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

1. Bicycles   2) Bikes   3) Bicycles (trikes, too!)
Access - infrastructure - education - repairs - children - commuters - recreation

6 MTC needs to address transportation needs of Vallejo with respect to the heavy burden of tolls on commuters and the lack of affordable, dependable time-sensitive offerings. The failure of MTC to do so has contributed to the isolation of Vallejo and the downward trend of middle-priced housing, causing a never-ending downward spiral.

7 There is a jobs-housing imbalance in the San Francisco Bay Area. It has been said that the Silicon Valley/South Bay has more jobs than housing; however, Solano County/North Bay has more housing than jobs. For Solano County, that means more residents traveling out-of-county to either Bay Area or Sacramento for high-paying jobs. Solano County has a lot of unused or underdeveloped business/commercial parks or areas that should satisfy this perceived problem.

8 Without improvement to our schools and transportation, Vallejo will always struggle. There is concern that we'll be forced to accept more housing without an increase in jobs because of transportation and schools issues, and the issues that ABAG 2040 - pollution, long commutes - will be exacerbated.

The Big Cities alternative ignores the issues Vallejo faces.
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PROCEEDINGS

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

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

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

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

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

The EI -- the EIR is organized into four key
areas. The first one addresses the introduction and executive summary, and so that gives you a context for the document and summarizes both the process and the conclusions of the document.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So the EIR focuses on things like forecasted
change in population, forecasted change in the number of households and also in the number of jobs.

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

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

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

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

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

The Draft EIR is a programmatic document, which means that it does not analyze individual site conditions or individual projects, but rather it looks at the whole
of the plan and the overall collective impact.

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

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

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

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

We identify the applicable thresholds that are used for identifying impacts. We describe the method of analysis that's being used, and then for each impact threshold or criterion, there's an assessment of the potential for impact, and that assessment is categorized by levels.
So, for example, you'll see language like "less than significant impact" or "potentially significant impact" or "significant impact."

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

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

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

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

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

So that is a comparative assessment of the differences in environmental impact for a number of
identified alternatives as compared to the impacts that
would occur as a result of implementing the project,
which in this case is implementation of the plan.

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

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

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

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

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

For this EIR, that alternative was determined
1 to be alternative three or the big cities alternative.
2 The land use modeling assumptions and the
3 transportation investments for the big cities alternative
4 are identified in chapter three of the EIR and
5 comparatively this alternative has the most compact
6 growth pattern, and that's one of the big reasons behind
7 that conclusion.
8 When considering the plan for adoption,
9 however, the Commission and the ABAG Executive Board can
10 consider all of this information.
11 They have to consider the alternatives
12 analysis, but they aren't precluded from adopting the
13 plan if they determine that the plan is preferable when
14 they balance all the relevant factors.
15 As we've mentioned, the comment period closes
16 on June 1st, and at that time we'll consider all of the
17 comments we've received on the Draft EIR and we'll
18 provide responses to them.
19 We'll also identify recommended changes in the
20 Draft EIR, and that information will all be packaged into
21 one separate document which, together with the Draft EIR,
22 will constitute the Final EIR.
23 And the Commission and ABAG Executive Board has
24 to certify that document before they can move forward
25 with adoption of the plan. Right now, we're working
towards adoption hearings in July.
So this is my final slide just to reiterate how you can comment on the Draft EIR. First of all, the document is available online.
You can also contact the MTC staff to make other arrangements to get access to the document. I noticed several of you have the stick drive that has the EIR on it, so that's another good way.
We encourage you to read it. The comment period is a full forty-five days. There's several ways you can submit comments. You can submit them orally like we're doing at this meeting. You can also submit written comments like you're doing with -- some of you I think are writing out comments that you can submit to staff. You don't have to give them verbally.
You could submit written comments through the US mail during the comment period. You can fax them in or you can e-mail them in. So all of those methods are acceptable.
And that concludes my overview on the EIR, and I think Ursula's going to help me monitor. I'm happy to answer questions, but I think it might be better given the experience on the prior one if we just go straight into comments.

MS. VOGLER: Only clarifying questions.
MS. TSCHUDIN: Okay.

MS. VOGLER: Yeah.

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

MS. TSCHUDIN: That's correct.

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TSCHUDIN: You bet.

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

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

MS. TSCHUDIN: There's a definition in State law. It has to do with density and proximity to a
certain quality of transit, and it's actually defined in
the code.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's State law?

MS. TSCHUDIN: Yes.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. TSCHUDIN: Yes, ma'am.

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

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

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

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

So near neighbors, and also some of the
emphasis in terms of the transportation investments, it
was less on highways and much more oriented towards
transit services and trying to increase services, expand
services that exist today. Much of the rail systems in this example are ones with less frequency. So it was a little different approach than looking at a more focused growth pattern and more transit may be more of an emphasis.

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

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

What's there for the North Bay?

MR. NOELTING: Well, there would be --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What cities?

MR. NOELTING: Yeah. I mean, it would be -- it would be less growth forecasted in the North Bay than it would be in the other alternatives. So there are four alternatives. There's a variation on each of those. The big cities would have certainly more of a focus on what would be, you know, the -- the core -- I don't know how you would want to define the core, but often people define it as looking from Oakland to maybe
Richmond down to San Francisco to San Jose.

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

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

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

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

MS. VOGLER: Okay. Clarifying question.

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

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

MS. VOGLER: Yes, sir.

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. VOGLER: Okay. Yes.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Clarifying question.

When you use the phrase that you are going to "streamline the process for business growth," does that mean you're removing -- who's the we that gets approval on the growth, and is that removing Vallejo's protections on authorizing projects in our own city?

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Mm-hmm.

MS. TSCHUDIN: -- statutes or laws that are behind this effort that takes away control for local decision-making from local governments.
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.


AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I have a question.

There are many disadvantaged communities in the Bay Area. Will an environmental justice analysis be required or will it be that all about during this process?

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Was Vallejo on there?

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is that available now?

MR. NOELTING: Yes. It's one of the supplemental reports. I can help plug into one of the computers and we can look at it if necessary.
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. VOGLER: Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

When I drive to see my sister and daughter in Sacramento, it takes me an hour and fifteen minutes. Marin doesn't want BART. This area wants BART. Why isn't BART here?

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Transportation question.

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

MR. NOELTING: You know, in terms of the plan,
we look at other options. That's certainly something we can keep looking into. I think there's been some recent studies looking at various corridors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. HARDY: That's me.

MS. VOGLER: Okay.
MS. HARDY: I am not from Vallejo and I --

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some water districts are looking at groundwater as their source, but we can already see we've used up a lot of our groundwater and they're continuing to frack --
do fracking in the State of California.

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

MS. VOGLER: Okay. Thank you very much.

The next commenter I have is Brittany Gray.

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

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

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

We're concerned that the population and job
growth projections included in the Plan Bay Area would
create serious negative environmental impacts on the
Tuolumne and other rivers as well as the Sacramento/San
Joaquin Bay Delta area.

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

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

This level of growth is not sustainable, and -- and the Delta Reform Act of 20009 establishes state policy that achieving water supply reliability and restoring the Delta ecosystem must be applied co-equally in these kinds of plans.

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

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

A 2010 flow criteria report by the State Water
Resources Control Board determined that sixty percent of
the San Joaquin River's unimpaired flow would be
necessary to fully protect the fish that live there.

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

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

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

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

Most water agencies have adopted drought plans
that are aimed at managing a three- to five-year drought,
and the SF-PUC's drought plan addresses an eight and a
half year drought, but the EIR appears to focus on water
quality impacts from one single dry year. So that's kind
of an area of weakness there.
Oh, and mitigation measures. The primary mitigation measure that's included in the EIR suggests that water agencies must conserve more water and/or identify new sources of water. Those are our mitigation plans to accommodate these millions of more people.

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

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

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

So we ask -- in conclusion, we ask that the EIR
include an alternative plan that dramatically reduces the amount of projected jobs growth to see what the impacts of that might be and also to provide more mitigation measures and alternatives for increasing our water supplies.

MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

Okay. I have no more cards.

Does anyone else like to comment?

VICE-MAYOR McCONNELL: I would.

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

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

MS. VOGLER: Can you state your name?

VICE-MAYOR McCONNELL: I'm Robert McConnell.

MS. VOGLER: Okay.

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

Does your Environmental Impact Report address the cost to the local jurisdictions of implementing alternate water sources such as reclaimed water and the use of purple pipes throughout the region? If not, I think it needs to do so.
MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

Okay. One more card. Cia Lynn.

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

MS. VOGLER: Cia Lynn.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But Cousteau said some something really
profound. He said Californians are confused about water
because you all have an ocean, right?

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

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

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

We had a drought. We had the gas and oil
crisis. We had a housing crisis in the '70s. He
comes -- and not one single governor from then,
Republican or Democrat or Independent or Green or Peace
and Freedom or vegetable and mineral or whatever, not one
of the governors has been able to cross party lines and
really get our elected officials from the bottom all the
way to the top to talk about the region which I would
suggest, given -- given the situation that we saw after the storms stopped, we had -- we had all over -- I mean, my -- my kids live in Marin.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. LYNN: Okay. My sister's -- in fact,
she's actually first or second African women to become a
civil engineer in the United States. She knew about
this. I did not even know about this.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

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

MS. HARDY: I just to add this.
MS. VOGLER: Okay. Can you state your name again?

MS. HARDY: Teresa Hardy.

We both talked about water issues with the increased --

MS. VOGLER: Yes.

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

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

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

MS. VOGLER: Thank you.

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

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

I want to thank you on behalf of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Thank you so much for coming. We appreciate it, and thank you.
Ending at 7:50 PM.

(The record was concluded at 7:50 PM)
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