



## Public Hearing on Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) May 18, 2017

*This document includes written comments received at the public hearing (shown below) as well as the complete hearing transcript provided by a court reporter.*

**Comments from Vallejo Public Hearing - May 18, 2017**  
**Vallejo Naval & Historical Museum**  
**Hall of History**  
**734 Marin Street**  
**Vallejo**

1	How did you determine the job projections? Vallejo's job projections are significantly higher than what MTC-ABAG has projected. I am concerned that this disparity will negatively impact the City's ability to qualify for regional/state funding, and that the City would be hampered in attempting to designate additional PDAs.
2	We just moved here from Marin County. But as I look around the room, we could still be in Marin. Out of over 20 people, 80% look to be over 60, and there were only one or two minority people present. Would like to see more outreach to the 60-70% of Vallejo that is <u>not</u> white (or collecting social security!).
3	Keep Highway 37 open with new roadway improvements to allow future transportation access.
4	Easing transportation could be achieved through: 1. Tax breaks 2. Commuter perks 3. Uniform HOV "rules" - two/three persons per vehicle 4. More employer use "flex" time

5	<p>Vallejo is, has been, and will be the "center" of it all - midway between Capitol and San Jose, etc. Let's continue this.</p> <p>1. Bicycles 2) Bikes 3) Bicycles (trikes, too!)  Access - infrastructure - education - repairs - children - commuters - recreation</p>
6	<p>MTC needs to address transportation needs of Vallejo with respect to the heavy burden of tolls on commuters and the lack of affordable, dependable time-sensitive offerings. The failure of MTC to do so has contributed to the isolation of Vallejo and the downward trend of middle-priced housing, causing a never-ending downward spiral.</p>
7	<p>There is a jobs-housing imbalance in the San Francisco Bay Area. It has been said that the Silicon Valley/South Bay has more jobs than housing; however, Solano County/North Bay has more housing than jobs. For Solano County, that means more residents traveling out-of-county to either Bay Area or Sacramento for high-paying jobs. Solano County has a lot of unused or underdeveloped business/commercial parks or areas that should satisfy this perceived problem.</p>
8	<p>Without improvement to our schools and transportation, Vallejo will always struggle. There is concern that we'll be forced to accept more housing without an increase in jobs because of transportation and schools issues, and the issues that ABAG 2040 - pollution, long commutes - will be exacerbated.</p> <p>The Big Cities alternative ignores the issues Vallejo faces.</p>

RE: DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA 2040  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
PUBLIC HEARING

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
Thursday, May 18, 2017  
Vallejo Naval and Historical Museum  
734 Marin Street, Vallejo, California 94590

Taken before MARK I. BRICKMAN  
Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 5527  
State of California

1           BE IT REMEMBERED that pursuant to Notice of the  
 2 Meeting, and on Thursday, May 18, 2017, commencing at  
 3 7:15 p.m., thereof, at the Vallejo Naval and Historical  
 4 Museum, 734 Marin Street, Vallejo, California 94590,  
 5 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, a Certified  
 6 Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California,  
 7 there commenced a public hearing.

8                           ---o0o---

9  
10                           MEETING AGENDA

11  
12   PAGE

13   Presentation on Draft Environmental Impact Report       4  
14   by Heidi Tschudin, Tschudin Consulting Group

15   Public Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Report 19

16                           ---o0o---

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 PUBLIC SPEAKERS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
2 FOR PLAN BAY AREA 2040

3		PAGE
4		
5	Teresa Hardy	19, 31
6	Brittany Gray	21
7	Vice-Mayor Robert McConnell	25
8	Cia Lynn	26

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Thursday, May 18, 2017

7:15 p.m.

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3

4 So now I want to introduce Heidi Tschudin. She  
5 will give our presentation on the Draft Environmental  
6 Impact Report.

7 MS. TSCHUDIN: Okay. Thank you. Good  
8 evening. I'm Heidi Tschudin. So I want to provide you  
9 with an overview on the Environmental Impact Report.

10 We're going to receive comments tonight on the  
11 adequacy of that document, and I just wanted to quote a  
12 little bit from the California environmental guideline --  
13 Environmental Quality Act guideline, guidelines on what  
14 an adequate EIR is, which is it's one that allows  
15 decision-makers to intelligently take into account  
16 environmental consequences.

17 So the idea there is adequacy, completeness and  
18 a good faith effort at full disclosure.

19 The purpose of an Environmental Impact Report  
20 is to identify impacts that would result from  
21 implementation of the plan, to disclose and inform those  
22 to the MTC and ABAG decision-makers, to identify  
23 mitigation measures that could mitigate those impacts and  
24 also to analyze alternatives of the plan.

25 The EI -- the EIR is organized into four key

1 areas. The first one addresses the introduction and  
2 executive summary, and so that gives you a context for  
3 the document and summarizes both the process and the  
4 conclusions of the document.

5 The second is the project description which  
6 provides a summary from an environmental impact  
7 perspective of the Plan Bay Area 2040 plan.

8 The third area which is in chapter three is  
9 The -- excuse me. Chapter two is the environmental  
10 analysis, and so that examines the potential for adverse  
11 physical impact in fourteen issue areas which I'll  
12 identify in a moment.

13 And then the last area, which is in chapter  
14 three addresses alternatives and then other required  
15 sections under CEQA.

16 So that allows a comparison of the plan to  
17 other alternative plans and also assesses additional  
18 requirements of the State law.

19 Now, Adam already gave you an overview of the  
20 plan, but from the environmental impact perspective,  
21 there's a couple of things I wanted to point out.

22 First of all, one of the focuses is on the  
23 aspects of the plan that could result in adverse physical  
24 impacts.

25 So the EIR focuses on things like forecasted

1 change in population, forecasted change in the number of  
2 households and also in the number of jobs.

3 It also discusses and talks about the  
4 implications of the fact that most of the growth is  
5 targeted to go into transit development areas -- excuse  
6 me. Transit priority areas and priority development  
7 areas.

8 So that concentrates the development which has  
9 the effect of minimizing some of the impacts.

10 The EIR analysis assumes the acreage that's  
11 associated with the land use footprint and the acreage  
12 that's associated with the footprint for the  
13 transportation investments and then uses that to do the  
14 analysis of some of the areas of impact.

15 The California Environmental Quality Act  
16 recognizes that there's different types of projects that  
17 merit different approaches in terms of the level and  
18 detail of environmental analysis.

19 And so for a large plan document such as Plan  
20 Bay Area, you're allowed to take a more programmatic  
21 approach to the analysis, and that is what's done in this  
22 EIR.

23 The Draft EIR is a programmatic document, which  
24 means that it does not analyze individual site conditions  
25 or individual projects, but rather it looks at the whole

1 of the plan and the overall collective impact.

2           The EIR also looks at impacts at several  
3 distinct levels. So you'll see in the impact analysis  
4 that there's a focus on the overall region, and then in  
5 most cases, the impact is also broken down by county, and  
6 then where possible, the impact is further broken down by  
7 transit priority areas.

8           This gives you a list of the fourteen issue  
9 areas that are addressed in the EIR. This organization  
10 is similar to the organization in the 2013 EIR if you  
11 were involved with that effort.

12           All of the areas of impact that you -- that we  
13 are required to address under State law are addressed in  
14 these fourteen chapters.

15           For each of those fourteen areas, a similar  
16 approach is taken in the environmental analysis. First  
17 we identify summary of existing conditions and we also  
18 identify both the regulations and policies that are  
19 applicable to that particular issue area.

20           We identify the applicable thresholds that are  
21 used for identifying impacts. We describe the method of  
22 analysis that's being used, and then for each impact  
23 threshold or criterion, there's an assessment of the  
24 potential for impact, and that assessment is categorized  
25 by levels.

1           So, for example, you'll see language like "less  
2 than significant impact" or "potentially significant  
3 impact" or "significant impact."

4           Where impacts are possible, within -- we also  
5 identify mitigation measures that could mitigate those  
6 effects, and then we also have to provide a conclusion  
7 about residual impacts.

8           So, in other words, does the mitigation measure  
9 fully address the impact, and where mitigation measure is  
10 not available or would not fully address the impact, then  
11 in the document it's identified as significant and  
12 unavoidable.

13           There are certain regulatory streamlining  
14 benefits that are available to future projects that are  
15 consistent with the plan. This is like an incentive to  
16 encourage those projects to move forward.

17           For a project to take advantage of those  
18 streamlining benefits, though, they do have to  
19 incorporate all of the feasible and applicable mitigation  
20 measures that are in the document.

21           The State requirements for environmental impact  
22 analysis also require us to provide an alternative  
23 analysis.

24           So that is a comparative assessment of the  
25 differences in environmental impact for a number of

1 identified alternatives as compared to the impacts that  
2 would occur as a result of implementing the project,  
3 which in this case is implementation of the plan.

4 The EIR in this case looks at four alternatives  
5 that were approved for that purpose by the MTC and ABAG  
6 decision-makers in December of 2016.

7 In order to compare these alternatives, the  
8 same regional forecasts for housing, jobs and  
9 transportation revenues are assumed for each alternative.

10 What changes between them, though, is the land  
11 use pattern, the land use development pattern that is  
12 assumed and also the assumed transportation investment  
13 strategies.

14 So while many of the impacts from the plan and  
15 the four alternatives are similar, there are differences  
16 that emerge and are analyzed in the document that are  
17 based on the location and the assumed size of the land  
18 use growth and transportation development footprints for  
19 each of the alternatives.

20 We're required also under State law to identify  
21 what's called an environmentally superior alternative.  
22 That's the alternative that would result in the least  
23 amount of environmental impact in the areas that are  
24 analyzed in the document.

25 For this EIR, that alternative was determined

1 to be alternative three or the big cities alternative.

2 The land use modeling assumptions and the  
3 transportation investments for the big cities alternative  
4 are identified in chapter three of the EIR and  
5 comparatively this alternative has the most compact  
6 growth pattern, and that's one of the big reasons behind  
7 that conclusion.

8 When considering the plan for adoption,  
9 however, the Commission and the ABAG Executive Board can  
10 consider all of this information.

11 They have to consider the alternatives  
12 analysis, but they aren't precluded from adopting the  
13 plan if they determine that the plan is preferable when  
14 they balance all the relevant factors.

15 As we've mentioned, the comment period closes  
16 on June 1st, and at that time we'll consider all of the  
17 comments we've received on the Draft EIR and we'll  
18 provide responses to them.

19 We'll also identify recommended changes in the  
20 Draft EIR, and that information will all be packaged into  
21 one separate document which, together with the Draft EIR,  
22 will constitute the Final EIR.

23 And the Commission and ABAG Executive Board has  
24 to certify that document before they can move forward  
25 with adoption of the plan. Right now, we're working

1 towards adoption hearings in July.

2 So this is my final slide just to reiterate how  
3 you can comment on the Draft EIR. First of all, the  
4 document is available online.

5 You can also contact the MTC staff to make  
6 other arrangements to get access to the document. I  
7 noticed several of you have the stick drive that has the  
8 EIR on it, so that's another good way.

9 We encourage you to read it. The comment  
10 period is a full forty-five days. There's several ways  
11 you can submit comments. You can submit them orally like  
12 we're doing at this meeting. You can also submit written  
13 comments like you're doing with -- some of you I think  
14 are writing out comments that you can submit to staff.  
15 You don't have to give them verbally.

16 You could submit written comments through the  
17 US mail during the comment period. You can fax them in  
18 or you can e-mail them in. So all of those methods are  
19 acceptable.

20 And that concludes my overview on the EIR, and  
21 I think Ursula's going to help me monitor. I'm happy to  
22 answer questions, but I think it might be better given  
23 the experience on the prior one if we just go straight  
24 into comments.

25 MS. VOGLER: Only clarifying questions.

1 MS. TSCHUDIN: Okay.

2 MS. VOGLER: Yeah.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I think you said it  
4 identifies the alternative that has the least  
5 environmental impact, but MTC and ABAG don't have to  
6 choose that one. Correct?

7 MS. TSCHUDIN: That's correct.

8 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Have they -- does the  
9 Draft EIR identify the one they chose?

10 MS. TSCHUDIN: No. Right now the preferred  
11 plan, so the one that's being promoted by MTC and ABAG  
12 staff, is the Plan Bay Area 2040, which is that document  
13 that some of you have a copy of and that's what's on the  
14 stick drive.

15 The decision on whether to adopt that or  
16 something else will be the decision that's made at the  
17 July hearings.

18 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. Thank you.

19 MS. TSCHUDIN: You bet.

20 MS. VOGLER: I have there was one other  
21 question, clarifying questions. Yes.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How do you define a  
23 transit priority area?

24 MS. TSCHUDIN: There's a definition in State  
25 law. It has to do with density and proximity to a

1 certain quality of transit, and it's actually defined in  
2 the code.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's State law?

4 MS. TSCHUDIN: Yes.

5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

6 MS. TSCHUDIN: Yes, ma'am.

7 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Can you state -- the  
8 big city options, what are the big city? Are they  
9 actually chosen?

10 MS. TSCHUDIN: They -- they are, and Adam  
11 might actually be a better person to kind of walk through  
12 a question like that if you don't mind.

13 MR. NOELTING: Well, yeah. And it's not just  
14 the three big cities. So we're not suggesting that all  
15 the growth that's forecasted would be going to those  
16 three cities. It's a lot of the growth, a higher  
17 percentage.

18 I think in the plan slides, it showed it was  
19 close to forty-six percent of households. So that number  
20 would increase in the big city alternative as well as  
21 some cities that are adjacent though those three cities.

22 So near neighbors, and also some of the  
23 emphasis in terms of the transportation investments, it  
24 was less on highways and much more oriented towards  
25 transit services and trying to increase services, expand

1 services that exist today.

2 Much of the rail systems in this example are  
3 ones with less frequency. So it was a little different  
4 approach than looking at a more focused growth pattern  
5 and more transit may be more of an emphasis.

6 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: So in the North Bay, is  
7 there any big city in -- in the north -- I sort of  
8 consider us the North Bay versus East Bay because we've  
9 got bridges that we have got to cross to get to the East  
10 Bay.

11 So what about our area? We're sort of stuck  
12 between Highway 37, as everyone already commented. So  
13 I'm hoping -- this is more a comment than a clarifying  
14 question, as well.

15 What's there for the North Bay?

16 MR. NOELTING: Well, there would be --

17 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What cities?

18 MR. NOELTING: Yeah. I mean, it would be --  
19 it would be less growth forecasted in the North Bay than  
20 it would be in the other alternatives. So there are four  
21 alternatives. There's a variation on each of those.

22 The big cities would have certainly more of a  
23 focus on what would be, you know, the -- the core -- I  
24 don't know how you would want to define the core, but  
25 often people define it as looking from Oakland to maybe

1 Richmond down to San Francisco to San Jose.

2 So that kind of area is probably one of the  
3 concentration of growth.

4 I didn't preclude growth from going to other  
5 areas, but again, that's more of the emphasis where  
6 there's a fair amount of more growth.

7 So likely we would see less households and in  
8 Vallejo than there would have been in the proposed plan  
9 and other alternatives.

10 And then ultimately, we limited it for  
11 transportation. So there would be less highway emphasis  
12 in some cases, too. So it's a different mix to give a  
13 different perspective range of outcomes.

14 MS. VOGLER: Okay. Clarifying question.

15 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Does the EIR address  
16 the issue of Southern California sucking more and more of  
17 our water south? The Delta tunnel?

18 MS. TSCHUDIN: I would say no. There's not a  
19 separate analysis. That is subject to its own  
20 environmental analysis that is available online threw  
21 through the State, but not through this document.

22 MS. VOGLER: Yes, sir.

23 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I just wanted to  
24 clarify something. You mentioned that there had to be an  
25 identified alternate superior project, I believe, in an

1 Environmental Impact Report.

2 What's the staff authority on that and does the  
3 identified alternate superior project have to be  
4 discussed in any example?

5 MS. TSCHUDIN: There is no real requirement or  
6 guideline regarding the depth of analysis. It is a  
7 specific explicit requirement out of the both the Public  
8 Resources Code and the California Code of Regulations.

9 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

10 MS. VOGLER: Okay. Yes.

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Clarifying question.  
12 When you use the phrase that you are going to "streamline  
13 the process for business growth," does that mean you're  
14 removing -- who's the we that gets approval on the  
15 growth, and is that removing Vallejo's protections on  
16 authorizing projects in our own city?

17 For example, someone's going to apply to use,  
18 but an incinerator plant, because you're looking at the  
19 whole Bay Area, you go to Vallejo.

20 MS. TSCHUDIN: There is no aspect of any of  
21 the --

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Mm-hmm.

23 MS. TSCHUDIN: -- statutes or laws that are  
24 behind this effort that takes away control for local  
25 decision-making from local governments.

1 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

2 MS. VOGLER: Yes. Clarifying questions. Yes,  
3 sir.

4 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I have a question.  
5 There are many disadvantaged communities in the Bay Area.  
6 Will an environmental justice analysis be required or  
7 will it be that all about during this process?

8 MS. TSCHUDIN: There is an environmental  
9 justice analysis that's been prepared. It's prepared  
10 outside of the CEQA process because there's separate  
11 environment requirement for it under SB 375, and Adam may  
12 be able to tell you more about that.

13 MR. NOELTING: Yeah. There is an analysis in  
14 one of the supplemental reports to the proposed plan. It  
15 goes into a fair amount of detail in terms of analysis  
16 that you referenced earlier, the air quality, looking at  
17 communities of concern and looking at measurements across  
18 the region.

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Was Vallejo on there?

20 MR. NOELTING: I'd have to look at the maps,  
21 but I would imagine.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is that available now?

23 MR. NOELTING: Yes. It's one of the  
24 supplemental reports. I can help plug into one of the  
25 computers and we can look at it if necessary.

1 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

2 MS. VOGLER: Yes, sir.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It it's necessary for  
4 us to get to Sacramento on highways like the 80, for  
5 example, are we looking at high speed rail?

6 MS. TSCHUDIN: You were talking so fast, I did  
7 not get the first part of that question.

8 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Let me slow it down for  
9 you. Vallejo is the geographic of the North and east Bay  
10 of this amazing area. Vallejo is the stepchild obviously  
11 of the bay as I can see here.

12 Isn't it time for us to focus on connecting  
13 Vallejo with Sacramento in a way other than 80? For  
14 example, high speed rail?

15 When I drive to see my sister and daughter in  
16 Sacramento, it takes me an hour and fifteen minutes.

17 Marin doesn't want BART. This area wants BART.  
18 Why isn't BART here?

19 MS. VOGLER: Yeah. So that -- that -- that  
20 wasn't an EIR question, but I --

21 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Transportation  
22 question.

23 MS. VOGLER: That's right. Well, I don't know  
24 if Adam has a comment, but -- okay.

25 MR. NOELTING: You know, in terms of the plan,

1 we look at other options. That's certainly something we  
2 can keep looking into. I think there's been some recent  
3 studies looking at various corridors.

4 We can check into a little bit more and  
5 certainly I think our assumptions looking at high speed  
6 rail certainly connecting us from the -- to the south and  
7 not even going through all the region at this point.

8 I'll leave it at that. You probably want to  
9 open it up for some of the comment cards we have now.

10 MS. VOGLER: Okay. So we're going to move  
11 into the public hearing. I have two cards, so I again  
12 would love it if you filled out a card and had a comment  
13 on the EIR.

14 I think a gentleman came in during this -- this  
15 presentation, and if you'd like to comment on the plan,  
16 that's okay, too.

17 So if you are commenting on the plan, I would  
18 just ask that you state your name and say this is a  
19 comment on the plan, because these comments are Now  
20 comments on the EIR.

21 So I'm going to go ahead and open the public  
22 hearing on the Draft EIR, and the first speaker I have is  
23 Teresa Hardy.

24 MS. HARDY: That's me.

25 MS. VOGLER: Okay.

1 MS. HARDY: I am not from Vallejo and I --

2 MS. VOGLER: Can you talk to him just so he  
3 can hear you?

4 MS. HARDY: I am -- I'm not from Vallejo, but  
5 I can appreciate all the concerns of the people that live  
6 in this community.

7 I actually attended the hearing in San  
8 Francisco, and it was in the morning. So there were not  
9 a lot of comments at that because, you know, a lot of  
10 people were working.

11 I'm going to touch on a broader issue that  
12 organizations have concerns about, and that is water.

13 Resiliency is part of the plan and climate  
14 change, and if you look at the State of California, I'm  
15 going to address some problems that we have which really  
16 are directly related also to these nine regions.

17 One is the Delta tunnel. Two is river flows.  
18 Three is the drought -- five years of drought. Four is  
19 flooding projecting ahead to the end of the century.

20 If climate change continues, we will no longer  
21 have CO melt in April. It will be in January. That will  
22 increase flooding.

23 Some water districts are looking at groundwater  
24 as their source, but we can already see we've used up a  
25 lot of our groundwater and they're continuing to frack --

1 do fracking in the State of California.

2 So as a region, we cannot afford two million  
3 more people by 2040 and we do not address language  
4 related to water in this EIR, and there are some  
5 organizations that would like to see more clarifying  
6 language, more specific language how water is going to be  
7 addressed, which will affect all of us.

8 MS. VOGLER: Okay. Thank you very much.

9 The next commenter I have is Brittany Gray.

10 MS. GRAY: Okay. So I'm Brittany Gray and I  
11 am a resident of Vallejo, but I also work for the  
12 Tuolumne River Trust. I'm here kind of on behalf of both  
13 of those things tonight.

14 The Tuolumne River Trust, just a little bit  
15 about us. We were founded in 1981 and we work throughout  
16 the Tuolumne River watershed. We have offices in Sonoma,  
17 Modesto and San Francisco.

18 The Tuolumne is the primary source of water  
19 through the Public Utilities Commission's 2.6 million  
20 customers in San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and  
21 Alameda Counties.

22 We're concerned that the population and job  
23 growth projections included in the Plan Bay Area would  
24 create serious negative environmental impacts on the  
25 Tuolumne and other rivers as well as the Sacramento/San

1 Joaquin Bay Delta area.

2 We believe that the Draft Environmental Impact  
3 Report fails to adequately address these potential  
4 impacts.

5 The Plan forecasts that the SF-PUC customer  
6 base will increase by twenty-eight percent, from 2.6  
7 million to 3.3 million people by 2040, and the population  
8 in the Santa Clara Valley Water District Service area is  
9 projected to increase by twenty-six percent, and the  
10 population in the immediate Bay Area is also projected to  
11 increase by twenty-five percent.

12 This level of growth is not sustainable, and --  
13 and the Delta Reform Act of 2009 establishes state  
14 policy that achieving water supply reliability and  
15 restoring the Delta ecosystem must be applied co-equally  
16 in these kinds of plans.

17 The Bay -- the Plan Bay Area Draft EIR barely  
18 scratches the surface of potential impacts on our  
19 waterways and the Bay Delta and fails to give equal  
20 weight to ecosystem restoration.

21 The dramatic decline in Central Valley salmon,  
22 steelhead and other aquatic species over the past few  
23 decades suggest that humans are already diverting too  
24 much water from our rivers and from the Delta.

25 A 2010 flow criteria report by the State Water

1 Resources Control Board determined that sixty percent of  
2 the San Joaquin River's unimpaired flow would be  
3 necessary to fully protect the fish that live there.

4           However, only about a third of the river's flow  
5 currently reaches the Delta on average.

6           The Tuolumne is the largest tributary to the  
7 San Joaquin, and on average only twenty percent of its  
8 unimpaired flow actually gets to the river because it's  
9 being withheld for human water use purposes.

10           We're already diverting too much water from the  
11 rivers and from the Delta, and the EIR needs to evaluate  
12 how the likely increase in water demands or the  
13 unavoidable increase in water demands might impact our  
14 river and the Delta ecosystem, especially potential  
15 impact to fish and wildlife, water quality and  
16 recreation.

17           We also have some concerns about the -- the  
18 focus of -- of drought and the use of drought in the  
19 evaluations made in the EIR.

20           Most water agencies have adopted drought plans  
21 that are aimed at managing a three- to five-year drought,  
22 and the SF-PUC's drought plan addresses an eight and a  
23 half year drought, but the EIR appears to focus on water  
24 quality impacts from one single dry year. So that's kind  
25 of an area of weakness there.

1           Oh, and mitigation measures. The primary  
2 mitigation measure that's included in the EIR suggests  
3 that water agencies must conserve more water and/or  
4 identify new sources of water.

5           Those are our mitigation plans to accommodate  
6 these millions of more people.

7           And this is through reclaimed water and  
8 desalinization. It's not entirely adequate and we're  
9 suggesting that the EIR should address the potential  
10 environmental impacts that would occur if conservation  
11 and alternative water supplies aren't able to keep pace  
12 with this projected growth and demands.

13           A case could be made for adding housing staff  
14 to the Bay Area, as you guys have mentioned, to enable  
15 people to live closer to their jobs and public transit,  
16 which would reduce greenhouse gas emissions and things  
17 like that, but the projected growth in employment is  
18 probably going to offset the gains by bringing people  
19 closer.

20           So you'll be bringing them in. There's going  
21 to be more people in the outer areas, too, and if these  
22 projections are accurate, the region will continue to  
23 face a severe housing shortage as well as adding more  
24 stress on our aquatic ecosystem.

25           So we ask -- in conclusion, we ask that the EIR

1 include an alternative plan that dramatically reduces the  
2 amount of projected jobs growth to see what the impacts  
3 of that might be and also to provide more mitigation  
4 measures and alternatives for increasing our water  
5 supplies.

6 MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

7 Okay. I have no more cards.

8 Does anyone else like to comment?

9 VICE-MAYOR McCONNELL: I would.

10 MS. VOGLER: Did you fill out a blue card?

11 VICE-MAYOR McCONNELL: No, but I will. I did  
12 the first. I will.

13 MS. VOGLER: Can you state your name?

14 VICE-MAYOR McCONNELL: I'm Robert McConnell.

15 MS. VOGLER: Okay.

16 VICE-MAYOR McCONNELL: Vallejo is blessed by a  
17 lot of water rights because of Lake Berryessa. Those  
18 water rights include Vallejo. If we are going to address  
19 water needs in the region, I think we're going to have to  
20 go to alternate sources such as reclaimed water.

21 Does your Environmental Impact Report address  
22 the cost to the local jurisdictions of implementing  
23 alternate water sources such as reclaimed water and the  
24 use of purple pipes throughout the region? If not, I  
25 think it needs to do so.

1 MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

2 Okay. One more card. Cia Lynn.

3 MS. LYNN: Yes. It's pronounced Cia.

4 MS. VOGLER: Cia Lynn.

5 MS. LYNN: That's okay. Sounds like Chia pet  
6 or something, but it doesn't have an H.

7 Just in response to some comments. By the way,  
8 I found out about this because a couple days ago I read  
9 this article in the Vallejo Times-Herald. Okay. Like a  
10 lot of things, it should have been.

11 So I'm not criticizing anybody and I just got  
12 informed -- I mean, I'm a newspaper junkie, so I read the  
13 Chronicle and I read Richmond newspaper and the  
14 Times-Herald.

15 If the press doesn't come and cover something,  
16 so I'm going to suggest the next time -- and I probably  
17 won't be here, but -- physically, but I would love if  
18 you'd just stage a little demonstration and take over  
19 Highway 80, give people lots of warning.

20 Just tell them we're going to be setting up,  
21 you know, picnic tables and -- and stuff and -- and just  
22 say, "Vallejo is seizing the main transportation."

23 By gosh, you're not going to listen to us based  
24 on being a small place, because every problem that's been  
25 talked about in here is global. Every single thing that

1 was brought up tonight is global.

2 Frankly, we have -- and I had children. I have  
3 grandchildren. I'm in no position as -- as a spoiled  
4 American to decide who can have children.

5 Nobody can decide who will or will not be a  
6 good parent unless the person -- we can't focus on that  
7 discussion right now.

8 But we have -- we have physically quote unquote  
9 too many people in the Bay Area given the planning and  
10 lack of planning.

11 In 1977, I drove across the United States. We  
12 had a drought. We had an oil and gas crisis. I drove  
13 across the United States and back again. I toured almost  
14 half of the country and Detroit built Hummers when Japan  
15 was building things smaller than Volkswagens practically.

16 One of the things that was told to me by -- and  
17 now I'm going to talk like I'm mad -- Jacques Cousteau.  
18 In the autumn of 1977, I was going to UC-Santa Cruz and I  
19 returned from my job across the country and he came to  
20 speak about the oceans, and Jacques said -- I never got  
21 to sleep with the man or anything like that. So I've  
22 known a lot of people in my life. I've been lucky to be  
23 in the right place at the right time. This hand shook  
24 Malcolm and Martin.

25 But Cousteau said some something really

1 profound. He said Californians are confused about water  
2 because you all have an ocean, right?

3           We take water for granted because we have the  
4 ocean, but as my son pointed out years ago, we live in  
5 basically what amounts to high desert kind of country-  
6 side, and the Sac -- the San Joaquin Valley, which  
7 became, you know, sort of the garden of the country and  
8 parts of the world, is basically done by agriculture.

9           We don't have enough water available to take  
10 care of the existing millions of people that we have here  
11 right now.

12           And -- and I like to point my finger at  
13 politicians because they -- you know, they want to run  
14 for office, they want to get elected and then I expect  
15 them to do things, but -- I'm a registered Democrat, but  
16 I will point out that Jerry Brown didn't do diddly in my  
17 opinion his first time around.

18           We had a drought. We had the gas and oil  
19 crisis. We had a housing crisis in the '70s. He  
20 comes -- and not one single governor from then,  
21 Republican or Democrat or Independent or Green or Peace  
22 and Freedom or vegetable and mineral or whatever, not one  
23 of the governors has been able to cross party lines and  
24 really get our elected officials from the bottom all the  
25 way to the top to talk about the region which I would

1 suggest, given -- given the situation that we saw after  
2 the storms stopped, we had -- we had all over -- I mean,  
3 my -- my kids live in Marin.

4 They moved there for the schools, and they  
5 won't move to Vallejo precisely because the schools, but  
6 we had literally roads crashing because of landslides all  
7 around the greater Bay Area and up into the -- up into  
8 the mountains.

9 I mean, we had transportation infrastructure  
10 that's been basically ignored for years, and I'm going to  
11 blame the politicians.

12 And, I mean, if we had -- if we had had a major  
13 earthquake this past month, we'd be hanging out with the  
14 neighbors that have a kayak.

15 We can't afford to have a major earthquake  
16 given what was going on. We have people in Santa Cruz  
17 mountains and in parts of Marin are still closed down,  
18 and as we come closer to home, it's not as big --  
19 dramatic, but we've got potholes in this town, just the  
20 pothole thing alone.

21 So from small -- it's like think locally, act  
22 locally. My --

23 MS. VOGLER: Can I ask you to wrap it up,  
24 please? Thank you.

25 MS. LYNN: Okay. My sister's -- in fact,

1 she's actually first or second African women to become a  
2 civil engineer in the United States. She knew about  
3 this. I did not even know about this.

4 We've got to get the word out to more people,  
5 and I know June 1st is approaching, but there's got to be  
6 modifications to these plans, you know, just given the  
7 environmental stuff, the water crisis that you so  
8 eloquently addressed.

9 I mean, everybody should know about the  
10 Tuolumne River, and I would also suggest that college  
11 students -- and I've got grandchildren in high school.

12 High school kids should be reading these plans  
13 and talking to them. This is their future. That is  
14 their life.

15 I mean, there's twenty people in the room  
16 tonight. This is -- I'm thrilled to be here. I think  
17 you're all marvelous, but wow. There's so much more to  
18 be -- so much to do.

19 so thank you all for everything that you've  
20 been doing, but -- I don't know.

21 MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

22 Okay. So -- okay. So before I close the  
23 public hearing, are there any formal comments -- do you  
24 have a comment?

25 MS. HARDY: I just to add this.

1 MS. VOGLER: Okay. Can you state your name  
2 again?

3 MS. HARDY: Teresa Hardy.

4 We both talked about water issues with the  
5 increased --

6 MS. VOGLER: Yes.

7 MS. HARDY: -- population that needs to be  
8 addressed, and I'd like to add one more comment on to  
9 that.

10 The infrastructure in a lot of cities in the  
11 regions that are being addressed have very old  
12 infrastructure and the reduced rates for population,  
13 there's less and less money for repairing this older  
14 construction.

15 So I think that also needs to be addressed as  
16 part of this big water picture.

17 MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

18 Okay. Do we have any other comments? I have  
19 no other comment cards.

20 Okay. Then I'm going to formally close the  
21 public hearing on the EIR, and that concludes our  
22 presentations.

23 I want to thank you on behalf of the  
24 Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Thank you so  
25 much for coming. We appreciate it, and thank you.

1 Ending at 7:50 PM.

2 (The record was concluded at 7:50 PM)

3 ----o0o----

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO )

3  
4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the  
5 discussion in the foregoing hearing was taken at the  
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a  
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
9 attorney for either or any of the parties in the  
10 foregoing hearing and caption named, or in any way  
11 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said  
12 action.

13  
14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have  
15 hereunto set my hand this  
16 \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_,  
17 2017.

18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25