial. As a result, this Bay Plan Amendment is the best alternative that best achieves project objectives; and will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

BCDC COMMISSION MEETINGS :

On October 1, 2026, the BCDC Commission met and took the following actions:

Conducted a Public Hearing and Vote on an application on the Peninsula Crossing Development Project, in the City of Burlingame, San Mateo County. The Commission conducted a public hearing and voted to approve an application for DW Burlingame I Owner, LLC, DW Burlingame II Owner, LLC, and DW Burlingame III Owner, LLC to develop a 12.1-acre site with a life sciences/office campus and public access areas in the Commission's Bay and Shoreline Band jurisdictions. The project involves construction of three life science/office buildings, two parking structures, various public access improvements, and sea level rise adaptation measures.

On October 15, 2026, the BCDC Commission met and confirmed the approval by the Executive Director on the following Marin County Administrative Permit Applications:

1. Applicant: Mark Conroe & Scott Robertson 310–312 Beach Rd, Belvedere, CA 94920

BCDC Permit Application No. M2026.020.00 Filed: September 24, 2026

Description: Extend the existing, shared overwater dock with an approximately 270-square foot area, install twelve new in-water piles, wrap eight existing timber piles in fiberglass, install two boat lifts on the bay-side of the overwater dock, replace the gangway and 500-square-feet of existing wood decking with artificial decking material. A preliminary site survey identified eelgrass beds within the vicinity of the project area; therefore, the project will be conditioned to avoid and minimize impacts to these habitats, including required pre- and post construction and surveys and compensatory mitigation if project activities result in impacts to these subtidal resources.

2. Applicant: Emory Williams 296 Beach Rd, Belvedere, California 94920

BCDC Permit Application No. M2026.030.00 Filed: October 7, 2026

Description: Remove and replace the existing boat lift adjacent to an existing dock off the shoreline of a residential waterfront property. The new boat lift will consist of two new 14-inch steel pilings and two I-beams tracks, spaced approximately 14 feet apart, replacing the existing one-piling and approximately 9-foot-wide boat lift. The pilings and I-beams will be installed using a vibratory hammer, and all work is expected to be installed from the existing dock and is not anticipated to require the use of a barge. Installation is anticipated to be completed in approximately four days to be conducted within the environmental work window of June 15 through November 30. A preliminary site survey identified eelgrass beds within the vicinity of the project area; therefore, the project will be conditioned to avoid and minimize impacts to these habitats, including required pre- and post-construction and surveys and compensatory mitigation if project activities result in impacts to these subtidal resources.

Committee Reports 5.b.

5.b. Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District

5.b. Written report provided by Holli Thier, Tiburon

TBD

Committee Reports 5.c.

5.c. Marin Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)

5.c. Written report provided by Barbara Coler, Fairfax

Councilmember Coler reported Marin LAFCO - there was no meeting held in October so no report is due; their next meeting will be held December 10, 2026.

Committee Reports 5.d.

5.d. MCCMC Legislative Committee

5.d. Written report provided by Alice Fredericks, Tiburon

Councilmember Fredericks reported MCCMC Legislative Committee - no report is due.

Committee Reports 5.e.

5.e. Transportation Authority of Marin

5.e. Written report provided by Alice Fredericks, Tiburon

Councilmember Fredericks reported Transportation Authority of Marin - no report is due.

Committee Reports 5.f.

5.f. SMART

5.f. Written report provided by Gabe Paulson, Larkspur

5.f. SMART Report

10/28/2026 SMART Report

This report summarizes progress in SMART's four key missions: ridership, extension, paths, freight:

1 RIDERSHIP

Ridership has been significantly increasing in 2025 and 2026.

Aug 2026 ridership up 26% from 125,407 Aug 2025 boardings to 158,000+ Aug 2026 boardings.

There are over 5000 daily passengers and over 1.4M annual passengers.

2 EXTENSION

Healdsburg station now funded should open 2028 (debating old depot vs downtown)

The Board voted to approve new station to Geyserville

3 PATHS

Path use has been increasing significantly along with train ridership.

Monthly trips are between 125,000 and 135,000 (bikes and walkers on 14 paths), about 33% increase from last year.

4 FREIGHT

The most significant news for SMART Freight centers on two interrelated developments: surging commercial freight demand and the growing operational and financial exposure of its eastern freight line. SMART Freight has proven its operational viability and commercial demand. However, the critical issue ahead is cost containment: ensuring that large highway projects (like SR 37) and track maintenance overhead do not turn an operationally successful public freight service into an unfunded liability.

CONCLUSION

Generally, the success in ridership increase, path use and extension funding helps explain the strong public support of SMART as evidenced by the 70% approval in the March 2026 election.

Reminder: Sept is transit month. All elected encourage to ride public transit for first hand experience and promotion. Also check out the mobile "Transit" app

Thank you

Gabe

gpaulson@larkspur.ca.gov