Attachment A – Summary of Comments Received

Date	Name	Agency/ Affiliation	Overall Position	Comments	Staff Response
22 – July - 11	Dick Tait	Mill Valley Resident	Oppose	• The motion to transfer TAM funds to SMART would not have passed without the affirmative votes of four Marin Board Members of SMART, specifically Arnold, Boro, Sears and Moulton-Peters, who should have recused themselves from voting due to their conflict of interest. Please communicate this information to the Commissioners and, reject any additional financial support of the SMART project.	Certain public officials with a financial interest in a decision must publicly identify the financial interest that causes the conflict; recuse himself/herself from discussing and voting on the matter; and leave the room until after the decision has been made. (Cal. Govt Code § 87100, 87105 and 87200). We would defer to TAM/SMART on whether there was a prohibited conflict of interest.
1- Aug - 11	Mike Arnold	Repeal SMART	Oppose	• My calculations indicate that the "pre-service deferral" deficit is $43 million and SMART will need to defer service for 3.6 years in order to claim their project is "in balance." This is very different from what SMART circulated to the public on July 22nd. • See attached table for my calculations.	The SMART Expenditure and Revenue Analysis presented at the SMART Board meeting on August 17, 2011 presents an updated financial plan.
25 - Aug - 11	Gail Bloom		Oppose	• The current request for RM2 funds does not include written/graphic schedule changes and consequences of those changes, the project's expenditures to date, other funds already awarded to SMART in prior years, and discussion regarding future RM2 allocations; SMART treats the train as a stand alone project, independent from the path despite having fungible funding, and a shared project definition and enabling legislation. • SMART is still seeking federal environmental clearance for separate independent elements of the project, maybe as a conscious attempt to segment federal environmental review which is contrary to the intent of NEPA.	• SMART has provided the information required by MTC to allocate RM2 funds in the form of the IPR package as well as the staff report and the expenditure and revenue analysis approved by the SMART board. These documents contain detailed project and cost information. • Regarding NEPA clearance, staff's understanding is that at this time, SMART is only able to pursue NEPA for the portions of the project that have federal funding, and that the potential reviewing federal agencies (i.e. FTA) will not undertake a NEPA review for projects that are not federally funded.