

Summary of Responses and Revisions from Public Comment Letters

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
128	Hunter, Steven	Thank you for your comment. With regards to your comment that the Plan adds people to the region, it is not an accurate portrayal of the planning effort. The Draft Plan merely identifies how we can accommodate future growth that is forecasted to occur. With regards to traffic congestion, it should be noted that the Draft Plan actually exceeds the congestion reduction target set by MTC/ABAG.	No action recommended.
129	Phillips, Wayne	Thank you for your comment. Staff concurs with the comment author that increased adoption of scooters and other lightweight vehicles can be beneficial to the region.	No action recommended.
130	Phillips, Wayne	Thank you for your comment. Staff concurs with the comment author that increased adoption of scooters and other lightweight vehicles can be beneficial to the region.	No action recommended.
131	Phillips, Wayne	Thank you for your comment. Staff concurs with the comment author that increased adoption of scooters and other lightweight vehicles can be beneficial to the region.	No action recommended.
132	Warkentin, Vivian	Thank you for your comment. The boards of MTC and ABAG are made up of elected officials who were appointed to represent their cities and counties on the regional level.	No action recommended.
133	Mayben, Bill	Thank you for your comment. In the context of the EIR, MTC and ABAG explored a more decentralized scenario known as Main Streets. What the analysis demonstrated was that a decentralization of jobs does not necessarily yield better environmental outcomes, as the author suggested. For additional comments, refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
134	Caffrey, Cathleen	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Plan invests in new and better buses as part of fleet replacement processes over the coming years. The Draft Plan also boosts bus service on a number of operators to improve conditions for riders.	No action recommended.
135	Building Industry Association of the Bay Area	Thank you for your comments. With regards to home ownership, MTC and ABAG are recommending solutions that benefit both those who rent and those who own. The appropriate forum for discussing additional targets, given that targets were	Add language related to bringing down the cost of housing construction to housing Action Plan. Add legal disclaimer to all Statutorily-Required Maps

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>approved in 2015 by MTC and ABAG, would be at the start of the next Plan cycle. Similarly, RHNA methodology concerns would best be handled at that time.</p> <p>With regards to multifamily housing, the Plan does not specifically seek to limit single-family housing but rather make it easier to build multi-family housing. Multi-family housing, especially when built in proximity to public transit, has many important benefits that support Plan goals, including the potential to lower GHG emissions and reduce auto mode share.</p> <p>Staff will review your suggestion for additional analysis on subsidies associated with Plan Bay Area 2040. Staff will review your proposal to add language relating to cost of construction and will include the disclaimer on statutorily-required Plan maps.</p> <p>With regards to your comments on the Action Plan, we will make some edits to resolve some of your concerns.</p>	<p>similar to what is in Plan Doc ("Map is for general information...").</p> <p>Replace "zoning" with "planned" on page 72.</p> <p>Refine language with regards to industrial lands in Action Plan.</p>
136	North Bay Leadership Council	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>With regards to home ownership, MTC and ABAG have traditionally remained neutral on this topic, trying to find solutions that benefit both those who rent and those who own. The appropriate forum for discussing additional targets, given that targets were approved in 2015 by MTC and ABAG, would be at the start of the next Plan cycle. Similarly, RHNA methodology concerns would best be handled at that time.</p> <p>With regards to multifamily housing, the Plan does not specifically seek to limit single-family housing but rather make it easier to build multi-family housing. Multi-family housing, especially when built in proximity to public transit, has many important benefits that support Plan goals, including the potential to lower GHG emissions and reduce auto mode share.</p> <p>Staff will review your suggestion for additional analysis on subsidies associated with Plan Bay Area 2040. Staff will review your proposal to add language relating to cost of construction and will include the</p>	<p>Add language related to bringing down the cost of housing construction to housing Action Plan.</p> <p>Add legal disclaimer to all Statutorily-Required Maps similar to what is in Plan Doc ("Map is for general information...").</p> <p>Replace "zoning" with "planned" on page 72.</p> <p>Refine language with regards to industrial lands in Action Plan.</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>disclaimer on statutorily-required Plan maps.</p> <p>With regards to your comments on the Action Plan, we will make some edits to resolve some of your concerns.</p>	
137	Brennan, Sabrina	Thank you for your comment; please refer to the EIR for a response given that your comment focused primarily on the environmental analysis.	No action recommended.
138	Jacobs, Ethan	Thank you for your comment. Funding to further study a west span bike path on the Bay Bridge is included in the Plan. The project was identified as low-performing through the project performance assessment due to a low benefit-cost ratio, but the decision to not include project construction in the Plan will be considered again as part of the next planning cycle in 2021.	No action recommended.
139	Grimes, Peta	Thank you for your comment. The Plan does assume continued growth in telecommuting over time; however, many jobs will continue to require "face time" with coworkers. Similarly, the expectation of continued service sector job growth where in-person interaction is essential means that telecommuting will remain a small but important component of commuting.	No action recommended.
140	6 Wins for Social Equity Network, NPH, & Greenbelt Alliance	MTC and ABAG staff have met directly with the comment author since this letter was submitted to discuss concerns and proposed revisions.	Make changes to the Action Plan to reflect areas of agreement between 6 Wins and MTC/ABAG based on discussion in recent meetings.
141	Gallo, Gloria	Thank you for your comment. Travel modeling for the Plan does incorporate capacity constraints on arterials and highways, meaning that the impacts discussed in this comment letter are already reflected in forecasts and affect the growth pattern. It should also be noted that Marin's growth forecast remains lower than in past regional planning cycles.	No action recommended.
142	Skinner, Rebecca E.	Thank you for your comment. Staff appreciate your recognition that the Draft Plan is a step in the right direction.	No action recommended.
143	Smith, Ron	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Plan invests in maintenance, safety and security of public transit systems across this region to	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		mitigate some of the concerns raised by this letter.	
144	Reeder, Ken	Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG recognize the challenges associated with growth in any community in the region, including Fairfield. We will review your comment and consider adding language about these pressures to the Final Plan.	Add discussion related to the benefits and challenges posed by growth, including localized traffic, school crowding, water constraints, etc.
145	Bay Area Transportation Working Group	<p>Thank you for your comment. Per-capita GHG reduction is the central goal of Senate Bill 375. Refer to the EIR for a detailed VMT analysis.</p> <p>While the Draft Plan does indeed fund the majority of the proposed Express Lane Network, it also spends billions of dollars on transit projects designed to reduce VMT. Roadway capacity expansion only accounts for 3% of all funding in the Draft Plan.</p>	No action recommended.
146	Marin Info	Thank you for your comment. Transit-oriented development has been shown to reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated GHG. For more information on this topic, refer to the detailed EIR response on focused growth from the original Plan Bay Area (2013).	No action recommended.
147	Hayes, Michael J.	Thank you for your comment. Priority Development Areas must be approved by the majority of a city council or county board of supervisors. Senate Bill 375 requires the region to plan for expected growth, as the region has no policy levers to "stabilize" overall population in the region.	No action recommended.
148	Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF)	<p>Thank you for your comments; please also refer to comment responses in the EIR.</p> <p>With regards to mode shift, MTC and ABAG would respectfully disagree that the Plan continues a trend of urban sprawl; after all, it achieves the target to grow solely in areas within current urban growth boundaries, rather than agricultural land/greenfields. Auto dependence does go down, albeit not to the same degree envisioned in target set by the Commission and ABAG Board. And while there are road projects in the Plan, the Plan is heavily focused on operations, maintenance, and transit expansion rather than new highways.</p> <p>Refer to the EIR for a response to the GHG</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>target concerns raised, including Climate Initiatives. More information on the Climate Strategies can be found in the Travel Modeling supplemental report. Also, refer to the EIR for a discussion of why the Smart Growth alternative was rejected.</p> <p>Commentary on the county planning guidelines are outside the scope of this planning process. It should be noted that county plans are a key input to the RTP/SCS, but projects are evaluated further and not all CTP projects are included in the fiscally-constrained Draft Plan. Notably, several major highway expansions were removed through the Plan's project performance assessment.</p> <p>SB 375 is clear that it is focused on GHG per-capita reduction rather than VMT reduction. Moreover, it does not require that every project in a Plan reduce GHG or VMT - just that the overall Plan meet its per-capita GHG targets overall.</p> <p>Staff cannot comment on VTA service levels as those are outside our control, although based on the latest available information, their 2017 service restructure is cost-neutral and focused on redistributing service rather than reducing it.</p>	
149	Contra Costa Transportation Authority	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>MTC/ABAG recognize and acknowledge your disappointment with regards to the failure of Measure X.</p> <p>MTC/ABAG continue to believe it is feasible for growth to be focused in PDAs - local policies are really the key to making this happen. Staff agrees that the housing production rate in Plan Bay Area 2040 is faster than in years past - in part because the region has underproduced housing in recent decades and needs to catch up with the strong regional demand. The Draft Plan was also tasked with ensuring sufficient housing is built within the region as opposed to Bay Area housing being produced in the San Joaquin Valley (triggering in-commuting). Additional information is available in the EIR master response related to this topic.</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>MTC/ABAG share CCTA's concern about rising traffic volumes over the Altamont Pass, but we believe land use strategies should be the primary approach to dealing with this trend. The proposed TriLink tollway project was identified as low-performing through the project performance assessment.</p> <p>With regards to innovative technologies, MTC/ABAG staff look forward to continued collaboration on this topic and intend to incorporate this much more deeply in our next plan cycle.</p>	
150	Martin, William L.	<p>Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG recognize the importance of green building, including water-neutral development, to achieve sustainability goals for the region. While this is generally outside the scope of the Plan, we will consider how this may be incorporated into our work the coming years.</p>	No action recommended.
151	FTL HUB	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Plan does envision a changing workforce with service sector jobs rising - but jobs in resources and manufacturing (at a greater risk from automation) declining over time. Staff will review to determine if additional clarification can be added to the Draft Plan or its supplemental reports.</p>	Add discussion of trends affecting employment forecast, including automation, to Land Use Modeling Report.
152	Alameda County Transportation Commission	<p>Thank you for your comment. MTC/ABAG will, as you suggest, continue to work closely with local governments on housing issues, with economic development agencies on job creation, and with key partners on sea level rise.</p>	No action recommended.
153	City of Orinda	<p>Thank you for your comment. We will correct the map labels to making the location of Orinda and Lafayette. While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	Adjust labels for Orinda and Lafayette to better reflect their west-east alignment on Map 1.2, Maps 4.4-4.7, and supplemental report maps.
154	Cavette, Chris	<p>Thank you for your comment. The transportation investment package for the Draft Plan was approved as final in November 2016, and it included both of these projects.</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
155	Remick, K	Thank you for your comment. MTC/ABAG agree that incentivizing conversion to electric vehicles is an appropriate climate initiative in urban, suburban, and rural contexts.	No action recommended.
156	West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee	Thanks for your comments on additional transportation solutions for Western Contra Costa County. While these projects were not submitted for evaluation or inclusion in the fiscally constrained investment package, MTC and ABAG remain open and interested in reviewing such projects as part of future long-range planning cycles. The transportation investment package for the Draft Plan was approved as final in November 2016.	No action recommended.
157	Fariss, Marcia	Thank you for your comment. The boards of MTC and ABAG are made up of elected officials who were appointed to represent their cities and counties on the regional level.	No action recommended.
158	Fernwood, Mark	Thank you for your comments. The Draft Plan does not directly "assign" housing to a particular city or location; free market mechanisms are assumed to be the primary driver of the region's housing market in the decades to come. Construction of additional deed-restricted affordable housing merely fills a gap for lower-income households that cannot find market-rate housing they can afford.	No action recommended.
159	Brown, Doreen	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Plan specifically highlights the current housing crisis, featuring a map showcasing the risk of displacement on page 13. The Draft Plan ultimately performs much better on displacement risk than No Project, although the region continues to move in the wrong direction. MTC and ABAG hope that efforts like the Action Plan and CASA will help us change course in the coming years.	No action recommended.
160	Jensen, Cheriel	Thank you for your comment. The boards of MTC and ABAG are made up of elected officials who were appointed to represent their cities and counties on the regional level.	No action recommended.
161	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority	Thank you for your comments. MTC and ABAG are fully supportive of "Fix It First" and strive to establish a level playing field for all transit operators. The Draft Plan does invest in the Tri-Valley through road and transit projects, and the Tri-Valley will be served by more frequent BART service in the years to come under the Draft Plan.	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		Furthermore, as your letter notes, the Draft Plan includes funding for further project development on the BART to Livermore/BART to ACE project.	
162	Shroyer, Toni	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.
163	Schwartz, Jeffrey A.	Thank you for your comment. The boards of MTC and ABAG are made up of elected officials who were appointed to represent their cities and counties on the regional level. It should be noted that RHNA was not updated or altered during this cycle of Plan Bay Area.	No action recommended.
164	Hensel, Peter	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards. Refer to the EIR comment response for additional information.	No action recommended.
166	Lavaroni, Julia	Thank you for your comment. For the record, development of Plan Bay Area 2040 is required under SB 375. Climate Initiatives are insufficient on their own to meet the CARB target. MTC and ABAG acknowledge that affordability and displacement risk are likely to rise under the Draft Plan and developed the Action Plan for this very reason.	No action recommended.
167	Shiner, Daniel	Thank you for your comment. While traffic congestion is indeed getting worse, it should be noted that Marin County is only taking on 1% of all future regional growth.	No action recommended.
168	Schmid, Greg	Thank you for your comment. More information on the growth forecasts can be found in the Regional Forecast supplemental report; more information about water impacts can be found in the EIR and the associated comment response.	No action recommended.
169	DeGeorge, Andrea	Thank you for your comment. We respectfully disagree with your perspective on the Draft Plan.	No action recommended.
170	Drew, Pam	Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG agree that infrastructure is also important for the region, connecting jobs and housing. The Draft Plan is intended to shine a spotlight on housing, which MTC and ABAG believe has now reached crisis levels. Demand has well exceeded supply in every county in the region, including Marin. Because MTC and ABAG have no ability to reduce growing demand to live in the Bay	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>Area, we instead look for ways to channel that growth in a manner that minimizes impacts on the environment and on existing communities.</p>	
171	<p>Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments; comments related to the EIR will be responded to through that process.</p> <p>With regards to Resilience, staff believes it is important to focus on sea level rise and natural disasters. Language has already been included with regards to vulnerable populations. MTC/ABAG intend to add language about green/resilience-focused jobs to the Economic Development section.</p> <p>With regards to Economic Development, MTC/ABAG will review your comments for potential incorporation into the document.</p> <p>With regards to Housing, MTC and ABAG will consider adding language to Chapter 1 highlighting overcrowding and unhealthy housing. Language has already been included on legislative solutions in the Action Plan; MTC/ABAG will consider underscoring displacement risk in the final draft.</p>	<p>Under the economic development Action Plan, add green/resilience-type jobs under the middle-wage category.</p> <p>Under the economic development Action Plan, add an emphasis on further improving economic modeling capabilities.</p> <p>Expand commentary of overcrowded and unhealthy housing in the problem statement on housing in Chapter 1.</p> <p>Under the housing Action Plan, revise language to more directly address displacement risk.</p>
172	<p>Bay Area Rapid Transit</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. MTC/ABAG recognize the importance of Fix It First and key core capacity investments, as noted in the Draft Plan. The Draft Plan also includes Clipper 2.0 funding. Staff will consider adding language to the Action Plan related to BART's housing comments. Staff will also consider adding references to middle-wage transit jobs to the Action Plan.</p> <p>With regards to interregional commuting, the Draft Plan recognizes the importance of the megaregion but also aligns with the goal of SB 375 – to provide housing inside the region to avoid inducing growth outside the Bay Area. This does not mean that additional investments at regional gateways should never be considered to provide capacity for existing travelers, but it should be done thoughtfully and strategically.</p> <p>With regards to new technologies, staff has identified this as a priority for the next long-range plan, and MTC/ABAG has already kicked off a next-generation mobility study to determine how to tackle it.</p>	<p>Add top 3 high-cost projects/programs each to Maps 4.4-4.7, including BART Core Capacity, in "Not Mapped" box at bottom.</p> <p>Add reference to housing near transit, and housing development on public lands, in Action Plan housing section.</p> <p>Add reference to transit middle-wage jobs in Economic Development Action Plan.</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
173	Legal Services of Northern California	<p>Thank you for your comments. We recognize the unique challenges of Solano County, as well as issues like housing and transportation that cross the 9-county region.</p> <p>With regards to housing, MTC/ABAG acknowledge the value of local measures to address challenges like displacement. The Action Plan does include a suite of proposed actions to tackle affordability challenges by MTC and ABAG, but we concur that the actions you suggest would need to be on a local level.</p> <p>With regards to transportation, MTC/ABAG concur with your comments. The Plan does include bus frequency improvements in Solano County to address the concerns raised, as well as the higher-priority projects mentioned.</p>	No action recommended.
174	Ditching Dirty Diesel Collaborative	<p>Thank you for your comments. With regards to item #1, staff believes the current language is broad enough to capture goods movement projects. Staff believes the current list of partners is sufficient.</p> <p>With regards to item #2, air quality is not a primary issue related to resilience. Staff does not believe these comments are relevant.</p> <p>With regards to item #3, the Action Plan is focused on targets moving in the wrong direction. While health & safety are critical, the Plan does move in the right direction, while falling short of the target.</p> <p>With regards to item #4, staff will consider adding a reference to equity & vulnerable communities under resilience.</p> <p>With regards to item #5, staff will consider adding a reference to health benefits.</p> <p>For additional detail, refer to the EIR comment response.</p>	<p>For item #4 under the Resilience Action Plan, acknowledge EJ and a special emphasis on vulnerable populations.</p> <p>For item #5 under the Resilience Action Plan, acknowledge health benefits of natural infrastructure.</p>
175	Kovac, Ferenc	<p>Thank you for your comments. For residents of suburban and rural communities, the Draft Plan does indeed have a number of investments to improve their transportation experience. State of good repair investments will replace buses and repave roads in these locations. Additional transit services - for example, express buses in Solano County -</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>will improve their mobility to major job centers. With regards to household size, the UrbanSim land use model used to develop forecasts, as well as the associated control totals, already incorporate the household size issue you raised.</p>	
176	<p>City and County of San Francisco; San Francisco Planning Department; San Francisco County Transportation Authority; San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the Draft Plan and the work completed over the course of the last two years.</p> <p>With regards to housing, MTC and ABAG look forward to working with San Francisco through the CASA effort. We believe the CASA effort can serve as a forum to explore what it would take to reach the Plan's ambitious targets, including policy effectiveness analyses. Staff will also consider your recommended definition of "housing performance" as we revise the Draft Plan. Additional information on the commercial development fee concept should be available through the Land Use Modeling supplemental report.</p> <p>With regards to economic development, staff will review and consider your proposed additions related to construction jobs, automation impacts, and industrial lands. With regards to resilience, staff intends to engage the public on this issue in a greater manner in the years to come through efforts like the Resilient by Design challenge. MTC and ABAG recognize the importance of NGOs and universities in this evolving field, as well as the importance of resiliency in achieving other Plan goals.</p>	<p>Add reference to construction jobs as middle-wage jobs.</p> <p>Add reference to automation in text before Action Plan table, discussing how it may threaten low- and middle-wage jobs in the coming years.</p> <p>Add reference to role of NGOs, universities under technical services in Resilience Action Plan.</p> <p>Add reference to how resilience is necessary to achieve other goals (such as housing) in text before the Action Plan table.</p>
177	<p>Greenbelt Alliance</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. MTC and ABAG appreciate the recommendations for data sources related to resource areas. Staff will work to incorporate additional resource lands in the maps based on the requirements identified in Senate Bill 375. As water and wildlife are specifically called out in the law, staff intends to focus on incorporating these into the Statutorily-Required Maps supplemental report using data from public agencies. Staff will also consider relabeling Map 1.2 to indicate that it focuses on agricultural lands. As carbon sequestration is not identified in SB 375 as a type of resource lands, staff does not propose to incorporate that layer at this time.</p>	<p>For Map 1.2 in Chapter 1, change the title to "Historical Development Pattern and Agricultural Lands". Also change "Resource Lands" to "Agricultural Lands" in the legend.</p> <p>In the Statutorily-Required Maps supplemental report, retitle all existing Resource Lands maps as "Resource Lands: Agriculture".</p> <p>Add new 9-county map</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>MTC and ABAG appreciate your recognition that the Policy Protection maps are sufficient in terms of data layers shown.</p>	<p>titled "Resource Lands: Water and Wildlife". Use data from Figure 2.12-3 in DEIR for Watersheds and use blue crosshatching to indicate zones. Watersheds need not be labeled. For Use data from California Department of Fish and Wildlife for "Wildlife-Rich Areas" using BioRankSW value of 5 to identify such zones.</p> <p>Finally, fix glitch in legends of supplemental report maps where population numbers are missing.</p>
178	Town of Hillsborough	<p>Thank you for your comments. The UrbanSim land use model incorporates many of the constraints that you raise here - zoning, for example. Additional employment may be a result of additional telecommuting, or businesses run from one's home - it does not necessarily require a commercial property in the town.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	No action recommended.
179	Cagnon, Charles	<p>Thank you for your comment. Staff respectively disagrees and notes that many other metrics - ranging from transit ridership to economic output to unemployment - have all improved over the past four years. Ultimately, any long-range plan must be judged based on its performance over the decades, rather than just a narrow window of a few years.</p>	No action recommended.
180	Rames, Linda	<p>Thank you for your comment. Staff disagrees with the assertions related to Chapter 1 - feedback received to date indicates that it is a useful foundation for the more detailed discussion of the housing crisis later in the document. MTC/ABAG agree that local control remains under the Draft Plan; implementation will focus on finding mutually workable solutions on the local</p>	Correct typo on page 77 - "Bay Conservation and Development Commission".

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		level to carry out the Plan's vision. With regards to Marin City, this PDA was specifically approved by the Marin County Board of Supervisors as a location for future growth, given its major bus transit center. With regards to the BCDC reference - we have fixed that typo.	
181	Save Marinwood	Thank you for comments; a brief response to each is provided below. MTC and ABAG are concerned about the risk of displacement impacts, although the analysis shows that under No Project conditions, displacement risk would rise even faster. With regards to automation impacts, we are currently funding a research project to explore this more fully and plan to incorporate in the next Plan cycle. On resiliency, we have included specific action items on the topic of earthquakes. With regards to business cycles, we agree that there will be booms and busts, which is why the job growth forecast is not an extrapolation of the last 5 years but incorporates decades of data. With regards to UrbanSim, we have worked with jurisdictions to resolve data glitches. On sea level rise, we evaluated this through the EIR process and identified mitigations. On quality of life, we believe we have captured many of these issues through specific targets like access to jobs and public health. On infrastructure, local jurisdiction typically pay for costs through impact fees. With regards to representation and outreach, we have interacted with thousands of individuals through the course of the planning cycle; MTC and ABAG reps are local elected officials. With regards to taxation, the Plan does not implement any taxes; it is merely a vision for growth and investment.	No action recommended.
182	Lee, Miguelle	Thank you for your comment. We respectively disagree with your perspective on the Draft Plan.	No action recommended.
183	Paczonay, Joe	Thank you for your comment. We respectively disagree with your perspective on the Draft Plan.	No action recommended.
184	Delta Protection Commission	Thanks for your comments on the UGB assumptions in the Draft Plan. The Plan supports future trail development through programmatic categories in the various Bay Area counties, as reflected in the adopted investment strategy.	Add reference to Bay Trails and other regional trails to Resiliency Action Plan. Add mention to Investment Strategy

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
			Report of specific major trails.
185	Dizon, Nora	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Plan does include significant funding for highways and streets as well - not only for state of good repair but also for major projects like the I-80/I-680/SR-12 interchange improvements in Solano County. That being said, transit also has a role to play in Solano. Although rail stations remain limited, local and regional bus service expansion in Solano County is included in the fiscally constrained Plan.	No action recommended.
186	California Department of Transportation, District 4	<p>Thank you for your comments. It should be noted that Senate Bill 1 was not signed into law until after the Draft Plan was published. In part, the additional funds generated under Senate Bill 1 are reflected through existing financial assumptions that already forecasted new revenues. This law is consistent with the Draft Plan's "fix it first" prioritization. A more comprehensive integration of Senate Bill 1 revenues into the regional planning process will take place as part of the next Plan cycle; fully incorporating these revenues in the Draft Plan would be infeasible given the timeline for Plan adoption.</p> <p>Refer to the EIR comment responses for all other EIR-related comments.</p> <p>With regard to Plan comments, staff disagrees that the original PBA approach contributed to the housing crisis. Rather, a failure of housing production at all income levels for many decades got us to this point.</p> <p>Staff will consider adding additional information to the Draft Plan indicating how the Plan relates to CTP 2040.</p> <p>Staff will add clarification related to congestion pricing reference on page 49. Staff will also add primary air carrier airports to maps as well as Travis AFB. Caltrans should consider that major airport access projects have already been completed over the past 15 years, including BART to SFO and OAK. Airport-bound trips are fully captured in the travel demand modeling for performance targets analysis. Nearby interchange projects and express lanes will</p>	<p>Add sidebar to Chapter 2 briefly discussing nexus between PBA 2040 and CTP 2040 (state transportation plan), including goals/policies and how local/regional/state can work together</p> <p>Rephrase sentence on page 49 to specifically identify San Francisco's congestion pricing projects as TI and SF cordon (see names on map).</p> <p>Add airport icons for SFO, OAK, SJC, and STS to Maps 4.4-4.7. Add to legend as "major airports". Add Travis AFB with some sort of military icon to Maps 4.4-4.7, and show in legend as "major military base".</p> <p>Add short paragraph to Land Use Modeling Report discussing how land use pattern addresses airport LU compatibility within the influence area (2 mile radius of airport) and how existing zones/general plans likely account for much of that.</p> <p>Add brief reference to airports in resilience</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>provide smaller-scale benefits to airports as shown on Map 4.6 and 4.7. Finally, the investment strategy includes further studies of SJC transit improvements.</p> <p>As part of the land use modeling for Plan Bay Area 2040, existing zoning data from general plans was incorporated into the UrbanSim model. Such zoning would likely reflect land use policies related to airport compatibility. Staff will consider adding a brief discussion of this to the Land Use Modeling report.</p> <p>Staff will consider adding a brief discussion of military needs and nearby projects to the investment strategy supplemental report.</p> <p>Staff will make the necessary revisions to address checklist issues as well.</p>	<p>writeup - SLR, disaster recovery, etc.</p> <p>Add 1-2 paragraphs on military base transport needs and projects to investment strategy; expand airport discussion in investment strategy report as needed.</p> <p>Add 1 paragraph on port, airports, goods movement engagement in Plan to Public Engagement Report; reference Freight Action Plan.</p> <p>Add 1 paragraph on federal CMP compliance to investment strategy report.</p> <p>Add sidebar on EIR mitigations to Plan Document to comply with checklist requirement.</p>
187	San Francisco Estuary Partnership	Thank you for your comment. Issues related to water and water quality are addressed through the Draft EIR.	Add Estuary Partnership to some of the Resilience Action Plan items as a partner.
188	City of Pleasanton	Thank you for your comments on potential transportation improvements in the Tri-Valley. Many of these projects can fit within programmatic categories for Alameda County already funded by Plan Bay Area 2040. With regards to the proposed BART extension, the Draft Plan includes funding for further planning and design activities associated with that project.	No action recommended.
189	Greenbelt Alliance, et al.	Thank you for your comments. With regards to "expanding natural infrastructure" as proposed in the Action Plan, it should be noted that the Action Plan is designed to focus on areas where the Plan is falling short. Given strong performance on target #4, we do not believe it is appropriate to add all your proposals given that they go outside the realm of resilience. We would also note that the Plan already has billions in funding for trails, bikeways, etc., as noted in the Investment Strategy & Project List.	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>Refer to the EIR for a response on the topic of mitigation measures. MTC/ABAG will consider edits to the housing Action Plan to provide greater emphasis on infill housing.</p>	
190	Bay Planning Coalition	<p>Thank you for your comment. MTC/ABAG recognize your concerns about CEQA/NIMBY opposition. Staff believes collaboration with local jurisdictions is the best way to address these challenges. MTC/ABAG is unclear what the comment letter means by "electrifying" BART as it is already powered by electricity (unlike Caltrain). With regards to goods movement, most goods movement projects were non-capacity-increasing and thus exempt from benefit-cost assessment during this cycle; this could be re-evaluated in the next planning cycle.</p> <p>Staff will consider adding a sidebar discussing the nexus between the Draft Plan and BAAQMD's broader regional vision. With regards to resilience, we appreciate the support for addressing governance and funding for resilience in the Action Plan.</p>	<p>Add sidebar on connection between Clean Air Plan and Plan Bay Area 2040.</p>
191	City of Brisbane	<p>Thank you for your comments on the land use pattern incorporated in the Draft Plan. The Draft Plan includes specific language underscoring local control of land use. While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	<p>No action recommended.</p>
192	Louie, Denise	<p>Thank you for your comments. Staff recommends comment author refer to the Draft EIR, which addresses many of the topic areas raised in her letter.</p>	<p>No action recommended.</p>
193	Public Advocates Inc.	<p>Thank you for your extensive comments.</p> <p>Refer to the EIR for responses on the EIR and Equity Report. Most importantly, MTC/ABAG would like to underscore that the land use pattern does account for displacement - some lower-income residents priced out to edge communities are residing in those places in 2040, which means that the environmental impacts are captured in full. This is the strength of using an economic model like UrbanSim to conduct the analysis.</p>	<p>Add additional specifics to Land Use Modeling Report.</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>With regards to the Land Use Modeling Report, SB 375 requires the region plan for housing for all - i.e., that there can be no outflow of residents out of the region to become new in-commuters. Refer to the Regional Forecast report for additional information. Staff will consider adding additional information to the Land Use Modeling Report about the specifics on subsidies and inclusionary zoning.</p> <p>Staff disagrees with the comment author's assertions about UrbanSim model biases. Given that the housing market is economically-driven, the use of the UrbanSim model is entirely appropriate. Select policies designed to improve housing affordability can be incorporated, contingent upon sufficient data and time for model calibration.</p> <p>With regards to OBAG modeling, it is possible to incorporate geographical preference. But at this time, many of the other funding requirements requested for modeling by 6 Wins cannot be incorporated. We will consider prioritizing these for future development, contingent on necessary quantitative data to determine policy efficacy.</p>	
194	350 Bay Area	<p>Thank you for your comment. Staff will consider adding a sidebar discussing the nexus between the Draft Plan and BAAQMD's broader regional vision. Staff would note that MTC and ABAG are primarily responsible for the SB 375 targets set by CARB. Other statewide GHG targets are discussed in the EIR.</p> <p>With regards to the EEJ Alternative, the respective boards of MTC and ABAG will have the opportunity to fully consider it in July.</p> <p>Your comments on the land use pattern are noted. Policies are more limited in terms of shifting the location of jobs as compared to housing.</p> <p>With regards to transportation, while expanding the system is important, maintaining what we have already built is</p>	Add sidebar on connection between Clean Air Plan and Plan Bay Area 2040.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>even more important for sustainability. The region cannot focus growth in existing communities without maintaining and modernizing our core assets.</p>	
195	Marin County Department of Public Works	<p>Thank you for your comment on local streets and roads funding. Transit maintenance, operations, and expansion are considered critical to reduce GHG emissions per the requirements of SB 375. Ultimately, there was not enough money in the fiscally-constrained plan to boost local streets & roads funding to the same level as the original Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that Senate Bill 1 was not signed into law until after the Draft Plan was published. In part, the additional funds generated under Senate Bill 1 are reflected through existing financial assumptions that already forecasted new revenues. This law is consistent with the Draft Plan’s “fix it first” prioritization. A more comprehensive integration of Senate Bill 1 revenues into the regional planning process will take place as part of the next Plan cycle; fully incorporating these revenues in the Draft Plan would be infeasible given the timeline for Plan adoption.</p>	No action recommended.
196	Sierra Club	<p>Thank you for your comments. With regards to modal shift, MTC/ABAG acknowledge it is hard to move the needle given that 90% of funding is needed for O&M and modernization - and that funding is limited. This fiscal constraint is a federal planning requirement, however.</p> <p>Refer to the EIR for responses on EIR-related comments, including Climate Initiatives.</p> <p>With regards to your comments on public transit, the Draft Plan fully funds existing operations and expands service on a number of different operators (note that the Needs Assessment focuses on existing operations, while service expansion is detailed in the Project List).</p> <p>Staff will forward along your suggestions with regards to increased local requirements for Complete Streets and OBAG to the MTC/ABAG boards to help move the needle on key targets. MTC Resolution 3765</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>currently guides agency requirements on Complete Streets.</p> <p>Sea level rise is appropriately addressed in the Action Plan; both sea level rise and water availability are addressed in the EIR context.</p>	
197	Town of Corte Madera	<p>Thanks for your comment. While there are some differences in housing and job forecasts between the city and the regional plan, the estimates for the Draft Plan reflect the regional control totals and policy assumptions included in the Final Preferred Scenario. For these reasons, they may differ somewhat from local plans.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p> <p>Sea level rise is a major regional challenge - refer to the EIR for a discussion of mitigations, etc.</p>	No action recommended.
198	San Mateo County	<p>Thank you for your comments. For more information, refer to EIR comment responses.</p> <p>With regards to your specific questions, Asian/Other refers to Asian, Pacific Islander, and other multiracial categories. Data was not available to break the pie chart into more detailed slices.</p> <p>MTC and ABAG concur with your comment that greater integration of the Bay Area's fragmented public transit system would be beneficial. In part, the Draft Plan addresses this by investing further in the Clipper 2.0 program to enable even more seamless transfers. Ongoing collaboration between operators is also a critical element to integrating the system; MTC will continue to facilitate this dialogue through the Partnership and other working groups in the coming years.</p> <p>Staff concurs with the comment that ongoing public participation, especially in underserved communities, is critical for the Action Plan. While we recognize the unique character of each site and community in the</p>	<p>Add * to Figure 3.2 next to Other, and add footnote indicating that "* Asian/Other refers to Asian, Pacific Islander, and other multiracial/multiethnic categories."</p> <p>Add reference to public engagement/participation in the context of Action Plan implementation.</p> <p>Add reference to healthy housing/overcrowding reduction to housing Action Plan.</p> <p>Add reference to clean/green jobs in economic development Action Plan.</p> <p>Add reference to broad range of impacts from climate change beyond just SLR in Resilience</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>region, no changes are proposed to the adopted preferred land use pattern at this time in Moss Beach and El Granada.</p> <p>Staff will consider adding new language to the Action Plan related to healthy housing, displacement risk, and clean industries. With regards to resilience, staff believes many of these issues are touched on in the economic development Action Plan. We will consider adding language related to other impacts of climate change such as heat impacts.</p>	<p>Action Plan (heat, floods, AQ, wildfires, etc.)</p>
199	East Bay Regional Park District	<p>Thanks for your comments focusing on the resiliency aspect of Plan Bay Area 2040. Staff will consider adding to existing actions to incorporate your suggestions.</p>	<p>Add language to Resiliency Action Plan noting categories of stakeholders that need to be included, including parks agencies that own lands at risk.</p>
200	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	<p>Thank you for your comments on employment; MTC and ABAG also seek a balanced land use pattern in the coming decades. Staff is considering adding a reference to the role of local jurisdictions in housing implementation. Staff will continue to explore successful strategies for housing like Measure A.</p> <p>On housing, staff does not readily have available General Plan projections for comparison. Staff is considering adding a reference towards housing near transit on page 74.</p> <p>Staff will review the Land Use Modeling Report to determine if any enhancements can be made. The final CEQA streamlining map will be made available on the web with the methodology (which was based upon the advice of OPR experts on this matter). Staff will also consider adding density and intensity maps to the web for consistency determination purposes.</p> <p>Refer to EIR comment responses for the remainder of the letter.</p>	<p>Add reference to role of local jurisdictions in housing Action Plan; add a reference to housing near transit to housing Action Plan</p> <p>Consider expanding Land Use Modeling Report with additional detail on modeling assumptions.</p> <p>Add URL to CEQA streamlining map to Statutorily-Required Plan Maps; create ArcGIS Online map for this purpose.</p> <p>Add URL for density/intensity maps; create ArcGIS Online maps.</p>
201	6 Wins Network	<p>Thank you for your comments. See responses to prior 6 Wins letter as well as EIR responses. The Equity, Environment, and Jobs alternative was appropriately updated given time and resources available during the scoping process. Refer to EIR master</p>	<p>Correct typo on page 6-4 of Equity Report - footnote 4 - 1 percent and 7 percent stats are reversed.</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>response on this topic as well.</p> <p>Staff will correct the typo on displacement risk results in the Equity Report.</p>	
202	City of Livermore	<p>Thanks for your comments on Plan Bay Area 2040 - we appreciate your support for the overall framework and emphasis on housing. We believe the current language is sufficient in terms of identifying that the land use assumptions are not prescriptive but that they are what would be needed to achieve the regional land use vision identified in this Plan. MTC and ABAG do not believe it is unreasonable to assume that inner-ring suburbs, which are not currently producing housing to the same extent as the Tri-Valley, will ultimately accelerate their housing production in the coming decades.</p> <p>With regards to additional transit options, the Draft Plan does include design and planning work for the BART to Livermore project you are referencing. However, the full project - including construction - was not submitted for consideration during the Call for Projects. Staff will review the merits of that project in a future planning cycle.</p>	No action recommended.
203	Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association	<p>Thanks for your comments. MTC/ABAG recognize the importance of sustainable streets that are resilient to flooding, sea level rise, etc. Because the Action Plan is focused on actions MTC and ABAG could lead - and your comment focuses on changing local jurisdictions' decision-making - staff will consider to incorporate your comment under the technical services action item. We will also consider your other proposed revisions in that context, while recognizing that related impacts on water addressed through the EIR process.</p>	<p>Rephrase last sentence of action #4 under Resilience to "Integrate resilience into Priority Development Area (PDA) planning and Complete Streets requirements".</p> <p>Better acknowledge other impacts from climate change other than sea level rise in the Action Plan.</p> <p>Rephrase second sentence of action #5 under Resilience to highlight air quality and urban heat island effects.</p>
204	Vision Zero Network	<p>Thanks for your comments on road safety. It should be noted that MTC will be setting annual targets on road safety starting in 2018 which may address some of the concerns raised. In part, the Draft Plan's limited progress on health and safety is due to limited funding for projects beyond operating</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		and maintaining the existing system, an inability to fully capture safety projects' benefits, and a highly-mature region with existing built-out infrastructure.	
205	Petritz, David	Thank you for your comment. Staff cannot identify any location in the document where Sonoma, Solano and Napa are identified as exurbs. With regards to growth, the Plan forecasts most growth will occur in the Central and South Bay, with more limited development along corridors like US-101/SMART. PCA determinations are made after cities submit these proposals to MTC/ABAG.	No action recommended.
206	City of Vacaville	Thank you for your comment. Staff will inform the boards of MTC and ABAG of your support for Main Streets EIR alternative. With regards to Maps 4.4 and 4.5, the maps focus on rail, ferry and BRT projects. The Draft Plan does indeed include additional funding for bus service expansion in Solano County to connect Solano residents to the rest of the Bay Area.	Add footnote to Map 4.5 indicating that map is zoomed in as no existing or proposed light rail and bus rapid transit lines are included in the fiscally-constrained plan for the North Bay.
207	California Coastal Commission	Thank you for your comments. Staff recommends the commenter refer to the EIR, which addresses many of the topic areas raised in this letter.	Add California Coastal Commission to several items for the Resiliency Action Plan.
208	Pfeifer, Linda	Thank you for your comment. Additional information on the growth projections is included in the Land Use Modeling supplemental report.	No action recommended.
209	East Bay Transportation & Logistics Partnership	Thank you for your comment. MTC/ABAG appreciate your support for Plan Bay Area 2040.	No action recommended.
210	City of Sunnyvale	<p>Thank you for your comment. While there are some differences in housing and job forecasts between the city and the regional plan, the estimates for the Draft Plan reflect the regional control totals and policy assumptions included in the Final Preferred Scenario. For these reasons, they may differ somewhat from local plans.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
211	Pfeiff, Donna	Thanks for your comment. The Draft Plan does include funding for additional Golden Gate express bus service in line with your suggestion - this information can be found in the Project List database on the Plan Document website.	No action recommended.
212	Bourret, Faye	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.
213	Unknown	Thank you for your comment. We respectively disagree with your perspective on the Draft Plan.	No action recommended.
214	R, Gilberto	Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG recognize your concerns about housing, the environment, and transportation. We believe that the Draft Plan addresses many of these issues head on, while identifying solutions in the Action Plan to take short-term action and make further progress.	No action recommended.
215	Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	Clarify that CTPs are a basis for Plan but projects must go through performance analysis in Investment Strategy Report. Add info on Climate Initiatives strategies to Chapter 4. Post final RTP checklist as a supplemental report on Plan website.
216	Wong, Karolyn	Thank you for your comment. Staff recognizes the concerns of the comment author with regards to racial inequities. While it was not possible to forecast where different racial groups will live in the future using existing models, this issue is addressed in the Equity Analysis Report in greater detail.	No action recommended.
217	Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCos)	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
218	Gibson, Kenneth	Thank you for your comment. Additional details on the Plan can be found in the numerous supplemental reports at 2040.planbayarea.org. With regards to water pricing, that topic is generally outside the scope of the regional transportation/land use plan.	No action recommended.
219	Citroen, Leslie	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Plan does attempt to tackle the jobs-housing mismatch; however, existing policy levers are more limited in terms of encouraging job growth in inland locations.	No action recommended.
220	Solomon, Barbara	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.
221	City of Dublin	<p>Thank you for your comment. While there are some differences in housing forecasts for Dublin PDAs, the estimates for the Draft Plan reflect the regional control totals and policy assumptions included in the Final Preferred Scenario. For these reasons, they may differ somewhat from local plans.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	No action recommended.
222	Arbuckle, Nancy	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
223	City of Sausalito	<p>Thanks for your comment. While there are some differences in housing and jobs forecasts for Sausalito, the estimates for the Draft Plan reflect the regional control totals and policy assumptions included in the Final Preferred Scenario. For these reasons, they may differ somewhat from local plans.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	No action recommended.
224	City of San Jose	Thank you for your comments. As noted in prior letters to San Jose, MTC and ABAG refined the land use policy assumptions between the Draft and Final Preferred to better align with San Jose's vision for	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>housing and jobs. Because the regional plan is based on a different forecast and a suite of policies - and is generated based on an economically-driven model rather than a traditional visioning process - the growth distribution was expected to be similar to but not the same as Envision San Jose 2040.</p> <p>Staff believes the analysis of the Big Cities alternative worked to capture many of San Jose's concerns about the insufficient jobs growth in San Jose.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	
225	Ditching Dirty Diesel Collaborative	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
226	City and County of San Francisco	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
227	Peak, Tina	<p>Thank you for your comment. Under the terms of MTC and ABAG's settlement agreement with the Building Industry Association, all EIR alternatives must have the same control totals. Therefore it is not possible to evaluate a so-called "zero growth alternative" while complying with the settlement agreement.</p> <p>Refer to the EIR for responses on water supply/availability.</p> <p>Nearly all regional plans across the country anticipate more jobs than housing units, because multiple employed residents often share a single housing unit ("two-income households"). Plan Bay Area 2040 does start to address the housing shortage the region faces by increasing the rate of housing production going forward.</p>	No action recommended.
228	Tuolumne River Trust	<p>Thank you for your comment. Refer to the EIR for a response on water issues raised, as well as proposed corrections to data tables.</p> <p>The Draft Plan does make progress towards addressing the jobs/housing imbalance. The office caps policy was primarily included to</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		incorporate caps already on the books, rather than going beyond that. Additional job growth in San Francisco would align well with the robust housing growth that city is taking on. Your recommendation to study an alternative with drastically different job growth totals would conflict with MTC/ABAG's settlement agreement with the Building Industry Association.	
229	Magdole, John	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
230	Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
231	City of Santa Rosa	<p>Thank you for your comment. While there are some differences in housing and jobs forecasts for Santa Rosa, the estimates for the Draft Plan reflect the regional control totals and policy assumptions included in the Final Preferred Scenario. For these reasons, they may differ somewhat from local plans.</p> <p>While the jobs and housing growth forecasts have not changed since the Final Preferred Scenario was adopted in November, MTC/ABAG staff would be willing to meet in-person or by phone to further discuss your continued concerns.</p>	No action recommended.
232	City of San Rafael	<p>Thank you for your comment. With regards to OBAG 2, that program was finalized by MTC in 2016 and will not be altered as a result of language in the Plan Document. To clarify, all the Plan says is that funds are distributed based on population, past housing production, and future housing commitments. While cities generally do not directly build housing, a city can be more or less supportive of new development going forward to alter its competitiveness for funding.</p> <p>With regards to the water comments, refer to the EIR response.</p>	No action recommended.
233	Marin Audubon Society	Thank you for your comment. The appropriate forum for discussing additional goals or targets, given that goals and targets were approved in 2015 by MTC and ABAG, would be at the start of the next Plan cycle.	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>Many of the issues raised are dealt with in the EIR context.</p> <p>With regards to SR-37, the Plan includes funding for future studies to improve that corridor. However, construction projects on SR-37 were not submitted during the Call for Projects process.</p> <p>Refer to the EIR for responses to remaining comments.</p>	
234	Caltrain	<p>Thank you for your comment. Caltrain Electrification is showcased on pages 50-51 as a major regional project. The CalMod Phase 2 project within Santa Clara County is recognized in the fiscally-constrained Project List posted on 2040.planbayarea.org/reports.</p> <p>MTC/ABAG will review the Caltrain Electrification project costs and contact your staff with any further questions. Refer to the EIR response regarding crowding.</p>	No action recommended.
235	Brown, Monica	<p>Thank you for your comment. Plan Bay Area 2040 does not include any major capital projects on SR-37; rather, it funds ongoing planning. The toll road proposal would be evaluated in a future planning cycle, assuming that the North Bay counties' CMAs submit it for consideration.</p> <p>With regards to public transit, the Draft Plan invests in additional local and express bus service in Solano County, as well as a new Fairfield/Vacaville Capitol Corridor station for intercounty mobility.</p>	No action recommended.
236	Delta Stewardship Council	Thank you for comments. We look forward to working with your agency on implementation in the years to come.	No action recommended.
237	Eklund, Pat	<p>Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG do not plan on adding a water section to the Action Plan. However, this topic has been appropriately addressed through the EIR process. Water planning typically takes place on a local rather than a regional level. However, staff is adding a brief discussion related to the benefits and challenges associated with growth (including water availability). Staff is also adding a reference to the role of the Estuary Partnership in the Action Plan.</p> <p>At this time, MTC/ABAG do not propose</p>	<p>Add discussion related to the benefits and challenges posed by growth, including localized traffic, school crowding, water constraints, etc.</p> <p>Add Estuary Partnership to some of the Resilience Action Plan items as a partner.</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>changing the technical assumptions of the land use aspect of the Draft Plan, as this would affect the adopted forecasted development pattern. As noted in the Draft Plan, these are illustrative policies but demonstrate what sorts of policies might help achieve the land use vision established in the Plan.</p> <p>Staff concurs with comments associated with sea level rise. This issue is at the core of the Resiliency Action Plan, and staff will provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions in the years to come. This issue is also explored further in the EIR.</p> <p>With regards to transportation funding levels, the investment strategy outlined in the Draft Plan matches the Final Preferred Scenario adopted by MTC and ABAG in November 2016.</p> <p>With regards to UrbanSim, staff will continue to review all options available for land use models in the years to come. However, at this time, MTC/ABAG staff believe that UrbanSim is the best available tool to test the effects of policies on the regional growth pattern and to craft Plan Bay Area 2040.</p>	
238	AC Transit	<p>Thanks for your comments. With regards to mode shift, MTC and ABAG recognize the challenges associated with mode shifts in a funding-constrained environment. We have sought to fully fund many O&M categories, but this leaves limited funding for expansion projects. Given that most expansion projects are not traditional highway investments, funding constraints are the primary challenge, not the allocation breakdown between roads and transit.</p> <p>With regards to transbay constraints, MTC/ABAG believe that the growth pattern in the Plan starts to tackle the demand side of the equation. Remember that the land use pattern is not a mere vision - it is an economic forecast based on specific policy actions to shift growth. These actions were selected, in part, to better balance housing and jobs in the East Bay.</p> <p>Given that transit operating accounts for the</p>	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
		<p>majority of all dollars in the Plan, staff believes the current levels included in the Draft Plan are sufficient given funding constraints. Additional information is available in the Transit Needs Assessment; service enhancements are expected on AC Transit, both in terms of frequency boosts and new BRT lines. We would be happy to consider additional AC Transit BRT projects if they are submitted in a future Plan cycle. Only International & San Pablo BRT lines were submitted this cycle, and both were ultimately included in the Plan.</p>	
239	Zone 7 Water Agency	<p>Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG believe that water resources are appropriately discussed in the EIR context. Staff is adding language about challenges related to growth to the Plan Document to briefly acknowledge this issue.</p>	<p>Add discussion related to the benefits and challenges posed by growth, including localized traffic, school crowding, water constraints, etc.</p>
240	SV@Home	<p>Thank you for your comment. Staff will review the Housing Action Plan to see if any additional specificity can be added. With regards to implementation, MTC's Vital Signs already tracks jobs-housing fit through housing affordability and jobs by wage level metrics.</p> <p>At this time, MTC/ABAG do not propose changing the technical assumptions of the Draft Plan, as this would affect the ultimate land use distribution. MTC/ABAG believe the 10 percent assumption is already aggressive in many communities with PDAs, while others will go above and beyond. For example, San Francisco recently reduced its share with the goal of increasing the total number of affordable units produced.</p> <p>With regards to transit, the Plan continues to invest in transit service and expansion to serve underserved communities.</p>	<p>No action recommended.</p>
241	Public Advocates et al.	<p>Thank you for the comments included in your petition. As discussed above, staff met directly with 6 Wins to discuss these issues and has developed revisions accordingly.</p>	<p>Make changes to the Action Plan to reflect areas of agreement between 6 Wins and MTC/ABAG based on discussion in recent meetings.</p>
243	Alameda County Water District	<p>Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.</p>	<p>No action recommended.</p>

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
244	Diermeyer, Sonia	Thank you for your comments. As most of these comments are related to the EIR, please refer to the EIR response.	No action recommended.
WEB-1	Richard Hall	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to the original Plan Bay Area EIR master response discussing the benefits of smart growth to better understand how higher-density development yields transportation benefits for the region.	No action recommended.
WEB-2	Annemarie Kemeny	Thank you for your comment. The Plan does envision a changing workforce with service sector jobs rising - but jobs in resources and manufacturing (at a greater risk from automation) declining over time. Staff will review to determine if additional clarification can be added to the Draft Plan or its supplemental reports.	Add discussion of trends affecting employment forecast, including automation, to Land Use Modeling Report.
WEB-3	Roderick Llewellyn	The full project list is included in the Reports section of the Plan Bay Area 2040 Document website under Project List.	No action recommended.
WEB-4	Robert S. Allen	Thank you for your comment. Given that the Call for Projects took place in 2015-16, staff recommends sharing this project concept with your CMA for submission in the next long-range planning cycle.	No action recommended.
WEB-5	Aaron Sage	Thank you for your comment - MTC/ABAG are correcting this typo.	Correct photo caption to note that Oakland is the third largest city.
WEB-6	Marian Paroo	Comment field was blank.	No action recommended.
WEB-7	Jessica	The Draft Plan website has a translation feature for Spanish and Chinese - this aligns with MTC's Public Participation Plan requirements.	No action recommended.
WEB-8	Robin Furner	The online comment system allows you to submit a comment to the DEIR.	No action recommended.
WEB-9	Stephen Bingham	Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG did explore pricing options as part of the Environment, Equity, and Jobs alternative studied in the EIR context.	No action recommended.
WEB-10	Mary Holman	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.
WEB-11	Alan Scotch	Thank you for your comment. It should be noted that Senate Bill 375 requires that Plan Bay Area 2040 focus on the statutory greenhouse gas reduction target, as well as the statutory housing target to house the region's population.	No action recommended.

Comment ID (Plan)	Commenter Author	Staff Response	Revisions Made
WEB-12	L Edson	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.
WEB-13	Robert Miltner	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.
WEB-14	Susan	Thank you for your comment. The Plan itself does not affect the economic makeup of the region; those trends are occurring outside of the scope of the Plan and the future forecasts merely reflect them.	No action recommended.
WEB-15	Kevin Burke	Thank you for your comment. MTC and ABAG have historically advocated for housing reforms similar to those suggested in your comment, and the agencies are likely to continue doing so in the future.	No action recommended.
WEB-16	Alfred Twu	Thank you for your comment. Priority development areas are nominated by local jurisdictions, meaning that MTC and ABAG do not currently have the authority to designate additional areas per your suggestion.	No action recommended.
WEB-17	Stephen Nestel	Thank you for your comment. Staff will forward this comment to the MTC and ABAG boards.	No action recommended.