

Scoping Meeting Transcripts

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PLAN BAY AREA)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT)
SCOPING MEETING)
_____)

SCOPING MEETING
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2012
MTC OFFICES

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ATTENDEES

ASHLEY NGUYEN - Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MIRIAM CHION - Association of Bay Area Governments
HANNAH LINDELOF - Dyett & Bhatia
JOHN FRANCIS - Dyett & Bhatia

---o0o---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the Meeting, and on June 20, 2012, 6:05 PM at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 101 8th Street, Oakland, California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of California, there commenced a Scoping Meeting under the provisions of California Environmental Quality Act.

---o0o---

1	MEETING AGENDA	
2		Page
3	Introduction by Ms. Nguyen	4
4	Presentation by Ms. Nguyen	7, 25
5	Presentation by Ms. Lindelof	13
6	Presentation by Ms. Chion	19
7		
8	PUBLIC SPEAKERS	
9	Duane De Witt	28
10	J.R. McConnell	30
11	Kay Tokerud	32
12	Diana Keena	33
13	Heather G	34
14	Larry Tong	37
15	Unidentified Speaker	40
16	Janet Jacobson	44
17	Carol Gottstein	45
18	Ralph Fernandez	48
19	Jim Mellander	54, 73
20	Kirsten Snow Spalding	55
21	Charles Cagnon	57
22	Jim Bennett	64, 70
23	Marilynne Mellander	66
24	Bill Gene	69
25	Laura Fultz Stout	72
		Page 3

1 MS. NGUYEN: Good evening, everyone. My name
2 is Ashley Nguyen. I'm with the Metropolitan
3 Transportation Commission. I'm the Project Manager for
4 the Plan Bay Area Environmental Impact Report.

5 I do want to express my appreciation for
6 everyone who is attending tonight's meeting and providing
7 us with your feedback on the contents of the scope of the
8 environmental analysis.

9 Before I begin, I want to just do a quick
10 round of introductions with the Environmental -- the EIR
11 team. Also via myself, Ashley Nguyen, MTC, and I'll just
12 turn it to the person next to me for self-introduction.

13 MS. LINDELOF: I'm Hannah Lindelof from Dyett
14 & Bhatia. I'm part of the consulting team for the EIR.

15 MS. CHION: Miriam Chion, the transportation
16 leader from ABAG.

17 MR. FRANCIS: I'm John Francis, also from
18 Dyett & Bhatia.

19 MS. NGUYEN: And also I'd like you to know
20 that our partner agency with the industry is also present
21 tonight.

22 We do have -- in terms of the meeting format,
23 we do have a presentation to share with you to provide
24 you with a synopsis of the Plan Bay Area EIR process, and
25 when we close with that presentation, we will open it up

1 for public comment.

2 But before I begin, let me start with just
3 some groundrules for tonight's meeting. So again, after
4 the presentation, we will take comments from the public.

5 We will ask that you line up at the
6 microphones that are on either side of the room. There's
7 one divided left and to my right.

8 When it's your turn to speak -- we do ask you
9 to pick up a blue card with -- so that you can fill out
10 your name, and when you are up at the mic, if you can
11 turn it in to staff, that will be very much appreciated.

12 Please keep your comments as concise as
13 possible and to allow the -- to the point where we would
14 allow as many number of speakers as possible to
15 participate in tonight's scoping session.

16 A court reporter is here today to record your
17 comments, so please speak clearly for his benefit. He's
18 sitting right here in the corner.

19 He -- he may ask you to repeat something or
20 request that you speak slower so that he's able to record
21 your comments on the record.

22 We ask you to please disagree respectfully.
23 We know that you have comments and opinions regarding the
24 environmental process, and we certainly would like to
25 hear them, but please be respectful in terms of how you

1 present it and don't disrespect others that are in the
2 room. Please do not shout or interrupt other speakers.

3 We will take oral comments today and any
4 written comments you have prepared to the staff and we'll
5 be happy to take those and include it in the record.

6 Additional comments beyond tonight's scoping
7 meeting are certainly welcome. We ask that you submit it
8 in writing by the deadline date of July 11th. The
9 address to submit comments is on the handout, so please
10 look at that and make sure that we get it in our hands.

11 So with these -- with those groundrules, let
12 me go ahead and do the staff presentation.

13 Again, we will take public comments following
14 the presentation.

15 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Considering how few
16 people are here, I would think you would make the public
17 comments more like five minutes.

18 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You don't care what we
19 say, anyway.

20 MS. NGUYEN: We would like to give you an
21 opportunity to speak. We will go for about three
22 minutes, but if you run a little bit longer, we certainly
23 would allow you to finish to close out your comments.

24 So with that, let me begin with the
25 presentation that we have for you tonight.

1 So the agenda for tonight's meeting, we will
2 be covering a number of topics. We will begin with the
3 Plan Bay Area overview, followed by the explanation of
4 the SB 375 CEQA Streamlining Provision.

5 We will also provide you with an overview of
6 the Transportation Improvement Program, and then we'll
7 dive straight into the EIR itself explaining the purpose
8 and scope of the EIR for the plan and the specific issues
9 that we will be evaluating in the EIR.

10 We will then also describe some of the
11 potential EIR alternatives that we sketched out in the
12 Notice of Preparation.

13 And again, we are looking for your comments,
14 both on the issues for the evaluation in the EIR as well
15 as the ideas you may have about the alternatives.

16 We will conclude our presentation with an
17 opportunity to provide you with an opportunity to provide
18 us with some oral comments.

19 So let's begin with the plan itself. So the
20 Plan Bay Area, which is a long-range plan, is really the
21 first regional plan to integrate transportation, land use
22 and housing as mandated under state law called Senate
23 Bill 375.

24 The primary purpose of the integrated land use
25 transportation plan is really help lower greenhouse gas

1 emissions from cars and lightweight trucks.

2 A long haul through the Bay Area to reduce our
3 greenhouse gas emissions by seven percent in year 2020
4 and by fifteen percent in year 2035 from 2005 levels.

5 However, in addition to the climate protection
6 goals, the plan really looks at carrying out a number of
7 complementary goals, as well. Those goals really
8 range over all of gamuts. They would help us to provide
9 housing for Bay Area residents, build a stronger economy,
10 protect our natural environment and accessibility and
11 opportunities for residents for all walks of life here in
12 the Bay Area.

13 There is a key provision in SB 375 that allows
14 for streamlining, and this is really aimed at both the
15 transportation projects that are in our plan, but also
16 the residential and mixed use development of the project
17 that are identified as part of this plan or sustainable
18 community strategy.

19 What the law has done is really given Bay Area
20 regional agencies like ourselves, MTC and ABAG, for the
21 co-agencies under the environmental process an
22 opportunity to really engage local jurisdictions, our
23 partner agencies, stakeholders and community members to
24 fully plan for an efficient land use pattern that really
25 best leverages the 277 billion dollars worth of

1 transportation investments that are being proposed for
2 this plan, particularly the transit sector.

3 So this law allows for streamlining for
4 certain residential or mixed use projects as well as
5 transit targeting projects identified as part of this
6 integrated land use and transportation plan.

7 More specifically, to qualify as a residential
8 and mixed use project, at least 75 percent of the total
9 building square footage must be residential use, and to
10 qualify as a transit authority project for TPP for short,
11 that project must have at least 58 percent of the
12 building square footage to be residential use, have a
13 floor area ratio of about -- no less .75, provide a
14 minimum density of twenty units to the acre as well as
15 be one half mile of a major transit stop or a within a
16 high quality transit quarter that provides at least
17 fifteen minutes to proceed.

18 For those of you who have been involved in the
19 regional planning efforts over the past few years, you
20 know that we've been working on supporting jobs and
21 housing growth in areas called priority development areas
22 or PDAs.

23 PDAs are areas that local governments have
24 volunteered as places for growth in their communities,
25 and we certainly want to support and facilitate the

1 development of course to help those areas in our region.

2 And in many ways, PDAs really are a first good
3 step in that direction, but state law allows us to look
4 at transit authority projects in those areas, as well.

5 Again, the transit forwarding project under SB
6 375 are places where our region, the Bay Area has
7 invested or plans to invest in transit. These transit
8 authority project areas are in many ways like PDAs, areas
9 of opportunities for new housing and job growth.

10 So in many ways, SB 375 really tries to make
11 this plan more relevant to local jurisdictions and
12 residents by removing barriers to creating walkable
13 livable communities near transit.

14 It also looks to save time and resources for
15 local jurisdiction advancing projects through the
16 environmental process, and I think overall, it helps the
17 Bay Area residents live a good, high quality of life,
18 healthier lifestyle by walking, biking or taking transit
19 to their work, recreation or other destinations.

20 I want to quickly drill down on some specific
21 with regard to the CEQA streamlining. There are three
22 opportunities to CEQA streamlining as part of state law.

23 So if a project is a residential or mixed use
24 project that is consistent with the uses, densities and
25 intensities that are called out in this potential plan,

1 that project -- and if that project is located in a
2 transit authority eligible area and meets all the
3 exception codes identified in the state law, that project
4 is fully exempt from CEQA. Therefore, that project does
5 not have to prepare a CEQA document. And the --

6 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What's the point of
7 streamlining and not having a CEQA document if you're
8 supposed to meet the GHG requirements? That makes no
9 sense.

10 MS. NGUYEN: Can you hold your comments until
11 we have completed our --

12 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's such a lie.

13 MS. NGUYEN: I appreciate your respect in not
14 distracting us --

15 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: If you wanted to
16 convert your garage, there wouldn't be that much of a
17 streamlining process.

18 MS. NGUYEN: Another case where there's CEQA
19 streamlining is that if a project is located in transit
20 area L area but doesn't meet all the exemption codes, the
21 CEQA review has changed.

22 The project qualifies for streamlined
23 environmental review and can produce a different kind
24 over environmental document which the law calls out as
25 sustainable community environmental document, and in the

1 third case, if a project is not located in a transit
2 authority eligibility area, that project still has some
3 CEQA streamlining benefit, but it's fairly limited.

4 I want to transition to describing the
5 Transportation Improvement Program. The Transportation
6 Improvement Program is a four-year funding document that
7 provides a comprehensive list of all the roadway, transit
8 and bicycle-pedestrian projects in our region that will
9 receive federal funds or are subject to some sort of
10 federal action or is regionally significant.

11 Projects in this -- in the TIP, the
12 Transportation Improvement Program, must be consistent
13 with this long-range plan.

14 So when MTC develops a long-range plan for the
15 Bay Area, we simultaneously conduct a constitutional
16 development of the TIP.

17 The current TIP is a 2011 Transportation
18 Improvement Program which contains about eleven billion
19 dollars' worth of transportation investment.

20 The largest fund source in this programming
21 document comes from local elements, such as county sales
22 tax or local funds.

23 MTC is in the process of developing an update
24 to the 2011 TIP. This is called a 2013 TIP, and we hope
25 to release a Draft 2013 TIP in -- for public review on

1 June 22nd.

2 So our plan is to present a final TIP for
3 Commission approval later in September.

4 I want to transition now to Hannah Lindelof
5 from Dyett & Bhatia to go through some of the details in
6 our environmental document.

7 MS. LINDELOF: Thanks, Ashley.

8 So the focus of the meeting today is to talk
9 about the Environmental Impact Report or EIR. The
10 purpose of the EIR is to identify the plan's significant
11 impact on the environment, to evaluate a range of
12 reasonable alternatives to the plan, and to determine how
13 the plan can avoid or mitigate any significant impact.

14 This is going to be a programmatic level EIR
15 that will present a regionalized evidence of the proposed
16 plan and alternative and provide CEQA streamlining and
17 opportunities, as Ashley just described, with
18 transportation project and programming and develop -- a
19 development project as defined by SB 375. Sorry.

20 The EIR focuses on environmental impacts in
21 particular. There will be two additional separate
22 studies completed that will address the other two ease of
23 feasibility issues.

24 The Economic Impact Analysis will be completed
25 in the fall of this year and will assess the economic

1 impacts of Plan Bay Area land use and patterns of
2 transportation investments on regional -- the regional
3 economy, and an equity analysis will be completed in 2013
4 and will assess equity of all the alternatives included
5 in the EIR as well as identify the benefits and burdens
6 of land use impacts of transportation investments for
7 different socioeconomic groups.

8 In terms of the EIR itself, the process will
9 begin with the Notice of Preparation at a scoping meeting
10 that we're holding today with all of you, and all
11 comments received during this period will be taken
12 forward through the EIR process.

13 The next stage of the process will be a
14 collection of all these environmental settings as well as
15 defining the project description and also defining the
16 alternatives and screening alternatives for use in the
17 evaluation.

18 All of those steps go into doing the actual
19 environmental impact assessment where we evaluate a range
20 of issue areas and identify the cumulative impacts as
21 well as analysis of the alternatives.

22 We'll produce an Administrative Draft EIR and
23 a public review Draft EIR which we plan to put out in
24 December of this year for a 45-day public review period
25 with public hearings in January, and then we'll respond

1 to all those comments in a Final EIR document in March of
2 2013 with the anticipation of certification of the Final
3 EIR in April of 2013.

4 So at the outset of the process, what we
5 really want to hear from you is some key scoping
6 questions that we'd like you to keep in mind through the
7 presentation, and when you make your comments, you can
8 consider the following questions.

9 What potential environmental issue areas
10 should be analyzed. What alternatives should be
11 evaluated. What types of mitigation measures should be
12 considered that would help avoid or minimize
13 environmental impacts, and what elements of this EIR
14 would help your agency and CEQA exemptions and hearing.

15 So at the -- at this stage, we've identified
16 thirteen environmental issue areas for evaluation as
17 outlined in the Notice of Preparation.

18 The first is transportation where we'll
19 evaluate impacts to commute times and increasing the
20 vehicles miles traveled.

21 For air quality, we'll look at short-term
22 construction impacts as well as any impacts related to
23 conditions of criteria and toxic air contaminants and
24 their related health impacts and whether or not the plan
25 would conflict with any air quality plans or standards.

1 For land use and fiscal development, we will
2 be evaluating any impacts to agricultural land and open
3 space, whether or not we conflict with any local land use
4 plans and any impacts to local communities by disruptions
5 in any resolutions.

6 For energy, we will assess if there's any
7 increase in non-renewable energy consumption or
8 inconsistencies with energy conservation plans or
9 policies.

10 With regard to greenhouse gas and climate
11 change, we'll be assessing any increase in lead per
12 capita, CO2 emissions from on-road and global forces, any
13 vulnerability to sea level rise and whether or not that
14 plan conflicts with greenhouse gas reduction plans,
15 policies or regulations.

16 As related to noise, we'll be assessing any
17 noise levels or groundwater penetration in excess of
18 standard.

19 Challenges. We'll be evaluating whether the
20 plan causes an increase to risk of injury or loss of
21 life, soil erosion or loss of topsoil or increase
22 development or causes any damage to the soil.

23 For biological resources, we will be
24 evaluating any birth effects on sensitive or special
25 status VPs, preparing bird habitat, wetlands or other

1 natural communities and also the plan -- if the plan
2 would interfere with identified species or conflict with
3 adoptive conservation policies resource plans.

4 The water resources, we'll be looking at a
5 range of impacts related to groundwater recharge, storm
6 water runoff, erosion and related to flooding, beach,
7 tsunami and the like.

8 We will be looking at visual impacts to visual
9 resources such as birth effects on phoenix or scenic
10 resources within a highway or existing visual character
11 of communities, and also be looking at sources of light
12 and glare.

13 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How about individual
14 liberty and private property rights? Will you be looking
15 at that? It doesn't matter.

16 MS. LINDELOF: We'll be looking at adverse
17 change or damage to archaeological resources or
18 obstruction to the community.

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's a standard EIR.
20 They're all exactly the same. We already know what we
21 normally study.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Forgive us you guys.

23 MS. NGUYEN: If you could hold your comments.

24 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You're not going to
25 deviate from the normal plan.

1 MS. NGUYEN: You need to be respectful of the
2 meeting. Please hold your comments.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You're ruining our
4 plans.

5 MS. NGUYEN: We will ask you to hold your
6 comments until the appropriate comment period.

7 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is this going to be a
8 forum for questions?

9 MS. LINDELOF: We will ask you to hold your
10 comments until the public comment period. We will answer
11 your questions in the EIR.

12 MS. NGUYEN: We appreciate your discontinued
13 disruption. Thank you.

14 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You are rude.

15 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: They're taking our
16 rights and our freedoms.

17 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What are you doing
18 here?

19 MS. NGUYEN: If you continue to disrupt the
20 meeting, we will ask you to leave.

21 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's a public meeting.

22 MS. NGUYEN: If you continue to disrupt the
23 meeting.

24 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You are listening to
25 the people.

1 MS. NGUYEN: You are disrupting the content
2 that we are trying to present to the folks that we
3 participate tonight. We ask that you be respectful.

4 MS. CHION: I just have a couple more issue
5 areas. I know that there are standard issue areas, but I
6 think it's important to share them with the group
7 regarding the comments process.

8 In terms of public utilities, we'll look at
9 our regional water supply, waste water, storm water
10 facilities, solid waste and we'll be assessing any growth
11 and evaluating whether the plan will cause substantial
12 unanticipated population growth.

13 We are -- at this time we're not anticipating
14 introducing public materials, minimal resources as we do
15 not expect any impacts for regional importance in these
16 areas.

17 All the issue areas that we just outlined, we
18 will access it or arrange an alternative. Each
19 alternative is defined with a land use component and a
20 transportation component.

21 The land use component's objective is to meet
22 the key goals of the plan and the approach is to start
23 with locally adopted general plans and zoning, assess the
24 preferred land use strategy and then assess a very land
25 use policies to conserve and assure growth distribution

1 scenarios for each alternative.

2 The transportation objective is to meet the
3 key goals of the plan subject to financially constrained
4 strategy and the approach is to start again with the
5 existing transportation network and then assess the
6 preferred transportation strategy or modify it to reflect
7 shifts in investment priorities.

8 Assess -- assessment will look at the
9 Transportation Demand Management policies for the
10 alternatives.

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I had a question
12 that's kind of pertinent to this portion of the
13 presentation.

14 MS. CHION: Ashley has mentioned we'll
15 address all questions or comments as soon as we're done
16 with our presentation. To insure that we share with you,
17 that might address some of the questions that you already
18 have.

19 So as has it has been explained already, what
20 we are -- the environmental review is an evaluation of
21 the project, and the important component of the project,
22 as has been explained already, is the priority areas, and
23 those are areas that have been designated by the local
24 jurisdictions to accommodate our housing growth and our
25 job growth.

1 There's also the priority conservation area,
2 which are areas that again are designated locally to
3 retain our open space and our agricultural land, and more
4 recently the investment areas that address the specifics
5 of the rural communities and some employment centers.

6 As many of you have seen already, the land use
7 pattern of the project, the jobs/housing connection
8 strategy, that focuses on addressing the -- most of the
9 growth and the priority development areas.

10 That allows the retention of existing
11 conditions in many of the -- in many of the
12 neighborhoods, the small neighborhoods.

13 So the areas in pink show again what has been
14 designated as the priority development area.

15 So there are five alternatives in this
16 evaluation process. The first one is the no project,
17 which is required by CEQA. The second one is the
18 project, the jobs-housing connection strategy. The third
19 one, the lower concentrations of PDA growth.

20 The fourth one, eliminate the inter-regional
21 community, and the fifth one, environment, equity and
22 jobs, and I'll walk through each of those to explain
23 what's included.

24 In the no project, again the idea is to
25 evaluate what will the region look like if we did not

1 have -- if we did not have sustainable community
2 strategies, if the priority development areas are removed
3 from the policies --

4 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Kind of like America.
5 That's what it will look like.

6 MS. CHION: There's a more dispersed pattern
7 of jobs and housing growth as supported by existing
8 plans.

9 In terms of the transportation, the
10 transportation component will rely on the 2010 existing
11 transportation network, and it will include the projects
12 that have either already received funding or have gone
13 through environmental clearance.

14 In terms of the jobs-housing connection study
15 in the project -- that's the one that you're most
16 familiar with -- also highlight some of the components of
17 eighty percent of the new housing and sixty percent of
18 the new employment goes into the priority development
19 areas.

20 There is a focused investment in those areas,
21 and there's an effort to retain some of the existing
22 housing and the existing affordability in -- in those
23 areas of new investments to proceed.

24 In terms of the transportation, we're
25 proceeding with a preferred transportation investment

1 strategy. 277 billion planned budget. 88 percent of
2 that budget is directed to operations and maintenance of
3 the existing system, and there's some key advances and
4 key strategies.

5 Addressing the GHG Gap, meaning, addressing
6 our goal for the GHG reductions. Providing a One Bay
7 Area framework to support counties and local
8 jurisdictions, make a very good use of existing systems
9 so we can take advantage of the investments that we have
10 made in the past, and make the overall transit system
11 more sustainable.

12 In terms of alternative three, that's a lower
13 concentration of -- lower concentration of growth in PDA.
14 So that means that some of the growth will go to some
15 areas that already have transit access or are proposed
16 for transit investment, and it will also allow for
17 decentralized jobs in single family construction as
18 permitted or guided by our General Plan.

19 In terms of the transportation, this proceeds
20 also with a preferred transportation investment strategy.

21 Alternative four, eliminate inter-regional
22 commute. The big assumption here is that all workers
23 live in the region.

24 As you know right now, there's a percent of
25 our workers that live in Central Valley or other areas

1 outside of the region and commute to work within the Bay
2 Area.

3 Under this alternative, we will assume that
4 the region is able to produce and accommodate the housing
5 for all the workers, current and new jobs within the
6 region.

7 In terms of the transportation network, we
8 have a modified preferred transportation investment
9 strategy that includes transit comprehensive operation
10 analysis implementation, HOV lane conversions for express
11 lanes and implementation of priority policies on both
12 pricing and parking price.

13 And the last alternative, environment, equity
14 and jobs. It addresses additional affordable housing in
15 locations with transit and location with high level of
16 services and locations with high performing schools, and
17 in terms of transportation, it is a modified version of
18 the preferred transportation investment strategy number
19 two.

20 2005 transit service level restoration and
21 only HOV lane conversions for express lanes.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Where do the low
23 performing schools go?

24 MS. CHION: And in order to address this
25 alternative, part of the discussion that we want to have

1 with you is -- is not just how to define those
2 alternatives, but what are the policy tools that you
3 think will be essential to analyze in this process, and
4 we have aligned some of the --

5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We never got to vote
6 on any of these.

7 MS. CHION: -- improved infrastructure and
8 transit, fees, develop incentives that will allow some of
9 the construction work to take place, other types of
10 subsidies, zoning changes to accommodate the necessary
11 growth of selected locations, urban growth boundaries.

12 Many of our local jurisdictions have already
13 defined those. Those can be strengthened or extended.

14 Parking pricing, low pricing, and again these
15 are just some of the components for your consideration.
16 We would love to get your input in terms of expanding
17 this list or adding to it.

18 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's not government's
19 job to impose boundaries on our land.

20 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: A lot of those people
21 have American dreams. They have their own plans.

22 MS. NGUYEN: We would like to -- before we go
23 over the alternatives that we just described, we are
24 carrying forth the no project alternative as well as the
25 proposed project, the jobs-housing connection

1 alternative.

2 The other three that we presented are really
3 just draft ideas that we have and that we based on the
4 table.

5 We certainly would like to hear comments from
6 you and get other ideas about alternatives and your ideas
7 May help us to further refine, modify or even switch that
8 alternative altogether.

9 So thinking about your comments on
10 alternatives, we do have a few questions that we offer
11 for your consideration.

12 The first question is: Are we applying the
13 appropriate policy levers to really encourage more
14 sustainable development?

15 Are there any missing land use or
16 transportation strategies that we ought to consider as we
17 move forward in the development of alternatives?

18 And lastly, should we test an entirely
19 different alternative?

20 If yes, again, one of those policy levers that
21 you would like us to determine the future growth pattern
22 as well as the transportation network strategy.

23 This is the schedule that we're working on
24 that develop this Plan Bay Area EIR. What we do plan to
25 do is hold a series of scoping meetings over the next two

1 weeks and put as much comment that we can, orally at the
2 scoping meetings, but we certainly accept written
3 comments through July 11.

4 We will be going back to the MTC and ABAG
5 Boards for their review of the final set of alternatives
6 to be carried forth in the EIR. That would take place in
7 the month of July on the date that's indicated on the
8 slide.

9 We do intend to move forward once we get
10 approval from our respective boards on alternatives. We
11 do plan to move forward to prepare the environmental
12 document itself, and our plan is to release a draft
13 environmental document in December for public comment.

14 We will look to our Final EIR during the early
15 part of 2013 with a plan being adoption of the Plan Bay
16 Area as well as the certification of the Plan Bay Area
17 EIR in spring of 2013.

18 Again, just as a reminder, we do have copies
19 of the Notice -- we do have the Notice of Preparation
20 posted on One Bay Area.Org, but this slide is a reminder
21 that the scoping comments are due to us on July 11th.
22 You can send it via mail, fax or e-mail in the contact
23 information shown on the slide.

24 Again, oral comments will certainly be
25 welcomed and received tonight. We do have recorded and

1 we appreciate if you can focus on the scope and content
2 of the environmental assessment, and again written
3 comments are accepted through July 11th.

4 With that, that concludes our staff
5 presentation, and what I would like to do is to move
6 forward with the public comment process.

7 And again, please do respect the groundrules
8 that we set out at the beginning of this meeting. We do
9 ask that you stand at the mic and maybe I'll do right and
10 left and in alternating order, and please fill out a
11 speaker card. This will allow us to again record your
12 name properly for the record.

13 So as you go up to the mic and finish your
14 comments, if you can hand in the comments to staff that's
15 sitting right there, Ellen Griffin, that will be very
16 much appreciated.

17 MR. DE WITT: My name is Duane De Witt. I
18 work in West Oakland. I think for your data collection,
19 especially on the jobs-housing connection, that this is
20 currently inadequate.

21 You basically are missing the land use
22 component for West Oakland and need alternatives
23 evaluated for West Oakland that take into effect that
24 there's currently a West Oakland Specific Plan being
25 undertaken with money from the Federal Government, TIGER

1 II Grant.

2 It specifically has a predetermined outcome to
3 have a new transportation system that would be perhaps a
4 light rail transit system linking the Oakland Army Base
5 and West Oakland.

6 This could be one of your transit priority
7 project areas, but I don't see that listed in your
8 mapping.

9 It's already a priority development area, and
10 I believe you should be looking at this in your EIR right
11 now.

12 So that comes under missing land use policy or
13 transportation strategy, and I want you folks to look
14 into that and give us written comments on it in the EIR.

15 Now, I'm from an area of southwest Santa Rosa
16 called Roseland and I would ask you to modify the transit
17 priority project area you have marked there on your maps.

18 It reaches out a full five miles from Downtown
19 Santa Rosa into an area that's been largely rural and
20 basically would be overburdened by this type of approach.

21 But in Santa Rosa, we don't necessarily have
22 what I would think are public servants, people that we
23 can trust working in government, and so they've over-
24 reached and said, "Yeah, we'll make that whole area a
25 priority development area along Sebastopol Road/Highway

Page 29

1 101 because they want to get lots of transit money for
2 you for a train they call SMART, but I don't really know
3 if it's smart, I mean. I know about the train.

4 For myself, I believe that so far, your
5 process has been rather hurried, and therefore it's
6 inadequate in its public outreach to these kind people
7 who have taken the time to come here, many of whom do not
8 know the terminology that you specifically use in-house
9 amongst your planners.

10 So they wouldn't know that an EIR, they have
11 to use the word "inadequate" for it to even be addressed,
12 that the things that you say tonight have to use some
13 specific terminology to get in writing responses from
14 government agencies.

15 So good luck on all your efforts. I can't
16 stay. I appreciate the time that you've taken. Please
17 look at both of those and have them responded to in
18 writing.

19 MR. McCONNELL: Good evening. My name's J.R.
20 McConnell. I'm a policy analyst and I'm here on behalf
21 of the Jobs and Housing Coalition.

22 We are a coalition of major employers and
23 residential and commercial developers. Our members are
24 the ones who built the new housing in Oakland under Mayor
25 Jerry Brown's 10-K plan, which includes the major

1 business associations throughout the region.

2 We're also part of the Bay Area Business
3 Coalition, which includes the major business associations
4 and building industries of the Bay Area is a member of
5 our group.

6 Like them, we support the goals of SB 355 and
7 we, too, are committed to the adoption and implementation
8 of the strategies that are feasible both economically and
9 politically and that fully fulfills SB 375 objectives.
10 We associate ourselves with their comments.

11 In addition, we are concerned that our City of
12 Oakland, which already ascribes more affordable housing
13 than all of the other cities in Alameda combined, be
14 given a fair share allocation of affordable housing that
15 reflect the region's needs and our city's capacity.

16 We also hope you will focus on the fact that
17 goals and objectives are one thing, but we need to
18 incentivize local residents and elected officials who
19 will ultimately approve or reject development proposals.

20 At the end of the day, the review of the EIR
21 and alternatives must be viewed through the prism of
22 local support or opposition to development.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. NGUYEN: Next person at the mic.

25 MS. TOKERUD: My name is Kay Tokerud. I'm

1 from Santa Rosa and I'm with Democrats Against UN Agenda
2 21, and there's a website that talks about One Bay Area.

3 I don't understand what you're doing letting
4 the big developers off the hook on CEQA. That's like a
5 give-away subsidy for the largest developers. It's
6 really a one percent accommodation you're making at the
7 expense of all other property owners that may own
8 properties outside of these very small little strips of
9 land here and there, you know.

10 It wouldn't surprise me if the big developer's
11 already purchased land knowing this was coming so that
12 they can make a killing.

13 You know, and using federal money, this is a
14 top down thing. It's coming from the Federal Government
15 and you're like their foot soldiers, the useful idiots
16 that are running these MTCs and ABAGs that are
17 implementing a UN Agenda 21 plan all over the United
18 States.

19 This isn't happening just in the One Bay Area.
20 There's one -- one City One vision, one -- there's all
21 kinds of things all over the country exactly like this,
22 and this is a top down central planning effort like what
23 they did in the Soviet Union.

24 You know, this isn't what America -- how
25 America was put together. There's no regional boards in

1 the constitution that have access to 200 billion dollars
2 that you're going to dole out to property owners that
3 will build the model of high density housing near
4 transportation, and now you're talking about you not even
5 letting people commute and somehow you're going to
6 dictate that eighty percent of all new housing goes in
7 these little tiny areas.

8 So if you own a piece of land and thought you
9 were going to build, forget it. Your property value may
10 be zero after this thing comes to pass.

11 You know, and you're going to get sued by
12 people that have lost money because of this plan, and
13 hanging the carrot of money over cities that you know are
14 cash strapped, you know they're going to take the bribe.

15 That's part of -- that's why you're doing it
16 like this. They're going to go, "Well, we really don't
17 think it's right, but we want that money," and, you know,
18 this -- this isn't the kind of thing that should be going
19 on in the United States, and we will fight you tooth and
20 nail to the bitter end on this.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. NGUYEN: Your comment, please.

23 MS. KEENA: Hello. I'm Diana Keena and I
24 work for the City of Emeryville and I just wanted to
25 comment on some of the topics that you were saying that

1 the EIR was not going to address, and that' public
2 services and recreation.

3 I'm thinking that if cities that are near
4 transit are given -- allocated more growth than -- than
5 they have planned for, they might have a hard time
6 providing public services and recreation for the
7 additional population.

8 Thank you.

9 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

10 Next comment, please.

11 MS. G: Yeah. My name's Heather. I've been
12 to many of these meetings and never have we been given
13 the alternatives. We have been shown the alternatives,
14 all the different options.

15 We've been treated to fake dog and pony shows.
16 The public never gets to see all the detail. This is all
17 worked out ahead of time. This is all rigged. It's
18 all -- all the plans are in place, and it's all been
19 signed off, and now you want to give CEQA waivers to the
20 developers if they agree to this, because you know darn
21 well that these projects are not going to meet the
22 requirements of CEQA. You have to give them waivers.

23 To -- every time I come to a meeting, the
24 billions and billions of dollars go up and up and nobody
25 can tell me exactly how much any of this is going to

1 cost.

2 Where is the economic impact report?
3 Shouldn't we be doing that first? But nobody cares how
4 much any of this is going to cost. Nobody cares about
5 private property rights here.

6 There's twenty people in the audience here.
7 This is not a public input meeting. This is a farce.
8 Every single one of these meetings has been rigged.

9 I recognize the people sitting in this room.
10 They are shills and stakeholders and paid people from
11 organizations that seek to benefit from the outcome of
12 these meetings and they know that I know who they are
13 because I've seen them before at these meetings.

14 So they can no longer say, "This is my first
15 time and I'm just here trying to learn and these people
16 are disrupting the meetings."

17 I am here because I am concerned about
18 individual private property rights, rezoning. Zoning of
19 private property is a police power. It means that you
20 must violate a person's private property rights in order
21 to change its actual use from what it currently is.
22 So you are using a police power to do that.

23 Open space is not yours to do with. It's not
24 government's job to take somebody's private property and
25 rezone it to open space and decide that they can't use

1 it.

2 And this is not a left or right issue. This
3 is about right and wrong. I don't care what side of
4 political aisle you are on. You are taking people's
5 private property.

6 You're making decisions about who the winners
7 and losers are going to be and the developers are now
8 standing in line of course because they want to develop.

9 Now, who wouldn't want to do that if you've
10 got somebody -- the Federal Government is offering you
11 billions of dollars? You will of course take the money
12 and put your workers to work.

13 And then of course they'll probably use
14 project labor agreements and all of that. So we're
15 funding our own demise.

16 There is no such thing as regional government.
17 There is no such thing. These bodies are made up
18 fictional entities. They don't exist. They shouldn't
19 exist. They are not in our constitution.

20 They're totally unconstitutional and a
21 violation of our rights. This regionalism is equated to
22 Soviet style Communism, and that's what's happening in
23 this country.

24 This is all top down planning, and I've been
25 to these meetings. I've seen local jurisdictions come in

1 and grovel and basically say, "We don't really want this
2 for our community. We know it's not right, but we want
3 to play ball and we want some of this transportation
4 money and we know we're not going to get it so we'll play
5 along."

6 Don't pretend that this is some volunteer
7 thing with these PDAs, are homegrown and that all these
8 cities want to do that, because that is not true.

9 Read the newspaper. There's plenty of
10 articles about cities that are pushing back and saying no
11 to this, and I applaud them, and there's a few citizens
12 here that care about this will continue to dog you guys
13 and -- and bang the drum about what's happening, because
14 once this becomes a regional plan, we will be forced to
15 adopt it.

16 And you cannot have our private property
17 rights. You cannot have our cars. You cannot take our
18 freedoms away from us. We will not stand for it.

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's right. I'd
20 rather die, and I'm being very serious.

21 MS. NGUYEN: Next comment, please.

22 MR. TONG: Good evening. Actually, I'm Larry
23 Tong, Intra-agency Planning Manager with the East Bay
24 Regional Park District.

25 Contrary to some beliefs, we've been around

1 for over 75 years serving both Contra Costa County and
2 Alameda County.

3 I would like to start by thanking MTC and ABAG
4 for taking the lead in creating a plan for a thriving and
5 sustainable Bay Area.

6 As part of that process, you will be preparing
7 a Draft EIR and it will be critical for you to address
8 the impacts of the transportation and land use
9 developments that are associated with this plan.

10 It will be important for you to identify
11 the -- and mitigate the significant and adverse impacts
12 on parks, recreation, open space and green fills.

13 The financial incentives for protecting
14 natural resource areas that are required by SB 375 need
15 to be included as mitigations for those impacts.

16 The mitigation measures also need to
17 acknowledge the role that natural resource areas and open
18 space conservation play in mitigating the adverse impacts
19 of the development of transportation and land uses.

20 Those would include carbon sequestration,
21 especially in tidal marsh and coniferous forests and
22 properly managed grass lands.

23 Greenhouse gas reduction, the health benefits
24 primarily of getting people out of their cars, reduced
25 demands on medical and community services, protecting

1 wildlife habitat, mitigation corridors and linkages,
2 preservation of endangered species habitats, restoration
3 of habitats to mitigate for development, attenuation of
4 noise and light through open space buffers, preparation
5 of scenic open spaces which enhance property values,
6 protecting and enhancing water quality through less
7 runoff and attenuation of pollution through open space
8 coffer, recreation again, creation of jobs in
9 conservation efforts, keeping agriculture viable and
10 preventing development in seismically unstable areas.

11 The mitigation measures also need to address
12 any conflicts with adopted city, county and regional open
13 space plans and elements.

14 We previously submitted a letter in February
15 of this year that outlines some of our requests for
16 mitigation. We will be submitting additional comments
17 prior to the cutoff.

18 Thank you very much.

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I got a comment for
20 you. No.

21 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I have a quick
23 question. How about when somebody is pro that starts
24 speaking, you all start writing notes, taking diligent
25 notes, and when people are speaking about freedom and

1 making their own decision, you just sit there with this
2 vacuous look on your face.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: They don't care.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I have a couple
5 questions. What is -- how are you going to measure CO2
6 with mobile devices. What do these things look like?

7 MS. NGUYEN: I don't think we've said that we
8 would evaluate CO2 using mobile devices.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought that's what
10 you said on your slide.

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How do you measure
12 greenhouse gases?

13 MS. NGUYEN: In terms of measuring greenhouse
14 gases or estimating the greenhouse gases that come from
15 cars, we will be using the Air Resources Board's latest
16 emissions model called Airfact 2011 to conduct our
17 analysis.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is that? What is
19 Airfact 2011?

20 MS. NGUYEN: It's an emissions model
21 developed by the Air Resources Board for use by our
22 agency.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So is it a mobile
24 device like this?

25 MS. NGUYEN: It's a mobile device.

1 MS. LINDELOF: It's a mobile source, not
2 device.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So essentially it
4 could be completely fraudulent, because it's somebody's
5 idea of what CO2 emissions are going to be.

6 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's a guesstimate.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Moving on. As far as
8 the -- the road pricing, can you explain road pricing to
9 me?

10 MS. NGUYEN: Road pricing could include fees
11 that you impose on roadways. It could include a -- A
12 vehicle models a travel fee that we would impose.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So my husband drives
14 an hour to work everyday. He would pay more than ninety
15 bucks a week, because that's what it's costing us now for
16 our jobs that we are happy to drive to, but we've already
17 paid for those stupid roads for our taxes.

18 You're going to charge people more? Do you
19 know how many people are going to lose jobs because
20 you're going to price them out of their job? Have you
21 ever thought of that?

22 There's no mass transit to where he goes, and
23 people don't need mass transit to where he goes. I'm
24 just saying that you're going to lose more jobs by
25 getting all these more taxes.

1 I mean, just stop and think about it. Have
2 some common sense. If you keep charging people to get to
3 work, at some point we're going to stop working.

4 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's what they want.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. As far as the
6 CEQA waivers, I thought the whole point of doing this was
7 the environment, and then you give CEQA waivers to
8 people. What's up with that? Then that's not to
9 point, apparently. What is the point if you're going to
10 give CEQA waivers to everyone?

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's the one
12 percent, giving them more money.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the point? Let
14 me know now. I want to know.

15 MS. NGUYEN: The CEQA streamlining provisions
16 are as I mentioned in Senate Bill 375. The intent of the
17 bill is to encourage transit oriented development.
18 And there is some benefits afforded to those projects
19 that have certain intensities that could take advantage
20 of the CEQA streamlining.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it's not about the
22 environment, then.

23 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You can't say it's
24 about the environment, then.

25 MS. LINDELOF: It's to promote sustainable

1 growth patterns that would reduce greenhouse gases.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They won't reduce if
3 you give them the waiver. I mean, it's a joke.

4 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I want to understand.

6 What is density? I think I understand the density.

7 What's the intensity?

8 MS. LINDELOF: Intensity is the same idea,
9 but for jobs. The same idea as for housing density, but
10 it relates more to jobs and employment.

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: So am I to interpret
12 that the housing -- we're going to force employment to be
13 -- and the housing to be in the same place? That's
14 density and intensity?

15 MS. LINDELOF: Well, density and intensity is
16 the focus that you can have a certain intensity or
17 certain standard.

18 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You don't want me to
19 walk away from the meeting not understanding that.

20 MS. NGUYEN: We'll ask you to come up to the
21 mic. That's not on the record.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's part of you
23 explaining.

24 MS. NGUYEN: I have no problems answering the
25 question, but just for the record, if you can be at the

1 mic so we can hear you and record you, that would be very
2 much.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I can hear him. It's
4 not that big of a group.

5 MS. NGUYEN: I'll take the next speaker,
6 please.

7 MS. JACOBSON: My name is Janet Jacobson and
8 I'm an East Bay citizen for my entire adult life and I
9 really appreciate you -- I am not a skill, number one.
10 I have been to one other Bay Area plan meeting
11 and I appreciate so much that you've been able to find
12 me, basically, and through the Emeryville Chamber and the
13 Emeryville Chamber of Commerce, I should say, and the
14 other East Bay Chambers of Commerce, I find that it's
15 hard because of this protest going on here to benefit as
16 much as I would like personally. It's hard to close them
17 off.

18 Nevertheless, I do have a background in some
19 transportation issues and I want to emphasize what I
20 think is important in terms of transit problems, mostly
21 transit issues, and that is the potential for shuttle
22 services that would be free.

23 I know to use that free word is -- I don't
24 know where that really goes in our world anymore, but I
25 think there's potential there if there were jitneys and

1 flex cars and fuel efficient fine, green, fine, but
2 something along the major corridors that we have right
3 now that are slowly taxing us emotionally, stressfully.

4 We could benefit if that was a viable talk,
5 okay.

6 And then the other one, the other idea -- and
7 my brain's going to stop me for a moment. Sorry. I had
8 another idea and I've lost it for the moment.

9 But I wanted to thank you and continue your
10 reach -- reaching out. If you can get someone like me
11 over here, then that's good, and whatever you need to do
12 more, I thank you.

13 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

14 Next speaker, please.

15 MS. GOTTSTEIN: Hello. My name is Carol
16 Gottstein. I'm a third generation Alameda resident. It
17 seems like very tasteless you're paying for. I don't
18 know who would want to live in it. I don't think human
19 beings live alone by what the government can provide for
20 them, but I just want to say this is like the second
21 meeting I've been to, although I've been following it by
22 reading the documents.

23 Striking from a big Agenda 21 document to the
24 little Bay Area plan, words like faith and family and
25 freedom and individualism were always missing from those

1 documents, and when I think about how I will fit in, I
2 will never fit in to these plans.

3 You talk about walkable communities. I'm
4 disabled. I will not be able to walk around the block
5 ever again in my whole lifetime.

6 My preferred -- my absolutely mandatory method
7 of transportation is my vehicle, my internal combustion
8 vehicle.

9 Are you going to force everybody who depends
10 on a disabled placard carrying vehicle to get out of them
11 somehow? Are you going to subsidize us?

12 Also, I'm not sure what you mean by a job --
13 I'm a medical doctor. Where would you like medical
14 doctors to live? Are we supposed to live in a compound
15 surrounding the hospital?

16 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Upstairs.

17 MS. GOTTSTEIN: I would really like to know.
18 There's a lot of things I could think of commenting on,
19 but one thing I never hear anybody mention, where do the
20 churches go? There's never any plan for any synagogues,
21 temples, churches, any faith communities.

22 Are there going to be transit trollies on
23 Sundays and Saturdays to take people of each faith to
24 their designated place, or are you going to be all the
25 churches on the outside by the wildlife refuges?

1 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We'll have Gaia and
2 our bicycles.

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The state religion.

4 MS. GOTTSTEIN: That's what's been the heart
5 of civilization from the beginning of time, and if you
6 leave stuff like tradition and churches out of the whole
7 plan, it's not going to work.

8 You know in your heart it's not going to work,
9 It's just suctioning billions of dollars away from the
10 surrounding municipalities, counties and states. They're
11 going bankrupt because of plans like One Bay Area Plan.

12 MS. CHION: If you may address the last
13 comment, I think some of those points are very important,
14 whether it's a church, whether it's a grocery store,
15 whether it's a library, those are the components that
16 need to be included and the idea of each neighborhood,
17 each community needs to define what -- what are the
18 components, what are the elements that are required.

19 The idea is to infrastructure and support the
20 people who want to walk and who want to bike, but
21 obviously we have a strong system that relies on driving
22 and -- and on automobiles, and that is not going to be
23 dismantled and there are many neighborhoods that will
24 stay as they are.

25 Again, part of this effort is to address

1 changes at selected locations by choice, and that allows
2 those communities that want to retain the same qualities
3 and the same densities and the same driving in pretty
4 much the same shape.

5 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

6 MR. FERNANDEZ: Good evening. I just -- I
7 just can't help but go back to our founding fathers who
8 fought for eight years for freedom and liberty. I don't
9 sense that here. I haven't sensed it in many of these
10 meetings for the last two years.

11 There was a comment made just one person ago.
12 We need to cut off these other comments. There's
13 supposed to be freedom of speech to have a difference of
14 opinion.

15 I've worked in corporations. Difference of
16 opinions are healthy. They're very healthy.

17 Something I might walk in with an idea that is
18 not necessarily the best idea when it's all said and
19 done, but it's something to branch off of and create a
20 bigger idea.

21 So there's way too many comments from the
22 folks that are for all of this that the other people
23 shouldn't be heard.

24 I don't know where to start. This -- this --
25 we allowed you to get through this. If this was

1 presented at a corporation in Silicon Valley, which most
2 of you people respect, this would be intolerable. This
3 would not be put up with.

4 Whether it was the general manager or the CEO
5 or even an upper level manager. When they left that
6 meeting, we expect to understand each and everyone of the
7 concepts here.

8 It's true. There's nothing -- when you talk
9 about all your jargon, I -- I don't know that I have a
10 prayer of getting -- of being able to write it out in
11 your language, and I'm a pretty intelligent guy.

12 I just don't have the hours and the day to put
13 into this.

14 So I don't feel like I even have a prayer of a
15 chance of really responding to this in the intelligent
16 way that it needs to be responded to.

17 We talk about the melting of aisles. It never
18 ceases to amaze me for those people who consider
19 themselves green, which most of us do consider ourselves
20 green. We just don't understand this existential
21 greenness.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Esoteric.

23 MS. FERNANDEZ: It's just -- it's just --
24 it's so frustrating to know that you're an intelligent
25 human being and it's like talking to a wall. So

1 frustrating.

2 The sea level rising. They've been rising for
3 millions of years, since the ice age, and I'm not trying
4 to be coy about it, but please, if you're going to push
5 this ecological movement, be rational and logical.

6 How much of the ice is gone? The seas are not
7 going to rise that much more, folks. Quit laying that on
8 me.

9 Investment in preferred transportation. I
10 have friends now just with the toll roads -- the toll
11 lanes that have just been put in.

12 Nobody wants in those lanes unless there's two
13 people in the car and everybody else is in the other
14 lane, and then the magic of it all, somebody somewhere in
15 some organization, board, committee or whatever.

16 The designs of these roads, the traffic coming
17 on the freeway has to come over four lanes. So what does
18 everybody do that can't get in the high density lane?
19 Backups.

20 When they want to get off, guess what they do?
21 After they've been on it to save two or \$3.00 to go a
22 couple five six miles, they have to come back across all
23 the lanes. Everybody's backing the cars up again.
24 That's certainly helping the CO2 emissions.

25 I can't believe that you're really -- I have

1 to believe that you understand that all this money that
2 goes to Sacramento and the Federal Government, they move
3 it around at will. There are people who -- who are
4 working in Sacramento, but the press won't print it. The
5 information is all there. All the lies, it's amazing.

6 This is going to be used for the schools. No,
7 they move it back to pensions where they stole the money
8 before so that they can make it over the next few years.

9 It's all -- it's just -- it's just -- they're
10 conning us. They're conning you.

11 Have any of you seen Waiting for Superman?
12 It's a movie. It's a documentary about the education in
13 the United States of America. Do you know how well we're
14 doing even in the preferred school districts? Do you?

15 Have you seen that movie, the documentary?
16 You really need to see this. You can put all the density
17 and you can tell businesses that they're going to move
18 Downtown Oakland, and when they try to compete in an
19 international marketplace and they can't add or subtract,
20 let alone do algebra, geometry and physics, there won't
21 be jobs.

22 Why don't you talk to us honestly? Five
23 businesses a week are leaving California. The highest
24 number of people, workers that are leaving California are
25 in their upper 20s and 30s because it's no longer

1 feasible to raise a family and make a living in
2 California.

3 How many of you have experienced -- I do. I
4 work with a lot of small businesses. They say, "Ralph,
5 can I explain something to you?" I say, "Sure. I'll
6 listen."

7 Here's the new rules. Here's what I do now.
8 Here's the end result of it. Now I have to go buy all
9 this equipment, send in letters and do all this other
10 rigmarole, and guess what happens? The end result is the
11 same thing.

12 Because somebody in Sacramento or somebody in
13 Washington, D.C. think they know it all.

14 I want to ask you a question. I used to work
15 at Intel. If I got up here in front of you and I said to
16 you I understand every single procedure, every single
17 professional discipline in the company and I have it all
18 A's and I can tell each and every department exactly how
19 they should run their department, you would think I was a
20 narcissistic fool.

21 We have people who have never worked --
22 they've gone from college, they go to Washington, D.C.
23 They go to Sacramento. They've never worked in a
24 business in their life. They haven't even run a
25 department to see how to run a budget.

1 They don't know what it takes. It's not a
2 slight on them. It's just they don't have the talent or
3 skill developed to know how to understand what their
4 rules and regulations are doing to the average guy, the
5 average business. It's horrific.

6 MS. NGUYEN: If I could ask you to conclude
7 your remarks, we would appreciate it.

8 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

9 MR. FERNANDEZ: See what I mean? Thank you.
10 No more freedom of speech.

11 I have to -- I have to tell you that I've been
12 to a lot of these meetings, as well. I can't tell you
13 how many times I've gotten up. I've asked questions to
14 the board members and they said, "We're going to get back
15 to you."

16 How many times in the last year and a half or
17 two years do you think that they came back with a
18 response and an answer?

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I know.

20 MR. FERNANDEZ: Zero. All I can ask you
21 tonight is I would wish that you would really get
22 involved in the communities in a way that's beyond this
23 utopian view.

24 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Shut up.

25 MR. FERNANDEZ: See how I got told to shut

1 up. Thank you for listening. I know it was some value.

2 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

3 MR. MELLANDER: Thank you. My name is Jim
4 Mellander. I'm a citizen of El Sobrante, and one of the
5 thing I've noticed is a lot of the leaders of this -- of
6 the movement against ABAG that's up here are women, and
7 I'm not sexist at all, but I will say I do think it's
8 shameful that there are not more men standing up against
9 a nanny government, standing up for their families,
10 standing up for their friends, standing up for their
11 country. Where are you?

12 We don't need nannies telling us how to live
13 our lives. We don't need nannies pushing us around. We
14 don't need that.

15 Where are the men? I'm serious. That's also
16 for the people that are watching us. It's going to be
17 broadcast, so there's lots of people that are going to
18 see this, as well.

19 Where are the men that are going to stand up
20 for their country and against this kind of nanny
21 government that you guys are instituting? Are they
22 afraid? Maybe they are.

23 I'll tell you what. I don't need any of you
24 to tell me how to take care of my family, and the men in
25 here, they don't need any of you to tell them how to take

1 care of their family and provide for their family.

2 It's a lie for you to think that you know
3 better than the people of the family how to run their
4 life and how to arrange for their transportation, how to
5 get to their job. All that's a fraud.

6 What you're talking about is a total fraud,
7 and -- and I'm not buying it one bit, and I hope there's
8 some men that are going to stand you said up and think
9 about that, and women, too, of course, and I -- I'm
10 grateful to all these women here and I love them all.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

13 Are there any -- next speaker, please?

14 MS. SPALDING: Kirsten Spalding with the San
15 Mateo County Union Community Alliance. We speak for a
16 community in San Mateo County of low and moderate income,
17 primarily blue collar workers who have been following
18 this process closely.

19 We have really three concerns, and I hope
20 you'll continue to follow them through the EIR process.

21 We're concerned, of course, about reducing
22 commute times for workers and by building housing close
23 to job centers.

24 We appreciate that commute times will be
25 reduced, and that is certainly better for the community,

1 better for the lives of workers.

2 We're concerned that there be affordable
3 transportation options, particularly during commute
4 hours.

5 So as you consider the highway pricing
6 options, we do want to be sure that you're accounting for
7 the fact that some workers, as a prior speaker noted, do
8 have to commute during commute hours to get to jobs, and
9 we want to make sure that they're not penalized and they
10 can afford to get to the jobs.

11 And then we are also concerned about job
12 creation, and frankly by putting public expenditure in
13 housing in dense areas, there's more economic activity,
14 there's more spending. We -- we expect jobs to be
15 created.

16 So as you look at the mitigation, you noted
17 that you're going to be looking at how many jobs are
18 reduced by the different options.

19 We would also like you to look at how many
20 jobs will be created as you create more dense housing and
21 more economic center.

22 We'd also note that all of your public
23 dollars, the federal dollars create jobs, and so to the
24 extent that you're measuring the amount of -- the
25 possible job creation at the same time that you count job

1 loss, please account also for the federal dollars and the
2 jobs that those money create.

3 We know in San Mateo County that the
4 construction jobs created by transit oriented development
5 is large and that those dollars get plowed right back
6 into the local economy. So we're really good for local
7 prosperity in the area.

8 Thank you for all your work.

9 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

10 MR. CAGNON: Good evening. My name is
11 Charles Cagnon. I'm from San Francisco. I have an
12 environmental background, a corporate social
13 responsibility background, a corporate planning
14 background. I was a senior planner for a number of
15 years, and I'm a member of the National Association of
16 Business Economists, but I'm speaking here as a lay
17 person to try and talk about some considerations for this
18 plan that I think might be valuable.

19 Dr. Thomas Sowell, the noted economist out of
20 Stanford, has written about the cost of living in the Bay
21 Area, and he attributes the cost of living in the Bay
22 Area to land use restrictions and regulations, and this
23 plan basically takes the existing land use restrictions
24 and burdens and exacerbates them, and it also accentuates
25 them over time, because there's a sense of wanting to

1 sort of continually compress people over the 25-year
2 forecast here.

3 What this does is the government's creating
4 shortages, and so what that does is it drives up prices.
5 And so what you're having with this plan is fundamentally
6 a policy which condemns the Bay Area to be the high cost
7 place of living and the high cost place of working, and
8 that high cost has consequences environmentally. This is
9 an environmental section.

10 So, for example, like if I wanted to buy a
11 house in Fairfield, such as one of the San Francisco
12 Supervisors did for a quarter million dollars, and the
13 land use boundary sales that I'm not allowed to do that
14 any more and I'm forced to not live in the cheap area and
15 I'm forced to live in Concord and pay 400,000, that
16 150,000 is economic waste, and that economic waste
17 percolates throughout every activity in the community
18 because it's not isolated to one home, and that economic
19 waste has to be paid for through economic activities that
20 people would not have had to do outside of the government
21 impositions.

22 And so that -- those wasteful economic
23 activities that you're imposing on society are polluting.

24 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

25 MR. CAGNON: You know, so when you think

1 about all of this stuff you're talking about, the thing
2 you really ever to look for is absolute cost and absolute
3 price.

4 If I were to boil this down to one simple
5 phrase for you, I would say price equals pollution, and
6 so if you're interested in -- if you're not reducing
7 price, you're increasing pollution according to this
8 plan, and I don't see anything -- anything in this plan
9 that has a kind of an economic consideration about how
10 much economic waste is being generated by this and how
11 much pollution is accompanying that.

12 The -- similarly along those lines, businesses
13 that are going to consider doing business here,
14 particularly the ones that involve physical items,
15 production of goods and distribution of goods, those
16 businesses will find themselves -- as the speaker before
17 pointed out, those businesses will find themselves being
18 increasingly non-competitive because of the cost
19 structure of living here and working here, and what
20 you're going to find is that those businesses are going
21 to exit.

22 So basically what we're talking about here is
23 most union jobs are toast. The woman before me was
24 talking about that.

25 These businesses will move to cheaper places

1 and they will truck in their goods to the Bay Area
2 because doing business here will be a mistake. They'll
3 be uncompetitive and they won't be able to compete with
4 people that are outside the -- outside the Bay Area, and
5 I think that what you're going to have to plan for is an
6 increase in -- this -- this is maybe speculative, but I
7 think you should plan for increase in truck traffic on
8 the roads here.

9 Similarly, as we've seen in other areas with
10 smart growth such as Portland, which is the one that's
11 been studied actively, is that the people flee the --
12 people flee smart growth.

13 And so what's happened in Portland is that
14 commute times have increased as people have fled for
15 their freedom outside of the growth boundaries and they
16 commute in.

17 They commute longer, but they want to --
18 people are not mechanical objects, and I think you're
19 treating people as mechanical objects with this whole
20 vision. It's scary. It's scary the way you're treating
21 people in this thing.

22 So you should expect that road use will
23 increase and commute times will increase according to
24 this thing because you will drive people away, and you've
25 seen it now.

1 You know, particularly in the South Bay, it's
2 a -- with the restrictions that are there, it's easy for
3 them to find refuge that are outside the growth
4 boundaries.

5 I think if you really want to -- I don't know
6 how serious you are about this stuff. But, you know,
7 Michael Tanner at the Cato Institute has studied this
8 stuff extensively, and I would recommend that rather than
9 hiring TransForum or Iikley, that you go back and hire
10 somebody that actually has done some real work on this
11 thing and realize what kind of damage you're about to do
12 with us.

13 And so there are other people that probably
14 you could join with, but you really need to get a -- have
15 a fresh point of view about this from a professional
16 basis, because what you're describing, you're living in a
17 fantasy world.

18 You know, the -- you know, there's a reason
19 why the Soviet Union was ecological disaster and that the
20 west is ecologically clean. But well -- as people get
21 more wealthy, they become more cleaner, they become
22 naturally designed for a higher quality of life.

23 So the people in the Bay Area, even before you
24 came here, decided that they wanted to be green. Who
25 would have thought that they could have been green

1 independent of the MTC?

2 The other thing that I want to mention here is
3 the capital expenditures. You're spending almost 300
4 billion dollars on capital expenditures without one shred
5 of input from the people who are going to be buying it.

6 So, you know, the notion that this capital is
7 going to be optimized is completely -- is complete --
8 another completely fanciful notion.

9 The people that are the taxpayers that live
10 here are the people that are going to be paying for this
11 stuff and they're going to be using it, and these are the
12 people that should be making the purchase decision, and
13 there's absolutely no provision in this thing for the
14 people that are going to be paying for this thing with
15 the hours out of their lives and the people that are
16 going to be using it for their own conveniences to
17 actually have a say in whether they actually want to buy
18 this stuff or not.

19 You're deciding as if it's true, but we have
20 vivid, vivid evidence with Solyndra that two-thirds of
21 the -- two-thirds of the green money that was allocated
22 in the last three years was wasted.

23 You know, we have a situation in the United
24 States where the country is reeling. The country is on
25 its back because the government distorted the real estate

1 markets and you've got a 25-year plan to distort the real
2 estate markets.

3 And finally, I think that -- so the idea with
4 this capital -- the capital -- when you look at the waste
5 that's incorporated in this capital budget, I don't know
6 whether you want to use the two-thirds figure that we
7 have from the Solyndra model, but let's just call this
8 capital Solyndra II.

9 So you've got to have some government thing --
10 some of that capital is just going to be wasted and it's
11 going to take economic activity out of Americans and then
12 that economic activity is just going to be put to waste,
13 and any pollution that was responsible for the creation
14 of that billions of dollars is going to be excess
15 pollution that wouldn't have been there had -- had there
16 been a rational process for capital deployment.

17 You know, finally, I just want to say, you
18 know, off the side of kind of like look -- the says is
19 this: Wasted economic activity means pollution that
20 shouldn't be there, and you've got a plan that waste
21 economic activity.

22 But what's really funny about this, this is a
23 terrifying plan. I mean, I'm here because I'm scared to
24 death. This is -- I've been involved with green stuff my
25 whole life and strategy and thinking, but this is the

1 most terrifying thing I've seen in my life, and the thing
2 that's really scary to me is that you're not scared.

3 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

4 MR. BENNETT: Jim Bennett, Santa Rosa,
5 California.

6 So look. Let the record show that a child
7 could report back and let you know that this charade that
8 you've lodged to resemble public input hasn't gone very
9 well. A child could tell you that.

10 Let the record show that this whole thing is
11 entirely inadequate, and I've said before, this will
12 decimate the property rights and freedom of choice in
13 terms of where and how they live and the transportation
14 options and the American dreams of eight million people.

15 I hope you understand and realize what a
16 significant crossroads we are at in terms of humanity and
17 what culmination we are embarking on with the second half
18 of 2012 and how consequential how we act in our decisions
19 as this crossroad is going to be in our ongoing.

20 This plan that you have aligned yourself with
21 and seek to align us with, UN Agenda 21, Sustainable
22 Development, Iikley, MTC, ABAG and all of its fabulous
23 warm and fuzzy names and terms that they've hijacked are
24 oppression.

25 That is not a matter of opinion. It is

1 history. Like the old duck adage, it has all of the
2 earmarks of oppression. Pick one. What are the
3 cornerstones of our freedom in our country? Property
4 rights, limited government.

5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What about oppressing
6 me?

7 MR. BENNETT: What are the other two again,
8 okay? Limited government, property rights. All of the
9 four cornerstones of freedom have been undermined with
10 this -- with Iikley and all of these Agenda 21 tentacles.

11 It is as though you folks that are supposedly
12 to be -- work for the public, it is as though you are
13 members of a cult. It is as though you are members of a
14 religious cult.

15 It has all of the makings. There is a bible,
16 Agenda 21 Sustainable Development, 400 pages, thirty
17 chapters. You have your own goals, your own language,
18 your own ideology, an assurance that if you're adherent,
19 your future will be assured. Your own motivational
20 rah-rah meetings. It has all of the makings.

21 I will do everything in my power to keep this
22 from happening to my community, to include petitions. I
23 have a trailer with a billboard on it. I'll do anything
24 and everything I can so that when I look back on this
25 chapter, I know that I did everything I could.

1 You shouldn't need somebody to tell you that
2 this is wrong. There should be a little voice inside
3 you, and the little temporary gain with the golden
4 handcuffs that is the -- the salary and the pensions that
5 a lot of you people are enjoying weighed against the pain
6 when you realize what has happened to our country, saying
7 oops, ain't going to get it all back.

8 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

9 MS. MELLANDER: My name's Marilynne
10 Mellander. I've lived in El Sobrante for forty years or
11 so.

12 Everybody's pretty much said everything
13 already, but I'd like to reiterate is that CEQA is just a
14 waste of taxpayer's dollars. It penalizes the little guy
15 like me.

16 If I wanted to put a roof on my house -- I've
17 owned this house for almost forty years. I'd have to get
18 an Environmental Impact Report, which will cost 200,000
19 bucks.

20 I have to jump through all kinds of hoops from
21 the Planning Department just to put one little room on my
22 house. I've checked into it, but if I want to convert my
23 land and a PDA, I could do it without doing any of that.

24 And you think about it, you say that SB 375
25 mandates this kind of stuff, and that has to do with

1 greenhouse gases, which is primarily CO2.

2 If you stack a bunch of people together, just
3 think of the level of -- if you want to put it this way,
4 CO2, because every same we exhale, CO2 comes out of our
5 mouth.

6 So it's kind of hard for me to see green or
7 whatever you want to call it, the fact of sustainability
8 concept is a flawed scientific concept in itself.

9 It's been investigated in several books. It
10 makes no sense. It's just an elitist concept. It has
11 been documented. That's what it is, and you're using it.
12 You're on the payroll because you're benefitting from it
13 and all of us are getting hosed by it, basically.

14 I believe the best plan is no plan. You have
15 an alternative A, which is no plan. It would save the
16 taxpayers money. It would -- it would enable private
17 property rights to flourish. It would enable us to
18 continue to get around like we want to and not be forced
19 into public transit and into smart road villages where I
20 would not want to live.

21 Smart road villages, by the way, are very
22 dangerous. In the event of a natural disaster, the more
23 stacked together people are, the more loss of life.
24 That -- that was proven during the earthquake. You had
25 that happen.

1 People in individual homes are less likely to
2 get killed than -- when they have a little land around
3 them than they are in apartment buildings. So you're
4 actually contributing to problems for people.

5 It's more dangerous, and I notice in the CEQA
6 process, it's animals and the land that are given the --
7 the most importance.

8 The impact on human beings, the kind of life
9 they want to live is of no importance whatsoever. It's
10 not evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report.

11 I've been through it because I used to be on
12 the El Sobrante Municipal Advisory Council, and they had
13 an EIR there to change the General Plan, and I see it now
14 in your little map over here, it would be a PDA.

15 It's a little street that goes through on Dam
16 Road on Appian Way and are all designated a PDA. All
17 they got to do is put in for their grant and they can
18 build their high density housing there in our little
19 communities, and I find that deplorable.

20 So I am -- I am for alternative A, no plan.
21 It's really for the best to do it that way.

22 One more comment I have. You're using our tax
23 dollars to invest in land use and transportation
24 scenarios that are actually -- come from faulty modeling,
25 and they have no basis in reality.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker.

3 MR. GENE: Bill Gene, Lafayette, California.

4 So I was at a -- a meeting several months ago
5 on another issue in San Jose. I guess that's your
6 standard -- your actual building, the MTC building, and I
7 was outside that waiting for the meeting to start and I
8 happened to see three or four of those trains go across
9 the main thoroughfare, and what I noticed was that each
10 train basically had the conductor or the person driving
11 and one or two people, and I think that's your answer
12 right there.

13 These agencies are not sustainable. Nobody
14 wants to use them and very few use them.

15 And in Lafayette, I am just getting involved
16 with a new development that -- that you people are
17 pushing, a stack and pack that's by the BART station
18 there, and in assessing the community input or the
19 community feel for these things, over 95 percent of the
20 people don't -- don't want these stack and pack buildings
21 in the middle of their towns.

22 For me, the -- the building right now --
23 Lafayette is a small community and it's got one major
24 road that goes through it with five -- five or six street
25 lights, and all of them now are rated D or F, and

1 basically what they're saying is they want another 81
2 units in this one development, five stories tall which
3 basically takes the entire skyline out of the downtown
4 and replaces it with the facade of a building, changes
5 the character of -- of the city, it increases the -- the
6 EIR report specifically says that it's going to increase
7 air pollution. It's going to increase noise pollution
8 and it's going to increase the density and it's going to
9 completely impact the flow of traffic in the community,
10 and I think that that's what you're going to see
11 throughout these communities where you're pushing this,
12 this business model, and I just flat out think it's
13 wrong.

14 I've been to two or three of these meetings
15 and it seems like 85 to 95 percent -- probably close to
16 95 percent of the people do not want this, and so the
17 fact that this is being pushed is -- yeah.

18 The taxpayers don't want it. I don't
19 understand why it just -- it's crazy that me that my tax
20 dollars go to something that basically's going to
21 negatively impact me.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. BENNETT: Forgive me. Give me one,
24 moment. You can do security thing in you want to. I
25 choked. I'm not used to being a public speaker. I guess

1 that's why people write things down, but this is worthy
2 of repeating.

3 MS. NGUYEN: Just restate your name.

4 MR. BENNETT: Jim Bennett.

5 The four cornerstones -- that stuff takes a
6 long time to get out of your system. My memory's
7 starting to -- property rights, limited government,
8 individual unalienable rights that are ours.

9 They're not to be granted by or reconciled
10 through government, and the fourth is the free market.

11 Now let's pause for a moment. All four of
12 those are decimated with this plan, so all of the most
13 famous oppressors ever -- Stalin, Mao, Hitler, they would
14 all love this.

15 This is like Hitler Urban Planning 101, right
16 next to trains stacked and packed where people can be
17 controlled. It's easy to understand.

18 You guys should be ashamed of yourself. You
19 know, a lot of things are going to come down the bike
20 path the second half of this year, and I just want you to
21 know that the people that you've aligned yourself with
22 are behind all of them, and through necessity, I think, I
23 pray, I hope that we're going to remember what the word
24 "community" really means, and it ain't going to have
25 anything to do with some oppressive orchestration through

Page 71

1 government and it ain't going to have an ism at the end
2 of it, either.

3 MS. NGUYEN: Are there any citizens who want
4 to speak?

5 MS. STOUT: Good evening. My name's Laura
6 Fultz Stout. I'm with the American Lung Association, and
7 I'm here today to provide a few comments on the EIR and
8 considering we'd like you -- we'll put that in writing,
9 as well, and submit that.

10 But consider analysis of a higher percentage
11 of investment in walking and cycling infrastructure that
12 is currently being proposed in the plan which would
13 result in more reductions in the greenhouse gases as well
14 as reductions in pedestrian/cyclist injury.

15 As you know, all the scenarios for infill
16 development show higher injury, and with increased
17 investment, we think -- and study, we think those could
18 be minimized or reduced.

19 The thought being that spending more money on
20 safe cycling and walking, there would be fewer injuries,
21 but also promote more walking and cycling and less car
22 trips.

23 We'd also encourage you to use the -- it's a
24 new study out of the California Department of Public
25 Health by Neal Maglish and his -- this study demonstrates

1 that increasing walking and cycling
2 related trans -- related to transportation, if we just --
3 it shows that the current average of four minutes is --
4 we increase walking and cycling from four minutes to 22
5 minutes, that fourteen percent reductions in heart
6 disease will happen, six to seven percent reduction in
7 dementia, depression, and five percent reduction in colon
8 cancer, and this study also shows that it adds 9.5 months
9 to life expectancy just by putting a few more minutes
10 into active transportation and getting out of our cars.

11 But in doing so, more investment to safe
12 pathways for walking and bicycling, and there are a few
13 more things, but we'll put it in writing.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

16 Are there any other participants who wish to
17 speak who did not have a chance to do so?

18 MR. MELLANDER: Well, since -- your name is
19 Jim, right? My name is Jim Mellander, too, and I just
20 spoke, and I've been passionate before.

21 I'll just say a real brief statement. Don't
22 drink this could Koolaid. It might taste good, but it's
23 poisonous.

24 MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Unless there's any other
25 speakers in the audience, we will adjourn. We certainly

1 appreciate the comments that we've received tonight.

2 We will, as I mentioned earlier, record the
3 comments and we will certainly provide responses as we
4 work through the preparation of the environmental
5 document.

6 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Where are you going to
7 post the answers to the questions?

8 MS. NGUYEN: We will be collecting all
9 comments and questions through the scoping process and
10 we'll compile them and we'll produce it as the document
11 that will be presented to the board in July.

12 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The answers. We've
13 been asking questions for a year and a half. We haven't
14 gotten any answers.

15 MS. NGUYEN: For any comments that we
16 receive, we will respond to them. So thank you.

17 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Online?

18 MS. NGUYEN: We certainly will post any
19 document --

20 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Answers to the
21 questions.

22 MS. NGUYEN: -- online.

23 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The questions at the
24 meeting were never answered. We were told we would get
25 answers. We never got answers. They -- we were told by

1 Scott Haggerty, Supervisor Haggerty that they would post
2 them on on the website and all they did was post all the
3 questions.

4 So none of our answers -- none of our
5 questions are answered. How much is it going to cost?
6 What does social justice mean? We know what our
7 questions are. We can't make decisions. You're going
8 through this process without answering any of the
9 questions of the public.

10 MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Again, thank you so much
11 for coming.

12 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Exactly.

13 MS. NGUYEN: I answered your question.

14 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And you know, this is
15 the thing -- this is the most important part.

16 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. I'm going to adjourn
17 this meeting.

18 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Make sure you get that
19 on camera because that is --

20 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You know, what we're
21 looking into, we think that -- we think that AB 32 and SB
22 375 are guidelines and not mandates. We think they're
23 guide lines, not mandates.

24 (The meeting adjourned at 7:47 PM).

25 ---o0o---

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

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

7

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

12

13

14

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this _____day of _____, 2012.

15

16

17

18

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

METROPOLITAN SCOPING MEETING
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

---o0o---

PLAN BAY AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
SCOPING MEETING

_____ /

SCOPING MEETING
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2012
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA

Taken before KRIS CASE, CSR No. 13142

Certified Shorthand Reporter

State of California

---o0o---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PRESENTERS

ASHLEY NGUYEN - Metropolitan Transportation Committee
MIRIAM CHION - Association of Bay Area Governments
HANNAH LINDELOF - Byett & Bhatia

--o0o--

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to Notice of meeting and on July 21, 2012, commencing at 10:00 a.m. thereof at Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Library, 150 East San Fernando Street, San Jose, California, before me, KRIS CASE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter there commenced a Scoping Meeting under the provisions of California Environmental Quality Act.

---o0o---

1 MS. NGUYEN: Good morning, everyone. We're going
2 to get started with our EIR Scoping meeting today. My
3 name is Ashley Nguyen. I'm with Metropolitan
4 Transportation Commission. I'm the project manager on
5 the Plan Bay Area EIR.

6 What I wanted to do first is to introduce the
7 Plan Bay Area EIR team. And because we have such a
8 small room today, such a minimal crowd today, I think we
9 can get self-introductions so we know who is in the
10 room. I'll start with myself. Ashley Nguyen with MTC.

11 I'm Hannah Lindelof with Byett & Bhatia.

12 John Francis also with Byett & Bhatia.

13 Miriam Chion with the Association of Bay Area
14 Government.

15 And JoAnne is in the back. JoAnne Bullock is
16 in the back. She has the roving mike.

17 Anell Bahbar, Director of Government Affairs
18 for the Santa Clara County Association of Realtors.

19 Interested citizen.

20 Rica Garcia.

21 My name is Jeff Windham. I'm with the Manetta
22 Transportation Institute, as a student.

23 Robert Means, I'm with the Advanced Transit
24 Association.

25 Hi, I'm Tiffany Norga, I work what Breathe

1 California, intern.

2 Xi Yang, with Breathe California, staff
3 person.

4 My name is Shelton Abriga and I'm an intern at
5 Breathe California and Silicon Valley Clean Cities
6 Coalition.

7 John Sighdmony with San Clara Valley
8 Transportation Authority.

9 Brad Speers director Government affairs BIA,
10 South Bay.

11 Good morning. Manolo Gonzalez-Estay for Trans
12 Form.

13 Leah Toeniskoetter, the director of SPURS, San
14 Jose.

15 Ursula, MTC.

16 Segal Metzger for the Bay Area Air Quality.

17 Mark Serett, ABAG.

18 I'm Leslie Lara with MTC.

19 Stephanie Hong with MTC.

20 Hi, I'm Randy.

21 MS. NGUYEN: You walked through the third door,
22 that's why.

23 Hello, I am with Randy.

24 I'm Jerry.

25 MS. NGUYEN: Well, thank you so much for

1 participating in today's Scoping meeting. As you know,
2 Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the
3 Association of Bay Area Governments are the co-lead
4 agencies preparing this environmental document. And we
5 certainly hope to get a lot of feedback from you today
6 in terms of issues and concerns that you may have with
7 regards to the content and scope of this environmental
8 document.

9 Before I begin, I do want to set a few ground
10 rules for today's meeting. I'm hoping none of them
11 applies to you guys today in terms of the more egregious
12 ones, but just let me go through them.

13 So the format for today's meeting will be a
14 staff presentation to run you through the EIR purpose's
15 scope as well as dive into the details about the issue
16 areas that we will be evaluating in the EIR, plus some
17 potential ideas that we have for the range of
18 alternatives for consideration.

19 Following that staff presentation, we will
20 open it up to public comments, and that's an opportunity
21 for you all to provide us with your comments and
22 thoughts about this environmental process.

23 We do have a roving mike. JoAnne will be
24 walking around, and we do ask that you speak into the
25 microphone so that we are able record your comments in

1 the record. We do ask that you to also fill out the
2 blue card that was on the table as you were coming
3 through the door, and we ask that you put your name on
4 that blue card so again, so we can properly record you
5 for the record.

6 We ask that you do keep your comments as
7 concise and to the point as possible. And we do want to
8 allow as many participants to be able to speak and
9 provide us comments today so we certainly appreciate the
10 courtesy that you have in terms of thinking about your
11 own comments.

12 We do have a reporter today, Kris, sitting up
13 here in front, to record your comments. We ask you that
14 you speak clearly for her benefit. She may ask you to
15 repeat something or request that you speak a little
16 slower so that she may record your comments.

17 Please disagree respectfully. Please do not
18 shout or interrupt other speakers. We do want to have
19 everyone give an opportunity to provide their feedback.
20 We will take you oral comments today and we ask that if
21 you have any additional comments following the Scoping
22 meeting that you please submit them in writing for our
23 consideration.

24 Any comments -- any written comments may be
25 submitted in writing by the deadline date of July 11.

1 Please address and submit your comments to the address
2 that's shown on the handbook.

3 So with that, let me go ahead and kick off our
4 staff presentations. We'll try to be as brief an
5 competent as is possible so that we allow you time to
6 provide with us your feedback.

7 So in terms of today's agenda, we have a
8 number of different topics we want to cover today. We
9 will be providing you with an overview of Plan Bay Area.
10 We will walk you through some of the CEQA streamline
11 provisions that are included in Senate Bill 375.

12 We will also provide you with an overview of
13 the Transportation Improvement Program. And then we
14 will provide some details about the scope and purpose of
15 the Environmental Impact Report that's been prepared for
16 Plan Bay Area.

17 We will discuss the issues for evaluation and
18 we seek your comments on those issues. And we also,
19 again, will walk you through the potential ideas that we
20 have thus far on the alternatives, but, again, we really
21 do seek your input on some ideas that we might want to
22 consider as we go through about modifications we find
23 and a complete changes to the alternative ideas that we
24 have as of today.

25 Then when we close the staff presentations, we

1 will open the floor up for public comments.

2 Just to make sure we're all on the same page,
3 the Plan Bay Area is really the first regional plan to
4 integrate transportation, land use, and housing. This
5 is also called a sustainable community strategy. It was
6 legally prompted and initiated by California Senate Bill
7 375.

8 The primary goal of the state law is to
9 identify a future land use pattern that would match with
10 a transportation network that would help our region
11 reach greenhouse gas emissions reduction. The Air
12 Resources board set forth some very specific greenhouse
13 gas emission reduction targets for our region. We are
14 required to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions from
15 cars and light-duty trucks by 7 percent in 2020, and by
16 15 percent in 2035 from 2005 levels.

17 So in addition to the climate protection
18 goals, the plan also looks to pare down the number of
19 goals that helps us to provide housing for Bay Area
20 residents, build a stronger economy, protect our natural
21 environment and enhance accessibility and opportunity
22 for all residence in the Bay Area from all walks of
23 life.

24 There is specific provisions in Senate Bill
25 375 that allows for CEQA streamlining for certain land

1 use development projects. And we wanted to call this
2 out because this is something that is potentially a real
3 benefit to look at jurisdictions as they move forward
4 with projects that they are thinking about within their
5 community.

6 So in Senate Bill 375, what -- there are CEQA
7 streamlining opportunities for residents for mixed use
8 projects and Transit Authority projects. As we look at
9 CEQA streamlining, what SB375 has really done is given
10 Bay Area agencies like MTC and ABAG, an opportunity to
11 engage in local government stakeholders and communities
12 to really plan for efficient land use patterns around
13 our transportation investments, particularly transit
14 investments.

15 And so to support these efforts, the CEQA
16 streamlining informed that a Residential Mixed Use
17 project as well as the Transit Authority projects are
18 included as a part of this plan. There are very
19 specific requirements, as you see on this slide, as to
20 what constitutes residential and mixed-use projects,
21 what kinds of projects actually get to take advantage of
22 the CEQA streamlining benefits.

23 The first is that you have to be a residential
24 mixed use project where your total, at least your total
25 building square footage has to be 75 percent residential

1 use. So you have to even qualify to have that minimum
2 threshold to even take advantage of CEQA streamlining.

3 There's also a present class of project that
4 was introduced as part of the state law called Transit
5 Priority Project or TPP for short. And in this case, to
6 qualify as a Transit Priority Project, your project must
7 have at least 50 percent of the building square footage
8 to be residential, have a floor area ratio of not less
9 than .75 and provide a minimum density of at least 20
10 dwelling units per acre. The key here, though, is in
11 order to be a Transit Priority Project, you have to be
12 within one-half mile of a major transit stop or a high
13 quality transit corridor, which is a corridor that
14 offers 15-minute frequent services.

15 We have a map here on the side that shows you
16 kind of areas within our region that could be Transit
17 Priority eligible areas. The project within those areas
18 must meet the criteria that you see on this slide.

19 We will take public comments --

20 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: How much of the day is
21 half --

22 MS. NGUYEN: It requires that you do that within
23 the peak period time frame.

24 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Which is defined as how many
25 hours?

1 MS. NGUYEN: Four hours. For hours in one time
2 frame. So for those of you who have been involved in
3 the regional plan process thus far, you know that we've
4 been working on supporting job and housing growth in
5 priority development areas, or PDA's for short. These
6 are areas that local government have identified as
7 places for growth in their communities, and to some
8 degree, we do definitely want to carry forth with
9 supporting the development department PDA as part of the
10 plan process.

11 However, because of the state law and
12 introduction of Transit Priority Projects, there is now
13 opportunities for additional areas that are indeed
14 well-served by transit to also look at ways to
15 potentially direct future job and housing growth in
16 these areas as well.

17 I think the ultimate goal here under SB375 and
18 with the CEQA streamlining is to really provide local
19 jurisdictions with opportunity to really think about
20 efficient land use patterns around transit. And if they
21 should do so, you have events -- they want projects
22 to -- events through the development projects, they can
23 certainly look to the CEQA streamlining benefit under
24 SB375. But clearly SB375 doesn't mandate or to use
25 certain local land use authorities. So this is just an

1 opportunity for local jurisdictions to take advantage
2 of, should they wish to do so.

3 Just to jewel down a little bit more on the
4 CEQA streamlining, there are, again, specific guidance
5 in the SB375 as to how this streamlining would work.
6 The first threshold, if you will, is that the proposed
7 residential or mixed-use project must be consistent with
8 the land use designation, density, intensity with
9 policies that are within the Plan Bay Area. And if this
10 is the case and the project is located in a transit
11 priority project eligible area and meet all the
12 extension codes that are given by state law, that
13 project is fully exempt from CEQA. That means they
14 would not need to prepare an environmental document.

15 In the second case, which is shown on blue
16 here in the slide, if that project is located in a TPP
17 eligible area but doesn't meet all exemption criteria,
18 that project may continue to have streamlined
19 environmental review. It would have to just prepare a
20 different document called the single community
21 environmental assessment.

22 In the third case, which is shown in red on
23 the slide, if the project is not located in a Transit
24 Priority Eligible area, that mixed-use residential
25 projects would still get some limited advantage of the

1 CEQA streamlining. It's just not as much as what you
2 would see in either the green or the blue areas in terms
3 of exemption or more maximized streamlining under CEQA.

4 And I want to transition to another
5 complimentary document that the MTC prepared along with
6 a long range plan. It's called the Transportation
7 Improvement Program. This is a four-year funding
8 document that provides a comprehensive listing of all
9 the roadway transit bicycles and pedestrian projects
10 that receive federal funds or are subject to some sort
11 of federal action or are just regionally significant and
12 we need to track them in our region.

13 The key here is that projects that do get
14 represented in the Transportation Improvement Program
15 they must be consistent with the long range plan which
16 is again the Plan Bay Area. When MTC developed this
17 funding plan, we developed and do consultation on this
18 financing plan when we do our long range plan.

19 The current TIP is the 2011 Transportation
20 Improvement Program, and it contains about \$11 million
21 worth of transportation investment over the next four
22 years. The largest fund source that we see in this
23 funding program comes from local dollars, and this
24 includes county transportation sales tax and local
25 streets and roads funds.

1 MTC is in the process of updating the TIP.
2 We are in the process of preparing the 2013
3 Transportation Improvement Program, and we hope to
4 release a draft for public review June 22nd. We will be
5 bringing a final 2013 TIP to our commission for approval
6 in September and it will move on to federal approval in
7 December.

8 I want to close my part of the presentation
9 and introduce Hanna Lindelof of Byett & Bhatia to really
10 walk you through some of the details about our
11 environmental process.

12 MS. LINDELOF: Thanks, Ashley. So the focus of
13 today is the content of the environment impact report on
14 Plan Bay Area, also known as EIR. The purpose of the
15 EIR is to identify the plan's significant impact on the
16 environment to evaluate a range of reasonable
17 alternatives to the plan and determine how the plan can
18 avoid or mitigate any significant impacts.

19 This will be -- the EIR will be a programmatic
20 EIR. It will present a region-wide assessment of the
21 proposed plan and alternatives, and it will provide CEQA
22 streamlining opportunities that actually just outline
23 both on transportation projects and programs and news to
24 this round of a -- that RTC of the development projects
25 as defined the SB375.

1 So they -- just to clarify, the scope of the
2 EIR. The EIR focus is on environmental impacts. There
3 are also two additional separate studies underway that
4 are undertaken to assess the other key elements of
5 sustainability, economy and equity.

6 So there's an economic impact analysis, which
7 will be completed in -- for the fall of this year that
8 will assess economic impacts of the Plan Bay Area and
9 land use patterns and transportation investment on the
10 regional economy, and an equity analysis that will be
11 completed in early 2013 that will assess the equity
12 implications of all the alternatives included in the EIR
13 and identify the benefits and burdens of land use impact
14 and transportation investments for different
15 socio-economic groups.

16 So we are right now at the start of the EIR
17 process with NOP and Scoping meetings that we're here
18 for today. And all of the feedback we receive from you
19 during this period will be used in forming all the
20 subsequent work.

21 The next phase will be data collection and
22 environmental settings. We will also further define the
23 project as well as the alternatives and screen
24 alternatives for use of the EIR. All of that work will
25 go into the environmental impact assessment. We'll look

1 at a range of environmental issue areas as well as
2 assess cumulative impact and analyze alternatives.

3 We'll complete an administrative draft and
4 then a public review draft which will be released
5 December of this year for a 45-day public review period
6 with additional hearings held in January.

7 We will complete our final EIR in March of
8 2013 that will respond to all of the comments we receive
9 on the draft EIR and then with the aim of a
10 certification of the final EIR in April of next year.

11 So there are several key questions we want
12 your feedback on today so as we go through the
13 environmental issue areas and alternatives, you can keep
14 in mind the following questions:

15 What potential environmental issues should be
16 analyzed? We have outlined some and we wanted your
17 feedback.

18 What alternatives to be evaluated?

19 What types of mitigation measures should be
20 considered that could help avoid and minimize any
21 environmental impact?

22 And what elements of this EIR will help your
23 agency with CEQA exemptions and tiering?

24 So we have identified 13 environment issue
25 areas to have analyzed at this point. The first being

1 transportation. We'll be looking at impact on commute
2 times and vehicle miles traveled.

3 In terms of air quality, we'll be looking both
4 at short term construction impact as well as any
5 increase or impact from criteria pollutants and toxic
6 air containments and their related health impact. And
7 we will be looking to see if we violate or conflict with
8 any air quality plans or standards.

9 For land use and physical development, we'll
10 be looking at any impact to agriculture land or open
11 space, any conflict with local plans or any impact to
12 existing communities, such as due to disruption
13 displacement or separation.

14 We'll be looking at energy impact, whether
15 there's an increase in non-renewable energy consumption
16 or inconsistency with any energy conservation plans or
17 policies.

18 We'll be looking at greenhouse gasses and
19 climate change to assess any increase in net per capita
20 CO2 emissions from on-road mobile sources or any
21 vulnerability in sea level rise, or if we conflict with
22 any other greenhouse gas reduction plans or policy
23 regulation.

24 We also assess if there's an increase in
25 exposure to noise beyond existing standards.

1 For geology and seismicity, we'll be
2 evaluating if the plan causes an increase or risk due to
3 earthquake landslides or ground failure, any additional
4 soil erosion or loss of topsoil or any increased
5 development or expansive or weak soils.

6 For biological resources, we'll evaluate any
7 adverse effects on sensitive or special status species,
8 riparian habitat, wetlands or other sensitive natural
9 community. And also that the plan wouldn't interfere
10 with the movement of any identified species or conflict
11 with any locally adopted conservation plans.

12 For water resources, we'll be looking at a
13 range of impacts related to ground water recharge, storm
14 water run off, erosion and risks related to flooding,
15 seiche or tsunami or mudflow.

16 For visual resources, we'll be looking at
17 adverse effects on scenic vistas, scenic resources
18 within a scenic highway, or any existing visual
19 characteristics in existing communities. We'll also be
20 looking for for additional creation of any glare or
21 light.

22 In terms of cultural resources, we'll be
23 looking at any adverse change to archaeological,
24 historical or paleontological resources or disruption of
25 human remains.

1 Public utilities, we'll assess adverse effects
2 on regional water supplies, wastewater and storm water
3 facilities and solid waste facilities.

4 And in growth-inducing effects, we'll evaluate
5 whether the plan would cause substantial unanticipated
6 population growth beyond the rates that are currently
7 projected for the region.

8 At this time, we are not anticipating
9 addressing hazardous materials, public services,
10 recreation or mineral resources. We don't expect any
11 regional impacts in these issue areas.

12 So for all the issue areas I just outlined,
13 we'll assess impact for range of alternatives and each
14 alternative is to find in terms of a land use component
15 and transportation component.

16 The objective of the land use component is to
17 meet the key goals of the plan and the approach is to
18 start with the locally adopted general plan zoning and
19 then assess the preferred plan's land use strategy,
20 which is the jobs-housing connection, and then to assess
21 various land use policies to consider a range of future
22 growth distribution scenarios for a range of
23 alternatives.

24 For the transportation component, the
25 objective is to meet key goals of the plan and also

1 subject to the financially constrained transportation
2 investment strategy. The approach is also to start with
3 the existing network as a baseline and then assess the
4 preferred transportation investment strategy or modify
5 it to reflect shifts in investment priorities, and then
6 assess explicit transportation demand management
7 policies such as pricing to establish the alternative.

8 I am going to hand it over now to Miriam from
9 ABAG to talk about -- more about the alternatives.

10 MS. CHION: Miriam Chion with the Association of
11 Bay Area Government. Thank you for coming this morning.
12 Some of you have been following the plan for several
13 months, more than a year. And as Hannah has indicated,
14 the purpose of the Environmental review is to evaluate
15 the plan -- the performance of the plan from an
16 environmental perspective.

17 This is -- you have seen the land use
18 component of the plan. It's the jobs-housing connection
19 strategy. For those of you who might have not seen it,
20 it's posted on the website. And as Ashley mentioned,
21 one of the key elements of the plan is the priority
22 development areas. We have about 200 areas that have
23 been nominated locally. Local jurisdiction cities, some
24 of you counties have been working on identifying those
25 areas as areas where we want to accommodate additional

1 housing, additional population, additional jobs, and
2 they really vary widely.

3 In some cases, we have regional centers such
4 as downtown San Jose or downtown San Francisco. In
5 other cases we have smaller scale city centers, such as
6 those in Berkeley or Fremont. And we have smaller areas
7 such as mixed-used corridors such as San Pablo Avenue
8 and some of your small commercial corridors here in
9 Santa Clara and San Jose. So there's a wide range of
10 areas, and, again, the intent is that each local
11 jurisdiction recognizes what are appropriate places to
12 accommodate future growth. What are the proper places
13 to accommodate new housing and new jobs.

14 In addition to the priority development areas,
15 we have the priority conservation areas. So by having
16 growth in -- is that a clarify question?

17 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: In this slide, I don't have
18 it in my packet. Is that another handout that we have
19 that you don't have or is this presentation that's not
20 being handed out?

21 MS. CHION: It's not included in the slide
22 printouts but information is summarized in the black and
23 white handout.

24 The priority conservation areas are areas
25 that, again, as I was saying, because we have addressed

1 growth and selected areas, this allows us the retention
2 of open space and agricultural land. And, again, the
3 idea is to retain some of those qualities that the Bay
4 Area offers to us.

5 The investment areas have been recently
6 designated, they're not approved yet. They are similar
7 to the priority development area but they are smaller in
8 scale. We have the rural investment areas, and they do
9 not accommodate a significant component of housing, but
10 it secures some of the access to services that the
11 facility pedestrians improvement in some of the rural
12 areas. And also the employment investment areas, those
13 are areas that do not accommodate housing either, but
14 can introduce improvements in transit in terms of
15 shuttle service and public transit, pedestrian or biking
16 facilities, and it can also provide some services to the
17 local worker.

18 So it's based on this framework that the plan
19 got developed. And you can see in this map, how much of
20 our open space and agriculture land is retained, how
21 much of the land is urbanized and how focused is the
22 growth that is proposed in the plan. About 4 percent of
23 the total region plan where we are accommodating about
24 80 percent of the new homes and 66 percent of the new
25 jobs.

1 This pattern also allows the retention of some
2 of the existing qualities in the neighborhood that want
3 to retain the qualities that they have today with
4 minimum component of growth for additional expansion.

5 So the alternatives. The environmental review
6 requires that the project is compared to other
7 alternatives. The project is number two. The
8 jobs-housing connection strategy, as we indicated. And
9 CEQA requires that we assess as an alternative no
10 project, which means removing the conditions to the
11 efforts that policies and investments that are addressed
12 in the jobs-housing connection strategy.

13 There are other three alternatives that we are
14 proposing and, again, these are conceptual alternatives
15 being used to take your input so we can address the
16 various concerns and refine the alternatives toward the
17 end of this 30-day period. I am going to go through
18 each of those.

19 So for the NOP project, we assume that there
20 will be no major investments or planning in priority
21 development areas. That there is more dispersed job and
22 housing growth, considering the existing general plans
23 and zoning regulations.

24 In terms of transportation, this is based on
25 2010 existing transportation network, and would only

1 include projects that have been funded already or have
2 gone through environmental plans.

3 The jobs-housing connection strategy, again,
4 this is the project that you're probably most familiar
5 with. To repeat some of the key components that
6 addresses and focus growth in the priority development
7 areas. 80 percent of housing, 66 percent of employment.
8 Investments are focused in this area, meaning
9 infrastructure investments, transit investments, and
10 there's an effort also to retain affordable housing in
11 this area that are going to be subject to major
12 investments.

13 In terms of transportation, this includes the
14 preferred transportation investment strategy with \$277
15 billion in the plan budget. 88 percent is directed to
16 operations and maintenance of existing systems, and
17 there is advancement in key strategies; addressing the
18 greenhouse gas reduction, a focus on maintenance, fix it
19 first. A one Bay Area grant framework, which is a new
20 funding source available at the county level to be
21 managed and administered by the county management
22 agency. That, again, focuses most of the funding in the
23 priority development area.

24 There is an effort to fund high performance
25 projects. There is an effort to make use -- make the

1 most efficient use of our system, and to make our
2 transit system sustainable.

3 The alternative 3. That's an alternative that
4 takes on a lower concentration in priority development
5 areas as it relates to the project. So fewer jobs and
6 fewer housing in the priority development areas. There
7 is also an effort to explore what other areas that are
8 served by transit could accommodate additional growth
9 that have not been identified in the project.

10 There's also an effort to identify some more
11 jobs and single family construction in a more
12 decentralized pattern, still according to the general
13 plans.

14 In terms of transportation, this relies on the
15 preferred transportation investment strategy that I just
16 described.

17 Alternative 4 is an alternative that assumes
18 elimination of interregional community, and that means
19 that we assume that all workers in the Bay Area live in
20 the Bay Area.

21 As you know, currently, or historically, a
22 number of workers that have a place of work within the
23 Bay Area live outside of the Bay Area in adjacent
24 counties, whether it's the Central Valley, Sacramento or
25 other adjacent counties. And here the idea is that we

1 eliminate the interregional commute.

2 So it's assumed that the region will be able
3 to provide housing for all those workers close to some
4 of the major employment centers at the edges of the
5 region to address this commute.

6 In terms of transportation, this is a modified
7 preferred transportation investment strategy number one
8 that includes a comprehensive -- transit comprehensive
9 operation analysis implementation. It assume only HOV
10 lane conversions or express lanes. And in terms of
11 implementation priority policies, there's road pricing
12 and parking pricing to assume there will be different
13 levels of congestions on our roads given the number of
14 additional people that will be in the Bay Area.

15 The last one, the alternative 5, is labeled
16 environment equity and jobs. The main focus here is to
17 increase levels of equity in the way the development
18 pattern is proposed, and in particular, focusing on
19 affordable housing and access to jobs.

20 So there is the assumption that additional
21 affordable housing in locations with high levels of low
22 income commuting will be identified, meaning more
23 inexpensive housing closer to jobs and additional
24 affordable housing in locations where we have good
25 services, good schools.

1 In term of the transportation component, it's
2 more to the previous one. The modified preferred
3 transportation investment strategy, number 2. We assume
4 that we restore the level of transit services that we
5 have in 2005, and there's a proposal for only HOV lane
6 conversion for express lanes.

7 There is -- in order to articulate or to enact
8 this alternative, to present these alternatives and to
9 do the analysis, there's a range of policy tools that
10 can be considered to again frame this alternative.

11 And there's a list of some of the components
12 that you can consider. This is, again, up for
13 discussion. We're including here improvements,
14 infrastructure and transit fees that could support some
15 of the development at specific locations, development
16 incentives to support, again, some of the construction
17 of housing or employment centers, some subsidies that
18 will be required for public facilities or housing,
19 zoning changes to accommodate additional growth, urban
20 growth boundaries.

21 Many cities, most cities in the Bay Area have
22 already established urban growth boundaries. Those can
23 be assumed to be retained, strengthened or modified. We
24 can also address parking pricing and road pricing.

25 Again, this is just a list of components for

1 you to consider to assess to give us your comments on In
2 terms of what is the most appropriate or the most
3 significant set of policy tools that we should be
4 analyzing through the requirement at review.

5 With that, I will give it back to Ashley.
6 Thank you.

7 MS. NGUYEN: I just have two more slides to show
8 you and we will close this presentation.

9 With regards to the alternatives, again, we
10 are looking for your feedback on ways to refine, modify
11 or even introduce a new alternative altogether.

12 When thinking about the alternatives in your
13 comments, what we would like you to focus on in terms of
14 a question that we were most interested in, includes the
15 following three. One is, are we applying the
16 appropriate policy levers to really better encourage and
17 sustain the development? What kinds of land and
18 transportation policy would help us shape our future
19 growth pattern?

20 Are there any missing language used for
21 transportation policies that we should be considering
22 including in our draft plan in developing these
23 alternatives?

24 And then, certainly, are there other ideas you
25 may have that we may consider in testing an entirely

1 different alternative than the five that we showed you
2 today.

3 If we -- yes, we would certainly like to hear
4 your feedback on the specific policy levers that you
5 would apply to that particular alternative.

6 Just a note here that only two of the
7 alternatives out of the five that were presented are
8 definitely limited in the EIR process. And that's the
9 no project alternative, as well as the proposed
10 projects, the general project strategy.

11 All the other alternatives are certainly on
12 the table for discussion; refinement, modification,
13 solution and additions, so we certainly welcome and
14 encourage any of your feedback on the alternatives.

15 In terms of the overall schedule, we do plan
16 to check all comments that we hear through the Scoping
17 meetings, both oral and written comments. We do want to
18 present a set of final alternatives for consideration by
19 the MTC and ABAG boards in July. July 13th is a
20 committee meeting, and July 19th is a board meeting.

21 Once we get the green light, if you will, from
22 our two boards, we would proceed into the development of
23 the draft environment document through the seven months,
24 through the end of December. Our plans are to release a
25 draft Plan Bay Area as well as a draft Plan Bay Area EIR

1 for public review on December 14th. And we will go
2 through the review process through the early part of
3 2013. And our ultimate plan is to have a final Plan Bay
4 Area and final Plan Bay Area EIR adopted and certified
5 by our respective boards in spring of 2013.

6 With that I'll close and we will open up
7 discussion for public comments.

8 MR. SPEERS: So my comments are actually prepared.
9 And we'll be submitting them later.

10 My name is Brad Speers. I represent the
11 Building Industry Association. Let's begin with SB375.
12 BIA Bay Area supported the passage of SB375 as a
13 statement of communities and climate protection in 2008,
14 which are committed to the adoption of the
15 implementation strategy that is both feasible,
16 economically feasible and politically feasible and that
17 fully fulfills the legislation's objectives. So housing
18 for all.

19 SB375 mandates that the final sustainable
20 community strategy identify areas sufficient to house
21 all of the region's housing. The preferred land use and
22 transportation investment scenario adopted last month
23 and to be studied by the EIR fails to do this. Meaning,
24 fully, you know, accommodate for our housing need.

25 Anything less would be a cop out. Failure to

1 meet 100 percent of our housing need is at odds with the
2 primary environmental objective of SB375, that is
3 reducing in commuting from other regions. It also hurts
4 job creation and economic growth, as our own analysis
5 and your own analysis of the preferred scenarios attest.
6 So recommendation number 1, and I will probably submit a
7 separate comment on this.

8 But for now, to address this one shortcoming
9 it would be nice to lay some ground work, so the final
10 plan needs a full housing accommodation standard. All
11 alternatives to be studied as a part of the EIR should
12 plan for the housing level in -- the housing level in
13 the housing for all theme alternative, dubbed Workforce
14 Housing Opportunities in the June 1st staff report.

15 Unlike the requirement to plan to meet 100
16 percent of the housing, SB377, 375 does not mandate the
17 regions to meet greenhouse gas emission reduction
18 targets established by the California Air Resource
19 Board, rather, it requires adoption of an SCS, or other
20 policies that will meet the greenhouse gas target only
21 if it is feasible to do so. And that is truly key.

22 It is therefore misguided to plan yet another
23 STUR study that uses, not necessarily what has been
24 proposed by the state as full housing need.

25 Recommendation number 2. In keeping with

1 feasible as a core value, MTC and ABAG should resist
2 pairing with proposed alternatives any transportation
3 pricing strategy or policy lever that previously has
4 been declared infeasible.

5 Lastly, it is essential to simultaneously
6 study from a market, economic and political standpoint
7 the feasibility of planning for up to 80 percent of all
8 future housing to be constructed in priority development
9 areas or PDAs, as is currently called for in the
10 preferred land use and transportation investment
11 scenario.

12 Only with this information will the agencies
13 be able to make an informed decision on the final
14 sustainable communities strategies for the Bay Area.
15 Boom.

16 JOHN CARPENTER: John Carpenter. Mountain View. I
17 was looking at the priority development area map, and
18 looking at the region charts and I see that there's gaps
19 between the various project -- priority development
20 areas, and I -- so I haven't heard anything about
21 completing the public transit gaps between those areas,
22 like in the South Bay and like in the East Bay. So the
23 thing is you bring those things up and have them
24 investment more. I just don't see them here.

25 Then, of course, I would like to make a

1 comment is that the job housing balance is very critical
2 to get to one-to-one -- get it to a one-to-one ratio.
3 If it's not feasible, make sure that you have
4 significant transit and the gaps that are here that are
5 important to fill.

6 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

7 John Sighdmony with VTA. Just have a quick
8 question on the regional housing need allocation. As
9 you know that is also a part of this whole process. I
10 was just kind of wondering, the, I guess, SB375 mandates
11 reasons to be in sync with SCS. Just want to know how
12 you're going to take that into account as you're doing
13 the EIR.

14 MS. CHION: As you know, for those of you who might
15 not be familiar, there's a regional housing need
16 allocation which is a separate state mandate that
17 defines what the level of housing that is needed in the
18 region, and the regional agency, in this case, ABAG is
19 responsible for distributing the number that we get from
20 the state to each local jurisdiction. That's for a
21 short time frame. The cycle that we're working on is
22 from 2014 to 2022.

23 SB375 requires that the two efforts are
24 consistent, which means that the distribution that we
25 have in the arena for -- so the same time period within

1 the sustainable community strategies within the
2 jobs-housing connection strategy will be the same
3 distribution for the period from 2014 to 2022. So the
4 overall distribution, the 30-year period, might be
5 slightly different depending on the long term objective
6 versus the most immediate present objective in the
7 arena.

8 So it's basically two times, two different
9 time frames. Short time frame and long-term time frame,
10 and our work will be to ensure that is consistent. The
11 specifics of how much of the short-term frame gets
12 analyzed in the EIR, that's something that we'll defer
13 to our consultant to see if there needs to be any
14 analysis by shortened time frame.

15 SUSAN MORSLAND: Susan Morsland. I live in San
16 Jose. And no affiliation except I'm concerned about the
17 long term growth of this plan. I'm in support of AB32,
18 SB375, also affordable housing. But what my concern is
19 with whatever kind of affordable housing, we should have
20 really -- I don't want see concentrated areas of
21 affordable housing. I believe in more of a inclusionary
22 policy, and that's part of social equity, and we don't
23 want to have concentrated areas of very low, low income
24 people in different pockets no matter whatever scenario
25 you go for.

1 And I know that's not -- we have to create
2 some kind of incentives for developers to do that, but
3 inclusionary policy where you can distribute different
4 levels of a social economic strata all over the Bay
5 Area. Real crucial for long term whatever scenario you
6 adopt.

7 MANOLO GONZALEZ-ESTAY: Good morning. Manolo
8 Gonzalez-Estay with Trans Form. I also live in
9 Sunnyvale. Couple of questions first, comments. First
10 procedurally, I appreciate you guys having these
11 meetings. I do have some concerns, and I appreciate you
12 guys adding another meeting, but of five meetings, only
13 one of them is after work hours when this is really
14 impacting low income, low communities that actually
15 can't take time off of work. I have a friend of mine
16 who asked me, should I take the morning off of work to
17 go to this type of meeting. And I told him that I would
18 give him the notes.

19 So I think that's an unfortunate first step of
20 missteps, in my eyes. And also, I appreciate you guys
21 giving us packets of information, however, when you
22 change a bunch of the slides and add a bunch of slides
23 that are not in here, it's kind of difficult to follow.
24 And so that was just on that procedural note.

25 In regards to what we're looking at here, and

1 your alternatives 4 and 5, I think are something that
2 are, anyways address some of the concerns that we have
3 in growth issues in an area as well as some of the
4 transportation issues.

5 I am happy to see that health is something
6 that's going to be also looked at in regards to air
7 pollutants, but I think health is also looked at in
8 other different ways not just air pollutants with
9 pedestrian access and other ways where health will be
10 looked at, and I hope that it's not only just considered
11 as an air particular matter but also in other aspects.

12 The alternatives for with looking at HOV
13 extensions and conversion lanes as well as the
14 boundaries and the low income communities and how
15 they're impacted, I think is something that we'll like
16 to see more of and how it's addressed, will be
17 transformed, will be something in formal comments also.
18 Just wanted to have an opportunity to say that. So
19 thank you.

20 MS. CHION: Just to address two points about
21 affordable housing. Just to address some of the
22 components that are already included in this effort, is
23 the regional housing need allocation.

24 The task is not only to define what is the
25 number of units that each city need to plan for, but

1 also for what is income need to be produced, that
2 housing needs to be produced. And as you know, through
3 the regional efforts, the definition of those groups
4 tries to address some of the regional disparities.

5 In other words, cities that already have a
6 high component of low income housing, should not have a
7 high responsibility of -- on that area and visa versa.
8 In the jobs-housing connection strategy, the project,
9 part of the effort was also to identify how the
10 employment that is generated at the local jurisdiction
11 needs to be reflected in the specific type of housing
12 needs. And while there's a lot of concern about we're
13 not seeking that people live and work in the same
14 jurisdiction, but at least there is an effort to address
15 the housing needs that an employment center is
16 generating.

17 One more component that is -- it came to me.
18 Oh, in terms of the alternatives, and that is where we
19 can get someone towards specific input, part of what
20 we'll be analyzing is decent patterns in the
21 distribution and the level of affordable housing. So
22 any thoughts or any specific inputting constructive,
23 those alternatives or analyzing that situation would be
24 very helpful. Thank you.

25 STEVEN LEVIN: Hi, my name is Steven Levin. I am

1 with the Santa Clara County Roads Commission and the
2 BPA, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee although
3 I'm not here representing either one in particular. I
4 live in San Jose.

5 Before you start timing me, I have a question.
6 Does this plan give consideration to how it is
7 consistent or inconsistent with the San Jose General
8 Plan 24. San Jose just went through a multi-year
9 process to come up with a new general plan to have a
10 more equity balance between housing and jobs, and I
11 would like to see that respected. So has consideration
12 been given to that or not? That's a question.

13 MS. CHION: We have been working very closely with
14 the folks in San Jose with Laura Provetti (phonetic) and
15 some of your other local planners and counsel planners,
16 and we have taken the input from San Jose very closely.
17 So the levels of growth that are proposed in the
18 jobs-housing connection strategy, the project, are very
19 close. In terms of employment, it's a little bit lower
20 than the expectation from the plan given the challenges
21 that we're facing. So while it's not completely in
22 sync, the pattern and the quality of the neighborhoods
23 that are proposing the plan is pretty much embedded in
24 the jobs-housing connection strategy.

25 STEVEN LEVIN: Speaking on behalf of San Jose,

1 which I don't represent, just as a resident, I would
2 like you to respect the jobs numbers that San Jose has
3 in General Plan 24. San Jose has got a tremendous
4 problem over the years with unequitable distribution of
5 housing versus jobs. It's really important for the
6 future financial health of the City of San Jose to get
7 more jobs here. I would like the regional government to
8 respect that. I'm not trying to propose a regional
9 solution upon San Jose which has tremendous economic
10 problems and needs more jobs.

11 I would like to echo the gentleman behind me
12 in terms of his comments. When you present things you
13 should have those exact things in the handouts. I would
14 like to see that map in color handed out to people. It
15 doesn't help when you give black and white versions of
16 the colored things. Please, in the future, have exact
17 copies of colored things in the exact slides that you
18 show for the handouts.

19 As to my more specific comments, I think that
20 on the plans that you carry forward, you should also
21 carry forward lower concentration on PDA growth. Not
22 all parts of the Bay Area are really enamored on those
23 PDA concepts and you should respect more local
24 jurisdictions on where they want to have their growth.
25 I'm really puzzled why you're going to draft

1 alternatives before you can get to the real EIR process.

2 In terms of issues the for evaluation, which
3 was one of the early things I saw for transportation.
4 Since these all seem to be phrased in the negative, I
5 think additional ones you should add are increase in
6 intersections and areas of level service F. You should
7 add increase in average speed of miles per hour, and you
8 should add increase costs for the taxpayers to subsidize
9 transit. I think also all these factors you take into
10 consideration in transportation.

11 And also I think that on the alternatives you
12 should have another one, which is eliminate use of
13 money -- of taxpayer money on transit systems and put
14 all the money towards road improvements and see the
15 effect of that, because nowhere is it shown a dollar
16 spent on transit is more effective than a dollar spent
17 on road improvements.

18 Transit is a money-sucking operation. It does
19 not help transportation situations. Thank you for my
20 comments.

21 MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

22 LEAH TOENISKOETTER: Leah Toeniskoetter for San
23 Jose. Thank you as well for coming to San Jose to
24 present this. And I do believe it would be really
25 helpful to have these after hours. I appreciated that

1 comment.

2 In terms of the alternatives, I just wanted to
3 state from our organization's standpoint we are most in
4 favor of number 4, but I want to also note the
5 importance of including a study of the full regional
6 housing needs for our region. I also would add a look
7 at tolling, specifically, around the edges of the
8 region. It would be very interesting to keep that in
9 the alternatives.

10 Just a question, did you have a mass number of
11 alternatives you're looking at or is it -- is it still
12 totally wide open. You may look at all of these and
13 then look at none.

14 MS. NGUYEN: We don't have a set number of
15 alternative. What we're looking for is feedback on the
16 alternatives that we presented terms of draft ideas.
17 But if there is other ideas that can be carried forward,
18 we will certainly look at that. Nothing is set other
19 than the two projects and the proposed project that will
20 be carried forward.

21 ROBERT MEANS: Robert Means with the Advance
22 Transit Association. I have got a question to start off
23 with. You're looking for a reduction in like 7 and 15
24 percent in Co2 emissions, and I wonder where that came
25 from because based on the car trajectory, if we're

1 talking about going to 2035 as the number, we have to
2 reduce our Co2 emissions by 55 percent from the current
3 standards. And I am wondering about the disparity
4 there.

5 MS. NGUYEN: So the Air Resource's board went
6 through a target-setting process for 18 of the different
7 metropolitan regions in California to try and achieve
8 both the AB32 goals as well as what's mandated under
9 SB375. So for our region, out of the 18, we were sent
10 very specific targets based on the analysis that the Air
11 Resources board did. So our responsibility in terms of
12 our contribution to the state-wide goal is that negative
13 7 and that negative 15 percent by 2035.

14 So each of the other metropolitan regions have
15 their own target and cumulatively, we will be all
16 helping to achieve a state GHG goal. So that's how
17 that's been set.

18 ROBERT MEANS: Robert Means. I don't see it the
19 same way, having you do the math on that one, but
20 I'll move on.

21 You also invited us to do an alternative plan
22 altogether, and one thing that I would suggest is take a
23 serious look at advanced transit options. In
24 particular, personal rapid transit or the automated
25 transit networks that are being considered for the

1 connection between the San Jose airport and the Cal
2 Train and LRT stations.

3 If you invest -- because, you know, this
4 gentleman back here has got a darn good point, that
5 based on results, investing in our existing mass transit
6 system is not producing the kinds of results on a per
7 dollar basis that we really need to produce. And
8 continuing to invest 88 percent of our transportation
9 dollars into the operations and maintenance of an
10 existing system that is emitting huge amounts of carbon
11 dioxide, also does not seem to make the transit systems
12 sustainable.

13 So I'm recommending you move some of that
14 money. Let's take 1 percent of that money. That would
15 be \$2.4 billion. You could put in approximately --
16 let's see, at 10 million a mile, that would be about,
17 what is that, two hundred miles worth of transit. Now,
18 this is not your standard transit where a bus comes by
19 every once in a while. This is a transit where there's
20 lots and lots of local stations, and the cars are
21 actually waiting for you when you get to the station
22 there.

23 There's a computer control so it doesn't shut
24 down in the evening. It's a 24/7 operation. This is
25 the kind of transit that would really make a difference

1 for people who depend on transit and would probably make
2 a big difference for folks that are currently commuting
3 single occupancy vehicle.

4 There was a study done in Palo Alto, and based
5 on that research it looks like we can cut our single
6 occupancy vehicle rate from 90 percent going to the
7 Stanford Research Park down to 45 percent. From 90
8 percent down to 45 percent. That's a cut in half using
9 this kind of transit system in that particular area.
10 Imagine what we could do if we spread that around.

11 And I haven't heard anything from the MTC or
12 ABAG or the RTP about any, any advanced transit options
13 even though they're being built in other places around
14 the world. And I think that that is -- exemplifies a
15 major oversight on your part, and that that may set you
16 up for another legal case like is being instituted down
17 in San Diego on their RTP. A case that was started by a
18 couple of organizations joined by the Sierra club and
19 also joined by the attorney general.

20 So we are setting ourselves up if we don't
21 really get our numbers in line for a similar type of a
22 lawsuit situation. And I would recommend that you
23 really start considering some of these advanced transit
24 options.

25 MS. LINDELOF: I have one other point to add to

1 Ashley's answer to the question about the reduction
2 target. Is that the 15 and 7 percent are just for the
3 on-road mobile sources. So I don't know if the number
4 you have there is for all greenhouse gas emissions or
5 just mobile sources.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or greenhouse whatever it's
7 much, much better than all of those other areas, it
8 sounds like.

9 MS. LINDELOF: Well, this plan targets the on-road
10 mobile sources. That's what those 7 and 15 percent
11 targets are.

12 RANDY KINMAN: Thank you. Randy Kinman from San
13 Jose. And I sit on MTC pack. And I want to let people
14 know that we did object to the meeting schedule in our
15 last meeting, and I would ask for the future meetings to
16 be scheduled during a time when the public can actually
17 participate. A 10 o'clock meeting in the middle of a
18 work week is not public participation.

19 My second issue is aligning with San Jose's
20 General Plan 24. While a lot of the projects that --
21 while a lot of this aligns with 2040, you don't get to
22 cherry pick which parts do. So I don't think that it's
23 appropriate to be picking out the housing element of
24 2040 and not picking out the jobs element. So I want
25 the plan to reflect -- San Jose just completed their

1 general plan so there's no reason not to align with it.
2 It's the most recent plan in the region aligned with our
3 job issues.

4 The third question or comment that I have is
5 the areas not being in accord in the EIR, specifically,
6 recreation. If we're increasing housing in certain
7 areas by 30 percent, where is the evaluation that we
8 don't need to investigate the recreational impact of
9 increasing the population by 30 percent?

10 I think that this is a gross oversight, and I
11 would either like to see an analysis as to why we're not
12 putting this in the EIR or I want it included in all
13 categories.

14 My final issue is a question of the Scoping
15 and tier down. So say we have the EIR approved and
16 we're looking at traffic mitigation issues. Based on
17 what I see, if a project qualifies for CEQA exemptions,
18 that also theoretically exempts them from the local
19 traffic impact, if I'm reading this correctly. And I
20 would like some clarification because it's one thing to
21 say it doesn't have a regional impact on traffic, but
22 when you are down at the -- on feet on the ground, it's
23 certain going to -- and I will just throw out or
24 ballpark stadium as an issue where regional traffic
25 might not be that big of a deal but what happens on the

1 ground is actually more important. And under this
2 scenario if that project were to come in right now, it
3 would be CEQA exemption, from what I can see.

4 MS. NGUYEN: Let me quickly respond to Randy's
5 point about the CEQA streamlines or exemptions.

6 So what SB375 allows is the CEQA streamlining
7 for two areas. Growth industry impact and cumulative
8 impact. So the regional transportation impact that you
9 mentioned, for those projects that qualify for the
10 streamlining, they would not -- they could refer to our
11 regional transportation analysis as part of this
12 environmental document. But that doesn't necessarily
13 mean that we would not continue to look at project
14 specific transportation or traffic impacts. They may
15 still necessarily need to do so if there are potentially
16 impacts in those areas.

17 It just allows that project to not have to
18 repeat the cumulative that are evaluated in EIR -- in
19 our EIR. So for any issue areas, it really is specific
20 to that project. They need to go through the same
21 process we are to say which environment issue would be
22 most germane to that project. And they would still need
23 it to cover in their project specific to EIR.

24 RANDY KINMAN: Then can your slide say regional?
25 Just pump that word in there?

1 MS. LINDELOF: Cumulative regional impact --

2 RANDY KINMAN: So that it's very clear.

3 MS. LINDELOF: I agree. We can certainly input
4 that more strongly.

5 RANDY KINMAN: Thank you.

6 GEORGINE SCOTT: Georgine Scott. I'm from south
7 county. I agree with the people that talked about the
8 slide and having everything, and also with the meeting
9 time so I just wanted to let you know that we have a
10 hard time getting people here during the day.

11 I have a question with regards to the
12 transportation. I've been to several meetings, and I
13 never -- I want to know if there's any studies that have
14 addressed -- I was in law enforcement. There's several
15 law enforcement, fire, safety people that cannot -- when
16 you talk about transportation, my life evolves around
17 being on call. If there's a crime scene, I can't wait
18 for a bus. I can't take public transportation. I have
19 to get into my private vehicle and respond just like a
20 lot of people in my line of work have to do.

21 Is there any studies done with respect to
22 people in my type of work that cannot utilize public
23 transportation, and how many of those type of people --
24 because we have a lot of law enforcement, a lot of fire,
25 a lot of safety, a lot of people that are in the same

1 line of work or similar lines of work where you can't
2 utilize that. And I want to know if that's been
3 included in any studies with respect to doing
4 transportation.

5 MS. LINDELOF: I will have to look at that. I
6 don't know.

7 MS. NGUYEN: I think in terms of just a general
8 travel characteristics over the next 25 years, we still
9 do see a lot of driving by cars. So if your question is
10 do we put emphasis to the fact that there will be
11 motorists in our region, residents in our region in law
12 enforcement and other areas that still relying on cars
13 for their travel, I think the answer is yes.

14 The share of the folks using transit is still
15 a relatively small proportion compared to those who
16 drive. So there are a lot of transportation projects in
17 this plan in addition to transit investments. There are
18 more also supporting basically roadway access.

19 So I think on that issue, we do have a full
20 spectrum of roadway transit and bicycle pedestrian
21 improvements in this plan that really address all the
22 travel characteristics that we expect to see in this
23 region over the next 28 years.

24 GEORGINE SCOTT: But that's not what I'm asking.

25 MS. NGUYEN: We don't have a specific study whether

1 or not law enforcement and others in the same
2 profession. The answer is no to that. But we do have
3 at least a regional look at the travel patterns in our
4 region. And, again, the point I wanted to make was
5 that, again, most folks still do drive to get to and
6 from work or to do work activities. So that's the trend
7 that we certainly will see continue over the next 28
8 years.

9 JIM PUTNAM: I joined the presentation and the
10 materials that you have here are very nice. Just a
11 couple of general comments. And you know, this state is
12 in a lot of trouble in a lot of ways, and the population
13 over the last couple of years hasn't met the
14 expectations that were forecasted. So we really need to
15 take a look at the lesson from the directions that we're
16 heading, and like I said, just some general comments.

17 I would like to see a little more
18 market-driven, market-based proposed to these things.
19 One where people can get on board, one where you're not
20 going to have a town like Palo Alto wanting to bail out
21 on the first word that's coming down, you know, where
22 there's more amenities, including more recreation
23 included, more inner city agricultural included, more
24 innovation as far as water reclamation, water re-usage,
25 roof top agricultural, roof top gardening.

1 But the state mandates and social engineering
2 is going to meet with a lot of confrontation, is going
3 to meet with a lot of law suits, it's going to meet with
4 a lot of public outcry, it's just not going to go down
5 well. And I don't think engineering ever equates to
6 social equity. I don't think it's ever proven that it
7 has. There has to be much more incentive to individuals
8 to do things on their own and much more opportunities
9 rather than trying to engineer it.

10 So I would like to see much more market-based
11 research and response to these things. We have a lot of
12 expenses that these projects are going to entail, a huge
13 amount of expense, and we just need to proceed
14 cautiously. Thank you.

15 XI YANG: Hello, everybody, my name is Xi Yang.
16 I'm with Breathe California. Since we have constantly
17 supported clean air and healthy lives, we truly want to
18 support everything we could possibly done to reduce
19 greenhouse gasses. And so I want to make a quick
20 comment on HOV lanes.

21 I think when we promote the HOV lanes, we
22 should focus on the benefits that the HOV lanes can
23 bring to drivers who are now carpooling or use
24 alternative fuel vehicles for transportation instead of
25 just doing, saying like we can do express lane, you can

1 pay extra to do, like, you know, just to travel faster
2 or just for highly extension, that's why we do HOV lane.

3 And also we -- I want to support the, you
4 know, sending out the platinum HOV lane stickers and
5 those are the green ones to vehicles. That way we can
6 definitely support -- I mean, the marking of alternative
7 fuel vehicles and that way we can further, you know, is
8 the traffic and also reduce greenhouse gasses. Thanks.

9 STEVEN LEVIN: This is Stephen Levin again.
10 Since the schedule you gave us says that written
11 comments will be accepted until July 11th on and on
12 July 13th present the final alternatives for review by
13 the joint MTC/ABAG, et cetera, what assurances do we
14 have as a public that any of our comments are going to
15 have any effect when you have a two-day window between
16 the time you that have the MTC and ABAG say what they
17 want to do and the end of the comments.

18 I serve on public commissions and a two-day
19 window does not give equal time to analyze anything that
20 came in and really make any changes. Can you address
21 that, please.

22 MS. NGUYEN: At the July 13th meeting we hope to do
23 two things. One is to really report on all the comments
24 we have heard and to demonstrate how we can refine the
25 alternatives to reflect those comments. It is a

1 two-step process so we do have another meeting on
2 July 19th. So if there were last-minute comments that
3 we raise with our board, and they may raise additional
4 ones as well, we have an opportunity as staff to take
5 all those comments and really prepare for the final
6 actions, which is slated for July 19th.

7 You're correct in the timeline is very tight.
8 We don't appreciate that anymore than anyone else, but
9 our schedule is our schedule and we will try to work
10 even within that schedule to really take in all the
11 comments, at least report it in a way that our
12 commission understands the feedback that we received
13 during the Scoping process and really start thinking
14 about how those comments are reflected in or
15 recommendations.

16 So we do have a short timeline to do that, but
17 it is our full intention to be as comprehensive as
18 possible.

19 STEVEN LEVIN: Is that meeting subject to the Brow
20 Act?

21 MS. NGUYEN: These are public meetings subject to
22 the Brown Act, yes.

23 STEVEN LEVIN: I don't think you can be in
24 compliance with that and determine comments from the
25 public in time for the meeting.

1 MS. NGUYEN: Again, the action isn't -- the action
2 is on July 19th, just to allow us to move forward into
3 the environmental process. During the environmental
4 process these alternatives may be further refined and
5 modified as we go through the environmental process.

6 The final action in terms of the adoption of
7 the plan doesn't occur until 2013. So a lot of things
8 could happen between July 13th and July 19th of this
9 year all the way up to the current adoption. So there
10 are many more opportunities for public feedback and
11 comments on the plan itself before our respective boards
12 take action.

13 RANDY KINMAN: I do want to echo that because it
14 was an issue that I raised before. This is a really
15 aggressive timeline, and I don't think that staff has
16 the capability of producing responses to question less
17 than 48 hours after they have been raised. I also don't
18 think it's appropriate to have a 6-day window for the
19 public to review the issues and the answers that the
20 staff has come up with to Scoping issues before the July
21 19th meeting. And that follows all the way down the
22 schedule.

23 And I will again reiterate my request that the
24 45-day window, the 55-day window be extended to
25 accommodate the fact that many of our municipalities

1 furlough along the Christmas holiday, so you're
2 releasing a report, you're opening it up to a 45-day
3 review and response period for these communications
4 where there's no staff in the office for two weeks. So
5 that pumps it down to a 30-day review during holiday
6 time.

7 And I, again, once that happens, I don't think
8 that you have enough time to produce a timely written
9 response that we can actually find, locate or know
10 about. So I just -- I just want to -- this is actually
11 supporting staff, not pushing back on staff, but I just
12 don't think that it's appropriate to put that kind of a
13 timeline together because it's not functional.

14 MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

15 JOHN CARPENTER: John Carpenter of Mountain View
16 again. We have a planning commission which has a time
17 that starts at about 7 o'clock at night. We got bumped.
18 We were fortunate to have our appropriate comments from
19 people who are working during the day. And there -- in
20 our case we had comments from Google employees, and I
21 will point out to you that the generation that's coming
22 up there's a lot of difference from the generation
23 that's in the past. These are highly aware people
24 especially the kind of people who look over your
25 shoulders, work at -- who look over the shoulder of

1 those who are doing Google Maps and updates and things
2 every year. Where they can see the progress of global
3 warming.

4 The type of a life that we have been living so
5 far is no longer getting here as mother nature has --
6 you know, if you want to talk about timelines when
7 mother nature has her timeline, and if we don't behave
8 ourselves, as greenhouse gas wife, she's going to turn
9 off our water supply. That's it.

10 MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

11 MS. HENDRICKS: I'm one that -- I know I'm kind of
12 late to this, and but what I would like to know, do you
13 have in your formula something -- we got this great
14 plan. People don't have to stay in the State of
15 California even in this area. So what are you going to
16 do when people move out in massive groves? Do you have
17 a plan for that? Is that in your plan? Is corporate
18 going to pay for this?

19 MS. CHION: That extreme situation has not been
20 ensued, but we have -- the forecast assumes intrinsic
21 population growth of slower population growth that we
22 have seen in prior decades. And that is based on a
23 slowdown in migration. That is based on some of the
24 rates of the national growths, some of the projections
25 of the national growth and is linked to the growth of

1 our economy that while healthy and probably one of the
2 healthiest regions in the country, it's growing at a
3 slower pace than we had growths in the last few decades.

4 We don't have a big assumption in terms of a
5 major contraction of the population, but we're assuming
6 it's a slower pace of growth.

7 MS. HENDRICKS: Well, to add to that, how
8 representative is this of the community and how many
9 people are out there coming to your meetings that
10 represent the community? There's millions of people in
11 this area. So these people are not going to know until
12 it happens to them, right?

13 MS. CHION: We have -- this is one of several
14 meetings, but in terms of the outreach about the plan,
15 there have been multiple efforts through our website,
16 through telephone polls, through working with
17 community-based organizations. In the next few months
18 we're also going to be working with your city councils
19 to ensure that there's a discussion at the local level.
20 So you are going to be hearing a lot more in addition to
21 what we have done.

22 So again, this is one meeting that is focused
23 on the Scoping of the EIR, and if you feel like for the
24 purpose of the Scoping meetings we need additional
25 outreach, we'll be glad to take your input, but keep in

1 mind that there have been many efforts in terms of
2 conveying the scope of the plan at the community and at
3 the city level.

4 MANOLO GONZALEZ-ESTAY: Manolo Gonzalez-Estray.
5 Trans Form. I want to reiterate, I agree with Miriam.
6 There have been a lot of opportunities for the community
7 to speak about this. And we have -- you know that I've
8 been coming to MTC and other meetings and other things,
9 and I acknowledge that.

10 I participated in a lot of the EIRs over the
11 years and managed several of them. The scent that I get
12 from your timeline shows that public gets to speak here,
13 here and a little here. It's been my experience that in
14 EIRs the public is at any point able to participate and
15 comment and talk to staff about their -- there are
16 official windows and hearing periods after certain
17 things are relayed and I understand that. But I would
18 just ask, does the public get an opportunity to continue
19 to participate throughout the process until the end of
20 this, or can we only talk in little snippets of time?

21 MS. LINDELOF: We would certainly encourage any
22 member of the public or community who has specific
23 issues that they want to bring to our attention to bring
24 them. There isn't --as you all have said, there's a
25 point in time in terms of just a more rigorous

1 environmental process that we do have to follow because
2 it's stated in the environmental regulations, but we
3 certainly encourage input of all kinds at all times.

4 So if there is comments that you receive, that
5 may come to you later following the Scoping meeting or
6 even after the close of the comments, we certainly
7 welcome that and you certainly can call, email, or let
8 us know in whatever fashion you think is most
9 appropriate what your concerns are.

10 The preparation of the EIR is a process, and
11 we don't close out comments and feedback certainly from
12 member communities or even our partner agencies on
13 transportation on any side in terms of the local
14 jurisdiction. But it's a very open process and we
15 certainly welcome any feedback.

16 We do have mandates in terms of when we do
17 things and so we're trying to respect those mandates,
18 but, again, it's an open door policy in terms of
19 allowing the public to provide us with feedback. That
20 would be helpful to us as we proceed with our own staff
21 analysis. So I certainly encourage and welcome that.

22 JEFF WINDHAM: Jeff Windham. In regards to the
23 public comment, and as far as the openness and
24 availability of information, I think there's a lack of
25 education in the general public. I think that a lot of

1 this stuff goes to either one extreme or the other. It
2 goes to proponents or it goes to opponents.

3 These public hearings that are large, get
4 unruly, they get out of control, people support
5 irrational behaviors coming from the public when a
6 meeting is trying to be conducted at a calmer level, and
7 you get factions of people supporting, you know,
8 disfunctional behavior at some of these meetings. It's
9 pathetic to witness some of it. So I am certainly
10 empathetic in that regard.

11 I think general education of the general
12 populous is missing. There's not a lot of newspapers
13 about these things. And until the newspaper gets wind
14 of somebody being upset about something, then it comes
15 out the negative way. So I think that there's much more
16 opportunity within the media. All types of media,
17 print, television, et cetera to get some more of this
18 word out and to utilize a lot more marketing in the
19 process.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I Just wanted to comment on
21 that. In general, people who are happy stay home. We
22 are the folks who -- we don't have an issue with what
23 we're doing, but we have gotten some pretty, I think
24 decent press on the plan. We, of course, do our own
25 press releases and I think, you know, the general public

1 may not pick up on that. But we are and have gotten
2 some pretty decent news stories and publication about
3 the plan.

4 ROBERT MEANS: Given that you've selected the
5 jobs-housing connection as your primary strategy
6 preferred scenario, and looking under the transportation
7 bulletin points, and the last one there is make the
8 transit system sustainable. And I was wondering whether
9 you folks have any idea how you were going to accomplish
10 that.

11 MS. NGUYEN: There had been a parallel effort on --
12 along with Plan Bay Area called a Transit Sustainability
13 Project where MTC worked with the general managers of
14 all the operators, the transit operators in the region
15 to find ways to do two things. One is more financial
16 sustainability from an operator's point of view, better
17 customer service and transit services from a ridership
18 point of view. And one of the key outcomes or maybe two
19 outcomes worth mentioning is that there is an approved
20 recommendation coming out of the study that all transit
21 operators have to achieve a 5 percent cost efficiency in
22 terms of the way they operate their services.

23 Because the way that we've been operating our
24 services, it's certainly not sustainable over the long
25 term. As many of you know, there's been a lot of

1 different financial issues based on all the different
2 operators in terms of some of the issues they have to
3 deal with, whether it's labor issues, service cuts or
4 service modifications. And so through that planning
5 process, we've actually made the transit operators look
6 at the way that they do their books to see if it
7 conforms with cost efficiency.

8 The other thing we have done is to ensure
9 better customer service in ridership level. We do have
10 an initial \$30 million program that helps to put in some
11 pretty low cost-effective strategy such as transit
12 priority on buses to allow buses to operate at a higher
13 speed and reliable time through that PSP project. And
14 this plan, in that last bullet that you referenced, we
15 put \$500 million over the next 28 years to continue that
16 sort of transit performance initiative, to put that in
17 place, so that we can continue to, again, put the
18 transit operator kind of on the line in terms of making
19 sure that not only are they sustainable from a financial
20 point of view, but are they providing the quality of
21 services this region needs in terms of ensuring that
22 good customer base and a good customer service overall.

23 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: A half a million dollars?
24 500 million? One half a billion dollars goes to the
25 maintenance in the existing system at \$244 million?

1 MS. NGUYEN: Maintaining the existing system is not
2 only -- is about basically painting our local streets
3 and roads, maintaining our trains in service that we
4 have today, and also paying for all the costs that are
5 associated with the transit today in terms of bus
6 replacement, system and railways, fixing the railways,
7 replacing our trains. Those are all big-ticket items.
8 And, yes, the commission has a long-standing policy to
9 maintain and operate the systems we have in place before
10 we go out and spend billions of dollars in expansion or
11 other new projects.

12 Because we have made this hefty investment
13 over the past many decades in our transportation system,
14 you don't let your existing system go to pot and think
15 about other new projects you want to entertain. You got
16 to have a balance of both. And it's our commission's
17 directive to fix what we have and maintain what we have
18 and use the other money more wisely in terms of where
19 you want to make transportation investments.

20 STEVEN LEVIN: Steven Levin. So to follow up that
21 point about maintenance plans to assist the system's
22 sustainability. One thing that's not sustainable about
23 it is they constantly require increasing taxes as a
24 percentage of people's own assets. So how about
25 factoring in having a sort of minimal percentage of fair

1 box recovery that every transit system hold that area or
2 cut the system out entirely.

3 JOHN CARPENTER: John Carpenter again. I am
4 hearing testimony from the Google employees last night.
5 And there's a number that I have confirmed myself to a
6 greater extent because I do count bicycles going into
7 that type of employment area. But overall, between 1500
8 to 2000 Google employees ride bicycles to and from work
9 daily.

10 This is because they struggle to be able to
11 live in Mountain View. They double up and they triple
12 up and all of that for things, and they can -- so they,
13 you know, they're serious about, you know, when they see
14 what's happening to global warming, they're serious
15 about the bicycle riding. And that's a very high
16 percentage of Google employees, 1500 to 2000. So when
17 you are talking about modes of transportation, when you
18 get your housing jobs in balance put together, a
19 bicyclist is the most efficient way to go, and nobody
20 has to spend that.

21 MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

22 ROLAND LEBRUN: My name is Roland from San Jose.
23 If I look at alternative 4 dispute, eliminate
24 inter-regional commuting, how does that work as high
25 speed rail? Are you trying to kill high speed rail and

1 if not, how do you expect high speed rail to be run
2 without a great subsidy. Thank you.

3 MS. CHION: Your question is about how we can
4 eliminate inter-regional commute, or is it related to
5 high speed rail?

6 ROLAND LEBRUN: Well, I thought the general idea
7 was high speed rail from the -- would you be able to
8 commute to the Bay Area for jobs, so how does that work?

9 MS. CHION: Well, it is a construct to address one
10 of the legal components of the SB375 legal requirements.
11 We have some challenges, I have to say, in making that
12 economically feasible. What's the level of housing
13 subsidy that will be required to house all the people
14 that are choosing to live in the Central Valley, and
15 what are the incentives that we need to provide in order
16 to bring those workers into the area and what prevents
17 all the workers from coming.

18 So this is just a sketch, a preliminarily
19 proposal. If several of these alternatives do not meet
20 the basic feasibility, we will not continue. We will
21 refrain from the alternative. So you highlight a good
22 point. If it runs -- that alternative runs into
23 subsidiary issues in terms of the effect of the
24 feasibility of transportation. Thank you.

25 MS. LINDELOF: Anybody else? Okay. Thank you all

1 for your time and coming out today and giving us your
2 comments.

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
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, KRIS CASE, CSR No. 13142, hereby certify that the discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a full, true and complete record of said matter.

And I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to the foregoing meeting and captioned name, nor in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 21st day of June, 2012.

KRIS CASE, CSR 13142

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ATTENDEES

ASHLEY NGUYEN - Metropolitan Transportation Commission
BRENDA DIX - Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MARK SHORETT - Association of Bay Area Governments
VICKI HILL - Dyett & Bhatia

---oOo---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the Meeting, and on June 26, 2012, at 10:05 a.m. at SPUR Public Assembly Hall, 654 Mission Street, San Francisco, California, before me, JUDITH L. LARRABEE, Hearing Reporter, State of California, there commenced a Scoping Meeting under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.

---oOo---

1	MEETING AGENDA	
2		Page
3	Introduction by Ms. Nguyen	4
4	Presentation by Ms. Nguyen	6
5	Presentation by Ms. Hill	13
6	Presentation by Mr. Shorett	21

7

8

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

9

10	Bernard Choden	32
11	Peter Brown	35
12	ShiuFan Lee	38
13	Richard Napier	41
14	Hilda LaFebre	44
15	Eleanor Hansen	47
16	Liz Brisson	49
17	Aubrey Freedman	51
18	Adrienne Heim	52
19	Lois Scott	53
20	Danielle Merenbach	55
21	Bernard Choden	57
22	Virginia Hoffman	58

23

5---oOo---

24

25

1

2

PROCEEDINGS

3

4

5

MS. NGUYEN: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Ashley Nguyen. I'm the project manager for the Plan Bay Area EIR.

6

7

8

9

10

I'd like to welcome you to today's scoping meeting here in San Francisco. We are very appreciative of all of you participating in today's scoping meeting. We are really excited to hear your comments on the scope and content of the Plan Bay Area EIR.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Just so we're on the same page, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments are the co-leading agencies on the development of this Plan Bay Area EIR. And we have been holding a series of scoping meetings over the past week or so to get feedback from agencies, community members and stakeholders, again, on the scope and content of the EIR. So again, we're very excited that you're here today to get that feedback.

20

21

22

23

24

Before I begin, I wanted to lay out some basic groundrules for today's meeting. It may not apply to this group because you seem to be very agreeable this morning. But just in case, let me go through some key points because they are applicable in other meetings.

25

So the format we're taking is very straightforward.

1 The EIR team will present a staff presentation, and
2 following the staff presentation, we will provide everyone
3 here with an opportunity to provide us with some oral
4 comments. We ask that in providing that oral comment that
5 you line up near the microphone which will be stationed to
6 the left and take your turn to speak.

7 To help us to record your name properly for the record,
8 we do ask that you fill out a blue card where you can
9 actually write down your name. And there is going to be a
10 basket nearby the podium. So you can just drop that
11 speaker card into that podium so that our court reporter
12 again can record your name properly.

13 We do ask that you keep your comments concise and to
14 the point to allow the maximum number of participants to be
15 able to speak today. If you do get a little bit engrossed
16 in your points, we may ask that you summarize and complete
17 your thoughts so that we can move to the next person.

18 As I mentioned, we do have a court reporter today to
19 record your comments. We ask that you speak clearly for
20 her benefit. And she may ask you to repeat something or to
21 request that you speak slower. Again, our intention really
22 here is to listen to your comments, but also to record it
23 properly on the record.

24 We please ask that you disagree respectfully. If you
25 have an opinion that differs from other speakers, we ask

1 that you do not shout or interrupt. If you do interrupt
2 and cause disruption and disallow us to continue our
3 meeting, we will ask you to leave.

4 We are taking oral comments today. You can submit any
5 written comments you have prepared to us today, or if you
6 have written comments that you would like to submit later,
7 we would like to encourage you to submit those comments by
8 the deadline date of July 11. The address and ways to
9 submit your written comments are on the postcard as well as
10 in the materials that you have in your handouts today.

11 Those are the groundrules. I hope that they are
12 straightforward enough and that we can all follow them so
13 that we have a really productive meeting today.

14 Let me go ahead and introduce the team for the Plan Bay
15 Area EIR. Going from my left to right, Brenda Dix of MTC;
16 Mark Shorett of the Association of Bay Area Governments and
17 Vicki Hill of Dyett & Bhatia. Dyett & Bhatia is a planning
18 consulting firm here in San Francisco and they're assisting
19 MTC and ABAG in preparation of this EIR.

20 Let me go ahead and go straight to the presentation,
21 and we'll try to be as brief but comprehensive as possible
22 to give you really an idea of what the Plan is about as
23 well as the environmental process we're undertaking to
24 evaluate the potential effects of that plan.

25 In terms of our agenda today, we have a number of key

1 topics that we would like to share with you. The first is
2 an overview of Plan Bay Area. This will be followed by
3 some details about the streamlining provision available in
4 Senate Bill 375. And then we'll transition to an overview
5 of the Transportation Improvement Program, and then we'll
6 go back straight on to content with the purpose and scope
7 of the EIR and the specific issues for evaluation which we
8 receive your comments on, as well as give you a run-through
9 of some potential ideas we have at this point in time about
10 alternatives to be considered in the EIR. And then we'll
11 close the presentation and then provide you with an
12 opportunity to provide comments.

13 So Plan Bay Area is really the first regional plan
14 to integrate transportation, land use and housing.
15 This was really initiated by California Senate Bill
16 375, the Sustainable Community Strategy. The goal of
17 this state law is really to find a way where our two
18 agencies can really identify and feature a land use
19 growth pattern, that when coupled with transportation,
20 help us to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars
21 and light-duty trucks.

22 The Air Resources Board sets very specific targets
23 for the Bay Area region. Our targets are to reduce
24 greenhouse gas emissions by a negative seven percent
25 in year 2020 and by a negative fifteen percent in year

1 2035 from the 2005 levels.

2 However, in addition to those climate protection
3 goals, the Plan also looks to carry out a number of
4 goals that help us to provide housing for Bay Area
5 residents, build a stronger economy, protect our
6 natural environment and enhance accessibility and
7 opportunities for residents from all walks of life.
8 And to the extent that we can, this EIR and the Plan
9 will strive to meet these Plan goals.

10 We did want to specifically call out some CEQA
11 streamlining provisions in SB 375, mainly for local
12 jurisdictions who will potentially advance a number of
13 residential mixed use projects as they move forward in
14 their own local planning process. And we want to be
15 able to facilitate that CEQA streamlining to the
16 extent possible through both this Plan and the EIR to
17 be prepared for this Plan.

18 So the state law has really given agencies like
19 MTC and ABAG an opportunity to engage with our local
20 government, the stakeholders and community members to
21 really plan for an efficient land use pattern that
22 best leverages the \$277 billion dollars that's
23 available through this Plan, particularly the
24 transportation investments that we're making with
25 regards to not only maintaining our existing transit

1 service levels, but also some major transit pathway
2 extensions that are planned over the next 28 years.

3 To support our efforts, a state law allows for
4 streamlining for certain residential and mixed use
5 projects as well as Transit Authority projects that
6 are identified as part of this Integrated Land Use and
7 Transportation Plan.

8 This slide shows you the specifics on the kinds of
9 projects that can take advantage of that CEQA
10 streamlining. So to qualify as a Residential or a
11 Mixed Used Project, at least 75 percent of the total
12 building square footage must be residential use. And
13 to qualify as a Transit Priority Project, or TPP for
14 short, that project must have at least 50 percent to
15 be residential use, have a floor/area ratio of no less
16 than 0.75; provide for a minimum density of at least
17 20 units/acre. And the key criteria in here is that
18 that project must be within half a mile of a major
19 transit stop or within a high-quality transit corridor
20 operating at 15-minute frequencies.

21 I know that the Transit Authority Project is a new
22 one for us. Particularly for those of you who have
23 been tracking our regional planning efforts over the
24 past few years, you know that we've been working to
25 engage our local government as well as stakeholders to

1 support job and housing both in Priority Development
2 Areas, or PDAs for short. PDAs are areas that local
3 government have identified or volunteered to be places
4 within their community where they like to see higher
5 levels of growth.

6 We do believe that PDAs are really a good step in
7 the right direction, and we certainly want to
8 facilitate the development of growth in those areas.
9 But because state law allows us to expand our reach,
10 in some respects, so we're really looking at other
11 areas as well that are indeed very well-served by
12 transit, we want to introduce this term to you so that
13 you're aware that those projects that are occurring in
14 these Transit Priority Eligible Areas indeed qualify
15 and get some CEQA relief.

16 Just to drill down a little bit more in terms of
17 the specifics, the streamlining position is one that
18 is not the easiest to navigate, so we're trying to
19 simplify it here in this slide. So in order to even
20 be considered for any kind of CEQA relief, that
21 residential or mixed use project must first be found
22 consistent with the land use designation densities and
23 intensities that are identified in the Plan itself,
24 and if that project is located in a Transit Priority
25 Eligible Area and meets all the exemptions specified

1 in state law, that project is fully exempt from CEQA.
2 We don't see a lot of opportunities for this to
3 happen, but we certainly would encourage local
4 jurisdictions that have that kind of project to be
5 able to take that kind of exemption.

6 The second class is probably the more likely
7 opportunity case, where again, a residential mixed use
8 project is found consistent with the Plan, and that
9 project is indeed located in a Transit Priority
10 Eligible Area but doesn't necessarily meet all the
11 exemption codes, that project can still qualify for
12 streamlined environmental review. Basically local
13 jurisdictions can then develop a streamlined document
14 called a Sustainable Community Environmental
15 Assessment.

16 And then the third case is that if a project is
17 not located in a Transit Priority Eligible Area, they
18 can still take some advantage of CEQA streamlining,
19 though it's fairly limited in its scope and capacity.

20 I'm going to make an abrupt transition here to the
21 Transportation Improvement Program. For those of you
22 who may not be familiar with this document, it is a
23 four-year funding document that provides a
24 comprehensive listing of all the roadway, transit, and
25 bicycle-pedestrian projects that receive federal funds

1 or are subject to some sort of federal action, or
2 these projects may be regionally significant and we
3 need it as part of our analysis.

4 The key here, though, and the reason why we're
5 bringing this Plan up in relationship to the Plan Bay
6 Area is that projects that are in the Transportation
7 Improvement Program must be consistent with the Long
8 Range Plan. And so when MTC developed our Long Range
9 Plan in Plan Bay Area, we simultaneously consult on
10 the Transportation Improvement Program so that folks
11 can see a connection between a Long Range Plan in a
12 20-year planning document and the relationship to a
13 programming document that actually builds out the
14 state and federal funds.

15 The current TIP is the 2011 Transportation
16 Improvement Program. It contains about 11 billion
17 dollars worth of transportation investments. The
18 largest fund source in the TIP come from local dollars
19 such as county transportation sales tax or local
20 streets and roads funds.

21 MTC is in the process of updating our TIP. We are
22 in the process of developing the 2013 TIP. We just
23 recently released the Draft 2013 TIP for public review
24 on June 22nd, and we're looking to, again, get to
25 approval by our commission in late September.

1 So if you have comments that you would like to
2 share on the TIP, there is a separate process -- a
3 parallel but separate process on it. And you're
4 certainly welcome to provide us your feedback on the
5 TIP as well.

6 Now I'm going to turn it over to Vicki Hill of
7 Dyett & Bhatia to walk you through some of the details
8 of the environmental process.

9 MS. HILL: So as Ashley mentioned earlier,
10 the focus of today's meeting primarily is to discuss
11 the scope of the EIR that we will be preparing over
12 the next five months. And I'd like you to know that
13 we have not prepared the EIR yet; we're just at the
14 beginning stages.

15 The EIR is required by CEQA, the California
16 Environmental Quality Act, and CEQA also requires the
17 process that we're going through now for the EIR.

18 The purpose of the EIR is to identify the Plan's
19 potentially significant impacts on the environment,
20 evaluate a range of reasonable and feasible
21 alternatives and then determine how the Plan or
22 alternatives can avoid or mitigate significant
23 impacts.

24 To do that, this EIR will be a Program EIR, not a
25 project-specific EIR, and as such it presents a

1 region-wide assessment of the proposed Plan and
2 alternatives. And as Ashley mentioned, it also
3 provides CEQA streamlining opportunities.

4 The EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts,
5 but we wanted to note that two additional separate
6 studies will be undertaken to assess other key
7 elements of sustainability, and those include the
8 economy or Economic Impact Study and the Equity
9 Analysis.

10 For the Economic Impact study, the purpose would
11 be to assess economic impact of the Plan Bay Area's
12 land use patterns and transportation investments on
13 the regional economy. And our key areas of interest
14 are state of good repair, pricing, housing policy, PDA
15 land use and development and goods movement. We're
16 hoping to complete this analysis this fall of 2012 and
17 use the results to inform future economic analysis
18 efforts.

19 The Equity Analysis has a two-fold purpose, and
20 that is to look at the equity implications of all the
21 alternatives, and identify the benefits and burdens of
22 impacts and transportation investments for different
23 socioeconomic groups. This analysis will take place
24 in parallel with the EIR, and we're hoping to have
25 that completed by early 2013.

1 This slide shows the overall EIR process, sort-of
2 the flow chart, and as shown, we're at the very far
3 left of the chart at the NOP scoping period. And this
4 kicks off the EIR process. And we're in the middle of
5 the 30-day period for public and agency comments.
6 That's why we're here today.

7 After we receive your comments, we will move into
8 the data collection and environmental setting followed
9 by the Environmental Impact Assessment. And at the
10 same time we will be further defining the proposed
11 project and alternatives to feed into the analysis.

12 The next key point for public input will be when
13 the public Draft EIR is published. We're hoping to do
14 that in mid-December, and that will include a 45-day
15 public review period. After that review period is
16 closed, then we will take all the comments, number
17 them and respond to all of them, include them in the
18 Final EIR which we're hoping to publish in March with
19 a Final EIR certification in April.

20 So here at the beginning of the process, we want
21 your feedback on several key questions. Please keep
22 these in minds as you formulate your comments either
23 today or submitting written comments later.

24 So the EIR scoping questions are first, what
25 potential environmental issues should be analyzed in

1 addition to the issues that we're identifying today?

2 What other feasible alternatives or changes to the
3 alternatives should be evaluated?

4 And what types of mitigation measures should be
5 considered that would help avoid or minimize potential
6 environmental impacts of either the Plan or the
7 alternatives?

8 Finally, what elements of the EIR would help with
9 CEQA exemptions and tiering?

10 So we'll turn now to the laundry list of issues
11 for evaluation, and since you have the handout, I
12 won't go through each of these. But these are divided
13 by issue area, and they are consistent with the CEQA
14 guidelines, the environmental checklist that lists all
15 the different types of impacts that need to be
16 studied.

17 We don't know right now if these are going to be
18 significant impacts or not with the Plan, but these
19 are issues that we will be looking at.

20 So two critical issues are transportation and air
21 quality. There are three primary measurements of
22 transportation. First, the potential decrease in the
23 average number of jobs within 15, 30 or 45 minutes
24 from home by auto or transit. In other words, how
25 would the Plan impact commute times?

1 The second one is increase in vehicle miles
2 traveled, or VMT, on facilities currently experiencing
3 level of service F which represents a heavily
4 congested condition.

5 And thirdly, the increase in per-capita vehicle
6 miles traveled.

7 For air quality, we will be looking at both
8 short-term construction and long-term operational
9 emissions; an increase in criteria pollutants and
10 toxic air contaminants and health risks due to
11 increased particulate matter and TACs from mobile and
12 stationary sources. We'll also look at the potential
13 conflicts with air quality plans or violation of air
14 quality standards.

15 In the land use and physical development issue
16 area, we'll be answering a question on whether or not
17 the Plan would result in conversion of agricultural
18 lands and open space, potential conflicts with locally
19 adopted land use plans, disruption of residential or
20 business uses or displacement of existing population
21 and housing, for other alterations to communities that
22 could represent a division of the community.

23 In energy, the primary issues there are an
24 increase in non-renewable energy consumption and
25 inconsistencies with energy conservation plans.

1 Greenhouse gasses and climate change. In this
2 issue area, we'll be looking at the increase in
3 overall and per-capita CO2 emissions, as well as
4 looking at whether the Plan would subject new land
5 uses and transportation facilities to sea level
6 changes or conflict with greenhouse gas reduction
7 plans, policies or regulations.

8 For noise, we'll be looking at both short-term
9 construction as well as long-term operational impacts.

10 In geology and seismicity, our primary concern is
11 creating a situation where there would be an increase
12 in the risk of injury or loss of life due to
13 earthquakes, landslides or ground failure, including
14 liquefaction. Also looking at soil erosion, an
15 increased development on expansive soils or weak
16 unconsolidated soils.

17 For biological resources, we're looking at the
18 adverse effects on sensitive or special status species
19 and riparian habitats, wetlands or other sensitive
20 natural communities.

21 We'll also be looking at the interference with the
22 movement of wildlife, and again, looking at how the
23 Plan would be consistent or inconsistent with adopted
24 local conservation policies and resource plans.

25 The water resources issue covers the surface and

1 groundwater resources, and you can see the long list
2 of the impacts that we'll be evaluating. We look at
3 runoff, increased runoff and flooding, particularly
4 the replacement of structures within a 100-year flood
5 hazard area.

6 For visual resources, a concern is adverse effects
7 on scenic vistas, damage to scenic resources within a
8 scenic highway or degradation of existing visual
9 character of communities and open space areas. We'll
10 also be evaluating creation of new sources of
11 substantial light or glare.

12 For cultural resources, this includes both
13 historic and prehistoric resources, looking at any
14 change or adverse effect on existing resources or
15 possibly disrupting human remains.

16 In public utilities, the concern here is potential
17 adverse effects on water supply, wastewater and
18 stormwater facilities and solid waste.

19 And finally, growth-inducing effects will take a
20 very careful look at whether the Plan would result in
21 direct or indirect substantial unanticipated growth
22 beyond rates that are currently projected.

23 At this time, we don't anticipate potentially
24 significant impacts in the following issue areas:
25 Hazardous materials, public services, recreation and

1 mineral resources.

2 So that is the list of environmental issues. This
3 next slides provides sort of a transition to the next
4 part of our presentation on alternatives, and it sort
5 of outlines how we define the EIR alternatives.

6 As Ashley mentioned, there's two components to the
7 Plan, the land use and the transportation sections.
8 So for land use, the objective is to meet the key
9 goals of the Plan, and our approach starts with
10 looking at the locally-adopted General Plan and zoning
11 policies which provide the base for the No Project
12 Alternative.

13 We then assess the Preferred Land Use Strategy,
14 which in this case is the Jobs-Housing Connection
15 Project, and then assess various land use policies to
16 consider a range of future growth distribution
17 scenarios for alternatives. These make up the
18 alternatives for the land use components.

19 For transportation, our objective, again, is to
20 meet the key goals of the Plan subject to the
21 financially-constrained Transportation Investment
22 Strategy. Our approach includes, again, starting at
23 the existing transportation network as the base for
24 the No Project, assessing the Preferred Transportation
25 Investment Strategy or modifying it to reflect shifts

1 in investment priorities, and finally assessing
2 explicit transportation demands, management policies
3 (such as pricing) for the alternatives.

4 So with that, I will turn it over to Mark.

5 MR. SHORETT: Hi. I'm going to talk for a
6 little bit about the Preferred Alternative and then go
7 into the other alternatives. These have kind of been
8 laid out, and I'm going to just provide a little more
9 detail on them.

10 So first, the Job-Housing Connection. This
11 particular alternative is the Project Alternative as
12 required by CEQA. This is the land use as well as
13 Transportation Investment Strategy that was adopted by
14 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the
15 ABAG Executive Board in May, and now this is kind of
16 the first piece of how we will meet the SB 375 target
17 particularly related to greenhouse gases. So this is
18 intended to do that, but of course, all the other
19 alternatives we're going to be looking at would be
20 required to do that as well.

21 So really the building block for this is a set of
22 Priority Development Areas. And we actually provided
23 an overview of those, so I won't go into too much
24 detail. But there are over 200 of them, and all of
25 them are nominated by cities.

1 In most cases they go through a process with city
2 council so there's very broad support. And then the
3 planners in the local jurisdictions work with planners
4 in ABAG to look at the way in which local plans would
5 support opportunities to provide a development pattern
6 both at the local scale and a combined way at the
7 regional scale that would help us leverage
8 transportation investments.

9 Obviously we have a great deal of transportation
10 infrastructure already on the ground. There's been a
11 substantial amount of investment in that, and there
12 are opportunities to further leverage that by an
13 increase in ridership, providing greater benefits to
14 the communities around the stations, et cetera. So
15 this is required to be within the existing community,
16 and in most cases in an infill development area; as
17 Ashley mentioned, near an existing or planned transit
18 station. There is a set of guidelines which relate to
19 most of the PDAs. Most of the PDAs achieve them, and
20 these will also relate to projects which would provide
21 some CEQA clearance as Transit Priority Project areas.

22 So to provide just a little linkage there, there
23 will be potentially quite a few projects or maybe
24 there will be a limited number of projects that would
25 be in areas already zoned for the TPP guidelines that

1 were shown earlier and that are already supported by
2 local governments in terms of the zoning, and that's
3 oftentimes part of the Jobs-Housing Connection
4 Strategy. And so that would be an opportunity to kind
5 of avail of those environmental benefits and CEQA
6 benefits.

7 So another part of the Priority Development Areas
8 is providing housing and/or jobs. And then a key part
9 is that there's a diversity of densities and community
10 identities that are captured by the Priority
11 Development Areas. And this really relates to the
12 collaborative process between the local jurisdictions
13 and other local jurisdictions, as well as ABAG.

14 So to take an example. Here in San Francisco,
15 we're in the middle of a Priority Development Area
16 which is anticipated for a very significant amount of
17 future jobs and housing, and that's because it's a
18 regional center. It's really the core of existing and
19 future transportation investments.

20 But then we also have locations such as 19th
21 Avenue which are anticipated to have lower levels of
22 growth but also the opportunities to really provide
23 people with greater mobility, help provide housing in
24 locations that are accessible to destinations within
25 San Francisco and other locations.

1 And then going down to San Mateo County, you can
2 take as an example downtown San Mateo. And downtown
3 San Mateo is, again, a center, but not the same kind
4 of center as downtown San Francisco. So we anticipate
5 something involving less jobs, less housing, but still
6 a substantial amount. And that focuses obviously
7 around the Caltrans station there. And in most cases,
8 the PDA projections are consistent with local zoning
9 or opportunities to increase density in the areas
10 identified by communities.

11 So in addition to the PDAs, the strategy includes
12 Priority Conservation Areas and Investment Areas.
13 Priority Conservation Areas are also locally
14 nominated, and they're areas to be retained for
15 agriculture or open space to maintain quality of life.

16 It's also important I mention that these were
17 primarily proposed by counties in the North Bay.
18 These are locations in which the local economy and the
19 ability to support community identity is very closely
20 tied to the agricultural and other resources
21 immediately surrounding the communities.

22 And so that also relates to the Investment Areas.
23 In the same way that most of the Priority Conservation
24 Areas were proposed by North Bay communities, the
25 Investment Areas were also proposed primarily by North

1 Bay communities. So you have this linkage between
2 providing relatively small-scale investments for these
3 Investment Areas, which are centers of the community,
4 and then also providing some support for protecting
5 the surrounding open space and agricultural lands.

6 So here on the map you see the Jobs-Housing
7 Connection Strategy from a spatial perspective. And
8 you can see that the vast majority of the development
9 in this particular alternative, the Project
10 Alternative, takes places within the existing urban
11 footprint.

12 PDAs comprise four percent of the region's land.
13 In this alternative, eighty percent of new homes will
14 go into PDAs and sixty six percent of new jobs will go
15 into PDAs. And ninety nine percent of all growth
16 would go into the existing urbanized footprint. So
17 that fits very closely with the overall framework of
18 PDAs and priority conservation areas and investment
19 areas. But, again, you can see the regional
20 transportation infrastructure there too, so the Plan
21 had to be developed in concert with the Transportation
22 Investment Strategy.

23 So we've already heard quite a bit about the No
24 Project Alternative. This, again, is required by
25 CEQA. From a land use perspective, this would include

1 no planning program for Priority Development Areas.
2 And we would anticipate that this would include a
3 dispersed job and housing growth pattern supported by
4 existing General Plans and zoning.

5 As far as transportation, this would be based on
6 the 2010 existing transportation network, and it would
7 only include projects that have either received
8 funding or environmental clearance as of May 1st,
9 2011.

10 So briefly the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy.
11 Land use, eighty percent of new housing and sixty
12 six percent of new development in PDAs; focused
13 investment in PDAs, and that would involve local
14 planning support coming from ABAG as well as the
15 OneBayArea grant program which helps facilitate
16 opportunities to focus transportation infrastructure
17 in these PDAs. And then also an effort to retain
18 affordable housing in PDAs.

19 So from a transportation perspective, the
20 Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy:
21 \$277 billion dollar plan budget; eighty eight percent
22 directed to operations and maintenance of existing
23 systems. So that really supports the kind of core
24 focus development pattern that helps support existing
25 communities.

1 And then this also advances key investment
2 strategies. And so these are really focused on issues
3 such as closing the GHG gap, taking a fix-it-first
4 approach to our existing infrastructure, using the
5 OneBayArea grant framework which we just talked about,
6 funding high performers which involves really taking a
7 more rigorous approach to future transportation
8 investments so that they can all be compared across
9 common metrics. And this is an analysis which MTC has
10 already done and this is built into the Transportation
11 Investment Strategy. Then we also get into squeezing
12 more efficiency out of our existing system, and then
13 making the transit system sustainable.

14 Alternative Three -- and as Ashley mentioned,
15 these are preliminary concepts that we would like to
16 develop. But they're also really open for discussion
17 and we'd like to get your input on these. And you'll
18 see following this some of the key questions.

19 So land use. Fewer new jobs and housing in PDAs,
20 additional growth close to transit outside of PDAs,
21 decentralized jobs and single family construction
22 supported by General Plans.

23 From a transportation perspective, we deemed it
24 the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy.

25 Alternative Four, Eliminate Inter-Regional

1 Commute. So in this particular alternative, all jobs
2 will be filled by Bay Area residents. We would
3 anticipate that this would involve major subsidies for
4 housing close to employment centers at edges of the
5 region which would help facilitate the process of not
6 having that housing go across the boundaries into
7 adjacent counties.

8 Transportation would be a modified version of
9 Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy. This
10 would involve the Transit Comprehensive Operations
11 Analyses implementation, and we can give more
12 information about that if you're interested. And then
13 only HOV lane conversions for express lanes. This
14 would also involve implementing priority policies such
15 as road pricing and parking pricing.

16 A Fifth Alternative is Environment, Equity and
17 Jobs. Land use. Additional affordable housing
18 locations with high levels of low-income commuting,
19 and then additional affordable housing locations with
20 high-performing schools and local services.

21 So in many cases, these are going to be the same
22 places. So, for example, there's a lot of locations
23 on the peninsula where you have really good schools
24 and you have a very high level of low-income
25 in-commuting.

1 And in terms of transportation, there's a second
2 modification of the Preferred Transportation
3 Investment Strategy. And this involves restoring
4 transit service back to 2005 levels, and then only HOV
5 lane conversions would take place for express lanes.

6 So one of the things we want to do through the
7 alternatives process is test out policies which can
8 help us achieve some of the objectives of the
9 Sustainable Community Strategy and then also achieve
10 other sorts of environmental benefits that we're going
11 to be testing out here.

12 So some of those are zoning. This would be
13 changes to local zoning. Incentives such as the CEQA
14 streamlining that we've discussed earlier. If that
15 were the case, we would assume that more communities
16 avail of the CEQA streamlining that was described.

17 Fees and subsidies. Such things as impact fees
18 and the Indirect Source Rule.

19 Road pricing, parking policies and then the extent
20 to which growth boundaries and natural areas are
21 protected by policy.

22 So I'm going to hand it back over to Ashley to
23 talk about what type of feedback we would like to
24 solicit today.

25 MS. NGUYEN: Just two more slides. Thanks

1 for bearing with us.

2 So in thinking or formulating your thoughts and
3 comments about alternatives, we do ask that you focus
4 on three specific questions that are shown here on
5 this slide.

6 The first is that are we applying the appropriate
7 policy levers to really encourage sustainable
8 development, whether those policy levers be the ones
9 that attract development or constrain development in
10 places where we would like to discourage growth?

11 Are there missing land use policy or
12 transportation strategies that we ought to think about
13 and consider when we are defining that range of
14 reasonable alternatives?

15 And lastly, should we test an entirely different
16 alternative altogether? We presented three
17 alternative ideas for you, but you may have a fourth
18 or even a fifth that we might want to consider.

19 So in thinking about that different alternative,
20 also let us know what the policy levers are to create
21 that alternative to really understand the policy
22 measures that would be needed in order to facilitate a
23 different land use growth pattern or a different
24 Transportation Investment Strategy so that we know
25 what the policies are that really determines the

1 outcome of that strategy.

2 This slide is the last slide. It's the EIR
3 schedule. We are on a pretty efficient schedule in
4 terms of preparing this EIR. As I mentioned from the
5 outset, we are holding regional scoping meetings.
6 This is the last one, I believe, tomorrow.

7 Our intention here as staff will be taking in the
8 comments and feedback received, and we will be
9 presenting some final alternative ideas for our joint
10 MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee review
11 on July 13th, and then we will seek approval from our
12 respective boards on July 19th. Once we have these
13 alternatives solidified in some respects, we will then
14 be able to more adequately move into the actual
15 preparation of the Draft EIR during the summer months
16 through the end of November.

17 The plan is to release a Draft EIR for a 45-day
18 public comment period in mid-December, and we still
19 look to have a Final Plan Bay Area as well as a Final
20 Plan Bay Area EIR ready for our commission and ABAG
21 approval in the spring of 2013.

22 With that, we'll close, and I will open it up for
23 public comment. If you would like to present us with
24 your comments and feedback today, we do ask that you
25 formulate a short line into the microphone so that we

1 can be taking your feedback.

2 And as you approach the microphone, again, please
3 keep in mind the groundrules that we set out in the
4 beginning, and also make sure to clearly state your
5 name for the record so that we know who you are and we
6 can capture your comments appropriately. It's also
7 adjustable.

8 MR. CHODEN: I'm Bernard Choden. I'm with
9 San Francisco Tomorrow. This is a very commendable
10 scope of analysis that is presented today. My problem
11 is that the analysis follows a predetermination of the
12 ends, namely in terms of alternate plans.

13 THE REPORTER: Excuse me, sir. You need to
14 speak into the microphone. It's hard for me to hear.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. CHODEN: The first question as to the
17 means, the mitigation required for the impacts, namely
18 as to resources and means necessary to carry them out.
19 For example, would you be doing input/output analysis
20 in terms of designee and efficacy and efficiency in
21 terms of varying enterprises relating to each other.
22 So that which is the best fit for sustaining the
23 overall economy? That's a technical question.

24 Following that is how will this be designated in
25 terms of necessary location as to the resources in

1 governmental institutions that should be designated to
2 carry out the mitigations? Are we creating, under
3 CEQA, in effect, the necessary resources to assuage
4 the impacts? Is that clear?

5 Okay. Predesignating the effectiveness of the
6 locations. I must confess that I'm engaged in suing
7 the City of San Francisco where we have 90,000 persons
8 in effect vacated out of their iconic 136 acres. And
9 19th Avenue is spending, in effect, money in violation
10 of CEQA. And there we have an excuse to abandon CEQA.
11 But untold resources.

12 There were other aspects of this, but I would like
13 to hear more about the economic underpinnings
14 regarding resources for things, and I would like to
15 hear more about what would be the primary stimulus for
16 our cohesive approach that overrides what I would call
17 the inefficiencies of local government.

18 MS. NGUYEN: I won't address all your
19 comments directly, but we will take that feedback in.

20 There's two points that I will respond to. One is
21 mitigations. And so for any potential impacts
22 identified as part of this Plan, we will indeed
23 provide mitigations to reduce or minimize those
24 impacts.

25 For the mitigations, we will be very specific as

1 to who would be responsible for implementing that
2 mitigation, whether it's a regional agency or local
3 jurisdictions. So we'd make sure that the roles and
4 responsibilities are clear.

5 With regard to the economic impacts, Vicki did
6 mention that in parallel to this environmental
7 assessment we are producing an Environmental Impact
8 Analysis. And I think more the question that you had
9 along the economic inputs/outputs and some of the
10 ramifications will be more directly addressed in that
11 document.

12 The key here is that our boards, the commission
13 and the ABAG executive board, will have three pieces
14 of information in front of them before they take
15 action on the Plan. They'll have the outcomes of the
16 Environmental Assessment. They'll have the outcomes
17 of the Environmental Impact Assessment, and they'll
18 also have the outcomes of the Equity Assessment. And
19 it's the entirety of that analysis that they would use
20 to inform their decision making.

21 MR. CHODEN: Thank you. Could I have a copy
22 of the analysis program?

23 MS. NGUYEN: Each of those analyses that I
24 just described, the Equity, the Environment and the
25 Economic Analysis are just starting, and we will be

1 releasing those work products, those reports, either
2 later in this fall or in December.

3 MR. CHODEN: I'm asking for, in effect, the
4 program that precedes the analysis. How are you
5 arranging the research, and what are you covering?
6 Specifically who are you designating --

7 MS. NGUYEN: Are you talking about the scope
8 of work?

9 MR. CHODEN: The abstracts, the analysis.
10 How are you handling --

11 MS. NGUYEN: We'll be happy to, one, engage
12 you in the specifics of each of the assessments, and
13 we will post as much information as we can on the
14 OneBayArea.org so that everyone has access to the same
15 information.

16 MR. CHODEN: I thank you. It would help, so
17 that I can put my resources at your behest; namely, if
18 I saw your work program before you start it.

19 MS. NGUYEN: Okay.

20 MR. CHODEN: I have considerable background
21 in this.

22 MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Great. Thank you. We
23 appreciate that. Next speaker, please.

24 MR. BROWN: Hopefully everybody can hear me
25 if I get low enough here. Thank you all for that nice

1 presentation. I really appreciated the detail. I
2 have four comments or questions.

3 The first one involves the project being fully
4 exempt from CEQA. I think this is an amazing move in
5 the right direction. I'm not sure that we should just
6 go ahead and say up front there's very few
7 opportunities for that. Perhaps in the whole
8 nine-county region there may be, but anything we can
9 do to increase the amount of projects that are
10 compliant and exempt I think is going to be positive
11 for the whole region.

12 I think we all need a little bit more information
13 on what an S-C-E-A is, since that's a new term or
14 perhaps a new document. So that was a first point.

15 The second one involves kind of clarifying what
16 you all mean by a "key area of interest." Certainly
17 for --- I don't know if I said my name. Peter Brown,
18 SFMTA.

19 The state of good repair and pricing being key
20 areas of interest; that's great. I just don't know
21 what that means. How would they be addressed in the
22 EIR as key areas of interest?

23 The third point that I have -- and this is
24 probably the most important one in my mind -- involves
25 around the issues of evaluation. And in your

1 transportation section, it's basically all geared
2 towards automobile analysis. I don't really
3 understand what you mean by decreasing the average
4 number of jobs within these different segments of
5 minutes. I'm not sure how that's a transportation
6 issue.

7 The next two bullets are all around VMT, level of
8 service and increased capacity or increase per-capita
9 VMT. I don't see anything on impacting transit service
10 or augmenting transit service or some type of analysis
11 on how to benefit what we all know is a great faith in
12 the regional goals both in terms of TACs and mobility
13 and TODs. So I think your transportation issues for
14 evaluation needs to be a little bit more robust and
15 including transit issues.

16 And then lastly, my fourth point gets to these
17 different scenarios that you guys laid out quite
18 nicely. I don't understand why implementing priority
19 policies -- you guys bulleted out road and parking
20 pricing -- will only be evaluated in one scenario.
21 You eliminate interregional commute.

22 When we did our analysis at MTA, we found that
23 parking and road pricing had the greatest impact on
24 TAC reductions, generating revenue, much-needed
25 revenue for transit in multimodal services, and that

1 the economic impacts have been mostly positive. In
2 fact, we have a lot of case studies that show that
3 it's incredibly positive.

4 So the only -- to include that in one
5 transportation scenario might not be the best thing.
6 It may be like a lever that you could put into each of
7 the different scenarios, including adding it to the
8 Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy.

9 So thank you.

10 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

11 MS. LEE: Good morning. My name is ShiuFan
12 Lee. I live in San Francisco for 38 years. I vote
13 this project No Plan. That's my position. And
14 there's no global warming. It's a lie.

15 Ocean covers 72 percent of earth's surface and
16 land covers 28 percent of earth's surface. And people
17 exhale CO2 and the plants inhale CO2. We inhale --
18 people inhale oxygen, and therefore it's healthy to
19 have both co-existing.

20 What's CARB? California Area Resources Board.
21 The CARB is an all-elected and unaccountable
22 bureaucracy that will impose unprecedented limits on
23 our economy and our freedom if not stopped.

24 CARB has 1176 employees and average salaries of
25 over \$85,000 a year, while our teachers are being laid

1 off and nearby all the agencies force cuts. CARB has
2 added hundreds of new employees.

3 MTBE was added to gasoline for 20 years and cost
4 California drivers thousands, millions, thousands of
5 dollars. Finally CARB announced it is a poison. It
6 contaminates water systems underground.

7 Hien T. Tran was the lead scientist who wrote a
8 report upon which the heavy trucks and buses
9 regulations are based. He bought a mail-order Ph.D
10 from Thornhill University, located at 255 Madison, New
11 York. Using his fake Ph.D the unqualified liar
12 applied for and got a position as manager of the
13 Health and Ecosystem Assessment Section.

14 Some of the board members, the chair of the
15 California Air Resources Board, Mary Nichols, knew of
16 the fraud before voting on the controversial
17 regulation. The board member who knew kept the
18 information from other board members for a year after
19 the vote. The governor also had information and
20 failed to take action.

21 Why I want to suspend AB 32: Economists estimate
22 if nothing is done, AB 32 will cost California up to
23 1.1 million jobs.

24 Number two. It will cost the average family
25 \$3,857 dollars a year, and will greatly increase

1 expenses for housing, transportation, food and energy.
2 It will cost \$50,000 for small businesses.

3 Number four. It will result in total loss of
4 output of \$182.649 billion dollars.

5 Number five. It will devastate budgets of
6 California social services agencies through massive
7 loss in cuts to revenues. California produces only
8 1.4 percent of world greenhouse gas emissions, so our
9 efforts to address climate changes, if even real,
10 cannot be successful alone.

11 MS. NGUYEN: May I ask you to wrap up your
12 comments, please?

13 MS. LEE: My comment is I have a letter to
14 back up Mr. Tran's unfortunately having a degree. I
15 have a letter written that is from CARB Executive
16 Officer James Goldstein, letter to Dr. Young on
17 February 23rd, year 2010.

18 And he said, "Dear Dr. Young, I am writing to
19 correct a statement made in a letter to you dated
20 November 4th, 2008 from California EPA Secretary Linda
21 Adams regarding the credential of the lead author of
22 ARB report.

23 "In December 2008, it was learned that Mr. Hien
24 Tran, the lead ARB staff member responsible for
25 preparing the report, falsely claimed he had received

1 a Ph.D from UC Davis. The issue was not fidelity of
2 the health data or accuracy of method used to prepare
3 the report, rather the credentials of the staff person
4 who was subsequently demoted and disciplined.

5 However, to eliminate any questions of the science,
6 the report will be redone, peer-reviewed, and brought

7 -- "

8 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comment. We
9 appreciate it.

10 MS. LEE: I'm not finished yet. Excuse me.

11 MS. NGUYEN: I'll give you thirty more
12 seconds to wrap up. We have other speakers.

13 MS. LEE: " -- back to the board in
14 April 2010. The board will also conduct a symposium
15 February 28, 2010, to review the science of the health
16 effects of these emissions. This will be done in an
17 open public symposium with board members, leading
18 academics in the World Health Organization and the
19 members of ARBS Research Screening Committee.

20 "Please contact me at 916 445-4383 if you have any
21 questions or would like additional information."

22 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comments.

23 MR. NAPIER: Richard Napier, and I'm with the
24 San Mateo Congestion Management Agency. There's just
25 a couple of points, and I'll try to be brief.

1 One relative to the definition of communities of
2 concern. I think I've heard this in Sonoma County and
3 others. A broad national definition doesn't fit the
4 Bay Area given the cost.

5 And also, we went through a community-based
6 transportation plan for communities of concern, and
7 MTC's definition didn't go with it. So we had to do a
8 county-wide plan also.

9 So what I'm asking is don't take a very simple
10 definition of communities of concern because I think
11 they've been defined within the counties.

12 The second point, you focused on the
13 transportation measure as vehicle miles traveled. But
14 when projection -- when you're at service level F, it
15 really doesn't have a lot of meaning. And I think you
16 need to also use vehicle hours of delay because F
17 means standing still.

18 One of the most significant points I wanted to
19 raise is on one of your charts, you had mentioned
20 that -- you said there would be none of these impacts;
21 therefore, it's not going to be studied. And one of
22 them was public services. I don't think you can make
23 that assumption.

24 Public services are inadequate to serve the
25 current people, much less any amount of growth. So I

1 would ask you to reconsider. I think you are going to
2 have to take a look at public services, especially the
3 limited funding that's available.

4 I did have just one other point, and this is a
5 question. The concept of a rural PDA -- although it's
6 somewhat of a different definition -- I take it that's
7 going to be something outside this process?

8 The question came up on the coast side of San
9 Mateo County. For right now, the PDA is just focused
10 on the urban areas, correct?

11 MR. SHORETT: That's correct with the PDAs.
12 What were previously discussed as real PDAs are
13 included as real investment areas at this point.

14 So the amount of growth is going to be similar to
15 what was estimated before -- the designation of
16 Investment Area relates largely to the way in which
17 the region is going to look at resources, including
18 planning grants, et cetera, for those areas relative
19 to PDAs.

20 MR. NAPIER: For instance, in the coast of
21 San Mateo county, they had submitted something for --
22 well, it was PDA at the time. I think the Rural
23 Investment Area is a much better name. Has that been
24 accepted or not accepted? It's my understanding you
25 hadn't really identified those Rural Investment Areas

1 at this point.

2 MR. SHORETT: So there are currently
3 adjustments being made to a number of those Rural
4 Investment Areas. Those are going -- there was a RPC
5 recommendation that the executive board adopt those as
6 per some of the adjustments that were recommended at
7 that meeting at the upcoming executive board meeting
8 in July.

9 MS. LaFEBRE: Hello. Hilda LaFebre. I'm
10 with San Mateo County Transit District, and I want to
11 thank you for the presentation. It's very important.
12 I just have a couple of questions.

13 One is about the CEQA streamlining opportunities.
14 If you could please elaborate in regards to what does
15 that mean? What would be the best practical way to
16 exercise that?

17 And the second is will the Grand Boulevard
18 Initiative be part of this programmatic EIR? And if
19 not, what would be the best approach to go through the
20 environmental period under CEQA?

21 As you know, this is an initiative that involves
22 many communities from San Francisco to San Jose. So
23 would that be another programmatic way, and then each
24 of the cities would have to do a project a specific
25 way? I think it's a good time for us to ask these

1 questions.

2 MS. NGUYEN: Okay. So you had two questions.
3 One is to have a better understanding of the CEQA
4 streamlining method that's under SB 375, and the
5 second is the enviromental process for the Grand
6 Boulevard Initiative.

7 So the CEQA streamlining provision in SB 375 are
8 really there as opportunities for local jurisdictions
9 as they have specific residential mixed use projects
10 that qualified on the number of different criteria
11 developed in the law to afford some CEQA streamlining.

12 So really in terms of steps that would need to be
13 taken, one is a development project that qualifies in
14 terms of the basic definition in SB 375. After it
15 materialized, it will go through the local planning
16 process, the planning commission and the city council,
17 and at that point in time as that project is preparing
18 its Environmental Assessment, they can look to the
19 Plan to see if, one, it's consistent with the uses,
20 densities and intensities in the Plan, and two, if it
21 qualifies as either the Residential or Mixed Use
22 Project or the Transit Authority Project. And at that
23 point in time, the local city council can make a
24 decision on both fronts, and if they do, then they can
25 go into those three different buckets of CEQA

1 streamlining.

2 There is a great level of detail in SB 375, and
3 there's also been follow-up guidance by the OPR,
4 Office of Planning and Research, that walks folks
5 through the schematic on how that works. It's hard to
6 explain in a minute, but what we'll do is we'll have
7 reference documents on OneBayArea.org so folks like
8 yourselves and others might dive into the details.

9 The second is the Grand Boulevard Initiative
10 environmental process. So just to be very clear, the
11 programmatic Environmental Impact Report that we're
12 preparing is for Plan Bay Area, and we'll be looking
13 at the broad regional impacts of that Plan in terms of
14 both the integrated land use and transportation
15 impacts on the physical environment.

16 We will not be able to go into any detail about
17 specific projects such as the Grand Boulevard
18 Initiative in this move in this programmatic document.
19 That said, we would expect or hope that the
20 environmental process for the Grand Boulevard
21 Initiative could in some respects tier off of our
22 programmatic EIR for Plan Bay Area. But that doesn't
23 mean that it doesn't have to conduct its own more
24 project-specific environmental impact assessment.

25 And so there's some benefit of having this Plan be

1 done at a programmatic level, and it uses information
2 that's useful in this Plan, particularly in the areas
3 of growth-inducing impact, or any of the cumulative
4 impacts could definitely be useful to the
5 jurisdictions that are moving forward and implementing
6 both environmental and the actual delivery of that
7 project to be able to use our document.

8 So there's some synergies and some benefits there.
9 But the bottom line is the Grand Boulevard Initiative
10 will have to have its own project specific (INAUDIBLE
11 - AUDIENCE BACKGROUND NOISE).

12 MS. LaFEBRE: Thank you very much.

13 MS. HANSEN: Hello. My name is Eleanor
14 Hansen. I'm a San Francisco business person -- that's
15 why I'm here -- and a Sunnyvale activist. I wanted to
16 make three comments.

17 The first is about what the comparisons of the
18 project need to be made to. And according to CEQA, my
19 understanding -- I'm a plaintiff in a case known as
20 Sunnyvale West et al, versus the City of Sunnyvale.
21 And this was about traffic baselines.

22 And so this is what we've got here. The baseline
23 needs to include current and existing. That has to be
24 one of them. And current and existing could be what
25 is operational as of the time the -- was rejected --

1 when right in the EIR -- was rejected to be
2 operational as of the time the EIR is approved.

3 In addition, you need to do cumulative. You need
4 to compare the project to what the cumulative
5 conditions are going to be, what, 40 years.

6 Now if in addition you want to do what you
7 describe you're going to do, that's fine. But the two
8 things that are required -- the first one according to
9 Sunnyvale West, et al -- is that you do current and
10 existing, not current and existing and all these other
11 things. Okay. It will be inadequate. Do not do
12 that.

13 Second. I'm involved in the Sunnyvale West case.
14 And under transportation, you say you're going to
15 judge the effect on "increase in vehicle miles
16 traveled on facilities experiencing level of service
17 F." Level of service F, LOS F.

18 One, F is not really that bad. Two, nothing gets
19 people out of their cars faster than leaving them in
20 LOS F. When they spend a lot of time in LOS F, they
21 start looking for public transportation. So that's
22 one reason why I don't particularly think that's an
23 important criteria.

24 Now, what you're planning on doing, and what's
25 happening in the case underlying Sunnyvale West, was

1 the city wanted to run the traffic away from a LOS F
2 situation into a quiet residential neighborhood which
3 had LOS BC.

4 That is not appropriate. You do not do that.
5 Forget about that for mitigation. Either give them
6 the public transportation or leave them in the LOS F
7 situation.

8 I had the experience maybe a year ago. I found
9 myself at 8:30 in the morning in the middle of San
10 Jose traffic on a Tuesday. I will never do that again.
11 When I need to go to that area, I will go on Saturday
12 when traffic is bad (sic). Seriously. Leave the
13 traffic high. People will figure out how to avoid it.

14 And the third point is about your scenario for
15 Eliminate Interregional Commute. People do not live
16 in Stockton. By the middle of the day Stockton will
17 probably go into bankruptcy. Sometime later this week
18 -- either early July if not this week.

19 People do not live over there because there isn't
20 adequate housing in the Bay Area. There's plenty of
21 adequate housing in the Bay Area. The problem is it's
22 not cheap enough for them. Okay. And you aren't
23 going to be able to build cheap housing or
24 cheap-enough housing in the Bay Area for them using
25 this kind of procedure. It's just a bunch of

1 handwick. Thank you.

2 MS. BRISSON: Good morning. Liz Brisson of
3 the San Francisco County Transportation Authority. I
4 thank you very much for the opportunity to provide
5 input early in the process.

6 I have just a couple of comments. One is that in
7 general I am very supportive of the range of different
8 alternatives that have been selected. I think it's a
9 good opportunity that some of the ideas considered
10 earlier in this planning process that weren't
11 considered in different scenarios need to be tested,
12 including looking at pricing, which we know is a very
13 effective way of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
14 And I think it's important to continue to bring that
15 along, and to identify its benefits for policy makers
16 if there's an opportunity later in the process perhaps
17 to include that, as well as looking at increasing
18 affordable housing in areas that have above-median
19 income housing income levels.

20 Second point I want to make relates to -- you
21 didn't touch on it too much -- but the new analysis
22 methodology for this EIR. This is something I'm very
23 supportive of, but I just wanted to sort of request
24 that as we switch to a new methodology, to try to be
25 as transparent as possible in terms of what the

1 assumptions are and what the caveats are so we can
2 sort of have that information included in the results.

3 And then my third point relates to something that
4 Peter Brown of SFMTA also mentioned earlier, which is
5 consider adding an impact measure for transit crowding
6 under the Transportation Impact Area.

7 We actually spent quite a bit of time, both our
8 agency as well as BART, working with the MTC modeling
9 staff to come up with a methodology to be able to
10 forecast that. And I think it would be a really
11 important thing to bring along. Because we know that
12 in San Francisco we have a pretty serious transit
13 crowding problem today, and with the amount of growth
14 anticipated in the area, that's probably going to
15 become worse. You, of course, identify what that
16 impact is and mitigate it. Thank you.

17 MR. FREEDMAN: Hi. My name is Aubrey
18 Freedman. I don't work for a government agency. I'm
19 a homeowner on the west side in Miraloma Park. I'm
20 kind of concerned about this whole process here
21 encouraging dense housing. Well, that's fine for
22 people who choose to live in that, but many families
23 actually like single family dwellings where you're not
24 looking at a building and you have a tiny bit of a
25 yard or whatever. This seems to be an effort to kind

1 of push people away from that.

2 So I am kind of concerned about that. Single
3 family dwelling is the American way as far as I'm
4 concerned. This seems to be opposed to it and trying
5 to push people into something different.

6 Also I've noticed on the west side -- these lanes
7 are disappearing. They're becoming bicycle lanes.
8 Car lanes are suddenly disappearing as three lanes
9 became two lanes, and there's a bicycle lane now which
10 just adds to the traffic congestion. It seems like
11 another effort to force people out of their cars.

12 People -- we still love our cars. We're going to
13 drive somewhere five or ten minutes versus taking
14 public transportation takes you an hour and a half to
15 get there. That seems rather silly. So most people
16 are still going to use their cars. Not to mention we
17 have families; public transportation is not always the
18 best way to get your kids to soccer practice or
19 whatever.

20 So I'm just kind of concerned about this whole
21 Plan. It seems to push dense housing. I'm also
22 concerned how would this affect the people on the west
23 side of the City who kind of like quiet residential
24 neighborhoods and do not want dense housing amongst
25 them.

1 That's it. Thank you.

2 MS. HEIM: My name is Adrienne Heim. I'm
3 with TransAct based in San Francisco. I just had some
4 questions with regards to the OneBayArea grant.

5 Some cities have to meet certain criteria
6 regarding their housing land plan and their
7 transportation plan strategy. I think there should be
8 some points that they have to touch on within those
9 plans, such as investment without displacement. And
10 within the TDM, parking policies in residential
11 development, and lowering the parking requirement. As
12 you can see with AB 904, they're thinking of having a
13 minimum of parking within transit-orient areas. So
14 that should be assessed if that actually moves
15 forward.

16 MS. SCOTT: Good morning. My name is Lois
17 Scott, and I live in the Geary corridor, east side of
18 San Francisco. It's already an area of pretty
19 substantial density.

20 My concern is the environmental CEQA exemption and
21 exactly -- I'm sure it's going to cover most of my
22 neighborhood. And how much of the rest of San
23 Francisco will it cover? Will we lose the check and
24 balance from the citizens' perspective of
25 environmental review?

1 It took me 45 minutes to take the 38 bus close in
2 to get here. One 38 bus, the Limited, completely
3 passed me by this morning. As has been stated, our
4 transit systems in San Francisco are often very
5 congested, even not at peak.

6 What is going to guarantee that if you do high
7 density residential infill that you're going to have
8 the transit services that are needed? All of us in
9 our neighborhood ride transit, but it's hard, and it
10 gets hard as you get older to access the buses all the
11 time.

12 The other -- I think there's much commendable in
13 the Plan. Of course, I think the question of public
14 services and community facilities also needs to be
15 addressed if you're going to make substantial increase
16 in density. Are you looking at the actual capacity of
17 a city environment to absorb more, or in fact a rural
18 environment to absorb more? Is there a capacity
19 analysis in terms of livability as a part of this
20 process?

21 And finally, while I think we all in principle
22 like the idea of sustainability, I would like to see
23 where is the efficiency and sustainability of a high
24 rise building? Is a 50-story building which
25 apparently is pretty energy-intensive,

1 material-intensive and so forth really what preserves
2 air quality and makes our region sustainable?

3 I guess from on-the-ground experience, it appears
4 to me that our bigger buildings are very much on the
5 luxury condo end of the economy. I'm not sure that
6 they really encourage their occupants to live in a
7 sustainable locally-oriented pattern. I think they're
8 often occupied by people who work in Silicon Valley or
9 people who are doing work from other countries rather
10 than a pattern that really is what I understand
11 sustainability is, which is trying to live and work
12 and recreate in the same area.

13 So I feel like there's gaps. I guess it's hard to
14 tell at this point in how you're really testing how
15 sustainable density is and also what the actual
16 capacities of places like San Francisco that are
17 already pretty dense are in absorbing and being able
18 to service more population. Thank you.

19 MS. MERENBACH: Hi. My name is Danielle
20 Merenbach. Thank you for the presentation. It's
21 really informative.

22 I just want to ask you about something that wasn't
23 really addressed today which was more on the line of
24 equity. We're mostly talking about commuters which is
25 a hugely important population for this project. But

1 I'd like to ask that you remember the other population
2 who will be affected by this, to include older
3 citizens, the disabled, children. There is a really
4 huge potential here to increase their use of transit,
5 increase mobility, make our streets safer for kids to
6 walk to school or bike to school or take a
7 easily-accessible bus to school instead of being
8 driven, letting our seniors have more mobility to get
9 their family to the doctor, to their place of worship,
10 whatever that is. And there's some really simple ways
11 to do that, and those weren't particularly addressed
12 today. We mostly focused on making the ride to work
13 easier which I understand is very important. But I'd
14 ask that you keep in mind things like sidewalks,
15 medians, bus stops that are covered with a bench for
16 older people who can't stand either in the rain or in
17 the sun for that long, even for a bus.

18 I hope that when you're planning this, you will
19 make our streets not only more efficient but also
20 safer and more attractive for our bicyclists and
21 pedestrians. Thanks.

22 MR. SHORETT: I just want to say one thing
23 about that. I'm just going to mention the -- if you
24 haven't looked at it, I would encourage you -- this
25 isn't directly 100 percent related to the

1 environmental process, but I would encourage you to
2 look at the OneBayArea grant that was adopted in May
3 by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the
4 ABAG executive board. You can find it on the
5 OneBayArea Web site.

6 So a big part of the OneBayArea grant which is
7 focused in our development areas is supporting exactly
8 the type of infrastructure investment you just
9 described. And then that's going to be carried out by
10 the congestion management agencies. So if you want to
11 look at who is doing that in your area and get
12 involved -- but I recommend taking a look at that.

13 MS. NGUYEN: Any more comments? All right.
14 Thank you. If there aren't any other comments, we're
15 going to go ahead and close the meeting. Yes?

16 MR. CHODEN: I'm so sorry. If I might say
17 one more word.

18 Seismic safety. Do we have sustainability to
19 survive in an inevitable major earthquake? It will
20 come soon. Seismic safety must precede any
21 consideration of alternate scenarios. Place it in
22 front of the analysis.

23 Seismic safety. It's not there. The City has not
24 adapted what we call Caps 1, 2 and 3. It refuses to
25 do so for political reasons. And to rely on those

1 political persons who give us those political reasons
2 turns the clock backwards.

3 MS. NGUYEN: Well, thank you up all for your
4 comments today.

5 MS. HOFFMAN: I just want to quickly ask in
6 listening to all the conversation, great presentation
7 and great comments. And so I just want to hear you
8 say that you're going to put your best foot forward
9 and best effort to address these issues that have been
10 brought to you today. I want to hear that. I'd like
11 to hear that.

12 MS. DIX: We're compiling all of the
13 comments, both ones that we receive orally in all of
14 these meetings as well as any written comments that
15 you submit, which we still encourage you to do so up
16 until the July 11th deadline, and then we will be
17 preparing a response to those comments and discussing
18 how we will incorporate it into the alternatives.

19 MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you. I'm Virginia
20 Hoffman.

21 MS. DIX: Thank you all for attending. Once
22 again, the information for submitting written comments
23 is on the screen as well as in the PowerPoint that you
24 should have.

25

---oOo---

(800)331-9029 emerickfinch@emerickfinch.com

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, JUDITH L. LARRABEE, a Hearing Shorthand Reporter in the State of California, hereby certify:

That the proceedings therein were taken down in shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time and place therein stated, that the proceedings were thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my direction and supervision, and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings therein to the best of my ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on this third day of July, 2012.

Judith Larrabee, Shorthand Reporter

Emerick And Finch, Certified Court Reporters

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PLAN BAY AREA)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT)
SCOPING MEETING)
_____)

SCOPING MEETING
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2012
EMBASSY SUITES HOTEL

Reported by: JUDITH L. LARRABEE
Hearing Reporter

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ATTENDEES

- ASHLEY NGUYEN - Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- HANNAH LINDELOF - Dyett & Bhatia
- MARK SHORETT - Association of Bay Area Governments

---oOo---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the Meeting, and on June 27, 2012, at 1:35 p.m. at Embassy Suites Hotel, 101 McInnis Parkway, San Rafael, California, before me, JUDITH L. LARRABEE, Hearing Reporter, State of California, there commenced a Scoping Meeting under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.

---oOo---

1

2

MEETING AGENDA

3

Page

4

Introduction by Ms. Nguyen

5

5

Presentation by Ms. Nguyen

8

6

Presentation by Hannah Lindelof

13

7

Presentation by Mr. Shorett

19

8

9

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

10

11

Sue Beittel

34

12

Karen Nygren

36

13

Clayton Smith

38

14

Michelle Kralovec

40

15

Richard Willis

45

16

Orlean Koehle

47

17

Toni Shroyer

50

18

Elizabeth Moody

54

19

Anne Durham

56

20

Deborah Tavares

59

21

Betty Pagett

64

22

Jim Bennett

65

23

Wendy Buchen

69

24

Don Wilhelm

71

25

Ann Spake

73

Page 3

1	Susan Kirseh	75
2	Angelika Randolph	77
3	Nancy Okada	79
4	Helen Lindquist	81
5	Nona Dennis	83
6	Katherine DaSilva Jain	89

7 ---oOo---

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. NGUYEN: So welcome to today's scoping meeting on the Plan Bay Area Environmental Impact Report. We are excited that you are here today to participate in the scoping process. We are looking forward to hearing your comments on the scope and content of the environmental issues that we are hoping to explore in this Environmental Impact Report.

Before I begin, let me go through a quick introduction and then a set of groundrules for today's meeting. So the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments are colead agencies on the preparation of this Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area.

We are here today to seek your comments on the scope and content of the EIR so that we are aware of the issues you may have with regards to environmental effects that we should consider as we move forward with our environmental assessment. So we hope today that you could give us that feedback.

Before I begin, the format to today's meeting is twofold. First, we will begin with a staff presentation so that we can explain and walk you through the Plan Bay Area process and the environmental process so that you are aware of the

1 work that we are doing. And we will open it up for
2 public comments, and we will give you an opportunity
3 to provide us with your feedback.

4 Before I begin the staff presentation, what I want
5 to do is walk you through a series of groundrules for
6 today's meeting so that we can have a really
7 productive and useful conversation.

8 So after the presentation, we will be taking your
9 comments. We will ask that you line up at the podium
10 -- it's just right here to my left -- and take your
11 turn to speak.

12 Many of you have seen the blue comment cards at
13 the table. We ask that you fill out the speaker card
14 with your name and give it the staff once you approach
15 the podium. The reason we do this is so that we can
16 properly spell your name for the record.

17 We do ask that you keep your comments as concise
18 and to the point as possible so that we can allow the
19 maximum number of participants to provide us with oral
20 comments today. We also ask that you really focus on
21 the environmental issues that you want us to consider
22 as we move forward with the development of this
23 environmental study.

24 A court reporter is here today to record your
25 comments. We ask that you speak clearly for her

1 benefit because we would like to have all your
2 comments recorded for the record. She may ask you to
3 repeat some things because she didn't hear it well, so
4 please be aware of that or she may request that you
5 speak slower so that she can properly record your
6 comments.

7 We do ask that you please disagree respectfully.
8 Please do not shout or interrupt speakers or staff as
9 we make the presentation or have cross-dialogue. It
10 makes it really difficult for us to hear your comments
11 and to also record them properly. So we just ask that
12 you respect each other as we move forward with this
13 scoping meeting.

14 We are planning to take oral comments today.
15 However, if you should have additional comments after
16 this meeting, we certainly invite and encourage you to
17 provide them to us in writing after this meeting. The
18 deadline for submitting written comments on the
19 Environmental Impact Report is July 11th, and we do
20 have the information on the table as to where to send
21 those comments.

22 So with that, let me go ahead and start our
23 presentation, and we will try to give you a brief and
24 comprehensive overview of Plan Bay Area Plan Bay Area
25 and the Environmental Impact Report, and then, again,

1 really give you the opportunity to provide us with
2 your feedback today.

3 So in terms of the agenda topics that we will
4 cover through this presentation, we will first begin
5 with an overview of Plan Bay Area. We will then drill
6 down to some specifics about some CEQA streamlining
7 opportunities that are afforded by Senate bill 375.
8 And then we will provide you with an overview of a
9 companion document called the Transition Improvement
10 Program, and then we will walk you through some of the
11 details in terms of the purpose and scope of the
12 Environmental Impact Report.

13 We are looking specifically for your comments on
14 issues for evaluation, so we'll walk you through some
15 of the key environmental issues that we will study in
16 this assessment. We will also walk you through some
17 of our initial ideas about alternatives for evaluation
18 and consideration in this environmental document, and
19 we also seek your feedback on these alternatives. We
20 will then conclude and we'll give you an opportunity
21 to provide comments.

22 So Plan Bay Area is the first regional plan to
23 integrate transportation, land use and housing as
24 mandated by California Senate Bill 375. The primary
25 purpose of this Integrated Land Use and Transportation

1 Plan is to help lower greenhouse gas emissions from
2 cars and light-duty trucks through, again, a
3 combination of land use and transportation
4 improvements that we will be making over the next 28
5 years. The law calls for the Bay Area to reduce our
6 greenhouse gas emissions by a negative 0.7 percent in
7 the year 2020 and by a negative 0.15 percent in the
8 year 2035 from 2005 levels.

9 So in addition to the climate goals, the Plan also
10 looks to point out a number of additional goals,
11 including providing housing for Bay Area residents,
12 building a stronger economy, protecting our natural
13 environment and enhancing accessibility and
14 opportunities for residents from all walks of life.

15 There is a key provision in this state law that
16 allows for CEQA streamlining for certain residential
17 and mixed use development projects that are well
18 supported by high-quality transit. What the state law
19 has really done is it has allowed our agency, MTC, and
20 the Association of Bay Area Governments to really
21 engage local governments, stakeholders and the
22 communities in a conversation about how can we really
23 define an efficient land use pattern that really takes
24 into account local character but also allows us to
25 really maximize the transportation investments we make

1 in this long-range plan.

2 To support this effort, the state law allows for
3 CEQA streamlining for certain projects. As you can
4 see on this slide, there's two classes of projects
5 that can take advantage of some of these CEQA-relief
6 opportunities in the state law.

7 The first is residential mixed use projects, and
8 to call qualify as a residential mixed use project,
9 you must meet certain density thresholds. And in this
10 case it's at least 75 percent of the total building
11 square footage must be residential.

12 The second class is what's called a Transit
13 Priority Project or TPP for short. And to qualify as
14 a Transit Priority Project, you again must meet
15 certain densities and intensities of development. But
16 the key thing here to be a Transit Priority Project
17 you really must be within a half mile stop of a major
18 transit station or within a high-quality transit
19 corridor that's served by (INAUDIBLE) frequencies.

20 For those of you who have been involved in our
21 regional plannings efforts to date, you know that
22 we've been working with local jurisdictions on
23 facilitating job and housing growth in Priority
24 Development Areas. And so the state law expands that
25 reach a little bit and includes these Transit Priority

1 Projects.

2 So this next slide drills down in a little bit
3 more detail about what opportunities are available to
4 local jurisdictions if they choose to admit these kind
5 of projects within their communities.

6 There is two screening processes, if you will.
7 The first is that the residential or mixed use project
8 must be consistent with Plan Bay Area in terms of
9 general uses, densities and intensities. And if you
10 passed that first screening, and your project is in
11 the Transit Authority-eligible area and you meet all
12 exemption codes that are called out in the state law,
13 that project may receive CEQA streamlining in terms of
14 a complete CEQA exemption.

15 Another case is that a project is consistent with
16 the Plan and it's in a Transit Authority-eligible
17 area, and it doesn't meet all the exemption codes.
18 Under state law, that project can still take advantage
19 of the CEQA streamlining through a different kind of
20 streamline where they can produce a different kind of
21 environmental document which is called a Sustainable
22 Community Environmental Assessment.

23 And in the third case, you can still be a
24 residential mixed use project that is a consistent
25 with our Plan, but you are not in an area that's

1 well-served by transit. There are some limited CEQA
2 streamlining benefits that you can take advantage of.
3 The state law allows local jurisdictions to retain
4 their land use authority, and they can make a decision
5 about whether or not these projects advance through
6 the local development process and are able to take
7 advantage of the CEQA streamlining called out in the
8 state law.

9 I want to transition to a companion document which
10 is called the Transportation Improvement Program.
11 This is a four-year funding document that lays out a
12 comprehensive listing of all the highways, roadways
13 transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are
14 receiving federal funds or are requiring some sort of
15 federal action or are just regionally significant and
16 we should consider in some of our regional analyses.

17 The key thing here is that projects in this
18 four-year funding document must be consistent with
19 Plan Bay Area. And so when MTC develops this
20 long-range plan called Plan Bay Area, we
21 simultaneously consult on the development of the
22 Transportation Improvement Plan.

23 The current TIP is the 2011 Transportation
24 Improvement Program, and it contains about \$11 billion
25 dollars worth of transportation investments. As you

1 can see from this slide and the next slide, a majority
2 of the fund sources that are in this programming
3 document come from local donors, primarily local
4 county transportation sales tax and local streets and
5 roads funds.

6 So in the next slide MTC is currently preparing a
7 2013 Transportation Improvement Program. We released
8 it on June 22nd for public review, and we certainly
9 appreciate any comments you have on that document.
10 And what we're looking to do is to get Commission
11 approval of that programming document later in
12 September.

13 What I want to do now is turn it over to Hannah
14 Lindelof of Dyett & Bhatia. Dyett & Bhatia is a
15 planning and consulting firm in San Francisco, and
16 they are helping MTC and ABAG prepare the
17 Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area. Hannah
18 is going to walk you through the scope and content of
19 the EIR.

20 MS. LINDELOF: Thanks, Ashley. So the focus
21 of our meeting today is to discuss the content of the
22 Environmental Impact Report or EIR on Plan Bay Area.
23 The purpose of the Environmental Impact Report is to
24 identify the Plan's significant impacts on the
25 environment, to expose that information to the public

1 and decision-makers, to evaluate a reasonable
2 alternative to the Plan, and to determine how the Plan
3 can avoid or mitigate any negative impacts on the
4 environment.

5 This will be a programmatic EIR that will present
6 a region-wide assessment of the proposed Plan and
7 alternatives and will also provide CEQA streamlining
8 opportunities, as Ashley outlined, both for
9 transportation, project proposals and for development
10 projects as outlined by SB 375.

11 So the EIR focuses on environmental impacts.
12 There will be two separate additional studies
13 undertaken that will look at the other two main
14 points, sustainability, equity and the economy.

15 The Economic Impact Analysis will be completed in
16 fall of this year and will assess the economic impact
17 to Plan Bay Area's land use patterns and
18 transportation investments on the regional economy.

19 The Equity Analysis will be completed in early
20 2013 and will assess the equity implications of all
21 the alternatives that we're studying in the EIR. We
22 will identify the benefits and burdens of land use,
23 impacts and transportation investments on different
24 socioeconomic groups.

25 In terms of the EIR process, the NOP and scoping

1 period that we're going through right now marks the
2 kick off of the EIR process. All of the feedback we
3 receive during this period will inform subsequent
4 work.

5 Following this period, we will start work on
6 researching environmental settings as well as defining
7 the Plan and screening and defining the alternatives.
8 All of that work will go into assessing environmental
9 impacts, including cumulative impacts and analysis of
10 alternatives.

11 We'll then complete an Administrative Draft EIR
12 and then release a Public Review Draft EIR for a
13 45-day public review period. We'll have additional
14 public hearings in January to review that report.

15 Following the Draft EIR, we'll produce a Final EIR
16 but will respond to all comments on the Draft EIR with
17 the aim of adopting -- certifying the Final EIR in
18 April 2013.

19 So at the outset of the process, we want feedback
20 on several key questions. Please keep these in mind
21 as you make your comments on the EIR today.

22 So the first is what potential environmental
23 issues should be analyzed? What alternatives should
24 be evaluated? What types of mitigation measures
25 should be considered that would help avoid or minimize

1 potential environmental impacts? And what elements of
2 the EIR would help your agency with CEQA exemptions
3 and tiering?

4 At this stage we have 13 environmental issue areas
5 for evaluation as outlined in the Notice of
6 Preparation and that are consistent with CEQA
7 guidelines.

8 The first is transportation. We'll be evaluating
9 impact on commute times and increased vehicle miles
10 traveled.

11 For air quality, we'll be assessing short-term
12 construction-related impacts as well as any increase
13 of emissions of criteria pollutants and toxic air
14 contaminants and any related health effects of those
15 emissions. And if there's any conflict with air
16 quality plans or violation of any air quality
17 standards.

18 In terms of land use and physical development,
19 we'll be evaluating each impact to agricultural land
20 and open space, any conflicts with locally-adopted
21 land use plans, and any impacts to existing
22 communities by disruption of placement or separation.

23 For energy, we'll assess any increase in
24 nonrenewable energy consumption or inconsistency with
25 energy conservation plans or policies.

1 For greenhouse gases and climate change, we'll
2 look at any increase in net and per-capita CO2
3 emissions from on-road mobile sources, any
4 vulnerability to sea level rise and any conflict with
5 greenhouse gas reduction plans, policies, or
6 regulations.

7 In terms of noise, we'll be looking for any
8 exposure to noise levels or ground-borne vibration in
9 excess of standards.

10 In related issues with geology and seismicity,
11 we'll evaluate the Plan's increase in risk related to
12 earthquakes, landslides, or ground failure, soil
13 erosion or loss of topsoil or any increased
14 development on expansive soils or on weak,
15 unconsolidated soils.

16 For biological resources, we'll evaluate any
17 adverse effect on sensitive or special status species,
18 riparian habitat, wetlands or other sensitive natural
19 communities. And we'll also evaluate interference
20 with the movement of identified species or conflicts
21 with adopted local conservation policies and resource
22 plans.

23 For water resources, we'll evaluate a range of
24 impacts related to groundwater recharge, stormwater
25 runoff, erosion and risks related to flooding, seiche,

1 tsunami or mudflows.

2 For visual resources, we'll assess any adverse
3 effects on scenic vistas, the scenic resources within
4 a highway or existing visual character of communities
5 and open space areas. We will also be looking at if
6 there's a creation of a new source of light or glare.

7 Cultural resources, we'll look at any adverse
8 change or damage to archaeological, historical, or
9 paleontological resources, or disruption of human
10 remains.

11 Public utilities, we'll assess any adverse effect
12 on regional water supply, wastewater and stormwater
13 facilities or solid waste.

14 And lastly, we'll be evaluating any
15 growth-inducing effects which would evaluate whether
16 the Plan would cause substantial unanticipated
17 population growth beyond what is already projected.

18 At this time, we are not anticipating addressing
19 hazardous materials, public services, recreation or
20 mineral resources as we do not expect any impacts of
21 regional importance in these areas.

22 So far all of the issue areas that I just
23 outlined, we will be assessing them for the proposed
24 Plan as well as for a range of alternatives. Each
25 alternative is defined in terms of its land use

1 component and transportation component.

2 The objective of the land use component is to meet
3 the goals of the Plan. And the approach is to start
4 with the locally adopted General Plans and zoning as
5 the baseline, assess the preferred land use scenario,
6 and then assess various land use policies to consider
7 a range of future growth distribution scenarios for
8 alternatives.

9 For transportation, we'll be also seeking to meet
10 the goals of the Plan subject to the
11 Financially-constrained Transportation Investment
12 Strategy.

13 The approach will also be to start with the
14 existing transportation network as the baseline, and
15 then assess the Preferred Transportation Investment
16 Strategy or modify that strategy to reflect shifts in
17 investment priorities, and then to assess explicit
18 transportation demand management policies.

19 I'm going to pass it to Mark with the Association
20 of Bay Area Governments to discuss today's
21 alternatives in greater detail.

22 MR. SHORETT: Thank you. Let me adjust this
23 Okay. I'll just lean down a little bit. Can
24 everybody here me back there? Okay. Great.

25 So before getting into all five of the

1 alternatives, which I'm going to discuss in a little
2 more detail, I wanted to go over the Preferred
3 Scenario or the Project Alternative, which is the
4 Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy which is paired with
5 the Transportation Investment Strategy, both of which
6 were adopted at the May Metropolitan Transportation
7 Commission and ABAG's Executive Board joint meeting.

8 So one of the key building blocks of the
9 Jobs-Housing Connection strategy are Priority
10 Development Areas. And as Ashley mentioned, these are
11 all city-nominated areas. There is nearly 200 of them
12 in over 60 cities and counties.

13 This is the outcome of a process that started in
14 2007 in which the regional agencies began to work with
15 local governments throughout the region to identify
16 the places where they thought it would be appropriate
17 to accommodate higher levels of growth that are
18 anticipated in the future -- I should say growth
19 that's anticipated in the future. And one of the
20 underlying ideas here is are there opportunities to
21 link our transportation investments more effectively
22 and leverage those -- they're very expensive,
23 obviously -- with our future land use pattern. So
24 that fed into the development of this particular
25 approach to allocating land use across the region.

1 So the criteria are that they be within an
2 existing community or infill development area, near an
3 existing or planned transit, providing housing and/or
4 jobs. And then within this context, there's really a
5 diversity of densities and a diversity of characters
6 that are captured.

7 So within Marin, for example, we will have a
8 couple of examples. We have a San Rafael downtown
9 which is really centered around the new Smart Station.
10 And then we would have, at a lower scale, development
11 along the 101 corridor.

12 And so these are very different types of places.
13 The idea for supporting planning in these PDAs
14 involves the difference of a process and different
15 sort of community-driven vision.

16 And then just to look at our neighbor to the
17 north, since we don't have a meeting up in Sonoma,
18 just a couple of examples. Santa Rosa downtown would
19 be a City Center PDA, which is really kind of a place
20 that, again, has a Smart Station and really anchors
21 future development. This is what we've been working
22 with Santa Rosa to develop, future development in that
23 particular part of the region. And then you get to a
24 place like Cloverdale which would have a lower-density
25 type of transit town center, again taking advantage of

1 the investment in Sonoma.

2 In addition, the strategy involves Priority
3 Conservation Areas and Investments Areas. And
4 Priority Conservation Areas work in tandem with the
5 PDAs because these are the places in the region where
6 we have a rich set of natural resources and open
7 spaces. A number of these resources are actually
8 really economically valuable, particularly in North
9 Bay communities.

10 And these are, again, locally selected. And I
11 should mention when we're talking about locally
12 nominated or locally selected, there are elected
13 officials involved in the proposal, and that involves
14 both saying we would like this to be a PDA as well as
15 saying here's the type of PDA in terms of growth, in
16 terms of character, et cetera, that we think is
17 appropriate.

18 So with the Priority Conservation Areas, again, it
19 was driven by that process. Obviously there's already
20 a lot of land that is restricted from development or
21 protected in some form or fashion, particularly in
22 Marin County. But these conservation areas are part
23 of a effort to really identify places that might be at
24 risk and places that would be of strategic value in
25 trying to secure.

1 So Investment Areas are part of the overall growth
2 strategy in the sense that they are places that don't
3 have the same level of anticipated development as the
4 Priority Development Area, but support the overall
5 regional objectives by preserving rural communities,
6 reducing pressure on open space and increasing access
7 to employment.

8 So for instance, there's a number of Investment
9 Areas which are Rural Community Investment Areas in
10 Sonoma County. And the local jurisdictions propose
11 that this typology, this type of Investment Area, be
12 brought forward because it's really a place where you
13 say, "Okay. How can we work with a very small amount
14 of growth which we're anticipating in our rural
15 community to help create a greater concentration of
16 local services right near downtown?"

17 One of the big issues for a number of these areas
18 is poor pedestrian access or bicycle access. How can
19 we use the very limited amount of resources that are
20 available to really support this investment strategy?

21 So let's then move on, and then we can get to all
22 the other alternatives. So very quickly, the
23 Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy. Just to look at it
24 on a map, this is a situation in which you see
25 80 percent of the region's new homes and 66 percent of

1 the region's new jobs going into Priority Development
2 Areas. Those comprise four percent of the Regional
3 Plan. So again, just to be clear, we are talking
4 about the Preferred Alternative. Here we're talking
5 about a 2010 to 2040 growth period. So that gives you
6 a sense for the overarching framework there.

7 Now let's go into all the alternatives. The first
8 one is No Project, and that's required by CEQA. The
9 second, Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy, which I
10 described in a little greater detail -- we can take
11 your comments after.

12 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No, I just thought
13 that No. 1 was the most appropriate one.

14 MR. SHORETT: We can take those comments
15 afterwards. Thank you.

16 The third alternative is Lower Concentrations of
17 PDA Growth. The fourth, Eliminate Inter-Regional
18 Commute, and then five, Environment, Equity and Jobs.

19 So let's get into a little more detail. No
20 Project. And again, this is required by CEQA.
21 There's two alternatives that are always required in a
22 CEQA analysis, and that involves the Project
23 Alternative and a No Project alternative. And then we
24 also want to look at a range of other reasonable
25 possible developments and transportation scenarios in

1 the future.

2 So this includes no planning project, no planning
3 effort in Priority Development Areas. That doesn't
4 mean there's not going to be any development there.
5 And we would anticipate dispersed job and housing
6 growth pattern supported by existing General Plans and
7 zoning.

8 Transportation. This would be based on the 2010
9 existing transportation network. It would only
10 include projects that have either received funding or
11 have environmental clearance as of May 1st, 2011.

12 And then going on to the Jobs-Housing Connection
13 Strategy, we really talked about the land use already.
14 But a key part of that is retaining affordable housing
15 in PDAs and then focusing investment into PDAs which
16 we are already starting to do and have been doing
17 through PDA Planning Programs which have distributed
18 grants to communities to put together specific plans
19 and other local plans to really put community-driven
20 visions into a clear framework through which future
21 developers can move forward.

22 But let's also talk about transportation. This is
23 where you get the Preferred Transportation Investment
24 Strategy. \$277 billion budget; 88 percent is directed
25 to operations and maintenance of the existing system,

1 and that really supports the fact that we're talking
2 about focusing most of the development into existing
3 communities and protecting other communities outside
4 of those locations. And so therefore we really want
5 to make sure that the infrastructure in those
6 locations is strong.

7 So this also advances key investment strategies:
8 Close the GHG Gap, Fix-It First, OneBayArea Grant
9 Framework, Fund High Performers -- we can provide more
10 detail on this if you'd like -- Squeeze More
11 Efficiency Out of Our Existing System, and then Making
12 our Existing Transit System Sustainable. So that's
13 particularly sustainable from a financial perspective.

14 So the next one is Lowered Concentrations of PDA
15 Growth. That would involve fewer new jobs and housing
16 in PDAs. We would anticipate additional growth close
17 to transit outside of PDAs and decentralized jobs and
18 single family construction supported by General Plans.

19 So from a transportation perspective, we would
20 again have the Preferred Transportation Investment
21 Strategy.

22 No. 4 is Eliminating Inter-Regional Commute. The
23 land use in this case would involve all jobs being
24 filled by Bay Area residents. And then we would
25 anticipate this would involve major subsidies for

1 housing close to employment centers at the edges of
2 the region to help make that first bullet possible.

3 In terms of transportation, this would involve a
4 modification of the Preferred Transportation
5 Investment Strategy which would include putting in
6 place the Transit Comprehensive Operations Analyses
7 set of recommendations. And then only HOV lane
8 conversions for express lanes. So it would also
9 involve implementing policies related to road pricing
10 and parking pricing.

11 So the final alternative, and again, as Ashley was
12 noting, a big part of what we're asking for today is
13 your feedback on the appropriateness of these
14 alternatives and any additional ideas you may have.

15 Finally, Environment, Equity, and Jobs. Land use.
16 This would involve additional affordable housing in
17 locations with high levels of low-income commuting as
18 well as additional affordable housing in locations
19 with high-performing schools and local resources. In
20 some cases, there would be the same kind of places.

21 Transportation for this alternative would be
22 another modification of the Preferred Transportation
23 Investment Strategy which would include restoring
24 transit to 2005 service levels and only converting HOV
25 lanes in express lanes.

1 So let's go to one more slide. And this is a
2 description, a set of puzzle pieces that together
3 provide us with a tool box that we can test to
4 identify ways in which we might be able to achieve the
5 intended outcomes of the Plan.

6 And so we have zoning, incentives, fees and
7 subsidies, road pricing, parking policies, growth
8 boundaries and natural areas. And through the
9 modeling process that we're going to use here, what
10 we're going to be able to do is introduce these into
11 the scenarios and find out what the relative impact of
12 them is going to be for the -- we should say the
13 projected impact of them is going to be on development
14 patterns and other outcomes that we're assessing.

15 So to reiterate, all five of these are going to be
16 analyzed by the same set of environmental criteria,
17 and also very importantly, none of them are going to
18 supersede local land use control. And if you look at
19 SB 375, there's absolutely nothing coming out of this
20 process that supersedes local land use control.

21 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That sir, is a lie.

22 MS. NGUYEN: Sit down, please.

23 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That last part is a
24 lie.

25 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's not true.

1 MS. NGUYEN: We ask that you hold your
2 comments. We will give you an opportunity --

3 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, what do I see
4 when you're telling a fib?

5 MS. NGUYEN: Sir, please. Please. We want
6 to have a really good conversation today and we will
7 give you an opportunity to speak.

8 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: This isn't a
9 conversation. That's an outright lie, and we don't
10 accept it.

11 MS. NGUYEN: Sir, we ask that you hold your
12 feedback. We will take your feedback.

13 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, we ask you to
14 tell the truth.

15 MS. NGUYEN: We ask that you hold your
16 feedback and please respect everyone in this room by
17 not shouting and disrupting.

18 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Respect us by telling
19 the truth.

20 MS. NGUYEN: We will give you an opportunity
21 to comment.

22 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And that's a big one.
23 That's heavy. That's how we start. That's a big one.

24 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How can you go forward
25 when everything you say is based on a lie?

1 THE REPORTER: Excuse me. I'm the court
2 reporter here. Just as a point of order, I am a
3 neutral person.

4 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No, you're not.
5 You've been to every one of these meetings.

6 THE REPORTER: It's my responsibility to make
7 a verbatim transcript of these proceedings. If you
8 want your comments to be on the record, you need to
9 state your name first.

10 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Dissent and objection.
11 That should pretty much cover it.

12 MS. NGUYEN: We ask that you, again, respect
13 the groundrules that we set for this meeting. We ask
14 for civility and respect, and if you continue to
15 disrupt we will ask you to leave.

16 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's what we're
17 asking for.

18 MS. NGUYEN: And I will give you an
19 opportunity to comment. This is the last call on
20 comments. We will provide you in less than two
21 minutes an opportunity to speak.

22 We just have two more slides to cover, and I'll do
23 them quickly. But the purpose of this scoping meeting
24 is again, to hear your comments on scope and content
25 for us to consider as we prepare the environment

1 document.

2 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That is not the
3 purpose.

4 MS. NGUYEN: So this slide -- please hold
5 your comments.

6 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That is not the
7 purpose.

8 MS. NGUYEN: Please hold your comments. The
9 purpose of this slide is to kind of give you some
10 questions that we have for you with regards to the
11 range of reasonable alternatives that we have to
12 evaluate. So in thinking about these alternatives, we
13 ask that you look at these questions.

14 Are we applying the right policy strategies to
15 really help shape both the land use and transportation
16 improvements that are planned over the next 28 years?
17 Are there any missing strategies that you want us to
18 consider as we define those alternatives?

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Absolutely.

20 MS. NGUYEN: Are there any alternatives that
21 you have that you want us to consider that's entirely
22 different from the ones that we presented?

23 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Definitely.

24 MS. NGUYEN: The ones we presented are open
25 for discussion, and this is the reason we're here

1 today is to hear your comments on those alternatives,
2 as well as any other environmental issue in this
3 document. So we do want to hear your feedback on
4 those areas.

5 We wanted to share with you the schedule and the
6 process by which we will be working on preparing this
7 environmental document. Our intention is to collect
8 comments through the scoping process, which has
9 occurred over the past two weeks. We'll take all the
10 feedback that we've heard and we will present it to
11 our Metropolitan Transportation Commission as well as
12 The Association of Bay Area Governments Executive
13 Board for their review and consideration. We do seek
14 their approval in July so that we can move forward
15 with the actual environmental assessment.

16 As Hannah mentioned, we will plan to produce a
17 Draft Environmental Impact Report for public review in
18 mid December, and we will look forward to presenting a
19 Final Environmental Report on the Plan for adoption
20 and certification in spring of 2013.

21 With that, that concludes our staff presentation,
22 and I will only it up for comments. Let me explain
23 again how we are taking comments.

24 We want to record your comments properly for the
25 record. We ask that you hold the blue speaker card

1 and stand in a line next to this podium. We ask that
2 each speaker has the opportunity to provide their
3 comments. We do not wish to have disruptions in the
4 audience so that we can hear the speaker. We ask for
5 no cross dialogue because it's a distraction that
6 disenables our court reporter to properly record your
7 comments.

8 We ask you again to disagree respectfully. We are
9 really hear to listen to your comments, and if you
10 disagree with us, we respectfully agree to listen to
11 those comments and we're not making any commentary one
12 way or the other. We ask that you do the same.

13 I'm really trying to give everyone here an
14 opportunity to speak and to provide your feedback. So
15 please, respect the groundrules. It's going to help
16 us really to move and hear comments from everyone who
17 wants to speak today.

18 So with that, if you are interested in speaking,
19 you may form a short line and as the line goes shorter
20 other folks can stand up. Please have your blue card
21 in hand, and before you speak, please state your name
22 for the record. But please provide us with your
23 feedback.

24 Because there is a large number of people in this
25 room, you may hear a timer ring. That just gives you

1 a sense that you've been there about two,
2 two-and-a-half minutes, and if you can wrap up your
3 comments, we would certainly appreciate it.

4 MS. BEITTEL: My name is Sue Beittel, and I
5 have lived in Marin County for over 50 years. And I
6 am currently the chairman of the Commission on Aging,
7 a 23-member commission that is advisory to the board
8 of supervisors.

9 One of the things that I'm here to say is that
10 we'd like you to take into consideration the growing
11 number of older people in Marin county. We're
12 currently at about 30 percent for people over the age
13 of 60. In the year 2025, that number will go to
14 45 percent. The fastest growing group are those
15 people 80 and over.

16 We have prepared a paper in 2010 about the housing
17 needs of older adults. Some maybe prefer to age in
18 place in their long-time homes or move to smaller
19 units with access to service. Whether they live in a
20 residential setting with others, as people age they
21 will likely need assistance and/or services to remain
22 living independently. Ideally, the work force
23 delivering the assistance and services should live
24 close by in housing they can afford.

25 It is important for older and disabled adults to

1 live where they can move about without cars and have
2 access to vital services such as shopping, medical
3 facilities, government centers, libraries, educational
4 programs, and recreational activities. There is a
5 need for both existing and new large housing
6 developments which will serve older adults and
7 individuals with disabilities to include appropriate
8 on-site services that support independent living and
9 aging in place. Overall development standards are
10 needed that include universal design principles such
11 as wheel chair accessibility and that sort of thing.

12 There is a critical need for affordable housing
13 and the protection of the existing supply of modest
14 homes and second units and the creation of policies
15 that make it easier to construct new modest-size homes
16 and second units.

17 Many older and disabled adults live on limited
18 fixed incomes; therefore policies and procedures
19 should be pursued to maintain and increase rental
20 housing and second units.

21 I would like to also mention that the Commission
22 on Aging has been working on senior mobility programs
23 to get people out of their cars because they don't
24 drive so well any more, and we are interested in a
25 volunteer driver program, increased access to

1 paratransit, and a new program that we're working on
2 now called Catch a Ride.

3 I might also add that I'm observing this meeting
4 for the League of Women Voters. Thank you.

5 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comments.
6 Next speaker, please.

7 MS. NYGREN: Yes. My name is Karen Nygren.
8 I am a member of the Transportation Authority of
9 Marin's Technical Advisory Committee. I've been
10 involved in transportation starting when I was mayor
11 in Tiburon and on the planning commission in Tiburon.

12 But I speak for myself today. I just told you
13 that to give some background, that I really am
14 involved. I have eight questions that I would like
15 answered in the EIR, for the scoping.

16 One, I request that you mix-match the
17 alternatives. The Preferred Alternative is not the
18 answer. Will the public support your PDAs or your TPP
19 PDAs as the density is proposed? You can propose
20 something, but in fact, what you propose must be
21 accepted by the public, and I question if the public
22 is going to support what you're proposing.

23 Will eliminating CEQA requirements or streamlining
24 them be a weakening of the California Environmental
25 Quality Act? Will environmental protections be

1 overlooked? Will significant impacts be created?
2 Will waste be made waste or create unknown significant
3 problems?

4 I am strongly opposed to waiving any CEQA
5 requirement or even streamlining it. It's just too
6 valuable to overlook.

7 How will greenhouse gases be improved with very
8 dense and congested PDAs or PDA TPPs? Would traffic
9 impacts significantly increase as density is increased
10 with PDAs and TPPs, including air quality? Would
11 increasing funds to support alternative fuel vehicles,
12 research, development and other ways to reduce use of
13 gas or reduce the vehicles rather than the billions
14 for roads and housing reach the goals for SB 375
15 faster?

16 I know that there is only supposedly 700 million
17 proposed to be given to your alternatives and billions
18 offered for roadways and housing. Is the Plan Bay
19 Area truly the best way to achieve SB 375 goals as it
20 is currently proposed? Will it as proposed reduce
21 greenhouse gases, or is this just a way for developers
22 and housing and jobs?

23 I think what you need to do is put the jobs first
24 and the housing to follow. Thank you very much.

25 One other point, please. If we can get a higher

1 percentage of funding for affordable housing, this
2 will make the PDA Areas even more capable of meeting
3 or improving the arena numbers to meet the goal of
4 affordable housing. Right now it's just insignificant
5 for what you're proposing. Thank you.

6 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comment.
7 Next speaker, please.

8 MR. SMITH: My name is Clayton Smith. I'm
9 from Mill Valley.

10 First I want to say that it is my opinion there is
11 no law as far reaching as SB 375. It should have been
12 put before the voters on the general ballot, on a
13 general statewide ballot.

14 This law is, in my opinion, an affront to
15 democracy and is a usurpation of the right of the
16 local communities in regards to their zoning and their
17 building.

18 Secondly, I'd like to say that -- I think it's a
19 point of important information that this whole Plan
20 Bay Area is based on a \$200 billion dollar bribe by
21 the federal government so as to buy off our local
22 politicians and displace the true will of the actual
23 residents of our community.

24 Thirdly, I'd like to point out that a
25 widely-distributed analysis by a Mill Valley resident

1 named Bob Silvestri, which is available online, has
2 demonstrated clearly that the so-called sustainable
3 development ideas promoted by this Plan will actually
4 increase greenhouse gases.

5 What we really have here is centocracy replacing
6 democracy. And this is what CEQA streamlining is
7 really about. It's about bureaucracy versus
8 community. And it's revealed here by the
9 Politbureau-like top-down dictates that are coming to
10 us from unelected government employees who, in my
11 opinion, are lining their pockets at the expense of
12 the greater community while engaging in their own
13 career self promotions at the expense of the
14 taxpayers.

15 It is not only undemocratic, it is in fact
16 anti-democratic. It promotes social parasitism,
17 governmental corruption by private development
18 interests, destruction of local control of our
19 communities, the subsidy of the big and the
20 destruction of the remaining human-scale aspects of
21 our communities. And I urge everyone in this room who
22 loves the Bay Area and loves particularly Marin County
23 to vote this down and to do whatever is in your power
24 to oppose this, and to oppose the people who are
25 promoting this great evil which I consider to be

1 simply a plan that has been brought to us as we know
2 by ICLEI. It's Agenda 21, and it is essentially a
3 means by which you were attempting to erase what is in
4 fact our community.

5 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

6 MS. KRALOVEC: My name is Michelle Kralovec.
7 I'm a concerned citizen. You know, I see with all
8 this opposition that OBA, ABAG and MTC, SMART, PBA and
9 all the other names, plus ICLEI, that they name
10 themselves. It kind of reminds me of a really bad
11 store I live near. They kept changing their name
12 because they thought people would think it was a
13 better store than the one before. But it was the same
14 crummy place inside.

15 The thing is is that the name didn't change a
16 thing, and you haven't taken into account or at the
17 very least show that you care what we think.

18 You have this website you keep saying our
19 questions will be answered on. Well, they're not.
20 They never have been. You run out of time before the
21 rest of us get to speak. And it makes me wonder back
22 to the brainwashing from an early age, games like Sims
23 and the biased schooling that you received. Makes me
24 wonder why more people don't send their kids out of
25 state to private schools so they're not indoctrinated

1 at any early age.

2 I raised two sons. They're awesome human beings,
3 and they can think for themselves, not like little
4 robots. The problem now facing you is that we do
5 think, and we're not fooled by you. We also have
6 plans, and they don't involve following all this
7 nonsense.

8 You break the Brown Act's rules over and over and
9 over again by trying to keep us out of your plans.
10 You did them way before a lot of us even knew about
11 it. You say you want our feedback. Well, get ready.
12 You're going to get it.

13 The question is would you like me to tell you how
14 I think you should live? Think about this. I know
15 that you're about to have a baby. Well, how are you
16 going to feel when that baby has 104 temperature and
17 you have to go down two flights of stairs to get your
18 baby to the doctors. Maybe there's an ear infection;
19 who knows? And you have to fight through the crowds
20 of people that live there only to get onto a train or
21 a bus to take you to that doctor. How safe do you
22 think that is for the other individuals plus your baby
23 when your baby is sick? Have you ever thought of
24 that?

25 Sustainable housing doesn't -- there is no

1 sustainable anything. There is no bit of housing
2 that's ever been built anywhere that lasts forever.
3 So just toss that word out. It doesn't make sense.

4 You get this kind of thing when you live in a
5 ghetto. I never have, so I've been very fortunate.
6 But it will be a ghetto. You'll have neighbors
7 fighting with neighbors, kids racing up and down the
8 floor above you. It's not going to be nice. People
9 will be allowed to take one bath a week if they're
10 lucky because they're knocking out all the dams. We
11 won't have enough water.

12 I have a friend that has a ranch that she just
13 inherited from her parents. She cannot subdivide it
14 among her two boys and themselves because there are
15 suddenly flowers there that is native to the area and
16 it wasn't there before.

17 So a lot of things are changing that we have no
18 control, and that's really how it's supposed to be.
19 Our forefathers made sure we had a constitution that
20 was supposed to be followed by the people for the
21 people.

22 You can't drive anymore now because there's gas to
23 consider, and you only have an allotment. The bikes
24 that you were supposed to be able to share with the
25 other people in your town are all gone. Suddenly

1 they're missing. So that doesn't work.

2 You have no more privacy, no property, and no more
3 rights. Does that sound really good to you? And
4 those of us that saved our money, bought a house,
5 saved for college for our children and maybe our
6 retirement have to give it all away to people that
7 don't want to work and live in the same ghetto as us?
8 I don't think so.

9 Would you like to hear somebody else's kids
10 screaming all day long? I love my kids. I could put
11 up with that for my kids, but I don't want to listen
12 to my neighbors.

13 What if the low-flow toilet isn't working because
14 there's not enough water to clear the line? That's
15 not sustainable.

16 You are not elected officials, yet you're making
17 plans for our lives, in our towns, in our counties,
18 our state and our country. You use the city and state
19 governments to facilitate your plan. You steal our
20 money, our tax dollars, and we don't like it.

21 You think that you can call these so-called
22 planning meetings and never answer questions and
23 always say we don't have more time? Well, you can't
24 shut us up anymore because we are coming back, and we
25 are sending every single thing that our videographer

1 tapes, and we're sending it out all over the United
2 States and that means millions and millions of people.
3 And it has reached the likes of Sean Hannity and some
4 others that are actually going to put it on their
5 show.

6 So I've noticed that the parking in Novato has
7 changed because they minimize the parking by sticking
8 a tree in between every two parking spaces. Up in
9 Petaluma, where there was once parking for people that
10 wanted to watch their kids play Little League, there
11 is no parking there anymore. They're narrowed the
12 street, made a bike lane and foot paths. And now you
13 can't go to see your son play unless you take a bus or
14 you walk miles and miles and miles. And there's one
15 handicapped woman that I watch that has three kids
16 that play Little League, and she has a hard time
17 getting in. And there is no handicapped parking there
18 for her.

19 So trust me. You think you're planning anything?
20 No, you're not. You're just mere puppets. Well there
21 are more of us now, and these videos, like I say, are
22 going out. We will take this standing up and fight
23 for our rights. And you're banking that we'll finally
24 give up and go away and that you can proceed as
25 planned? You did this behind closed doors for way too

1 long a lot earlier than 2007, and now we're taking
2 action. And just who do you think you are?

3 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please. And
4 again, we ask and remind you that we are looking for
5 your feedback on the environmental issues for this
6 EIR. So we appreciate if you can stay on point.

7 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: America is our
8 environment.

9 MS. NGUYEN: We again ask you to not disrupt
10 That's your final warning. The next warning we will
11 escort you out.

12 MR. WILLIS: The name is Richard Willis.
13 Would you like to tell me what questions you would
14 like me to ask? Go ahead. Maybe I can give you some
15 answers. May I ask my questions or do you want me to
16 ask your questions? Okay.

17 Folks, I think I have got it in a nutshell. I
18 kind of inadvertently picked up this pen as I was
19 filling out the speaker card, and I noticed after a
20 few seconds it didn't work. It was all bent.

21 Folks, this is the sustainable community
22 strategies.com pen. Made of cardboard. With a little
23 bamboo sticker that says recycled. (Approaches
24 Ms. Nguyen) Would you mind giving it to those folks?
25 Just so you know I'm not kidding.

1 There is your sustainable plan. I'm so mad. I
2 have very little more to say. But I should add that I
3 spent many years in the venture capital business, and
4 I've seen more plans and thousands and thousands of
5 business plans.

6 I've got to tell you, on a scale of one to ten,
7 this doesn't make the scale. It totally lacks
8 credibility. It's full of self-serving statements.
9 It's alphabet soup. It's a million government
10 agencies; nobody quite knows who does what and who
11 pays how much.

12 It's based on a senate bill that is basically
13 fraud and anybody with any science background knows
14 that. There are no references; there are no
15 authorities. There is no published science backing
16 the bill that this is based on. Somewhere somebody's
17 got to say, boy, we're working on a program here
18 that's based on something that is not true.

19 And I would add on the subject of civility, we
20 need to be told the truth, and when I'm told that none
21 of this, the SB 375 and 32, don't impinge on local
22 planning, that is not true, and we would rather you
23 not tell us that. It's been repeated over and over.
24 It's part of the narrative, and it's not true. So on
25 the subject of truth and civility, we expect it from

1 you in order for us to give it back.

2 Last point. Some of you may be familiar with
3 George Orwell and Animal Farm, 1984. Another book
4 that he wrote had to do with language. It was very,
5 very good. I see spread throughout these
6 presentations this vague language of equitable access,
7 economic vitality, healthy and safe communities,
8 climate protection. Be serious. The world's been
9 going up and down for millions of years, tens of
10 millions of years, and you think you're going to
11 change it and protect it? I think the cardboard pen
12 says it better than I can.

13 MS. KOEHLE: My name is Orlean Koehle, and I
14 am the state president of Eagle Forum of California.
15 Eagle Forum has long had a history of standing up for
16 property rights and privacy rights. And I believe
17 that what we have experienced with this OneBayArea
18 Plan is a violation of both of those.

19 I would like to be respectful and I will talk
20 about the EIR and the environmental issues that you
21 recommended. I'm going to talk about sustainable
22 development, about the greenhouse gases, global
23 warming, about endangered species, and I would like to
24 end saying something about social equity.

25 First of all, how do we define sustainable

1 development? Nobody seems to have any clear
2 definition. Last week was this huge conference in Rio
3 de Janeiro called Agenda 21 + 20. And before it got
4 started, a reporter was interviewing some of the key
5 people. None of them could give a clear definition of
6 sustainable development.

7 I would like to tell you my definition. It is
8 pure socialism, and it is top-down government control.
9 It is planned economy rather than the wonderful free
10 enterprise system that has made our nation so great.
11 It is a planned economy where your free economy, your
12 free enterprise system, the free market system will no
13 longer be in existence.

14 Secondly, the global warming, the greenhouse gas
15 issue. I was listening to the radio last Saturday and
16 it mentioned that the reason why Sonoma County did not
17 have a very good grape crop -- in fact it was down 13
18 percent -- was because of the cold summer we had last
19 year. And I thought, now how does that go with global
20 warming? We had a really cold year. We had a cold
21 year around the globe. For someone to say that we
22 have a continual rise in temperature, that is not
23 true.

24 We have climate change. You've changed the name,
25 and true, climates change. They get warm; they get

1 cold. And what tiny little bit of difference can
2 mankind do to that?

3 We heard Lord Monckton speak in Sacramento a few
4 months ago at a hearing at the state capital. He
5 said -- he's the authority on global warming, on
6 climate change, from England. He's world-renowned.
7 He goes all over speaking. He said that if we
8 continue with this policy in California implementing
9 AB 32 and SB 375, we will cost our state in ten years
10 \$400 billion, and we will do absolutely nothing to
11 curb any greenhouse gases. It's ludicrous.

12 And for California to think that we can do this
13 all by ourselves -- we're the lone state supposedly
14 taking on this whole climate change program -- it's
15 arrogant of us to think. We are not the lone state on
16 the planet. We're affected by all the other nations.

17 China and India are doing nothing to curb their
18 greenhouse gases, so how with that affect us? The
19 atmosphere goes around the globe.

20 Thirdly, I would like to mention endangered
21 species. We are the endangered species. We are the
22 ones that are going to be suffering the most from
23 this, especially those who live on rural land, which I
24 live on.

25 My husband and I are in the rural section of

1 Sonoma County. We've already had to fight so many of
2 these policies with the new policy that was
3 implemented in 2006, the General Plan in 2020. And
4 rural land, anyone who lives on it, is suffering from
5 this and will suffer even more so.

6 And secondly, we need equal justice not social
7 justice. This is going to be making it so that
8 certain people will be given certain privileges. It's
9 not going to equal justice for all people.

10 The speaker before me mentioned Animal Farm. I
11 recommend you all read it. In there you will see the
12 wording, "Some animals are more equal than other
13 animals." Now that's what this is doing. Thank you.

14 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next speaker.

15 MS. SHROYER: Hi. I'm Toni Shroyer. I'm a
16 Marin County native and a Novato resident. And I want
17 to thank everybody that's here that's taken time off
18 of work. No matter what your opinions are, you care,
19 and that's part of the democratic process. So thank
20 you.

21 Before I go to what you were asking us to respond
22 to, what I found was very disturbing is to just kind
23 of bypass the "No Expected Impacts of Regional
24 Importance." And one was not only hazardous materials
25 but public services.

1 This is of grave concern because right now what's
2 happening -- and we're seeing this dramatically so
3 with two projects in Novato -- is that the nonprofit
4 housing doesn't pay any real estate taxes; no county
5 tax, no city tax, no school tax, no real estate taxes
6 at all. Yet they can make millions of dollars a year
7 off the backs of the poor, off the backs of the
8 taxpayers and off the backs of the community.

9 And there is no accountability. They can get away
10 with not providing crime-free or safe housing for the
11 people that they claim to help. So we have a
12 situation here in Novato right now where people are
13 being victimized in their own homes. This is women
14 and children, and they don't live in safe housing.

15 So it's kind of a misnomer when, in fact, in one
16 of these pages where it says "healthy and safe
17 communities" because we don't have that. And there's
18 no restrictions here to mandate that. So that is a
19 grave concern.

20 And nonprofits need to give back too. Right now
21 because we have -- I witnessed a drug deal as I was
22 biking. I was being environmentally -- instead of
23 driving I was biking. And on Center Place, Center and
24 Diablo, my son at I at 3:00 o'clock in Novato,
25 Saturday, saw a drug deal, a blatant drug deal.

1 So what we've done, the children of Novato and
2 some parents, we've literally asked for pennies for
3 police dogs so we could buy a third police dog so that
4 we could be safe and have all three dogs narcotics
5 trained. So we as a community and children are
6 picking up change off the street so that they can be
7 safe while these -- let's call it what it is -- slum
8 lords are making millions. So it's just not fair.

9 Also I do encourage you to read all three -- and
10 there's going to be a fourth one coming out -- of Bob
11 Silvestri's blog, because he has alternative ways that
12 are not included in here to be sustainable. And to --
13 well, I don't like the word sustainable because I
14 think it's abused, but meaning environmentally.

15 So right with this sustainable community strategy,
16 we're actually having a loss of life, a loss of
17 quality of life, increased local pollution. And is it
18 really sustainable? Because as an environmentalist,
19 I'm really looking at how sustainable this is. And
20 what it is is sustainable for the developers who can
21 get a tax exemption for 55 years without paying
22 anything back to the infrastructure. So it seems that
23 you're concerned more about the infrastructure of the
24 transportation on Scenario Two than you are on the
25 infrastructure of the community.

1 And how are you going to help potentially
2 high-risk people -- some yes, some no -- so that they
3 can escape the cycle of poverty? What are the social
4 programs? What are the life skills? What is the
5 asset management? The family planning? It's simply
6 not here.

7 Also with the sustainable community strategy, the
8 developer does not have to have local talent, not
9 local construction, not local jobs that are created.
10 For example, the Warner Creek Project which is 30
11 units per acre is 60 units, right across from the
12 Wyndover Apartments. And they have used construction
13 workers from out of town, out of Novato, and out of
14 county. So they are going back and forth, back and
15 forth on the 101 to create a sustainable community.
16 It's a hypocrisy.

17 So going back to what you're asking us to do, we
18 need to mandate mandatory safe housing, because that's
19 not happening. Nonprofit housing needs to give back
20 to the community and not make millions off of the poor
21 and not waive any CEQA requirements. And also we need
22 monies for social services so that people can succeed.

23 I support affordable housing, but I don't support
24 high-density housing. We need to go look at Bob
25 Silvestri's suggestions.

1 So I think it's important that we also have local
2 control. And what has been mentioned by some of the
3 speakers but not here is private property rights.
4 Whose property are you going to be rezoning? Is this
5 going to be right now without their consent or with
6 their consent? What happens if you have a property
7 owner with a site that you want to build something on
8 and they don't want you to build it? I think our
9 private property rights are being attacked under this
10 scenario.

11 So I would go for Number 1. And thank you for
12 listening. I know you have a hard job. This is just
13 kind of -- for lack of a better word -- a dog and pony
14 show because I keep on seeing the same thing over and
15 over again for the last two and a half years, and all
16 the public input is really not being considered. And
17 that's not democratic and it's not fair. Thank you.

18 MS. MOODY: I'm Elizabeth Moody, and I have
19 been 48 years in Marin County. 33 in Novato and 15 in
20 Mill Valley. I believe the One Bay Area Plan is
21 absolutely essential. We must have regional planning.

22 60 percent of our workers and the ones that
23 probably work on Warner Creek were there because they
24 weren't available in Marin. We must look at SB 375,
25 and I think the Plan Bay Area does that very well.

1 Sustainability means balanced environment and
2 economics and equity, and that's what I believe the
3 Plan Bay Area does for our region. With 60 percent of
4 our workers coming in from outside the county and
5 driving further than any other county does is
6 something that we have to address regionally.

7 I think that Plan Bay Area is doing everything
8 they can to get input, and the timeline indicates
9 that. I think that it does not impact in any way on
10 local planning and 20 units per acre is very fair.

11 I think that in some cases density is very
12 favorable. I especially like it when there are the --
13 such as our Miller Avenue in Mill Valley where there
14 is the only opportunity for any mixed use, and that
15 one level with some apartment buildings that are
16 several levels, I think, make still with proper
17 landscaping keep a very small community, local
18 feeling, that Mill Valley desires very much.

19 The local planning is not affected. The design
20 and planning and zoning and all is retained by the
21 local community. And the local communities have their
22 representation in the regional planning.

23 We must work together, and the sustainability --
24 and that also means reducing the greenhouse gases
25 because most it comes from cars and our workers have

1 to come in because they can't afford to live here.

2 It's fascinating that in Mill Valley besides the
3 seniors who have been increasing in such great numbers
4 in the county, the children are the other growth
5 group, and that this is absolutely delightful.

6 So please keep up your good work, and we'll all
7 work together, I hope, to develop a plan that allows
8 the local communities to plan and design the way they
9 want to and yet regionally works together for a
10 sustainable and keeping a healthy and viable region.
11 So thank you very much.

12 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next speaker.

13 MS. DURHAM: Anne Durham. We're seeing here
14 again today the effect of a communitarian and
15 philosophical approach to government which dominates
16 public expectations and legislative agendas.
17 Seemingly gone are the days when the government was
18 limited, where individual's inalienable rights were
19 politically acknowledged and where money was honest.

20 At the core of this transformation is the
21 political process of regionalizing the country, of
22 which MTC and ABAG are an integral part. Political
23 regionalism is the antithesis of representative
24 government, and is thereby unconstitutional.
25 Regionalism restructures or reinvents the operation of

1 government and is the blueprint for your serfdom. It
2 has infiltrated our transportation, water, farming,
3 land uses systems and cities and countries, every
4 aspect of governments.

5 Regionalism is being used to destroy traditional
6 political boundaries like county lines and usher in a
7 transformed system of governance that abolishes
8 private property.

9 If you look at Agenda 21, Chapter 7, Human
10 Settlements Promoting Transport Systems, you will see
11 where they are getting their marching orders.

12 Towns across the country are adopting these
13 transport systems because these systems are imposed
14 upon locales by a regional level of government largely
15 unknown and underestimated. Regionalism might sound
16 benign, but the consequences must be understood by
17 freedom-loving people or liberty will be trampled.

18 The metropolitan planning organizations are
19 federally mandated, and like the COGs, give
20 opportunity for the restructuring of American
21 government. They are setting an infrastructure for a
22 new economic system based on public-private
23 partnership in replacement of free enterprise.

24 COGs and MPOs are federalized organizations that
25 break down America's constitutionally-formulated

1 government structure. Their purpose is to control and
2 direct local government from behind the scenes. Today
3 they propel the federal injection of the globalist
4 agenda into local government policy, and thereby
5 negate the protections afforded by our constitutional
6 system of government.

7 In other words, regionalism is in fact, communism.
8 Regionalism promotes Soviet-style councils that
9 develop policy that is rubber-stamped by elected
10 officials with no real meaningful public oversight.
11 It is an extra constitutional level of government that
12 advances globalist objectives while insulating most
13 elected officials.

14 The government no longer operates the way we were
15 told in our eighth grade textbooks. Federal regional
16 organizations are throughout the country, but the
17 battle is always local. Our prospects for the future
18 of America hang in the balance.

19 It is absolutely essential for the restoration of
20 the American republic that political regionalism be
21 terminated, and all that they have done here and those
22 before them, all that you have done here has to be
23 declared constructionally null and void. Thank you.

24 //

25 //

1 MS. TAVARES: Hi. Deborah Tavares. First, I
2 want to let you know that they would not show the map
3 that they are really orchestrating this agenda from.
4 This is the Wildlands Project map that everyone can go
5 to, stopthecrime.net, and print off.

6 This is a map that was originally by Dr. Michael
7 Coffman. You can see that under this program of
8 treason that you are orchestrating under -- and make
9 no mistake about it -- you are organizing under the
10 plan, and I just -- hear me out because you're my
11 kids' age. So this is an educational moment for you.

12 I just want to tell you that you are organizing
13 under the Iron Mountain Report. It was a report that
14 was hatched in the 60s in an underground nuclear
15 survival retreat. And it was asked to be started by
16 Kennedy. It took them a number of years, about four,
17 and it was released when Lyndon Johnson was president.

18 It was so catastrophically wicked and evil and
19 treasonous that it was asked never, ever to be
20 released to the American people. On top of the fact
21 that it talks about regionalism, dividing America up
22 into ten districts, collapsing our Constitution and
23 Bill of Rights -- which is what this is doing, and
24 you're working in that regard -- it states the most
25 horrific, fear-based program to cause people on a

1 global scale to buy into agendas out of fear. They
2 believed that through fear we would abate all common
3 sense. And through fear, we would give up our
4 freedoms, which is what has happened.

5 Unfortunately, we see in the Iron Mountain Report,
6 that pollution, mass pollution, was invented. And
7 when you see the report, you will see how mass
8 pollution was created. They were willing to pollute
9 the earth to create fear that we were the cause of
10 pollution. And we are not.

11 I will tell you that what this report calls for is
12 absolute complete domination of all people, of all
13 nations, for all times. This is an enormous,
14 enormous, massive global land grab. This is an
15 enormous massive global grab of all energy and
16 resources on the face of the planet. It's intention
17 is to create all of us into a third-world country and
18 be slaves, and it's intention is to eliminate a great
19 number of us.

20 In this map you will see the Wildlands Project
21 Map. If you research this, you will find that among
22 many of the foundations that are supportive of this,
23 Ted Turner is one of the foundations. He gave a
24 billion dollars to the United Nations. He is a
25 globalist. He is eugenist. He wants elimination of

1 the current population of 95 percent.

2 But that's a lot of numbers. Many people think it
3 might only be 80 percent global depopulation, and some
4 think it might be 50 or 60. But it is a program of
5 elimination of population.

6 And make no mistake about it, the report called
7 NWO Exposed 1969 by an insider, a eugenicist, also laid
8 out what we see in the Iron Mountain Report and
9 exactly what you youngsters are doing unbeknownst.
10 You are bringing forth a program that is treason. I
11 started out telling you that. And I know that you
12 don't know it, or you wouldn't be sitting there right
13 now I would hope.

14 I can tell you that when we discussed this with
15 our kids, my daughter in particular started crying at
16 4:30 in the morning when she learned the truth. She
17 couldn't believe that this was hatched into the end of
18 the demise of the American people.

19 We are as an American nation in the crosshairs of
20 the most inhumane global disaster that we've ever
21 faced. And One Bay Area is a portion of that being
22 manifested before our very eyes.

23 Rural living is considered sprawl. We are
24 considered gluttons. We're considered pigs if we have
25 rural property. We must be relocated to human

1 settlement zones. I don't know if you have had the
2 opportunity to watch the Hunger Games, but I would ask
3 that you do. That's an excellent illustration of the
4 human settlement zones.

5 This map talks about that. You're seeing a
6 collapse in all of our highways and roads. If you go
7 to Portugal right now, all the new highways that they
8 installed have road sensors in them, which is what our
9 highways have in them now. All the roads that are
10 under construction right now are going to be become
11 toll roads. The cost of traveling on what few roads
12 will remain will take you out of your cars simply
13 because you will not be able to drive on the roads.

14 In Portugal, a man rented a Hertz car from the
15 airport, drove to Lisbon and couldn't pay the tolls
16 because it was all by camera. He became a felon and
17 received additional fines because he had to leave the
18 country before they ascertained what his toll fees
19 were.

20 Make no mistake. That's what's happening here.
21 In America. Right now.

22 We also know that the global grid, the smart grid,
23 has a built-in obsolescence. If you didn't know it,
24 you will now. It's only intended to last 20 years.
25 Why only 20 years, when our grid has lasted between 50

1 and 100 years? That's because there just won't be the
2 need to supply all of you because many of you truly
3 won't be here.

4 You can see on this map -- again, stopthecrime.net
5 -- you will see exactly where the human settlement
6 zones were then. But there are fewer zones now.

7 And I can tell you that we have much to be
8 concerned about, and we should fight every single day
9 against this type of treason that's being presented to
10 the United States and to all us. It is going to
11 eliminate private property rights, and that is one of
12 the bases of the Iron Mountain Report, elimination of
13 private property rights.

14 It's also creating a new religion, the love of the
15 earth. We see that now happening all over the
16 country. And I can tell you that humans will take a
17 lesser status than an animal. Humans will take a
18 lesser status than a rock. This is what it calls for.

19 On the Web site, you will also see the Wildlands
20 Project revealed, and it tells you all life, human and
21 nonhuman, has equal value. Resources and consumption
22 above what is needed to supply vital human needs is
23 immoral.

24 Human population must be reduced. They say this.
25 I'm not saying this. This is in their plan. And

1 western civilization must radically change, present
2 economic, technological and ideological structures.
3 That's a requirement of this plan. Thank you very
4 much.

5 MS. NGUYEN: I'm just reminding people to try
6 to focus their comments on the environmental issue
7 areas. Thank you.

8 MS. TAVARES: It's all about the environment.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. PAGETT: Betty Pagett. Resident of Ross
11 Valley since 1981. Long before many of the
12 conspiracies described today, my father worked with
13 Governor Reagan on how cities and counties needed to
14 look to serve the 20th century. And many of the same
15 ideas emerged from that but were never acted on.

16 I speak today for the future of my grandchildren
17 and those who will grow up with them. We wanted Marin
18 to preserve the 80 percent of our county that's open
19 space and agriculture. We want to reduce Marin's
20 enormous ecological footprint.

21 We want to face up to our service economy. We've
22 created many low-paying jobs because those are the
23 people that serve us in health care, retail,
24 restaurants. And we have created in our free economy
25 no place for those people to live or any way to get to

1 work except for single occupancy vehicles. And
2 therefore, I speak in support of the Jobs-Housing
3 Connection.

4 Nobody is doing this to us. We need to do it to
5 make our own community viable. And it's time for
6 Marin to take some responsibility for its impact on
7 the rest of the region with most of our workers coming
8 in from across the region. It's time for people who
9 question how we live to look at some of the smaller
10 homes that we've created in small communities that
11 actually are near services, jobs and transportation
12 and do reduce traffic and do create community that is
13 a good place to raise children or to age. It's time
14 for us to live together with those our children will
15 grow up with.

16 MR. BENNETT: Jim Bennett, Sonoma County.
17 See, I respect these handful of folks' right and
18 freedom to see the benefit of being close to their
19 shopping and not having a need for an automobile.
20 That is your choice. That's what our country is about
21 is choice and freedom.

22 But this is about anything but. Personally, I
23 didn't sell my home in Southern California near the
24 beach and come live in Sonoma County to live in a
25 human settlement gulag. I came up here to live in the

1 country. And from the playbook that we're supposed to
2 be playing by, the Constitution, which pays homage to
3 our natural unalienable rights that are uniquely ours
4 and not to be reconciled through or granted by
5 government, I and the other 8 million people in the
6 Bay Area whose freedom of choice in terms of where and
7 how they live and their transportation options and
8 their economy and their American dream will be
9 absolutely abolished and decimated. Unless you are
10 one of the few, the chosen few, that will benefit in
11 terms of being a developer or something with this
12 smart growth developer, pretty much anything that you
13 do for a living will be decimated.

14 See, the basic tenet is that an impoverished serf
15 will go along with things that an abundant free
16 citizen simply will not. It's as old as the hills.
17 As a matter of fact, this oppression -- and make no
18 mistake; I'm not comfortable associating that word
19 with our country -- but if it looks like a duck and
20 walks like a duck and quacks and it's got all the
21 earmarks of a duck, I guess it's a duck. And this is
22 has got al-l-l-l-l-l-l-l-l-l-l of the earmarks of
23 oppression. Ain't nothing unique about it. The only
24 thing new is the excuse, the trigger for this whole
25 Hegelian dialectic and the high-tech component of it.

1 Speaking to the CEQA part of this. The growth
2 rate postulates are flawed. Your job projection
3 postulates are flawed. The whole methodology is
4 flawed. The Plan is fundamentally opposed to our
5 Constitution, namely the Fifth Amendment; therefore,
6 it is flawed. You're taking the liberty, literally,
7 of thinking it is within your authority to impose this
8 Plan is flawed. Your claims that this Plan will
9 create jobs to maintain and sustain a prosperous and
10 equitable economy is flawed. In fact, it is a
11 complete lie.

12 This will devastate our economy; not hurt it, ruin
13 it for all but the few stakeholders and public/private
14 partners. In keeping with the very definition of
15 fascism, government will pick winners and losers in
16 what was a free market landscape, all but abolishing
17 the free market and property rights.

18 The decline in California, the numbers that we
19 show that we all read about in desirable California,
20 mirror our adherence to this sustainable policy as
21 insidiously implemented in the American Planning
22 Association's Growing Smart, a Legislative Guidebook,
23 Model Statutes for the Management of Change. I used
24 to like that word.

25 It would be impossible for MTC ABAG's EIR project

1 team to understand, review and reconcile this amount
2 of public input between July 11th and July 13th. The
3 short predetermined timeframe speaks to the lack of
4 genuine intention to conduct a bona fide legal, valid
5 EIR, even though this step's legitimacy is required
6 for One Bay Area's legality.

7 The empowerment of, and huge appropriation of
8 money being granted to unelected commissions and
9 associations mirrors a Soviet model of governance as
10 does the whole concept of One Bay Area, which is
11 illegal and unacceptable in these United States, as it
12 employs a model of Soviet governance. And we live in
13 the United States of America.

14 Now, the Constitution provides for our dissent
15 under exactly these circumstances, and we fully intend
16 to exercise it. And if you think you have taken the
17 measure of our resolve, as you will soon see, you have
18 not. We are going to see to it that our local public
19 officials are tattooed with this treasonous decision
20 to go along with this One Bay Area Plan, and we're
21 going to see to it that they have all kinds of
22 opportunity to explain it to their constituents. They
23 can use that same rhetoric and warm and fuzzy words
24 that you guys have been employing in these One Bay
25 Area meetings and see how it plays with their

1 constituents. I don't think it's going to play that
2 good.

3 So in closing the only thing I would say, and I
4 try to find a bright light in this whole deal, it has
5 been said that all bad things that happen and all bad
6 situations and all bad people are both our teacher and
7 a lesson to us and an opportunity. And the second
8 half of 2012 is going to represent a culmination of
9 both of those things. And if we get it right, we're
10 going to find grace in this horrific situation, and
11 we're going to pull together and remember what the
12 word community really means, and not community with an
13 "ism" at the end of it. A community where we are
14 accountable to each other and not to an overreaching
15 government.

16 MS. BUCHEN: I am Wendy Buchen, and I live in
17 San Rafael. I used to live in Belvedere. I've lived
18 in Marin County since 1959.

19 I've seen several of these sort of regional
20 governments going on. We really were pushing for
21 regional government in 1973, but I guess that didn't
22 happen.

23 I would like to point out, first of all, that the
24 members of ABAG are all elected. They are not
25 appointed. They are elected.

1 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Not by us. Not by us.

2 MS. NGUYEN: Please. We ask that you do not
3 have cross-dialogue so we can properly record her
4 comments.

5 MS. BUCHEN: You elect your city or county
6 government. Each city has a representative, and that
7 is an elected member of the city council or town
8 council or whatever you have. You also have the
9 counties -- I think they have more than one
10 representative. They are all representing the county
11 so that they are elected people. And they are elected
12 people. And you voted indirectly -- you vote for
13 people that are serving on ABAG as among their civic
14 duties.

15 I'd like to point out, gas and air pollution is
16 really -- a good deal of it is major health. The
17 children are getting asthma much more than they used
18 to. That's a new thing. Please try and make the air
19 unpolluted. And that is a regional thing.

20 The next thing is -- oh, the woman who said the
21 slumlords are making millions. I am involved in one
22 of these low-cost housing buildings, and we have to
23 fundraise to get that place going. We can't keep it
24 up without trying to raise money from the community to
25 keep it going. That is a total loss. It's hard to

1 manage. And actually one of the problems is that we
2 have so few people in our housing as opposed to some
3 of the larger houses -- developments -- apartments and
4 stuff. This meant it's much cheaper to keep a big
5 place up because you just have -- one yard will take
6 care of everybody. We have one yard taking care of 15
7 people. It is all this dealing in quantities.

8 My question of ABAG after the end of this is that
9 I notice that all of your red stuff in San Francisco
10 was along the Bay. And I wondered if the BCDC is
11 going to have anything to say about -- they have
12 developments there.

13 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment?

14 MR. WILHELM: Good afternoon. My name is Don
15 Wilhelm. I'm a resident of Novato and a past chair of
16 the Citizens Oversight Committee for the
17 Transportation Authority in Marin. I've been involved
18 in citizen involvement in transportation issues
19 throughout the county.

20 Today I'd like to express my concern about the
21 CEQA streamlining that was included in SB 375. Why
22 did the authors of that legislation find it necessary
23 to consider destroying something that has been very
24 effective in controlling the development and the
25 impacts within the state through the CEQA operation?

1 It looks like that the staff is having some
2 difficulty in handling the CEQA streamlining issue.
3 The Transit Priority Project, TPP, to my knowledge is
4 just another new description of the need to change
5 CEQA. In their presentation today, you have a
6 three-line issue describing the TPP. Now there has to
7 be more detail on what a TPP is, and that information
8 should be made fully available to the public.

9 In the same PowerPoint presentation, you have the
10 statement, "If the proposed residential or mixed use
11 project is consistent with the land use designation,
12 the density, the intensity and policies of Plan Bay
13 Area, if they have that, they may be eligible for
14 complete exemption of CEQA."

15 Now each of those statements, land use
16 designation, density, intensity and policies and Plan
17 have to also be defined very thoroughly so that one
18 would know what decisions were being made in providing
19 some exemptions. I think it would be very important
20 in your alternatives to present the alternative that
21 would result in a CEQA streamlining, but also
22 alongside of that, have an analysis of what the
23 impacts would be if there were the current CEQA
24 regulations. So in that way, one could make a
25 judgment as to what the impacts are of CEQA

1 streamlining.

2 If you don't want to do the comparison, then we
3 won't know until years down the road when some of
4 these projects keep coming through and the developers
5 are claiming exemptions. And it's in accordance with
6 the laws. There would be no means to control what you
7 end up with. And of course we know that the
8 developers will be striving for maximum density,
9 minimum cost and minimum remedies.

10 So again, I would recommend that you do a
11 comparison in each of your alternatives with CEQA
12 streamlining and without CEQA streamlining. Thank
13 you.

14 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment.

15 MS. SPAKE: Hello. My name is Ann Spake. My
16 concerns have to do with the fact that supposedly in
17 our county-wide plan, we're concerned with the 3Es,
18 the environment, the economy and equity. And what I
19 see in this Plan that concerns me greatly is the fact
20 that the economic interests, namely the Building
21 Industry Association and such, have overridden equity
22 and environmental concerns.

23 This is very clear in their opinion article
24 bragging about having spent years of advocacy to try
25 to eliminate environmental considerations, streamline

1 CEQA and even get the Bay Area Management District to
2 disregard the overwhelming knowledge that exists about
3 the health impacts building in close proximity to
4 major roads and freeways.

5 This is unconscionable. This is not sustainable.
6 If you want to develop a plan -- and I do believe in
7 planning -- we need to understand that change is
8 inevitable, growth is optional, and we have to stop
9 making plans that put vulnerable people in vulnerable
10 places.

11 I understand there was a CARE study that showed
12 that approximately 20 percent -- between 20 and 25
13 percent, I think -- of the PDAs in five of the
14 counties were in areas where the air impacts were
15 absolutely adverse for any sensitive receptors, namely
16 children, pregnant women, seniors and so forth. They
17 recommended strongly on an equity basis that it would
18 be environmental injustice to be placing residential
19 development in such locations.

20 In my particular case, I live in Tam Valley.
21 We're looking forward to sea level rise there, and we
22 also happen to have a transit center. So somehow
23 you're planning for basically TPP and PDA in an area
24 that's going to be inundated and is too close to two
25 major freeways for consideration of the health

1 impacts.

2 These health impacts also increase health
3 disparity and medical costs. So I would ask you to in
4 your EIR to not streamline CEQA because that is the
5 very guarantee that we have that we will be able to
6 live sustainably in the environment and without
7 adverse health impacts.

8 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment.

9 MS. KIRSEH: My name is Susan Kirseh. I'm
10 from Mill Valley, California. I'd like to go on
11 record as just recommending that the project
12 consideration go for a No Project, the first option in
13 this.

14 And I'd like to say a part of that is based on the
15 fact that going back to the very first meeting of One
16 Bay Area that I went to over a year ago, we were
17 looking at some of the assumptions that this whole
18 project is based on.

19 One of the key assumptions is that we're going to
20 be facing incredible growth, job growth in this
21 country. But today, we have in today's Marin's IJ,
22 today's paper saying that the Census found that Marin
23 lost more than 10,000 jobs in the downturn that has
24 just happened in this recent period.

25 So what we're faced with is looking at One Bay

1 Area attempting to do a 28-year plan. So the whole
2 timeframe of it seems inappropriate.

3 Further, the idea that this state would be
4 allocating -- on page 30 it says \$277 billion dollars
5 to go towards transportation planning. When we're
6 facing so many issues around health care and
7 education, or we know what's happening in the housing
8 market, to have so much money being delegated to this
9 project from legislation that can't even balance our
10 own state budget on a year-to-year basis seems like
11 we're moving in a really poor direction.

12 And it's not that planning isn't a good thing. I
13 think everyone would agree we need planning. But this
14 Plan is so off base.

15 Going back to what you referred to (INAUDIBLE)
16 2007, that we need to go back to revisit what's
17 happening in One Bay Area for the cost, the timeframe.
18 These meetings -- I've been to several of them --
19 there's rarely not distrust with what's going on, and
20 with some understanding of why there's mistrust for a
21 feeling of misinformation coming our way.

22 Just a couple of final points. I would agree that
23 we should keep CEQA strong. There should not be
24 streamlining for CEQA in ways that our environment is
25 actually undermined.

1 I'd further like to support the references to Bob
2 Silvestri's article and encourage people to go to The
3 Patch to see some of the alternatives and bigger,
4 broader thinking around planning for housing and
5 transportation than what we're getting from One Bay
6 Area.

7 And finally, another one of the speakers had
8 talked about how you do not intend to look at the
9 impacts on public service. And again, I would like to
10 say that by having -- and again, the numbers in this
11 document vary, but it's from 11.1 billion to the 277
12 billion -- to say that that much money going for this
13 kind of project will not have impact on public service
14 seems to be an oversight that needs to be
15 reconsidered. Thank you.

16 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment.

17 MS. RANDOLPH: Hi. My name is Angelika
18 Randolph. And I actually feel sorry for all of you
19 for having to put up with us. However, we have been
20 sold these bags of tricks before, and we're not
21 putting up with it any longer. So that's just the
22 beginning of what you're to hear today.

23 I'd like to refer especially to your claiming to
24 reduce greenhouse gases. To that, I need to say that
25 some of our local organizations have put all our money

1 that was supposed to go for roads, et cetera, into
2 this so-called smart train. We all thought we were
3 going to get a European clean speedy train, and what
4 we got is a diesel stinker.

5 And we know from the East Bay -- we know how many
6 of the children are affected with this horrible diesel
7 train going through there. So they are very weary of
8 these projects.

9 And also with affordable housing. We've tried
10 that. We have it here in Marin. We have it all over.
11 And what do we get? Look at the Canal. High density
12 there. We have crime. We have illegals living there.
13 It's a perfect haven. All these high-density
14 communities are all fantastic for -- in one apartment
15 -- and I speak from experience. Six or eight families
16 live in one apartment. They're all illegal.

17 And then beware if they ever hit you. They drive
18 undocumented, have no insurance. One of them broke my
19 neck -- (Indicating) -- driving with no insurance.
20 Some darn illegal. And if I did not have insurance on
21 my insurance for uninsured or for someone driving
22 without insurance, I would have lost my home and
23 everything because I was in a wheelchair. I had to
24 learn to walk again. My arm was paralyzed, et cetera.

25 I am saying no more of these housings here in

1 Marin. These low-income housings don't work. Forget
2 it about saying transportation to these places. We
3 don't have any normal transportation here. We have
4 maybe one or two clean buses. The rest of them are
5 all those stinkers. So we don't even have a European
6 system.

7 Let's first concentrate on getting the jobs and
8 then we get the transportation. We're no longer
9 giving money, \$8 million dollars of our local money
10 that was supposed to go to fix our roads to SMART or
11 any of those nonsense organizations. Thank you.

12 MS. OKADA: Good afternoon. My name is Nancy
13 Okada. I live in the Ross Valley. I want to thank
14 you for coming here and taking public comment, and I
15 hope that you listen and consider public comment
16 because a lot of us feel the same way here in Marin.

17 We have a beautiful place. We have some
18 inappropriate development in spots, but it seems that
19 what the plan is for Plan Bay Area -- and I know that
20 you plan to designate, or Marin's already been
21 designated urban -- is to basically just pack 'em in.

22 I would like to go on record in favor of the No
23 Project. As a friend of mine said, if you come to a
24 public hearing and you don't speak, you are not there.
25 I'd like you to just really consider the amount of

1 money that's being spent to do this dog and pony show
2 that you've taken around the Bay Area. I've gone to a
3 couple of other events of yours.

4 There are child care centers for poor women that
5 are being closed in this county. There are people who
6 are on GSA who are having their benefits cut. There
7 are people who are homeless living in the Canal area
8 and living in the Woodlands area in their cars and
9 probably in other places. There are people who are
10 surfing on couches. There are really a lot of things
11 that are going on where the money that's being spent
12 to rent this room and to provide your per diem or
13 whatever you're getting, salaries, could really better
14 be spent on social services for our population.

15 If you're going to be packing more people in, I'd
16 like to know what kind of jobs we're going to be
17 getting in San Rafael. It seems that more and more we
18 see more and more vacancies of commercial buildings.
19 And these businesses can't make money so they've got
20 to go out. So that means we lose important services
21 for our population.

22 People are renting rooms in their houses just so
23 they can hold on to their houses. There's
24 foreclosures that are not being talked about all over
25 this county, and yet, we still have huge salaries for

1 some of our wonderful administrative personnel in our
2 various schools and civic enterprises.

3 So I would just like to say that we really need to
4 learn in the entire Bay Area to live within our
5 environmental footprint, and that means that we need
6 to consider that we can only take so much. And for
7 your Plan, it would be better to scrap it at this
8 point and then concentrate on really helping the
9 people at the bottom level who really are the ones who
10 need the help. Thank you.

11 MS. LINDQUIST: Good afternoon. My name is
12 Helen Lindquist. I am a resident of Tiburon.

13 I want to look at the basis for all this planning
14 and scheming. You may remember if you are up with the
15 scientific or political scene that back in 2006,
16 Schwarzenegger brought in the Global Warming Solutions
17 Act. Everyone was being scared that the globe was
18 warming up and we have to do all these things to cut
19 back the greenhouse gas emissions so that the globe
20 doesn't overheat. And then not much later on came SB
21 375, and this is the transportation one that's all
22 this one big plan's coming on.

23 How many of you know -- oh, I'm not allowed to ask
24 you questions, but I'll pose it as a question -- how
25 many of you know the basis for all this? All this is

1 based on the IPCC at the United Nations, the
2 International Panel on Climate Change.

3 They have been putting out reports every three or
4 four years. They have utilized gray literature.
5 Scientists who have contributed articles -- the
6 overseeing committee writes the summary for the report
7 before checking back with the scientists that that's
8 what they really said.

9 There's been Climategate, where a lot of these
10 scientists were exposed as fudging their data, making
11 out that the temperature was going whoop like this
12 (indicating) and in fact it's not. There has been no
13 global warming, no temperature change, since, what, 10
14 years now. More. 12. And all this is based on this
15 greenhouse gas emissions.

16 How many of you know what greenhouse gases are
17 that is meant to be causing this trend, this big
18 crisis? Anthropogenic global warming. Greenhouse
19 gases -- you'll never guess what 95 percent of
20 greenhouse gases are. Have a guess. Water vapor.
21 Right.

22 Carbon dioxide, the bogey gas, is colorless,
23 odorless, and less than five percent, is meant to
24 control the whole temperature of the world. Bunco.
25 And this has scared us into all this planning and

1 scheming and basing on this. Run clean energy. Got
2 to cut back greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation.
3 One Bay Area. Greenhouse gas emissions. It's bogus.

4 If you follow the true scientists -- and there
5 aren't many of them out there. I heard Lord
6 Monckton's name mentioned. There's CFact. There's
7 Morano. There's lots of people to follow on with
8 that. You'll find that all of this is hype.

9 It all comes from the United Nations. And if you
10 were attuned to the politics a while back, Rio. They
11 had their big Rio + 20 convention in Rio again. They
12 changed their tune. It's no longer global warming or
13 climate change. Climate change is all the time, by
14 the way, in case you haven't known about ice ages and
15 things in the past.

16 This new convention was a change to sustainable
17 development. What do we got filtering down to a local
18 level already? Sustainable development. They're
19 going to pack us in around transportation corridors.

20 Let's get rid of AB 32. Let's repeal SB 375.
21 Dump the lot. It's all based on false science.

22 MS. DENNIS: Good afternoon. My name is Nona
23 Dennis. I represent Marin Conservation League, not to
24 present a position on the sustainable communities
25 strategy, but rather to focus on the content and the

1 scope of the EIR. I believe that's the purpose of the
2 meeting this afternoon.

3 So I've gone through the topics that you've listed
4 at the beginning with transportation and would like to
5 ask you to either address some questions or to add
6 some points or to consider where we think emphasis
7 should be placed in the EIR.

8 The first one I think I would follow on a previous
9 speaker's comment which is that probably one of our
10 biggest concerns is the streamlining of CEQA to be
11 considered as incentive to prepare plans.

12 We've already heard from Don Wilhelm what our
13 concerns are around streamlining CEQA. I have engaged
14 in CEQA practice as a professional as well as a public
15 interest person since 1971 since CEQA actually began.
16 So I've watched it evolve, and I'm particularly
17 concerned -- we are concerned that it will be
18 weakened.

19 We would like you to clarify since we've only seen
20 kind of telegraphic information as to how CEQA would
21 be eliminated or streamlined, what particular facets
22 of CEQA would be removed or weakened in streamlining?
23 Would it be cumulative impacts? Would it be
24 conformance with a local General Plan? What
25 specifically do you mean by levels of streamlining

1 CEQA? We're very concerned about that.

2 Beginning with the actual topics, the first one is
3 transportation. The first point, your first bullet
4 point is just baffling to me and I don't know how
5 you're going to do it, "decrease in the average number
6 of jobs within 15, 30, or 45 minutes from home by auto
7 or transit." I have no idea how you're going to do
8 this at a programmatic level. This seems to relate to
9 very specific job centers and so forth. So you're
10 going to need to explain how you -- it's really a
11 demographic study here as much as the transportation.
12 So how are you going to do this?

13 The second point is that while you mentioned level
14 of service only at Level F, we feel that if anything
15 is not to be taken out of the CEQA analysis of a
16 particular project, it is balancing vehicle miles
17 traveled with level of service. We're concerned about
18 the so-called paradox of densification, which is
19 something that occurs when you're trying to achieve
20 long-term goals through reduced vehicle miles
21 traveled, but in fact you may end up with a dense,
22 poor level of service within a concentrated area. So
23 please take that off.

24 In looking at air quality, which is next on your
25 list, I think that we would benefit from some kind of

1 a comparison showing how much of greenhouse gas you
2 could reduce by focusing on auto efficiency, on
3 low-carbon fuels, and so forth, in comparison to.
4 This approach, which is to shift to land use, which is
5 a very slow-moving kind of boat, shift to land use.

6 So please give us a comparison. How effective --
7 what are the benefits of the two approaches, the fuel
8 efficiency approach versus the land use approach.

9 The second one, let's see. Well, we want you to
10 focus under, in the topic of air quality, the question
11 of health risks due to increased particulates, TACs --
12 toxic air emissions from mobile sources within transit
13 corridors -- we want you to particularly emphasize
14 issues that may come up with placing denser housing in
15 close proximity to transit corridors. How are you
16 going to mitigate that problem? You're trying to
17 achieve both? Denser housing? Close to transit
18 corridors? How are you going to solve that conflict,
19 air quality problem?

20 Under land use and physical development, this is a
21 partial list. We'll probably submit something in
22 writing. We would like you to compare -- consider the
23 reuse of existing housing stock, the recycling of
24 existing housing stock compared to new construction in
25 order to accommodate growth.

1 Under energy, we'd like you to analyze not just
2 the increase in nonrenewables, but rather the increase
3 in energy consumption overall, which may come along
4 with the growth. That is to say, that even renewable
5 resources of energy are not benign. There are impacts
6 associated with wind and solar and so forth. And we
7 think that those -- it's those increases in energy
8 overall that needs to be considered.

9 Under greenhouse gas emissions, climate change,
10 the second point is vulnerability of land uses and
11 transportation to sea level rise. We'd like you to
12 look at the impacts of various approaches to adapting
13 the sea level rise which would have to be followed in
14 order to accommodate any new growth or densification
15 in areas that are vulnerable to sea level rise. Like
16 Tam Valley, for example. Areas along the shore. In
17 many instances in Marin County. So what are the
18 impacts of those adaptive methods? Go one step
19 further if you're determined to densify in those
20 areas. They're vulnerable.

21 Under noise, we'd like you to consider not only
22 construction noise but post-construction noise. That
23 is, if you are going to be siting -- if the idea is to
24 site housing in close proximity to transportation
25 corridors, what are the mitigations for noise from

1 transportation? They're considerable, the impacts
2 are.

3 Under geology and seismicity, we'd like you to
4 consider the impacts of adding any housing or
5 development in areas on fill lands. We have many,
6 many communities in Marin County along the shore that
7 are already built on old Bay mud fill drains. To
8 densify will perhaps raise some geologic problems.

9 We'll skip biology for the moment. We hope you're
10 planning to avoid wetlands and stream corridors,
11 habitats in Marin County. As you well know, we have
12 many, many areas that are simply not going to be even
13 considered for future development.

14 Water resources. Again, tie this back -- the
15 placement of structures within 100-year flood hazard
16 areas; tie this back to the cross reference to sea
17 level rise.

18 Visual resources. That really has to do with
19 community character. Culture. I won't go into that.

20 Under water supply, we certainly want you to look
21 very, very closely at Marin County at our finite water
22 supply. We can conserve up to a point, but you can't
23 conserve nothing. You can't conserve no water.

24 Finally, under No Expected Impacts of Regional
25 Importance, we do not want you to dismiss hazardous

1 materials. The fact that you are actually considering
2 the possible development areas at sea level rise will
3 in fact expose critical infrastructure that is capable
4 of emitting hazardous materials. So do not eliminate
5 that from a programmatic EIR. There are too many
6 areas that do have hazardous materials within the
7 reach of sea level rise.

8 And public services, I think that's already been
9 pointed out that that's an area that should not be
10 eliminated simply because it does not seem to have
11 regional importance.

12 So with that, we will probably submit perhaps more
13 detailed comments. But I really wanted to focus on
14 what you're here for today, to hear about the scope of
15 the EIR. Thank you.

16 MS. DaSILVA JAIN: Hello. My name is
17 Katherine DaSilva Jain, and I just want to say thank
18 you very much to the people who have been very
19 explicit and clear to those of you sitting there
20 representing ABAG. I thank you for your patience.

21 I want to reiterate the critical nature of CEQA
22 and that we certainly may not do any streamlining
23 which is detrimental to the environment. It's
24 ridiculous to be supporting bills which are to reduce
25 greenhouse gases and then to eliminate one of the

1 biggest protections to avoiding greenhouse gases.

2 I also want to emphasize as well the Marin County
3 Plan. The overall plan is that we must not have
4 development when it will require desalination of
5 water. We talked very little about water, but it's a
6 very finite resource. It's part of the Marin County
7 Plan, and please, that has to be observed. Thank you
8 very much.

9 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Are there any other
10 comments?

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Five percent of
12 America is developed. Have you flown lately?

13 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you everybody for your
14 comments. The meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

15 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: CEQA legally provides
16 for your responding. You guys aren't adhering to the
17 law.

18 ---oOo---

19

20

21

22

23

24

25