Scoping Meeting Transcripts
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PLAN BAY AREA )
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT )
SCOPING MEETING )

____________________________)

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

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

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

---o0o---

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

---o0o---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEETING AGENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction by Ms. Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presentation by Ms. Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Presentation by Ms. Lindelof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Presentation by Ms. Chion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PUBLIC SPEAKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duane De Witt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J.R. McConnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kay Tokerud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Diana Keena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Heather G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Larry Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unidentified Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Janet Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carol Gottstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ralph Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jim Mellander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kirsten Snow Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Charles Cagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jim Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Marilynne Mellander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bill Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Laura Fultz Stout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emerick And Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters
MTC Meeting
MS. NGUYEN: Good evening, everyone. My name is Ashley Nguyen. I'm with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. I'm the Project Manager for the Plan Bay Area Environmental Impact Report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We ask you to please disagree respectfully. We know that you have comments and opinions regarding the environmental process, and we certainly would like to hear them, but please be respectful in terms of how you
present it and don't disrespect others that are in the room. Please do not shout or interrupt other speakers.

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

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

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

Again, we will take public comments following the presentation.

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

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

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

So with that, let me begin with the presentation that we have for you tonight.
So the agenda for tonight's meeting, we will be covering a number of topics. We will begin with the Plan Bay Area overview, followed by the explanation of the SB 375 CEQA Streamlining Provision.

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

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

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

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

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

The primary purpose of the integrated land use transportation plan is really help lower greenhouse gas
emissions from cars and lightweight trucks.

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

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

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

What the law has done is really given Bay Area regional agencies like ourselves, MTC and ABAG, for the co-agencies under the environmental process an opportunity to really engage local jurisdictions, our partner agencies, stakeholders and community members to fully plan for an efficient land use pattern that really best leverages the 277 billion dollars worth of
transportation investments that are being proposed for this plan, particularly the transit sector.

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

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

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

PDAs are areas that local governments have volunteered as places for growth in their communities, and we certainly want to support and facilitate the
development of course to help those areas in our region. And in many ways, PDAs really are a first good step in that direction, but state law allows us to look at transit authority projects in those areas, as well.

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

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

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

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

So if a project is a residential or mixed use project that is consistent with the uses, densities and intensities that are called out in this potential plan,
that project -- and if that project is located in a transit authority eligible area and meets all the exception codes identified in the state law, that project is fully exempt from CEQA. Therefore, that project does not have to prepare a CEQA document. And the --

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's such a lie.

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: If you wanted to convert your garage, there wouldn't be that much of astreamlining process.

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

The project qualifies for streamlined environmental review and can produce a different kind over environmental document which the law calls out as sustainable community environmental document, and in the
third case, if a project is not located in a transit authority eligibility area, that project still has some CEQA streamlining benefit, but it's fairly limited.

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

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

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

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

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

MTC is in the process of developing an update to the 2011 TIP. This is called a 2013 TIP, and we hope to release a Draft 2013 TIP in -- for public review on
June 22nd.

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

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

MS. LINDELOF: Thanks, Ashley.

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

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

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

The Economic Impact Analysis will be completed in the fall of this year and will assess the economic
impacts of Plan Bay Area land use and patterns of transportation investments on regional -- the regional economy, and an equity analysis will be completed in 2013 and will assess equity of all the alternatives included in the EIR as well as identify the benefits and burdens of land use impacts of transportation investments for different socioeconomic groups.

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

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

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

We'll produce an Administrative Draft EIR and a public review Draft EIR which we plan to put out in December of this year for a 45-day public review period with public hearings in January, and then we'll respond
to all those comments in a Final EIR document in March of 2013 with the anticipation of certification of the Final EIR in April of 2013.

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

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

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

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

For air quality, we'll look at short-term construction impacts as well as any impacts related to conditions of criteria and toxic air contaminants and their related health impacts and whether or not the plan would conflict with any air quality plans or standards.
For land use and fiscal development, we will be evaluating any impacts to agricultural land and open space, whether or not we conflict with any local land use plans and any impacts to local communities by disruptions in any resolutions.

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

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

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

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

For biological resources, we will be evaluating any birth effects on sensitive or special status VPs, preparing bird habitat, wetlands or other...
natural communities and also the plan -- if the plan
would interfere with identified species or conflict with
adoptive conservation policies resource plans.

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

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Forgive us you guys.

MS. NGUYEN: If you could hold your comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You're not going to
deviate from the normal plan.
MS. NGUYEN: You need to be respectful of the meeting. Please hold your comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You're ruining our plans.

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You are rude.

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What are you doing here?

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's a public meeting.

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You are listening to the people.
MS. NGUYEN: You are disrupting the content that we are trying to present to the folks that we participate tonight. We ask that you be respectful.

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

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

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

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

The land use component's objective is to meet the key goals of the plan and the approach is to start with locally adopted general plans and zoning, assess the preferred land use strategy and then assess a very land use policies to conserve and assure growth distribution.
scenarios for each alternative.

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

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

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

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

So as has it has been explained already, what
we are -- the environmental review is an evaluation of
the project, and the important component of the project,
as has been explained already, is the priority areas, and
those are areas that have been designated by the local
jurisdictions to accommodate our housing growth and our
job growth.
There's also the priority conservation area, which are areas that again are designated locally to retain our open space and our agricultural land, and more recently the investment areas that address the specifics of the rural communities and some employment centers.

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

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

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

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

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

In the no project, again the idea is to evaluate what will the region look like if we did not
have -- if we did not have sustainable community
strategies, if the priority development areas are removed
from the policies --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Kind of like America.

That's what it will look like.

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

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

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

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

In terms of the transportation, we're
proceeding with a preferred transportation investment
strategy. 277 billion planned budget. 88 percent of that budget is directed to operations and maintenance of the existing system, and there's some key advances and key strategies.

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

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

In terms of the transportation, this proceeds also with a preferred transportation investment strategy. Alternative four, eliminate inter-regional commute. The big assumption here is that all workers live in the region.

As you know right now, there's a percent of our workers that live in Central Valley or other areas
outside of the region and commute to work within the Bay Area.

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Where do the low performing schools go?

MS. CHION: And in order to address this alternative, part of the discussion that we want to have
with you is -- is not just how to define those alternatives, but what are the policy tools that you think will be essential to analyze in this process, and we have aligned some of the --

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

MS. CHION: -- improved infrastructure and transit, fees, develop incentives that will allow some of the construction work to take place, other types of subsidies, zoning changes to accommodate the necessary growth of selected locations, urban growth boundaries. Many of our local jurisdictions have already defined those. Those can be strengthened or extended. Parking pricing, low pricing, and again these are just some of the components for your consideration. We would love to get your input in terms of expanding this list or adding to it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And lastly, should we test an entirely different alternative?

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

This is the schedule that we're working on that develop this Plan Bay Area EIR. What we do plan to do is hold a series of scoping meetings over the next two
weeks and put as much comment that we can, orally at the scoping meetings, but we certainly accept written comments through July 11.

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

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

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

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

Again, oral comments will certainly be welcomed and received tonight. We do have recorded and
we appreciate if you can focus on the scope and content of the environmental assessment, and again written comments are accepted through July 11th.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But in Santa Rosa, we don't necessarily have what I would think are public servants, people that we can trust working in government, and so they've over-reached and said, "Yeah, we'll make that whole area a priority development area along Sebastopol Road/Highway..."
101 because they want to get lots of transit money for you for a train they call SMART, but I don't really know if it's smart, I mean. I know about the train.

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

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

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

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

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

Like them, we support the goals of SB 355 and we, too, are committed to the adoption and implementation of the strategies that are feasible both economically and politically and that fully fulfills SB 375 objectives.

We associate ourselves with their comments.

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

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

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

Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Next person at the mic.

MS. TOKERUD: My name is Kay Tokerud. I'm
from Santa Rosa and I'm with Democrats Against UN Agenda 21, and there's a website that talks about One Bay Area.

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

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

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

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

You know, this isn't what America -- how America was put together. There's no regional boards in
the constitution that have access to 200 billion dollars
that you're going to dole out to property owners that
will build the model of high density housing near
transportation, and now you're talking about you not even
letting people commute and somehow you're going to
dictate that eighty percent of all new housing goes in
these little tiny areas.

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

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

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

Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Your comment, please.

MS. KEENA: Hello. I'm Diana Keena and I
work for the City of Emeryville and I just wanted to
comment on some of the topics that you were saying that
the EIR was not going to address, and that public services and recreation.

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

   Thank you.

   MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

   Next comment, please.

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

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

   To -- every time I come to a meeting, the billions and billions of dollars go up and up and nobody can tell me exactly how much any of this is going to
Where is the economic impact report? Shouldn't we be doing that first? But nobody cares how much any of this is going to cost. Nobody cares about private property rights here.

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

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

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

I am here because I am concerned about individual private property rights, rezoning. Zoning of private property is a police power. It means that you must violate a person's private property rights in order to change its actual use from what it currently is.

So you are using a police power to do that.

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

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

6 You're making decisions about who the winners
7 and losers are going to be and the developers are now
8 standing in line of course because they want to develop.
9
10 Now, who wouldn't want to do that if you've
11 got somebody -- the Federal Government is offering you
12 billions of dollars? You will of course take the money
13 and put your workers to work.

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

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

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

25 This is all top down planning, and I've been
26 to these meetings. I've seen local jurisdictions come in
and grovel and basically say, "We don't really want this for our community. We know it's not right, but we want to play ball and we want some of this transportation money and we know we're not going to get it so we'll play along."

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

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

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

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

MS. NGUYEN: Next comment, please.

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

Contrary to some beliefs, we've been around
for over 75 years serving both Contra Costa County and Alameda County.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Greenhouse gas reduction, the health benefits primarily of getting people out of their cars, reduced demands on medical and community services, protecting
wildlife habitat, mitigation corridors and linkages,
preservation of endangered species habitats, restoration
of habitats to mitigate for development, attenuation of
noise and light through open space buffers, preparation
of scenic open spaces which enhance property values,
protecting and enhancing water quality through less
runoff and attenuation of pollution through open space
coffers, recreation again, creation of jobs in
conservation efforts, keeping agriculture viable and
preventing development in seismically unstable areas.

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I have a quick
question. How about when somebody is pro that starts
speaking, you all start writing notes, taking diligent
notes, and when people are speaking about freedom and
making their own decision, you just sit there with this vacuous look on your face.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: They don't care.

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How do you measure greenhouse gases?

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

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

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's a guesstimate.

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

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

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

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

There's no mass transit to where he goes, and people don't need mass transit to where he goes. I'm just saying that you're going to lose more jobs by getting all these more taxes.
I mean, just stop and think about it. Have some common sense. If you keep charging people to get to work, at some point we're going to stop working.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's what they want.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. LINDELOF: It's to promote sustainable
growth patterns that would reduce greenhouse gases.

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

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I want to understand.

What is density? I think I understand the density.

What's the intensity?

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

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's part of you explaining.

MS. NGUYEN: I have no problems answering the question, but just for the record, if you can be at the
mic so we can hear you and record you, that would be very much.

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

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

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

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

I know to use that free word is -- I don't know where that really goes in our world anymore, but I think there's potential there if there were jitneys and
flex cars and fuel efficient fine, green, fine, but something along the major corridors that we have right now that are slowly taxing us emotionally, stressfully. We could benefit if that was a viable talk, okay.

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

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

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

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

Striking from a big Agenda 21 document to the little Bay Area plan, words like faith and family and freedom and individualism were always missing from those
documents, and when I think about how I will fit in, I will never fit in to these plans.

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT:   Upstairs.

MS. GOTTSTEIN:   I would really like to know.

There's a lot of things I could think of commenting on, but one thing I never hear anybody mention, where do the churches go? There's never any plan for any synagogues, temples, churches, any faith communities.

Are there going to be transit trollies on Sundays and Saturdays to take people of each faith to their designated place, or are you going to be all the churches on the outside by the wildlife refuges?
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We'll have Gaia and our bicycles.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The state religion.

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

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

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

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

Again, part of this effort is to address
changes at selected locations by choice, and that allows those communities that want to retain the same qualities and the same densities and the same driving in pretty much the same shape.

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

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

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

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

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

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

I don't know where to start. This -- this -- we allowed you to get through this. If this was
presented at a corporation in Silicon Valley, which most of you people respect, this would be intolerable. This would not be put up with.

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

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Esoteric.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Backups.

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

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

This is going to be used for the schools. No,
they move it back to pensions where they stole the money
before so that they can make it over the next few years.
It's all -- it's just -- it's just -- they're
conning us. They're conning you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have people who have never worked -- they've gone from college, they go to Washington, D.C. They go to Sacramento. They've never worked in a business in their life. They haven't even run a department to see how to run a budget.
They don't know what it takes. It's not a slight on them. It's just they don't have the talent or skill developed to know how to understand what their rules and regulations are doing to the average guy, the average business. It's horrific.

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MR. FERNANDEZ: See what I mean? Thank you.

No more freedom of speech.

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I know.

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Shut up.

MR. FERNANDEZ: See how I got told to shut
up. Thank you for listening. I know it was some value.

   MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

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

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

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

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

   I'll tell you what. I don't need any of you to tell me how to take care of my family, and the men in here, they don't need any of you to tell them how to take
care of their family and provide for their family.
It's a lie for you to think that you know better than the people of the family how to run their life and how to arrange for their transportation, how to get to their job. All that's a fraud.
What you're talking about is a total fraud, and -- and I'm not buying it one bit, and I hope there's some men that are going to stand you said up and think about that, and women, too, of course, and I -- I'm grateful to all these women here and I love them all.
Thank you.
MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.
Are there any -- next speaker, please?
MS. SPALDING: Kirsten Spalding with the San Mateo County Union Community Alliance. We speak for a community in San Mateo County of low and moderate income, primarily blue collar workers who have been following this process closely.
We have really three concerns, and I hope you'll continue to follow them through the EIR process.
We're concerned, of course, about reducing commute times for workers and by building housing close to job centers.
We appreciate that commute times will be reduced, and that is certainly better for the community,
better for the lives of workers.

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

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

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

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

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

We'd also note that all of your public dollars, the federal dollars create jobs, and so to the extent that you're measuring the amount of -- the possible job creation at the same time that you count job
loss, please account also for the federal dollars and the
jobs that those money create.

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

Thank you for all your work.

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

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

Dr. Thomas Sowell, the noted economist out of
Stanford, has written about the cost of living in the Bay
Area, and he attributes the cost of living in the Bay
Area to land use restrictions and regulations, and this
plan basically takes the existing land use restrictions
and burdens and exacerbates them, and it also accentuates
them over time, because there's a sense of wanting to
sort of continually compress people over the 25-year forecast here.

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MR. CAGNON: You know, so when you think
about all of this stuff you're talking about, the thing you really ever to look for is absolute cost and absolute price.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So you should expect that road use will increase and commute times will increase according to this thing because you will drive people away, and you've seen it now.
You know, particularly in the South Bay, it's a -- with the restrictions that are there, it's easy for them to find refuge that are outside the growth boundaries.

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

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

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

So the people in the Bay Area, even before you came here, decided that they wanted to be green. Who would have thought that they could have been green.
independent of the MTC?

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

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

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

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

You know, we have a situation in the United States where the country is reeling. The country is on its back because the government distorted the real estate
markets and you've got a 25-year plan to distort the real estate markets.

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

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

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

But what's really funny about this, this is a terrifying plan. I mean, I'm here because I'm scared to death. This is -- I've been involved with green stuff my whole life and strategy and thinking, but this is the
most terrifying thing I've seen in my life, and the thing
that's really scary to me is that you're not scared.

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

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

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

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

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

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

That is not a matter of opinion. It is
history. Like the old duck adage, it has all of the earmarks of oppression. Pick one. What are the cornerstones of our freedom in our country? Property rights, limited government.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What about oppressing me?

MR. BENNETT: What are the other two again, okay? Limited government, property rights. All of the four cornerstones of freedom have been undermined with this -- with Iikley and all of these Agenda 21 tentacles. It is as though you folks that are supposedly to be -- work for the public, it is as though you are members of a cult. It is as though you are members of a religious cult.

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

I will do everything in my power to keep this from happening to my community, to include petitions. I have a trailer with a billboard on it. I'll do anything and everything I can so that when I look back on this chapter, I know that I did everything I could.
You shouldn't need somebody to tell you that this is wrong. There should be a little voice inside you, and the little temporary gain with the golden handcuffs that is the -- the salary and the pensions that a lot of you people are enjoying weighed against the pain when you realize what has happened to our country, saying oops, ain't going to get it all back.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

And you think about it, you say that SB 375 mandates this kind of stuff, and that has to do with
greenhouse gases, which is primarily CO2.

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

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

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

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

Smart road villages, by the way, are very dangerous. In the event of a natural disaster, the more stacked together people are, the more loss of life. That -- that was proven during the earthquake. You had that happen.
People in individual homes are less likely to get killed than -- when they have a little land around them than they are in apartment buildings. So you're actually contributing to problems for people.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker.

MR. GENE: Bill Gene, Lafayette, California.

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

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

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

For me, the -- the building right now -- Lafayette is a small community and it's got one major road that goes through it with five -- five or six street lights, and all of them now are rated D or F, and
basically what they're saying is they want another 81 units in this one development, five stories tall which basically takes the entire skyline out of the downtown and replaces it with the facade of a building, changes the character of -- of the city, it increases the -- the EIR report specifically says that it's going to increase air pollution. It's going to increase noise pollution and it's going to increase the density and it's going to completely impact the flow of traffic in the community, and I think that that's what you're going to see throughout these communities where you're pushing this, this business model, and I just flat out think it's wrong.

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

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

Thank you.

MR. BENNETT: Forgive me. Give me one, moment. You can do security thing in you want to. I choked. I'm not used to being a public speaker. I guess
that's why people write things down, but this is worthy
of repeating.

MS. NGUYEN: Just restate your name.

MR. BENNETT: Jim Bennett.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We'd also encourage you to use the -- it's a new study out of the California Department of Public Health by Neal Maglish and his -- this study demonstrates
that increasing walking and cycling related trans -- related to transportation, if we just -- it shows that the current average of four minutes is -- we increase walking and cycling from four minutes to 22 minutes, that fourteen percent reductions in heart disease will happen, six to seven percent reduction in dementia, depression, and five percent reduction in colon cancer, and this study also shows that it adds 9.5 months to life expectancy just by putting a few more minutes into active transportation and getting out of our cars. But in doing so, more investment to safe pathways for walking and bicycling, and there are a few more things, but we'll put it in writing.

Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

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

MR. MELLANDER: Well, since -- your name is Jim, right? My name is Jim Mellander, too, and I just spoke, and I've been passionate before. I'll just say a real brief statement. Don't drink this could Koolaid. It might taste good, but it's poisonous.

MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Unless there's any other speakers in the audience, we will adjourn. We certainly
appreciate the comments that we've received tonight. We will, as I mentioned earlier, record the comments and we will certainly provide responses as we work through the preparation of the environmental document.

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Online?

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Answers to the questions.

MS. NGUYEN: -- online.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The questions at the meeting were never answered. We were told we would get answers. We never got answers. They -- we were told by
1 Scott Haggerty, Supervisor Haggerty that they would post
2 them on on the website and all they did was post all the
3 questions.
4
5 So none of our answers -- none of our
6 questions are answered. How much is it going to cost?
7 What does social justice mean? We know what our
8 questions are. We can't make decisions. You're going
9 through this process without answering any of the
10 questions of the public.
11
12 MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Again, thank you so much
13 for coming.
14
15 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Exactly.
16
17 MS. NGUYEN: I answered your question.
18
19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And you know, this is
20 the thing -- this is the most important part.
21
22 MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. I'm going to adjourn
23 this meeting.
24
25 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Make sure you get that
26 on camera because that is --
27
28 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You know, what we're
29 looking into, we think that -- we think that AB 32 and SB
30 375 are guidelines and not mandates. We think they're
31 guide lines, not mandates.
32
33 (The meeting adjourned at 7:47 PM).
34
35 ---o0o---
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MS. NGUYEN: Good morning, everyone. We're going to get started with our EIR Scoping meeting today. My name is Ashley Nguyen. I'm with Metropolitan Transportation Commission. I'm the project manager on the Plan Bay Area EIR.

What I wanted to do first is to introduce the Plan Bay Area EIR team. And because we have such a small room today, such a minimal crowd today, I think we can get self-introductions so we know who is in the room. I'll start with myself. Ashley Nguyen with MTC. I'm Hannah Lindelof with Byett & Bhatia. John Francis also with Byett & Bhatia. Miriam Chion with the Association of Bay Area Government.

And JoAnne is in the back. JoAnne Bullock is in the back. She has the roving mike. Anell Bahbar, Director of Government Affairs for the Santa Clara County Association of Realtors. Interested citizen. Rica Garcia.

My name is Jeff Windham. I'm with the Manetta Transportation Institute, as a student. Robert Means, I'm with the Advanced Transit Association.

Hi, I'm Tiffany Norga, I work what Breathe
California, intern.

Xi Yang, with Breathe California, staff person.

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

John Sighdmony with San Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

Brad Speers director Government affairs BIA, South Bay.

Good morning. Manolo Gonzalez-Estay for Trans Form.

Leah Toeniskoetter, the director of SPURS, San Jose.

Ursula, MTC.

Segal Metzer for the Bay Area Air Quality.

Mark Serett, ABAG.

I'm Leslie Lara with MTC.

Stephanie Hong with MTC.

Hi, I'm Randy.

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

Hello, I am with Randy.

I'm Jerry.

MS. NGUYEN: Well, thank you so much for
participating in today's Scoping meeting. As you know, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments are the co-lead agencies preparing this environmental document. And we certainly hope to get a lot of feedback from you today in terms of issues and concerns that you may have with regards to the content and scope of this environmental document.

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

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

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

We do have a roving mike. JoAnne will be walking around, and we do ask that you speak into the microphone so that we are able record your comments in
the record. We do ask that you to also fill out the blue card that was on the table as you were coming through the door, and we ask that you put your name on that blue card so again, so we can properly record you for the record.

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

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

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

Any comments -- any written comments may be submitted in writing by the deadline date of July 11.
Please address and submit your comments to the address that's shown on the handbook.

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

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

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

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

Then when we close the staff presentations, we
1 will open the floor up for public comments.
2 Just to make sure we're all on the same page,
3 the Plan Bay Area is really the first regional plan to
4 integrate transportation, land use, and housing. This
5 is also called a sustainable community strategy. It was
6 legally prompted and initiated by California Senate Bill
7 375.

8 The primary goal of the state law is to
9 identify a future land use pattern that would match with
10 a transportation network that would help our region
11 reach greenhouse gas emissions reduction. The Air
12 Resources board set forth some very specific greenhouse
13 gas emission reduction targets for our region. We are
14 required to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions from
15 cars and light-duty trucks by 7 percent in 2020, and by
16 15 percent in 2035 from 2005 levels.
17 So in addition to the climate protection
18 goals, the plan also looks to pare down the number of
19 goals that helps us to provide housing for Bay Area
20 residents, build a stronger economy, protect our natural
21 environment and enhance accessibility and opportunity
22 for all residence in the Bay Area from all walks of
23 life.
24 There is specific provisions in Senate Bill
25 375 that allows for CEQA streamlining for certain land
use development projects. And we wanted to call this out because this is something that is potentially a real benefit to look at jurisdictions as they move forward with projects that they are thinking about within their community.

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

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

The first is that you have to be a residential mixed use project where your total, at least your total building square footage has to be 75 percent residential
use. So you have to even qualify to have that minimum threshold to even take advantage of CEQA streamlining. There's also a present class of project that was introduced as part of the state law called Transit Priority Project or TPP for short. And in this case, to qualify as a Transit Priority Project, your project must have at least 50 percent of the building square footage to be residential, have a floor area ratio of not less than .75 and provide a minimum density of at least 20 dwelling units per acre. The key here, though, is in order to be a Transit Priority Project, you have to be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or a high quality transit corridor, which is a corridor that offers 15-minute frequent services.

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

We will take public comments --

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

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

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Which is defined as how many hours?
MS. NGUYEN: Four hours. For hours in one time frame. So for those of you who have been involved in the regional plan process thus far, you know that we've been working on supporting job and housing growth in priority development areas, or PDA's for short. These are areas that local government have identified as places for growth in their communities, and to some degree, we do definitely want to carry forth with supporting the development department PDA as part of the plan process.

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

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

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

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

In the third case, which is shown in red on the slide, if the project is not located in a Transit Priority Eligible area, that mixed-use residential projects would still get some limited advantage of the
CEQA streamlining. It's just not as much as what you would see in either the green or the blue areas in terms of exemption or more maximized streamlining under CEQA.

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

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

The current TIP is the 2011 Transportation Improvement Program, and it contains about $11 million worth of transportation investment over the next four years. The largest fund source that we see in this funding program comes from local dollars, and this includes county transportation sales tax and local streets and roads funds.
MTC is in the process of updating the TIP. We are in the process of preparing the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program, and we hope to release a draft for public review June 22nd. We will be bringing a final 2013 TIP to our commission for approval in September and it will move on to federal approval in December.

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

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

This will be -- the EIR will be a programmatic EIR. It will present a region-wide assessment of the proposed plan and alternatives, and it will provide CEQA streamlining opportunities that actually just outline both on transportation projects and programs and news to this round of a -- that RTC of the development projects as defined the SB375.
So they -- just to clarify, the scope of the EIR. The EIR focus is on environmental impacts. There are also two additional separate studies underway that are undertaken to assess the other key elements of sustainability, economy and equity.

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

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

The next phase will be data collection and environmental settings. We will also further define the project as well as the alternatives and screen alternatives for use of the EIR. All of that work will go into the environmental impact assessment. We'll look
at a range of environmental issue areas as well as assess cumulative impact and analyze alternatives.

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

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

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

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

What alternatives to be evaluated?

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

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

So we have identified 13 environment issue areas to have analyzed at this point. The first being
transportation. We'll be looking at impact on commute
times and vehicle miles traveled.

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

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

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

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

We also assess if there's an increase in
exposure to noise beyond existing standards.
For geology and seismicity, we'll be evaluating if the plan causes an increase or risk due to earthquake landslides or ground failure, any additional soil erosion or loss of topsoil or any increased development or expansive or weak soils.

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

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

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

In terms of cultural resources, we'll be looking at any adverse change to archaeological, historical or paleontological resources or disruption of human remains.
Public utilities, we'll assess adverse effects on regional water supplies, wastewater and storm water facilities and solid waste facilities.

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

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

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

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

For the transportation component, the objective is to meet key goals of the plan and also
subject to the financially constrained transportation
investment strategy. The approach is also to start with
the existing network as a baseline and then assess the
preferred transportation investment strategy or modify
it to reflect shifts in investment priorities, and then
assess explicit transportation demand management
policies such as pricing to establish the alternative.
I am going to hand it over now to Miriam from
ABAG to talk about -- more about the alternatives.

MS. CHION: Miriam Chion with the Association of
Bay Area Government. Thank you for coming this morning.
Some of you have been following the plan for several
months, more than a year. And as Hannah has indicated,
the purpose of the Environmental review is to evaluate
the plan -- the performance of the plan from an
environmental perspective.
This is -- you have seen the land use
component of the plan. It's the jobs-housing connection
strategy. For those of you who might have not seen it,
it's posted on the website. And as Ashley mentioned,
one of the key elements of the plan is the priority
development areas. We have about 200 areas that have
been nominated locally. Local jurisdiction cities, some
of you counties have been working on identifying those
areas as areas where we want to accommodate additional
housing, additional population, additional jobs, and they really vary widely.

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

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

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

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

The priority conservation areas are areas that, again, as I was saying, because we have addressed
growth and selected areas, this allows us the retention
of open space and agricultural land. And, again, the
idea is to retain some of those qualities that the Bay
Area offers to us.

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

So it's based on this framework that the plan
got developed. And you can see in this map, how much of
our open space and agriculture land is retained, how
much of the land is urbanized and how focused is the
growth that is proposed in the plan. About 4 percent of
the total region plan where we are accommodating about
80 percent of the new homes and 66 percent of the new
jobs.
This pattern also allows the retention of some of the existing qualities in the neighborhood that want to retain the qualities that they have today with minimum component of growth for additional expansion. So the alternatives. The environmental review requires that the project is compared to other alternatives. The project is number two. The jobs-housing connection strategy, as we indicated. And CEQA requires that we assess as an alternative no project, which means removing the conditions to the efforts that policies and investments that are addressed in the jobs-housing connection strategy.

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

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

In terms of transportation, this is based on 2010 existing transportation network, and would only
include projects that have been funded already or have
gone through environmental plans.

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

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

There is an effort to fund high performance
projects. There is an effort to make use -- make the
most efficient use of our system, and to make our
transit system sustainable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So there is the assumption that additional affordable housing in locations with high levels of low income commuting will be identified, meaning more inexpensive housing closer to jobs and additional affordable housing in locations where we have good services, good schools.
In term of the transportation component, it's more to the previous one. The modified preferred transportation investment strategy, number 2. We assume that we restore the level of transit services that we have in 2005, and there's a proposal for only HOV lane conversion for express lanes.

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

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

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

Again, this is just a list of components for
1 you to consider to assess to give us your comments on In
terms of what is the most appropriate or the most
significant set of policy tools that we should be
analyzing through the requirement at review.

With that, I will give it back to Ashley.

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

And then, certainly, are there other ideas you
may have that we may consider in testing an entirely
different alternative than the five that we showed you today.

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

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

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

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

Once we get the green light, if you will, from our two boards, we would proceed into the development of the draft environment document through the seven months, through the end of December. Our plans are to release a draft Plan Bay Area as well as a draft Plan Bay Area EIR...
for public review on December 14th. And we will go
through the review process through the early part of
2013. And our ultimate plan is to have a final Plan Bay
Area and final Plan Bay Area EIR adopted and certified
by our respective boards in spring of 2013.

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

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

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

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

Anything less would be a cop out. Failure to
meet 100 percent of our housing need is at odds with the primary environmental objective of SB375, that is reducing in commuting from other regions. It also hurts job creation and economic growth, as our own analysis and your own analysis of the preferred scenarios attest. So recommendation number 1, and I will probably submit a separate comment on this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then, of course, I would like to make a
comment is that the job housing balance is very critical
to get to one-to-one -- get it to a one-to-one ratio.
If it's not feasible, make sure that you have
significant transit and the gaps that are here that are
important to fill.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

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

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

SB375 requires that the two efforts are
consistent, which means that the distribution that we
have in the arena for -- so the same time period within
the sustainable community strategies within the
jobs-housing connection strategy will be the same
distribution for the period from 2014 to 2022. So the
overall distribution, the 30-year period, might be
slightly different depending on the long term objective
versus the most immediate present objective in the
arena.

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

SUSAN MORSLAND:  Susan Morsland. I live in San
Jose. And no affiliation accept I'm concerned about the
long term growth of this plan. I'm in support of AB32,
SB375, also affordable housing. But what my concern is
with whatever kind of affordable housing, we should have
really -- I don't want see concentrated areas of
affordable housing. I believe in more of a inclusionary
policy, and that's part of social equity, and we don't
want to have concentrated areas of very low, low income
people in different pockets no matter whatever scenario
you go for.
And I know that's not -- we have to create some kind of incentives for developers to do that, but inclusionary policy where you can distribute different levels of a social economic strata all over the Bay Area. Real crucial for long term whatever scenario you adopt.

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

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

In regards to what we're looking at here, and
your alternatives 4 and 5, I think are something that
are, anyways address some of the concerns that we have
in growth issues in an area as well as some of the
transportation issues.

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

The alternatives for with looking at HOV
extensions and conversion lanes as well as the
boundaries and the low income communities and how
they're impacted, I think is something that we'll like
to see more of and how it's addressed, will be
transformed, will be something in formal comments also.

Just wanted to have an opportunity to say that. So
thank you.

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

The task is not only to define what is the
number of units that each city need to plan for, but
also for what is income need to be produced, that
housing needs to be produced. And as you know, through
the regional efforts, the definition of those groups
tries to address some of the regional disparities.

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

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

STEVEN LEVIN: Hi, my name is Steven Levin. I am
with the Santa Clara County Roads Commission and the BPA, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee although I'm not here representing either one in particular. I live in San Jose.

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

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

STEVEN LEVIN: Speaking on behalf of San Jose,
which I don't represent, just as a resident, I would like you to respect the jobs numbers that San Jose has in General Plan 24. San Jose has got a tremendous problem over the years with unequitable distribution of housing versus jobs. It's really important for the future financial health of the City of San Jose to get more jobs here. I would like the regional government to respect that. I'm not trying to propose a regional solution upon San Jose which has tremendous economic problems and needs more jobs.

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

As to my more specific comments, I think that on the plans that you carry forward, you should also carry forward lower concentration on PDA growth. Not all parts of the Bay Area are really enamored on those PDA concepts and you should respect more local jurisdictions on where they want to have their growth. I'm really puzzled why you're going to draft
alternatives before you can get to the real EIR process. In terms of issues the for evaluation, which was one of the early things I saw for transportation. Since these all seem to be phrased in the negative, I think additional ones you should add are increase in intersections and areas of level service F. You should add increase in average speed of miles per hour, and you should add increase costs for the taxpayers to subsidize transit. I think also all these factors you take into consideration in transportation.

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

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

MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

ROBERT MEANS: Robert Means with the Advance Transit Association. I have got a question to start off with. You're looking for a reduction in like 7 and 15 percent in Co2 emissions, and I wonder where that came from because based on the car trajectory, if we're
talking about going to 2035 as the number, we have to reduce our Co2 emissions by 55 percent from the current standards. And I am wondering about the disparity there.

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

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

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

You also invited us to do an alternative plan altogether, and one thing that I would suggest is take a serious look at advanced transit options. In particular, personal rapid transit or the automated transit networks that are being considered for the
connection between the San Jose airport and the Cal
Train and LRT stations.

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

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

There's a computer control so it doesn't shut
down in the evening. It's a 24/7 operation. This is
the kind of transit that would really make a difference
for people who depend on transit and would probably make a big difference for folks that are currently commuting single occupancy vehicle.

There was a study done in Palo Alto, and based on that research it looks like we can cut our single occupancy vehicle rate from 90 percent going to the Stanford Research Park down to 45 percent. From 90 percent down to 45 percent. That's a cut in half using this kind of transit system in that particular area.

Imagine what we could do if we spread that around.

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

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

MS. LINDELOF: I have one other point to add to
Ashley's answer to the question about the reduction target. Is that the 15 and 7 percent are just for the on-road mobile sources. So I don't know if the number you have there is for all greenhouse gas emissions or just mobile sources.

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

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

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

My second issue is aligning with San Jose's General Plan 24. While a lot of the projects that -- while a lot of this aligns with 2040, you don't get to cherry pick which parts do. So I don't think that it's appropriate to be picking out the housing element of 2040 and not picking out the jobs element. So I want the plan to reflect -- San Jose just completed their
general plan so there's no reason not to align with it. It's the most recent plan in the region aligned with our job issues.

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

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

My final issue is a question of the Scoping and tier down. So say we have the EIR approved and we're looking at traffic mitigation issues. Based on what I see, if a project qualifies for CEQA exemptions, that also theoretically exempts them from the local traffic impact, if I'm reading this correctly. And I would like some clarification because it's one thing to say it doesn't have a regional impact on traffic, but when you are down at the -- on feet on the ground, it's certain going to -- and I will just throw out or ballpark stadium as an issue where regional traffic might not be that big of a deal but what happens on the...
ground is actually more important. And under this scenario if that project were to come in right now, it would be CEQA exemption, from what I can see.

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

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

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

RANDY KINMAN: Then can your slide say regional? Just pump that word in there?
MS. LINDELOF: Cumulative regional impact --

RANDY KINMAN: So that it's very clear.

MS. LINDELOF: I agree. We can certainly input

that more strongly.

RANDY KINMAN: Thank you.

GEORGINE SCOTT: Georgine Scott. I'm from south

county. I agree with the people that talked about the

slide and having everything, and also with the meeting

time so I just wanted to let you know that we have a

hard time getting people here during the day.

I have a question with regards to the

transportation. I've been to several meetings, and I

never -- I want to know if there's any studies that have

addressed -- I was in law enforcement. There's several

law enforcement, fire, safety people that cannot -- when

you talk about transportation, my life evolves around

being on call. If there's a crime scene, I can't wait

for a bus. I can't take public transportation. I have

to get into my private vehicle and respond just like a

lot of people in my line of work have to do.

Is there any studies done with respect to

people in my type of work that cannot utilize public

transportation, and how many of those type of people --
because we have a lot of law enforcement, a lot of fire,
a lot of safety, a lot of people that are in the same
line of work or similar lines of work where you can't
utilize that. And I want to know if that's been
included in any studies with respect to doing
transportation.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. NGUYEN: We don't have a specific study whether
or not law enforcement and others in the same profession. The answer is no to that. But we do have at least a regional look at the travel patterns in our region. And, again, the point I wanted to make was that, again, most folks still do drive to get to and from work or to do work activities. So that's the trend that we certainly will see continue over the next 28 years.

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

I would like to see a little more market-driven, market-based proposed to these things. One where people can get on board, one where you're not going to have a town like Palo Alto wanting to bail out on the first word that's coming down, you know, where there's more amenities, including more recreation included, more inner city agricultural included, more innovation as far as water reclamation, water re-usage, roof top agricultural, roof top gardening.
But the state mandates and social engineering is going to meet with a lot of confrontation, is going to meet with a lot of law suits, it's going to meet with a lot of public outcry, it's just not going to go down well. And I don't think engineering ever equates to social equity. I don't think it's ever proven that it has. There has to be much more incentive to individuals to do things on their own and much more opportunities rather than trying to engineer it.

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

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

I think when we promote the HOV lanes, we should focus on the benefits that the HOV lanes can bring to drivers who are now carpooling or use alternative fuel vehicles for transportation instead of just doing, saying like we can do express lane, you can
pay extra to do, like, you know, just to travel faster
or just for highly extension, that's why we do HOV lane.
And also we -- I want to support the, you
know, sending out the platinum HOV lane stickers and
those are the green ones to vehicles. That way we can
definitely support -- I mean, the marking of alternative
fuel vehicles and that way we can further, you know, is
the traffic and also reduce greenhouse gasses. Thanks.

STEVEN LEVIN: This is Stephen Levin again.

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

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

MS. NGUYEN: At the July 13th meeting we hope to do
two things. One is to really report on all the comments
we have heard and to demonstrate how we can refine the
alternatives to reflect those comments. It is a
two-step process so we do have another meeting on July 19th. So if there were last-minute comments that we raise with our board, and they may raise additional ones as well, we have an opportunity as staff to take all those comments and really prepare for the final actions, which is slated for July 19th.

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

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

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

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

STEVEN LEVIN: I don't think you can be in compliance with that and determine comments from the public in time for the meeting.
MS. NGUYEN: Again, the action isn't -- the action is on July 19th, just to allow us to move forward into the environmental process. During the environmental process these alternatives may be further refined and modified as we go through the environmental process.

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

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

And I will again reiterate my request that the 45-day window, the 55-day window be extended to accommodate the fact that many of our municipalities
furlough along the Christmas holiday, so you're releasing a report, you're opening it up to a 45-day review and response period for these communications where there's no staff in the office for two weeks. So that pumps it down to a 30-day review during holiday time.

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

MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

JOHN CARPENTER: John Carpenter of Mountain View again. We have a planning commission which has a time that starts at about 7 o'clock at night. We got bumped. We were fortunate to have our appropriate comments from people who are working during the day. And there -- in our case we had comments from Google employees, and I will point out to you that the generation that's coming up there's a lot of difference from the generation that's in the past. These are highly aware people especially the kind of people who look over your shoulders, work at -- who look over the shoulder of
those who are doing Google Maps and updates and things
every year. Where they can see the progress of global
warming.

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

MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

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

MS. CHION: That extreme situation has not been
ensued, but we have -- the forecast assumes intrinsic
population growth of slower population growth that we
have seen in prior decades. And that is based on a
slowdown in migration. That is based on some of the
rates of the national growths, some of the projections
of the national growth and is linked to the growth of
our economy that while healthy and probably one of the
healthiest regions in the country, it's growing at a
slower pace than we had growths in the last few decades.

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

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

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

So again, this is one meeting that is focused
on the Scoping of the EIR, and if you feel like for the
purpose of the Scoping meetings we need additional
outreach, we'll be glad to take your input, but keep in
mind that there have been many efforts in terms of conveying the scope of the plan at the community and at the city level.

MANOLO GONZALEZ-ESTAY: Manolo Gonzalez-Estray.

Trans Form. I want to reiterate, I agree with Miriam. There have been a lot of opportunities for the community to speak about this. And we have -- you know that I've been coming to MTC and other meetings and other things, and I acknowledge that.

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

MS. LINDELOF: We would certainly encourage any member of the public or community who has specific issues that they want to bring to our attention to bring them. There isn't -- as you all have said, there's a point in time in terms of just a more rigorous
environmental process that we do have to follow because it's stated in the environmental regulations, but we certainly encourage input of all kinds at all times.

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

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

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

JEFF WINDHAM: Jeff Windham. In regards to the public comment, and as far as the openness and availability of information, I think there's a lack of education in the general public. I think that a lot of
this stuff goes to either one extreme or the other. It
goes to proponents or it goes to opponents.

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

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I Just wanted to comment on
that. In general, people who are happy stay home. We
are the folks who -- we don't have an issue with what
we're doing, but we have gotten some pretty, I think
decent press on the plan. We, of course, do our own
press releases and I think, you know, the general public
may not pick up on that. But we are and have gotten some pretty decent news stories and publication about the plan.

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

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

Because the way that we've been operating our services, it's certainly not sustainable over the long term. As many of you know, there's been a lot of
different financial issues based on all the different operators in terms of some of the issues they have to deal with, whether it's labor issues, service cuts or service modifications. And so through that planning process, we've actually made the transit operators look at the way that they do their books to see if it conforms with cost efficiency.

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

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: A half a million dollars? 500 million? One half a billion dollars goes to the maintenance in the existing system at $244 million?
MS. NGUYEN: Maintaining the existing system is not only -- is about basically painting our local streets and roads, maintaining our trains in service that we have today, and also paying for all the costs that are associated with the transit today in terms of bus replacement, system and railways, fixing the railways, replacing our trains. Those are all big-ticket items. And, yes, the commission has a long-standing policy to maintain and operate the systems we have in place before we go out and spend billions of dollars in expansion or other new projects.

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

STEVEN LEVIN: Steven Levin. So to follow up that point about maintenance plans to assist the system's sustainability. One thing that's not sustainable about it is they constantly require increasing taxes as a percentage of people's own assets. So how about factoring in having a sort of minimal percentage of fair
JOHN CARPENTER: John Carpenter again. I am hearing testimony from the Google employees last night. And there's a number that I have confirmed myself to a greater extent because I do count bicycles going into that type of employment area. But overall, between 1500 to 2000 Google employees ride bicycles to and from work daily.

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

MS. LINDELOF: Thank you.

ROLAND LEBRUN: My name is Roland from San Jose. If I look at alternative 4 dispute, eliminate inter-regional commuting, how does that work as high speed rail?
if not, how do you expect high speed rail to be run without a great subsidy. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MS. LINDELOF: Anybody else? Okay. Thank you all.
for your time and coming out today and giving us your comments.
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MS. NGUYEN: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Ashley Nguyen. I'm the project manager for the Plan Bay Area EIR.

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

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

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

So the format we're taking is very straightforward.
The EIR team will present a staff presentation, and following the staff presentation, we will provide everyone here with an opportunity to provide us with some oral comments. We ask that in providing that oral comment that you line up near the microphone which will be stationed to the left and take your turn to speak.

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

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

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

We please ask that you disagree respectfully. If you have an opinion that differs from other speakers, we ask
that you do not shout or interrupt. If you do interrupt and cause disruption and disallow us to continue our meeting, we will ask you to leave.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Air Resources Board sets very specific targets for the Bay Area region. Our targets are to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by a negative seven percent in year 2020 and by a negative fifteen percent in year
2035 from the 2005 levels.

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

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

So the state law has really given agencies like MTC and ABAG an opportunity to engage with our local government, the stakeholders and community members to really plan for an efficient land use pattern that best leverages the $277 billion dollars that's available through this Plan, particularly the transportation investments that we're making with regards to not only maintaining our existing transit
service levels, but also some major transit pathway extensions that are planned over the next 28 years.

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

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

I know that the Transit Authority Project is a new one for us. Particularly for those of you who have been tracking our regional planning efforts over the past few years, you know that we've been working to engage our local government as well as stakeholders to
support job and housing both in Priority Development Areas, or PDAs for short. PDAs are areas that local government have identified or volunteered to be places within their community where they like to see higher levels of growth.

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

Just to drill down a little bit more in terms of the specifics, the streamlining position is one that is not the easiest to navigate, so we're trying to simplify it here in this slide. So in order to even be considered for any kind of CEQA relief, that residential or mixed use project must first be found consistent with the land use designation densities and intensities that are identified in the Plan itself, and if that project is located in a Transit Priority Eligible Area and meets all the exemptions specified
in state law, that project is fully exempt from CEQA. We don't see a lot of opportunities for this to happen, but we certainly would encourage local jurisdictions that have that kind of project to be able to take that kind of exemption.

The second class is probably the more likely opportunity case, where again, a residential mixed use project is found consistent with the Plan, and that project is indeed located in a Transit Priority Eligible Area but doesn't necessarily meet all the exemption codes, that project can still qualify for streamlined environmental review. Basically local jurisdictions can then develop a streamlined document called a Sustainable Community Environmental Assessment.

And then the third case is that if a project is not located in a Transit Priority Eligible Area, they can still take some advantage of CEQA streamlining, though it's fairly limited in its scope and capacity.

I'm going to make an abrupt transition here to the Transportation Improvement Program. For those of you who may not be familiar with this document, it is a four-year funding document that provides a comprehensive listing of all the roadway, transit, and bicycle-pedestrian projects that receive federal funds.
or are subject to some sort of federal action, or
these projects may be regionally significant and we
need it as part of our analysis.

The key here, though, and the reason why we're
bringing this Plan up in relationship to the Plan Bay
Area is that projects that are in the Transportation
Improvement Program must be consistent with the Long
Range Plan. And so when MTC developed our Long Range
Plan in Plan Bay Area, we simultaneously consult on
the Transportation Improvement Program so that folks
can see a connection between a Long Range Plan in a
20-year planning document and the relationship to a
programming document that actually builds out the
state and federal funds.

The current TIP is the 2011 Transportation
Improvement Program. It contains about 11 billion
dollars worth of transportation investments. The
largest fund source in the TIP come from local dollars
such as county transportation sales tax or local
streets and roads funds.

MTC is in the process of updating our TIP. We are
in the process of developing the 2013 TIP. We just
recently released the Draft 2013 TIP for public review
on June 22nd, and we're looking to, again, get to
approval by our commission in late September.
1     So if you have comments that you would like to
2  share on the TIP, there is a separate process -- a
3  parallel but separate process on it. And you're
4  certainly welcome to provide us your feedback on the
5  TIP as well.
6     Now I'm going to turn it over to Vicki Hill of
7  Dyett & Bhatia to walk you through some of the details
8  of the environmental process.
9     MS. HILL: So as Ashley mentioned earlier,
10  the focus of today's meeting primarily is to discuss
11  the scope of the EIR that we will be preparing over
12  the next five months. And I'd like you to know that
13  we have not prepared the EIR yet; we're just at the
14  beginning stages.
15     The EIR is required by CEQA, the California
16  Environmental Quality Act, and CEQA also requires the
17  process that we're going through now for the EIR.
18     The purpose of the EIR is to identify the Plan's
19  potentially significant impacts on the environment,
20  evaluate a range of reasonable and feasible
21  alternatives and then determine how the Plan or
22  alternatives can avoid or mitigate significant
23  impacts.
24     To do that, this EIR will be a Program EIR, not a
25  project-specific EIR, and as such it presents a
region-wide assessment of the proposed Plan and alternatives. And as Ashley mentioned, it also provides CEQA streamlining opportunities.

The EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts, but we wanted to note that two additional separate studies will be undertaken to assess other key elements of sustainability, and those include the economy or Economic Impact Study and the Equity Analysis.

For the Economic Impact study, the purpose would be to assess economic impact of the Plan Bay Area's land use patterns and transportation investments on the regional economy. And our key areas of interest are state of good repair, pricing, housing policy, PDA land use and development and goods movement. We're hoping to complete this analysis this fall of 2012 and use the results to inform future economic analysis efforts.

The Equity Analysis has a two-fold purpose, and that is to look at the equity implications of all the alternatives, and identify the benefits and burdens of impacts and transportation investments for different socioeconomic groups. This analysis will take place in parallel with the EIR, and we're hoping to have that completed by early 2013.
This slide shows the overall EIR process, sort-of the flow chart, and as shown, we're at the very far left of the chart at the NOP scoping period. And this kicks off the EIR process. And we're in the middle of the 30-day period for public and agency comments. That's why we're here today.

After we receive your comments, we will move into the data collection and environmental setting followed by the Environmental Impact Assessment. And at the same time we will be further defining the proposed project and alternatives to feed into the analysis.

The next key point for public input will be when the public Draft EIR is published. We're hoping to do that in mid-December, and that will include a 45-day public review period. After that review period is closed, then we will take all the comments, number them and respond to all of them, include them in the Final EIR which we're hoping to publish in March with a Final EIR certification in April.

So here at the beginning of the process, we want your feedback on several key questions. Please keep these in minds as you formulate your comments either today or submitting written comments later.

So the EIR scoping questions are first, what potential environmental issues should be analyzed in
addition to the issues that we're identifying today? What other feasible alternatives or changes to the alternatives should be evaluated? And what types of mitigation measures should be considered that would help avoid or minimize potential environmental impacts of either the Plan or the alternatives?

Finally, what elements of the EIR would help with CEQA exemptions and tiering?

So we'll turn now to the laundry list of issues for evaluation, and since you have the handout, I won't go through each of these. But these are divided by issue area, and they are consistent with the CEQA guidelines, the environmental checklist that lists all the different types of impacts that need to be studied.

We don't know right now if these are going to be significant impacts or not with the Plan, but these are issues that we will be looking at.

So two critical issues are transportation and air quality. There are three primary measurements of transportation. First, the potential decrease in the average number of jobs within 15, 30 or 45 minutes from home by auto or transit. In other words, how would the Plan impact commute times?
The second one is increase in vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, on facilities currently experiencing level of service F which represents a heavily congested condition.

And thirdly, the increase in per-capita vehicle miles traveled.

For air quality, we will be looking at both short-term construction and long-term operational emissions; an increase in criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants and health risks due to increased particulate matter and TACs from mobile and stationary sources. We'll also look at the potential conflicts with air quality plans or violation of air quality standards.

In the land use and physical development issue area, we'll be answering a question on whether or not the Plan would result in conversion of agricultural lands and open space, potential conflicts with locally adopted land use plans, disruption of residential or business uses or displacement of existing population and housing, for other alterations to communities that could represent a division of the community.

In energy, the primary issues there are an increase in non-renewable energy consumption and inconsistencies with energy conservation plans.
1. Greenhouse gasses and climate change. In this issue area, we'll be looking at the increase in overall and per-capita CO2 emissions, as well as looking at whether the Plan would subject new land uses and transportation facilities to sea level changes or conflict with greenhouse gas reduction plans, policies or regulations.

2. For noise, we'll be looking at both short-term construction as well as long-term operational impacts.

3. In geology and seismicity, our primary concern is creating a situation where there would be an increase in the risk of injury or loss of life due to earthquakes, landslides or ground failure, including liquefaction. Also looking at soil erosion, an increased development on expansive soils or weak unconsolidated soils.

4. For biological resources, we're looking at the adverse effects on sensitive or special status species and riparian habitats, wetlands or other sensitive natural communities.

5. We'll also be looking at the interference with the movement of wildlife, and again, looking at how the Plan would be consistent or inconsistent with adopted local conservation policies and resource plans.

6. The water resources issue covers the surface and
groundwater resources, and you can see the long list of the impacts that we'll be evaluating. We look at runoff, increased runoff and flooding, particularly the replacement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

For visual resources, a concern is adverse effects on scenic vistas, damage to scenic resources within a scenic highway or degradation of existing visual character of communities and open space areas. We'll also be evaluating creation of new sources of substantial light or glare.

For cultural resources, this includes both historic and prehistoric resources, looking at any change or adverse effect on existing resources or possibly disrupting human remains.

In public utilities, the concern here is potential adverse effects on water supply, wastewater and stormwater facilities and solid waste.

And finally, growth-inducing effects will take a very careful look at whether the Plan would result in direct or indirect substantial unanticipated growth beyond rates that are currently projected.

At this time, we don't anticipate potentially significant impacts in the following issue areas: Hazardous materials, public services, recreation and
1 mineral resources.
2 So that is the list of environmental issues. This
3 next slides provides sort of a transition to the next
4 part of our presentation on alternatives, and it sort
5 of outlines how we define the EIR alternatives.
6 As Ashley mentioned, there's two components to the
7 Plan, the land use and the transportation sections.
8 So for land use, the objective is to meet the key
9 goals of the Plan, and our approach starts with
10 looking at the locally-adopted General Plan and zoning
11 policies which provide the base for the No Project
12 Alternative.
13 We then assess the Preferred Land Use Strategy,
14 which in this case is the Jobs-Housing Connection
15 Project, and then assess various land use policies to
16 consider a range of future growth distribution
17 scenarios for alternatives. These make up the
18 alternatives for the land use components.
19 For transportation, our objective, again, is to
20 meet the key goals of the Plan subject to the
21 financially-constrained Transportation Investment
22 Strategy. Our approach includes, again, starting at
23 the existing transportation network as the base for
24 the No Project, assessing the Preferred Transportation
25 Investment Strategy or modifying it to reflect shifts
in investment priorities, and finally assessing explicit transportation demands, management policies (such as pricing) for the alternatives.

So with that, I will turn it over to Mark.

MR. SHORETT: Hi. I'm going to talk for a little bit about the Preferred Alternative and then go into the other alternatives. These have kind of been laid out, and I'm going to just provide a little more detail on them.

So first, the Job-Housing Connection. This particular alternative is the Project Alternative as required by CEQA. This is the land use as well as Transportation Investment Strategy that was adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the ABAG Executive Board in May, and now this is kind of the first piece of how we will meet the SB 375 target particularly related to greenhouse gases. So this is intended to do that, but of course, all the other alternatives we're going to be looking at would be required to do that as well.

So really the building block for this is a set of Priority Development Areas. And we actually provided an overview of those, so I won't go into too much detail. But there are over 200 of them, and all of them are nominated by cities.
In most cases they go through a process with city council so there's very broad support. And then the planners in the local jurisdictions work with planners in ABAG to look at the way in which local plans would support opportunities to provide a development pattern both at the local scale and a combined way at the regional scale that would help us leverage transportation investments.

Obviously we have a great deal of transportation infrastructure already on the ground. There's been a substantial amount of investment in that, and there are opportunities to further leverage that by an increase in ridership, providing greater benefits to the communities around the stations, et cetera. So this is required to be within the existing community, and in most cases in an infill development area; as Ashley mentioned, near an existing or planned transit station. There is a set of guidelines which relate to most of the PDAs. Most of the PDAs achieve them, and these will also relate to projects which would provide some CEQA clearance as Transit Priority Project areas. So to provide just a little linkage there, there will be potentially quite a few projects or maybe there will be a limited number of projects that would be in areas already zoned for the TPP guidelines that
were shown earlier and that are already supported by local governments in terms of the zoning, and that's oftentimes part of the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy. And so that would be an opportunity to kind of avail of those environmental benefits and CEQA benefits.

So another part of the Priority Development Areas is providing housing and/or jobs. And then a key part is that there's a diversity of densities and community identities that are captured by the Priority Development Areas. And this really relates to the collaborative process between the local jurisdictions and other local jurisdictions, as well as ABAG.

So to take an example. Here in San Francisco, we're in the middle of a Priority Development Area which is anticipated for a very significant amount of future jobs and housing, and that's because it's a regional center. It's really the core of existing and future transportation investments.

But then we also have locations such as 19th Avenue which are anticipated to have lower levels of growth but also the opportunities to really provide people with greater mobility, help provide housing in locations that are accessible to destinations within San Francisco and other locations.
And then going down to San Mateo County, you can take as an example downtown San Mateo. And downtown San Mateo is, again, a center, but not the same kind of center as downtown San Francisco. So we anticipate something involving less jobs, less housing, but still a substantial amount. And that focuses obviously around the Caltrans station there. And in most cases, the PDA projections are consistent with local zoning or opportunities to increase density in the areas identified by communities.

So in addition to the PDAs, the strategy includes Priority Conservation Areas and Investment Areas. Priority Conservation Areas are also locally nominated, and they're areas to be retained for agriculture or open space to maintain quality of life. It's also important I mention that these were primarily proposed by counties in the North Bay. These are locations in which the local economy and the ability to support community identity is very closely tied to the agricultural and other resources immediately surrounding the communities.

And so that also relates to the Investment Areas. In the same way that most of the Priority Conservation Areas were proposed by North Bay communities, the Investment Areas were also proposed primarily by North
Bay communities. So you have this linkage between providing relatively small-scale investments for these Investment Areas, which are centers of the community, and then also providing some support for protecting the surrounding open space and agricultural lands.

So here on the map you see the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy from a spatial perspective. And you can see that the vast majority of the development in this particular alternative, the Project Alternative, takes places within the existing urban footprint.

PDAs comprise four percent of the region's land. In this alternative, eighty percent of new homes will go into PDAs and sixty six percent of new jobs will go into PDAs. And ninety nine percent of all growth would go into the existing urbanized footprint. So that fits very closely with the overall framework of PDAs and priority conservation areas and investment areas. But, again, you can see the regional transportation infrastructure there too, so the Plan had to be developed in concert with the Transportation Investment Strategy.

So we've already heard quite a bit about the No Project Alternative. This, again, is required by CEQA. From a land use perspective, this would include...
no planning program for Priority Development Areas. And we would anticipate that this would include a dispersed job and housing growth pattern supported by existing General Plans and zoning.

As far as transportation, this would be based on the 2010 existing transportation network, and it would only include projects that have either received funding or environmental clearance as of May 1st, 2011.

So briefly the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy. Land use, eighty percent of new housing and sixty six percent of new development in PDAs; focused investment in PDAs, and that would involve local planning support coming from ABAG as well as the OneBayArea grant program which helps facilitate opportunities to focus transportation infrastructure in these PDAs. And then also an effort to retain affordable housing in PDAs.

So from a transportation perspective, the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy: $277 billion dollar plan budget; eighty eight percent directed to operations and maintenance of existing systems. So that really supports the kind of core focus development pattern that helps support existing communities.
And then this also advances key investment strategies. And so these are really focused on issues such as closing the GHG gap, taking a fix-it-first approach to our existing infrastructure, using the OneBayArea grant framework which we just talked about, funding high performers which involves really taking a more rigorous approach to future transportation investments so that they can all be compared across common metrics. And this is an analysis which MTC has already done and this is built into the Transportation Investment Strategy. Then we also get into squeezing more efficiency out of our existing system, and then making the transit system sustainable.

Alternative Three -- and as Ashley mentioned, these are preliminary concepts that we would like to develop. But they're also really open for discussion and we'd like to get your input on these. And you'll see following this some of the key questions.

So land use. Fewer new jobs and housing in PDAs, additional growth close to transit outside of PDAs, decentralized jobs and single family construction supported by General Plans.

From a transportation perspective, we deemed it the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy.

Alternative Four, Eliminate Inter-Regional
1 Commute. So in this particular alternative, all jobs
2 will be filled by Bay Area residents. We would
3 anticipate that this would involve major subsidies for
4 housing close to employment centers at edges of the
5 region which would help facilitate the process of not
6 having that housing go across the boundaries into
7 adjacent counties.

8 Transportation would be a modified version of
9 Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy. This
10 would involve the Transit Comprehensive Operations
11 Analyses implementation, and we can give more
12 information about that if you're interested. And then
13 only HOV lane conversions for express lanes. This
14 would also involve implementing priority policies such
15 as road pricing and parking pricing.

16 A Fifth Alternative is Environment, Equity and
17 Jobs. Land use. Additional affordable housing
18 locations with high levels of low-income commuting,
19 and then additional affordable housing locations with
20 high-performing schools and local services.

21 So in many cases, these are going to be the same
22 places. So, for example, there's a lot of locations
23 on the peninsula where you have really good schools
24 and you have a very high level of low-income
25 in-commuting.
And in terms of transportation, there's a second modification of the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy. And this involves restoring transit service back to 2005 levels, and then only HOV lane conversions would take place for express lanes.

So one of the things we want to do through the alternatives process is test out policies which can help us achieve some of the objectives of the Sustainable Community Strategy and then also achieve other sorts of environmental benefits that we're going to be testing out here.

So some of those are zoning. This would be changes to local zoning. Incentives such as the CEQA streamlining that we've discussed earlier. If that were the case, we would assume that more communities avail of the CEQA streamlining that was described.

Fees and subsidies. Such things as impact fees and the Indirect Source Rule.

Road pricing, parking policies and then the extent to which growth boundaries and natural areas are protected by policy.

So I'm going to hand it back over to Ashley to talk about what type of feedback we would like to solicit today.

MS. NGUYEN: Just two more slides. Thanks
for bearing with us.

So in thinking or formulating your thoughts and comments about alternatives, we do ask that you focus on three specific questions that are shown here on this slide.

The first is that are we applying the appropriate policy levers to really encourage sustainable development, whether those policy levers be the ones that attract development or constrain development in places where we would like to discourage growth?

Are there missing land use policy or transportation strategies that we ought to think about and consider when we are defining that range of reasonable alternatives?

And lastly, should we test an entirely different alternative altogether? We presented three alternative ideas for you, but you may have a fourth or even a fifth that we might want to consider.

So in thinking about that different alternative, also let us know what the policy levers are to create that alternative to really understand the policy measures that would be needed in order to facilitate a different land use growth pattern or a different Transportation Investment Strategy so that we know what the policies are that really determines the
outcome of that strategy.

This slide is the last slide. It's the EIR schedule. We are on a pretty efficient schedule in terms of preparing this EIR. As I mentioned from the outset, we are holding regional scoping meetings. This is the last one, I believe, tomorrow.

Our intention here as staff will be taking in the comments and feedback received, and we will be presenting some final alternative ideas for our joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee review on July 13th, and then we will seek approval from our respective boards on July 19th. Once we have these alternatives solidified in some respects, we will then be able to more adequately move into the actual preparation of the Draft EIR during the summer months through the end of November.

The plan is to release a Draft EIR for a 45-day public comment period in mid-December, and we still look to have a Final Plan Bay Area as well as a Final Plan Bay Area EIR ready for our commission and ABAG approval in the spring of 2013.

With that, we'll close, and I will open it up for public comment. If you would like to present us with your comments and feedback today, we do ask that you formulate a short line into the microphone so that we
can be taking your feedback.

And as you approach the microphone, again, please keep in mind the groundrules that we set out in the beginning, and also make sure to clearly state your name for the record so that we know who you are and we can capture your comments appropriately. It's also adjustable.

MR. CHODEN: I'm Bernard Choden. I'm with San Francisco Tomorrow. This is a very commendable scope of analysis that is presented today. My problem is that the analysis follows a predetermination of the ends, namely in terms of alternate plans.

THE REPORTER: Excuse me, sir. You need to speak into the microphone. It's hard for me to hear. Thank you.

MR. CHODEN: The first question as to the means, the mitigation required for the impacts, namely as to resources and means necessary to carry them out. For example, would you be doing input/output analysis in terms of designee and efficacy and efficiency in terms of varying enterprises relating to each other. So that which is the best fit for sustaining the overall economy? That's a technical question.

Following that is how will this be designated in terms of necessary location as to the resources in
governmental institutions that should be designated to carry out the mitigations? Are we creating, under CEQA, in effect, the necessary resources to assuage the impacts? Is that clear?

Okay. Predesignating the effectiveness of the locations. I must confess that I'm engaged in suing the City of San Francisco where we have 90,000 persons in effect vacated out of their iconic 136 acres. And 19th Avenue is spending, in effect, money in violation of CEQA. And there we have an excuse to abandon CEQA. But untold resources.

There were other aspects of this, but I would like to hear more about the economic underpinnings regarding resources for things, and I would like to hear more about what would be the primary stimulus for our cohesive approach that overrides what I would call the inefficiencies of local government.

MS. NGUYEN: I won't address all your comments directly, but we will take that feedback in.

There's two points that I will respond to. One is mitigations. And so for any potential impacts identified as part of this Plan, we will indeed provide mitigations to reduce or minimize those impacts.

For the mitigations, we will be very specific as...
to who would be responsible for implementing that mitigation, whether it's a regional agency or local jurisdictions. So we'd make sure that the roles and responsibilities are clear.

With regard to the economic impacts, Vicki did mention that in parallel to this environmental assessment we are producing an Environmental Impact Analysis. And I think more the question that you had along the economic inputs/outputs and some of the ramifications will be more directly addressed in that document.

The key here is that our boards, the commission and the ABAG executive board, will have three pieces of information in front of them before they take action on the Plan. They'll have the outcomes of the Environmental Assessment. They'll have the outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment, and they'll also have the outcomes of the Equity Assessment. And it's the entirety of that analysis that they would use to inform their decision making.

MR. CHODEN: Thank you. Could I have a copy of the analysis program?

MS. NGUYEN: Each of those analyses that I just described, the Equity, the Environment and the Economic Analysis are just starting, and we will be
releasing those work products, those reports, either later in this fall or in December.

MR. CHODEN: I'm asking for, in effect, the program that precedes the analysis. How are you arranging the research, and what are you covering? Specifically who are you designating --

MS. NGUYEN: Are you talking about the scope of work?

MR. CHODEN: The abstracts, the analysis. How are you handling --

MS. NGUYEN: We'll be happy to, one, engage you in the specifics of each of the assessments, and we will post as much information as we can on the OneBayArea.org so that everyone has access to the same information.

MR. CHODEN: I thank you. It would help, so that I can put my resources at your behest; namely, if I saw your work program before you start it.

MS. NGUYEN: Okay.

MR. CHODEN: I have considerable background in this.

MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Great. Thank you. We appreciate that. Next speaker, please.

MR. BROWN: Hopefully everybody can hear me if I get low enough here. Thank you all for that nice
presentation. I really appreciated the detail. I have four comments or questions.

The first one involves the project being fully exempt from CEQA. I think this is an amazing move in the right direction. I'm not sure that we should just go ahead and say up front there's very few opportunities for that. Perhaps in the whole nine-county region there may be, but anything we can do to increase the amount of projects that are compliant and exempt I think is going to be positive for the whole region.

I think we all need a little bit more information on what an S-C-E-A is, since that's a new term or perhaps a new document. So that was a first point.

The second one involves kind of clarifying what you all mean by a "key area of interest." Certainly for --- I don't know if I said my name. Peter Brown, SFMTA.

The state of good repair and pricing being key areas of interest; that's great. I just don't know what that means. How would they be addressed in the EIR as key areas of interest?

The third point that I have -- and this is probably the most important one in my mind -- involves around the issues of evaluation. And in your
transformation section, it's basically all geared towards automobile analysis. I don't really understand what you mean by decreasing the average number of jobs within these different segments of minutes. I'm not sure how that's a transportation issue.

The next two bullets are all around VMT, level of service and increased capacity or increase per-capita VMT. I don't see anything on impacting transit service or augmenting transit service or some type of analysis on how to benefit what we all know is a great faith in the regional goals both in terms of TACs and mobility and TODs. So I think your transportation issues for evaluation needs to be a little bit more robust and including transit issues.

And then lastly, my fourth point gets to these different scenarios that you guys laid out quite nicely. I don't understand why implementing priority policies -- you guys bulleted out road and parking pricing -- will only be evaluated in one scenario. You eliminate interregional commute.

When we did our analysis at MTA, we found that parking and road pricing had the greatest impact on TAC reductions, generating revenue, much-needed revenue for transit in multimodal services, and that
the economic impacts have been mostly positive. In fact, we have a lot of case studies that show that it's incredibly positive.

So the only -- to include that in one transportation scenario might not be the best thing. It may be like a lever that you could put into each of the different scenarios, including adding it to the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy.

So thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

MS. LEE: Good morning. My name is ShiuFan Lee. I live in San Francisco for 38 years. I vote this project No Plan. That's my position. And there's no global warming. It's a lie.

Ocean covers 72 percent of earth's surface and land covers 28 percent of earth's surface. And people exhale CO2 and the plants inhale CO2. We inhale -- people inhale oxygen, and therefore it's healthy to have both co-existing.

What's CARB? California Area Resources Board. The CARB is an all-elected and unaccountable bureaucracy that will impose unprecedented limits on our economy and our freedom if not stopped.

CARB has 1176 employees and average salaries of over $85,000 a year, while our teachers are being laid off.
off and nearby all the agencies force cuts. CARB has added hundreds of new employees.

MTBE was added to gasoline for 20 years and cost California drivers thousands, millions, thousands of dollars. Finally CARB announced it is a poison. It contaminates water systems underground.

Hien T. Tran was the lead scientist who wrote a report upon which the heavy trucks and buses regulations are based. He bought a mail-order Ph.D from Thornhill University, located at 255 Madison, New York. Using his fake Ph.D the unqualified liar applied for and got a position as manager of the Health and Ecosystem Assessment Section.

Some of the board members, the chair of the California Air Resources Board, Mary Nichols, knew of the fraud before voting on the controversial regulation. The board member who knew kept the information from other board members for a year after the vote. The governor also had information and failed to take action.

Why I want to suspend AB 32: Economists estimate if nothing is done, AB 32 will cost California up to 1.1 million jobs.

Number two. It will cost the average family $3,857 dollars a year, and will greatly increase
expenses for housing, transportation, food and energy. It will cost $50,000 for small businesses.

Number four. It will result in total loss of output of $182.649 billion dollars.

Number five. It will devastate budgets of California social services agencies through massive loss in cuts to revenues. California produces only 1.4 percent of world greenhouse gas emissions, so our efforts to address climate changes, if even real, cannot be successful alone.

MS. NGUYEN: May I ask you to wrap up your comments, please?

MS. LEE: My comment is I have a letter to back up Mr. Tran's unfortunately having a degree. I have a letter written that is from CARB Executive Officer James Goldstein, letter to Dr. Young on February 23rd, year 2010.

And he said, "Dear Dr. Young, I am writing to correct a statement made in a letter to you dated November 4th, 2008 from California EPA Secretary Linda Adams regarding the credential of the lead author of ARB report.

"In December 2008, it was learned that Mr. Hien Tran, the lead ARB staff member responsible for preparing the report, falsely claimed he had received
a Ph.D from UC Davis. The issue was not fidelity of
the health data or accuracy of method used to prepare
the report, rather the credentials of the staff person
who was subsequently demoted and disciplined.
However, to eliminate any questions of the science,
the report will be redone, peer-reviewed, and brought
-- "

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comment. We
appreciate it.

MS. LEE: I'm not finished yet. Excuse me.

MS. NGUYEN: I'll give you thirty more
seconds to wrap up. We have other speakers.

MS. LEE: " -- back to the board in
April 2010. The board will also conduct a symposium
February 28, 2010, to review the science of the health
effects of these emissions. This will be done in an
open public symposium with board members, leading
academics in the World Health Organization and the
members of ARBS Research Screening Committee.

"Please contact me at 916 445-4383 if you have any
questions or would like additional information."

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comments.

MR. NAPIER: Richard Napier, and I'm with the
San Mateo Congestion Management Agency. There's just
a couple of points, and I'll try to be brief.
One relative to the definition of communities of concern. I think I've heard this in Sonoma County and others. A broad national definition doesn't fit the Bay Area given the cost.

And also, we went through a community-based transportation plan for communities of concern, and MTC's definition didn't go with it. So we had to do a county-wide plan also.

So what I'm asking is don't take a very simple definition of communities of concern because I think they've been defined within the counties.

The second point, you focused on the transportation measure as vehicle miles traveled. But when projection -- when you're at service level F, it really doesn't have a lot of meaning. And I think you need to also use vehicle hours of delay because F means standing still.

One of the most significant points I wanted to raise is on one of your charts, you had mentioned that -- you said there would be none of these impacts; therefore, it's not going to be studied. And one of them was public services. I don't think you can make that assumption.

Public services are inadequate to serve the current people, much less any amount of growth. So I
would ask you to reconsider. I think you are going to
have to take a look at public services, especially the
limited funding that's available.

I did have just one other point, and this is a
question. The concept of a rural PDA -- although it's
somewhat of a different definition -- I take it that's
going to be something outside this process?

The question came up on the coast side of San
Mateo County. For right now, the PDA is just focused
on the urban areas, correct?

MR. SHORETT: That's correct with the PDAs.
What were previously discussed as real PDAs are
included as real investment areas at this point.

So the amount of growth is going to be similar to
what was estimated before -- the designation of
Investment Area relates largely to the way in which
the region is going to look at resources, including
planning grants, et cetera, for those areas relative
to PDAs.

MR. NAPIER: For instance, in the coast of
San Mateo county, they had submitted something for --
well, it was PDA at the time. I think the Rural
Investment Area is a much better name. Has that been
accepted or not accepted? It's my understanding you
hadn't really identified those Rural Investment Areas
at this point.

MR. SHORETT: So there are currently adjustments being made to a number of those Rural Investment Areas. Those are going -- there was a RPC recommendation that the executive board adopt those as per some of the adjustments that were recommended at that meeting at the upcoming executive board meeting in July.

MS. LaFEBRE: Hello. Hilda LaFebre. I'm with San Mateo County Transit District, and I want to thank you for the presentation. It's very important. I just have a couple of questions.

One is about the CEQA streamlining opportunities. If you could please elaborate in regards to what does that mean? What would be the best practical way to exercise that?

And the second is will the Grand Boulevard Initiative be part of this programmatic EIR? And if not, what would be the best approach to go through the environmental period under CEQA?

As you know, this is an initiative that involves many communities from San Francisco to San Jose. So would that be another programmatic way, and then each of the cities would have to do a project a specific way? I think it's a good time for us to ask these
questions.

MS. NGUYEN: Okay. So you had two questions. One is to have a better understanding of the CEQA streamlining method that's under SB 375, and the second is the environmental process for the Grand Boulevard Initiative.

So the CEQA streamlining provision in SB 375 are really there as opportunities for local jurisdictions as they have specific residential mixed use projects that qualified on the number of different criteria developed in the law to afford some CEQA streamlining.

So really in terms of steps that would need to be taken, one is a development project that qualifies in terms of the basic definition in SB 375. After it materialized, it will go through the local planning process, the planning commission and the city council, and at that point in time as that project is preparing its Environmental Assessment, they can look to the Plan to see if, one, it's consistent with the uses, densities and intensities in the Plan, and two, if it qualifies as either the Residential or Mixed Use Project or the Transit Authority Project. And at that point in time, the local city council can make a decision on both fronts, and if they do, then they can go into those three different buckets of CEQA
streamlining.

There is a great level of detail in SB 375, and there's also been follow-up guidance by the OPR, Office of Planning and Research, that walks folks through the schematic on how that works. It's hard to explain in a minute, but what we'll do is we'll have reference documents on OneBayArea.org so folks like yourselves and others might dive into the details.

The second is the Grand Boulevard Initiative environmental process. So just to be very clear, the programmatic Environmental Impact Report that we're preparing is for Plan Bay Area, and we'll be looking at the broad regional impacts of that Plan in terms of both the integrated land use and transportation impacts on the physical environment.

We will not be able to go into any detail about specific projects such as the Grand Boulevard Initiative in this move in this programmatic document. That said, we would expect or hope that the environmental process for the Grand Boulevard Initiative could in some respects tier off of our programmatic EIR for Plan Bay Area. But that doesn't mean that it doesn't have to conduct its own more project-specific environmental impact assessment.

And so there's some benefit of having this Plan be
done at a programmatic level, and it uses information that's useful in this Plan, particularly in the areas of growth-inducing impact, or any of the cumulative impacts could definitely be useful to the jurisdictions that are moving forward and implementing both environmental and the actual delivery of that project to be able to use our document.

So there's some synergies and some benefits there. But the bottom line is the Grand Boulevard Initiative will have to have its own project specific (INAUDIBLE - AUDIENCE BACKGROUND NOISE).

MS. LaFEBRE: Thank you very much.

MS. HANSEN: Hello. My name is Eleanor Hansen. I'm a San Francisco business person -- that's why I'm here -- and a Sunnyvale activist. I wanted to make three comments.

The first is about what the comparisons of the project need to be made to. And according to CEQA, my understanding -- I'm a plaintiff in a case known as Sunnyvale West et al, versus the City of Sunnyvale. And this was about traffic baselines.

And so this is what we've got here. The baseline needs to include current and existing. That has to be one of them. And current and existing could be what is operational as of the time the -- was rejected --
when right in the EIR -- was rejected to be operational as of the time the EIR is approved.

In addition, you need to do cumulative. You need to compare the project to what the cumulative conditions are going to be, what, 40 years.

Now if in addition you want to do what you describe you're going to do, that's fine. But the two things that are required -- the first one according to Sunnyvale West, et al -- is that you do current and existing, not current and existing and all these other things. Okay. It will be inadequate. Do not do that.

Second. I'm involved in the Sunnyvale West case. And under transportation, you say you're going to judge the effect on "increase in vehicle miles traveled on facilities experiencing level of service F." Level of service F, LOS F.

One, F is not really that bad. Two, nothing gets people out of their cars faster than leaving them in LOS F. When they spend a lot of time in LOS F, they start looking for public transportation. So that's one reason why I don't particularly think that's an important criteria.

Now, what you're planning on doing, and what's happening in the case underlying Sunnyvale West, was
the city wanted to run the traffic away from a LOS F situation into a quiet residential neighborhood which had LOS BC.

That is not appropriate. You do not do that. Forget about that for mitigation. Either give them the public transportation or leave them in the LOS F situation.

I had the experience maybe a year ago. I found myself at 8:30 in the morning in the middle of San Jose traffic on a Tuesday. I will never do that again. When I need to go to that area, I will go on Saturday when traffic is bad (sic). Seriously. Leave the traffic high. People will figure out how to avoid it.

And the third point is about your scenario for Eliminate Interregional Commute. People do not live in Stockton. By the middle of the day Stockton will probably go into bankruptcy. Sometime later this week -- either early July if not this week.

People do not live over there because there isn't adequate housing in the Bay Area. There's plenty of adequate housing in the Bay Area. The problem is it's not cheap enough for them. Okay. And you aren't going to be able to build cheap housing or cheap-enough housing in the Bay Area for them using this kind of procedure. It's just a bunch of
handwick. Thank you.

MS. BRISSON: Good morning. Liz Brisson of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority. I thank you very much for the opportunity to provide input early in the process.

I have just a couple of comments. One is that in general I am very supportive of the range of different alternatives that have been selected. I think it's a good opportunity that some of the ideas considered earlier in this planning process that weren't considered in different scenarios need to be tested, including looking at pricing, which we know is a very effective way of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. And I think it's important to continue to bring that along, and to identify its benefits for policy makers if there's an opportunity later in the process perhaps to include that, as well as looking at increasing affordable housing in areas that have above-median income housing income levels.

Second point I want to make relates to -- you didn't touch on it too much -- but the new analysis methodology for this EIR. This is something I'm very supportive of, but I just wanted to sort of request that as we switch to a new methodology, to try to be as transparent as possible in terms of what the
assumptions are and what the caveats are so we can
sort of have that information included in the results.

And then my third point relates to something that
Peter Brown of SFMTA also mentioned earlier, which is
consider adding an impact measure for transit crowding
under the Transportation Impact Area.

We actually spent quite a bit of time, both our
agency as well as BART, working with the MTC modeling
staff to come up with a methodology to be able to
forecast that. And I think it would be a really
important thing to bring along. Because we know that
in San Francisco we have a pretty serious transit
crowding problem today, and with the amount of growth
anticipated in the area, that's probably going to
become worse. You, of course, identify what that
impact is and mitigate it. Thank you.

MR. FREEDMAN: Hi. My name is Aubrey
Freedman. I don't work for a government agency. I'm
a homeowner on the west side in Miraloma Park. I'm
kind of concerned about this whole process here
encouraging dense housing. Well, that's fine for
people who choose to live in that, but many families
actually like single family dwellings where you're not
looking at a building and you have a tiny bit of a
yard or whatever. This seems to be an effort to kind
of push people away from that.

So I am kind of concerned about that. Single family dwelling is the American way as far as I'm concerned. This seems to be opposed to it and trying to push people into something different.

Also I've noticed on the west side -- these lanes are disappearing. They're becoming bicycle lanes. Car lanes are suddenly disappearing as three lanes became two lanes, and there's a bicycle lane now which just adds to the traffic congestion. It seems like another effort to force people out of their cars.

People -- we still love our cars. We're going to drive somewhere five or ten minutes versus taking public transportation takes you an hour and a half to get there. That seems rather silly. So most people are still going to use their cars. Not to mention we have families; public transportation is not always the best way to get your kids to soccer practice or whatever.

So I'm just kind of concerned about this whole Plan. It seems to push dense housing. I'm also concerned how would this affect the people on the west side of the City who kind of like quiet residential neighborhoods and do not want dense housing amongst them.
That's it. Thank you.

MS. HEIM: My name is Adrienne Heim. I'm with TransAct based in San Francisco. I just had some questions with regards to the OneBayArea grant. Some cities have to meet certain criteria regarding their housing land plan and their transportation plan strategy. I think there should be some points that they have to touch on within those plans, such as investment without displacement. And within the TDM, parking policies in residential development, and lowering the parking requirement. As you can see with AB 904, they're thinking of having a minimum of parking within transit-orient areas. So that should be assessed if that actually moves forward.

MS. SCOTT: Good morning. My name is Lois Scott, and I live in the Geary corridor, east side of San Francisco. It's already an area of pretty substantial density.

My concern is the environmental CEQA exemption and exactly -- I'm sure it's going to cover most of my neighborhood. And how much of the rest of San Francisco will it cover? Will we lose the check and balance from the citizens' perspective of environmental review?
It took me 45 minutes to take the 38 bus close in
to get here. One 38 bus, the Limited, completely
passed me by this morning. As has been stated, our
transit systems in San Francisco are often very
congested, even not at peak.

What is going to guarantee that if you do high
density residential infill that you're going to have
the transit services that are needed? All of us in
our neighborhood ride transit, but it's hard, and it
gets hard as you get older to access the buses all the
time.

The other -- I think there's much commendable in
the Plan. Of course, I think the question of public
services and community facilities also needs to be
addressed if you're going to make substantial increase
in density. Are you looking at the actual capacity of
a city environment to absorb more, or in fact a rural
environment to absorb more? Is there a capacity
analysis in terms of livability as a part of this
process?

And finally, while I think we all in principle
like the idea of sustainability, I would like to see
where is the efficiency and sustainability of a high
rise building? Is a 50-story building which
apparently is pretty energy-intensive,
material-intensive and so forth really what preserves
air quality and makes our region sustainable?

I guess from on-the-ground experience, it appears
to me that our bigger buildings are very much on the
luxury condo end of the economy. I'm not sure that
they really encourage their occupants to live in a
sustainable locally-oriented pattern. I think they're
often occupied by people who work in Silicon Valley or
people who are doing work from other countries rather
than a pattern that really is what I understand
sustainability is, which is trying to live and work
and recreate in the same area.

So I feel like there's gaps. I guess it's hard to
tell at this point in how you're really testing how
sustainable density is and also what the actual
capacities of places like San Francisco that are
already pretty dense are in absorbing and being able
to service more population. Thank you.

MS. MERENBACH: Hi. My name is Danielle
Merenbach. Thank you for the presentation. It's
really informative.

I just want to ask you about something that wasn't
really addressed today which was more on the line of
equity. We're mostly talking about commuters which is
a hugely important population for this project. But
I'd like to ask that you remember the other population who will be affected by this, to include older citizens, the disabled, children. There is a really huge potential here to increase their use of transit, increase mobility, make our streets safer for kids to walk to school or bike to school or take a easily-accessible bus to school instead of being driven, letting our seniors have more mobility to get their family to the doctor, to their place of worship, whatever that is. And there's some really simple ways to do that, and those weren't particularly addressed today. We mostly focused on making the ride to work easier which I understand is very important. But I'd ask that you keep in mind things like sidewalks, medians, bus stops that are covered with a bench for older people who can't stand either in the rain or in the sun for that long, even for a bus.

I hope that when you're planning this, you will make our streets not only more efficient but also safer and more attractive for our bicyclists and pedestrians. Thanks.

MR. SHORETT: I just want to say one thing about that. I'm just going to mention the -- if you haven't looked at it, I would encourage you -- this isn't directly 100 percent related to the
environmental process, but I would encourage you to
look at the OneBayArea grant that was adopted in May
by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the
ABAG executive board. You can find it on the
OneBayArea Web site.

So a big part of the OneBayArea grant which is
focused in our development areas is supporting exactly
the type of infrastructure investment you just
described. And then that's going to be carried out by
the congestion management agencies. So if you want to
look at who is doing that in your area and get
involved -- but I recommend taking a look at that.

MS. NGUYEN: Any more comments? All right.
Thank you. If there aren't any other comments, we're
going to go ahead and close the meeting. Yes?

MR. CHODEN: I'm so sorry. If I might say
one more word.

Seismic safety. Do we have sustainability to
survive in an inevitable major earthquake? It will
come soon. Seismic safety must precede any
consideration of alternate scenarios. Place it in
front of the analysis.

Seismic safety. It's not there. The City has not
adapted what we call Caps 1, 2 and 3. It refuses to
do so for political reasons. And to rely on those
political persons who give us those political reasons turns the clock backwards.

MS. NGUYEN: Well, thank you up all for your comments today.

MS. HOFFMAN: I just want to quickly ask in listening to all the conversation, great presentation and great comments. And so I just want to hear you say that you're going to put your best foot forward and best effort to address these issues that have been brought to you today. I want to hear that. I'd like to hear that.

MS. DIX: We're compiling all of the comments, both ones that we receive orally in all of these meetings as well as any written comments that you submit, which we still encourage you to do so up until the July 11th deadline, and then we will be preparing a response to those comments and discussing how we will incorporate it into the alternatives.

MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you. I'm Virginia Hoffman.

MS. DIX: Thank you all for attending. Once again, the information for submitting written comments is on the screen as well as in the PowerPoint that you should have.
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MS. NGUYEN: So welcome to today's scoping meeting on the Plan Bay Area Environmental Impact Report. We are excited that you are here today to participate in the scoping process. We are looking forward to hearing your comments on the scope and content of the environmental issues that we are hoping to explore in this Environmental Impact Report.

Before I begin, let me go through a quick introduction and then a set of groundrules for today's meeting. So the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments are colead agencies on the preparation of this Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area.

We are here today to seek your comments on the scope and content of the EIR so that we are aware of the issues you may have with regards to environmental effects that we should consider as we move forward with our environmental assessment. So we hope today that you could give us that feedback.

Before I begin, the format to today's meeting is twofold. First, we will begin with a staff presentation so that we can explain and walk you through the Plan Bay Area process and the environmental process so that you are aware of the
work that we are doing. And we will open it up for
public comments, and we will give you an opportunity
to provide us with your feedback.

Before I begin the staff presentation, what I want
to do is walk you through a series of groundrules for
today's meeting so that we can have a really
productive and useful conversation.

So after the presentation, we will be taking your
comments. We will ask that you line up at the podium
-- it's just right here to my left -- and take your
turn to speak.

Many of you have seen the blue comment cards at
the table. We ask that you fill out the speaker card
with your name and give it the staff once you approach
the podium. The reason we do this is so that we can
properly spell your name for the record.

We do ask that you keep your comments as concise
and to the point as possible so that we can allow the
maximum number of participants to provide us with oral
comments today. We also ask that you really focus on
the environmental issues that you want us to consider
as we move forward with the development of this
environmental study.

A court reporter is here today to record your
comments. We ask that you speak clearly for her
benefit because we would like to have all your
comments recorded for the record. She may ask you to
repeat some things because she didn't hear it well, so
please be aware of that or she may request that you
speak slower so that she can properly record your
comments.

We do ask that you please disagree respectfully.
Please do not shout or interrupt speakers or staff as
we make the presentation or have cross-dialogue. It
makes it really difficult for us to hear your comments
and to also record them properly. So we just ask that
you respect each other as we move forward with this
scoping meeting.

We are planning to take oral comments today.
However, if you should have additional comments after
this meeting, we certainly invite and encourage you to
provide them to us in writing after this meeting. The
deadline for submitting written comments on the
Environmental Impact Report is July 11th, and we do
have the information on the table as to where to send
those comments.

So with that, let me go ahead and start our
presentation, and we will try to give you a brief and
comprehensive overview of Plan Bay Area Plan Bay Area
and the Environmental Impact Report, and then, again,
1 really give you the opportunity to provide us with
2 your feedback today.
3
4 So in terms of the agenda topics that we will
5 cover through this presentation, we will first begin
6 with an overview of Plan Bay Area. We will then drill
7 down to some specifics about some CEQA streamlining
8 opportunities that are afforded by Senate bill 375.
9 And then we will provide you with an overview of a
10 companion document called the Transition Improvement
11 Program, and then we will walk you through some of the
details in terms of the purpose and scope of the
12 Environmental Impact Report.
13
14 We are looking specifically for your comments on
15 issues for evaluation, so we'll walk you through some
16 of the key environmental issues that we will study in
17 this assessment. We will also walk you through some
18 of our initial ideas about alternatives for evaluation
19 and consideration in this environmental document, and
20 we also seek your feedback on these alternatives. We
21 will then conclude and we'll give you an opportunity
22 to provide comments.
23
24 So Plan Bay Area is the first regional plan to
25 integrate transportation, land use and housing as
26 mandated by California Senate Bill 375. The primary
27 purpose of this Integrated Land Use and Transportation
Plan is to help lower greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks through, again, a combination of land use and transportation improvements that we will be making over the next 28 years. The law calls for the Bay Area to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by a negative 0.7 percent in the year 2020 and by a negative 0.15 percent in the year 2035 from 2005 levels.

So in addition to the climate goals, the Plan also looks to point out a number of additional goals, including providing housing for Bay Area residents, building a stronger economy, protecting our natural environment and enhancing accessibility and opportunities for residents from all walks of life.

There is a key provision in this state law that allows for CEQA streamlining for certain residential and mixed use development projects that are well supported by high-quality transit. What the state law has really done is it has allowed our agency, MTC, and the Association of Bay Area Governments to really engage local governments, stakeholders and the communities in a conversation about how can we really define an efficient land use pattern that really takes into account local character but also allows us to really maximize the transportation investments we make.
In this long-range plan.

To support this effort, the state law allows for CEQA streamlining for certain projects. As you can see on this slide, there's two classes of projects that can take advantage of some of these CEQA-relief opportunities in the state law.

The first is residential mixed use projects, and to call qualify as a residential mixed use project, you must meet certain density thresholds. And in this case it's at least 75 percent of the total building square footage must be residential.

The second class is what's called a Transit Priority Project or TPP for short. And to qualify as a Transit Priority Project, you again must meet certain densities and intensities of development. But the key thing here to be a Transit Priority Project you really must be within a half mile stop of a major transit station or within a high-quality transit corridor that's served by (INAUDIBLE) frequencies.

For those of you who have been involved in our regional plannings efforts to date, you know that we've been working with local jurisdictions on facilitating job and housing growth in Priority Development Areas. And so the state law expands that reach a little bit and includes these Transit Priority
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Projects.

So this next slide drills down in a little bit more detail about what opportunities are available to local jurisdictions if they choose to admit these kind of projects within their communities.

There is two screening processes, if you will. The first is that the residential or mixed use project must be consistent with Plan Bay Area in terms of general uses, densities and intensities. And if you passed that first screening, and your project is in the Transit Authority-eligible area and you meet all exemption codes that are called out in the state law, that project may receive CEQA streamlining in terms of a complete CEQA exemption.

Another case is that a project is consistent with the Plan and it's in a Transit Authority-eligible area, and it doesn't meet all the exemption codes. Under state law, that project can still take advantage of the CEQA streamlining through a different kind of streamline where they can produce a different kind of environmental document which is called a Sustainable Community Environmental Assessment.

And in the third case, you can still be a residential mixed use project that is a consistent with our Plan, but you are not in an area that's
well-served by transit. There are some limited CEQA streamlining benefits that you can take advantage of. The state law allows local jurisdictions to retain their land use authority, and they can make a decision about whether or not these projects advance through the local development process and are able to take advantage of the CEQA streamlining called out in the state law.

I want to transition to a companion document which is called the Transportation Improvement Program. This is a four-year funding document that lays out a comprehensive listing of all the highways, roadways transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are receiving federal funds or are requiring some sort of federal action or are just regionally significant and we should consider in some of our regional analyses.

The key thing here is that projects in this four-year funding document must be consistent with Plan Bay Area. And so when MTC develops this long-range plan called Plan Bay Area, we simultaneously consult on the development of the Transportation Improvement Plan.

The current TIP is the 2011 Transportation Improvement Program, and it contains about $11 billion dollars worth of transportation investments. As you
1 can see from this slide and the next slide, a majority of the fund sources that are in this programming document come from local donors, primarily local county transportation sales tax and local streets and roads funds.

So in the next slide MTC is currently preparing a 2013 Transportation Improvement Program. We released it on June 22nd for public review, and we certainly appreciate any comments you have on that document. And what we're looking to do is to get Commission approval of that programming document later in September.

What I want to do now is turn it over to Hannah Lindelof of Dyett & Bhatia. Dyett & Bhatia is a planning and consulting firm in San Francisco, and they are helping MTC and ABAG prepare the Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area. Hannah is going to walk you through the scope and content of the EIR.

MS. LINDELOF: Thanks, Ashley. So the focus of our meeting today is to discuss the content of the Environmental Impact Report or EIR on Plan Bay Area. The purpose of the Environmental Impact Report is to identify the Plan's significant impacts on the environment, to expose that information to the public.
and decision-makers, to evaluate a reasonable alternative to the Plan, and to determine how the Plan can avoid or mitigate any negative impacts on the environment.

This will be a programmatic EIR that will present a region-wide assessment of the proposed Plan and alternatives and will also provide CEQA streamlining opportunities, as Ashley outlined, both for transportation, project proposals and for development projects as outlined by SB 375.

So the EIR focuses on environmental impacts. There will be two separate additional studies undertaken that will look at the other two main points, sustainability, equity and the economy.

The Economic Impact Analysis will be completed in fall of this year and will access the economic impact to Plan Bay Area's land use patterns and transportation investments on the regional economy.

The Equity Analysis will be completed in early 2013 and will assess the equity implications of all the alternatives that we're studying in the EIR. We will identity the benefits and burdens of land use, impacts and transportation investments on different socioeconomic groups.

In terms of the EIR process, the NOP and scoping
period that we're going through right now marks the kick off of the EIR process. All of the feedback we receive during this period will inform subsequent work.

Following this period, we will start work on researching environmental settings as well as defining the Plan and screening and defining the alternatives. All of that work will go into assessing environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts and analysis of alternatives.

We'll then complete an Administrative Draft EIR and then release a Public Review Draft EIR for a 45-day public review period. We'll have additional public hearings in January to review that report.

Following the Draft EIR, we'll produce a Final EIR but will respond to all comments on the Draft EIR with the aim of adopting -- certifying the Final EIR in April 2013.

So at the outset of the process, we want feedback on several key questions. Please keep these in mind as you make your comments on the EIR today.

So the first is what potential environmental issues should be analyzed? What alternatives should be evaluated? What types of mitigation measures should be considered that would help avoid or minimize
potential environmental impacts? And what elements of
the EIR would help your agency with CEQA exemptions
and tiering?

At this stage we have 13 environmental issue areas
for evaluation as outlined in the Notice of
Preparation and that are consistent with CEQA
guidelines.

The first is transportation. We'll be evaluating
impact on commute times and increased vehicle miles
traveled.

For air quality, we'll be assessing short-term
construction-related impacts as well as any increase
of emissions of criteria pollutants and toxic air
contaminants and any related health effects of those
emissions. And if there's any conflict with air
quality plans or violation of any air quality
standards.

In terms of land use and physical development,
we'll be evaluating each impact to agricultural land
and open space, any conflicts with locally-adopted
land use plans, and any impacts to existing
communities by disruption of placement or separation.

For energy, we'll assess any increase in
nonrenewable energy consumption or inconsistency with
energy conservation plans or policies.
For greenhouse gases and climate change, we'll look at any increase in net and per-capita CO2 emissions from on-road mobile sources, any vulnerability to sea level rise and any conflict with greenhouse gas reduction plans, policies, or regulations.

In terms of noise, we'll be looking for any exposure to noise levels or ground-borne vibration in excess of standards.

In related issues with geology and seismicity, we'll evaluate the Plan's increase in risk related to earthquakes, landslides, or ground failure, soil erosion or loss of topsoil or any increased development on expansive soils or on weak, unconsolidated soils.

For biological resources, we'll evaluate any adverse effect on sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat, wetlands or other sensitive natural communities. And we'll also evaluate interference with the movement of identified species or conflicts with adopted local conservation policies and resource plans.

For water resources, we'll evaluate a range of impacts related to groundwater recharge, stormwater runoff, erosion and risks related to flooding, seiche,
tsunami or mudflows.

For visual resources, we'll assess any adverse effects on scenic vistas, the scenic resources within a highway or existing visual character of communities and open space areas. We will also be looking at if there's a creation of a new source of light or glare.

Cultural resources, we'll look at any adverse change or damage to archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources, or disruption of human remains.

Public utilities, we'll assess any adverse effect on regional water supply, wastewater and stormwater facilities or solid waste.

And lastly, we'll be evaluating any growth-inducing effects which would evaluate whether the Plan would cause substantial unanticipated population growth beyond what is already projected.

At this time, we are not anticipating addressing hazardous materials, public services, recreation or mineral resources as we do not expect any impacts of regional importance in these areas.

So far all of the issue areas that I just outlined, we will be assessing them for the proposed Plan as well as for a range of alternatives. Each alternative is defined in terms of its land use...
component and transportation component.

The objective of the land use component is to meet the goals of the Plan. And the approach is to start with the locally adopted General Plans and zoning as the baseline, assess the preferred land use scenario, and then assess various land use policies to consider a range of future growth distribution scenarios for alternatives.

For transportation, we'll be also seeking to meet the goals of the Plan subject to the Financially-constrained Transportation Investment Strategy.

The approach will also be to start with the existing transportation network as the baseline, and then assess the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy or modify that strategy to reflect shifts in investment priorities, and then to assess explicit transportation demand management policies.

I'm going to pass it to Mark with the Association of Bay Area Governments to discuss today's alternatives in greater detail.

MR. SHORETT: Thank you. Let me adjust this Okay. I'll just lean down a little bit. Can everybody here me back there? Okay. Great.

So before getting into all five of the
alternatives, which I'm going to discuss in a little
more detail, I wanted to go over the Preferred
Scenario or the Project Alternative, which is the
Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy which is paired with
the Transportation Investment Strategy, both of which
were adopted at the May Metropolitan Transportation
Commission and ABAG's Executive Board joint meeting.

So one of the key building blocks of the
Jobs-Housing Connection strategy are Priority
Development Areas. And as Ashley mentioned, these are
all city-nominated areas. There is nearly 200 of them
in over 60 cities and counties.

This is the outcome of a process that started in
2007 in which the regional agencies began to work with
local governments throughout the region to identify
the places where they thought it would be appropriate
to accommodate higher levels of growth that are
anticipated in the future -- I should say growth
that's anticipated in the future. And one of the
underlying ideas here is are there opportunities to
link our transportation investments more effectively
and leverage those -- they're very expensive,
obviously -- with our future land use pattern. So
that fed into the development of this particular
approach to allocating land use across the region.
So the criteria are that they be within an existing community or infill development area, near an existing or planned transit, providing housing and/or jobs. And then within this context, there's really a diversity of densities and a diversity of characters that are captured.

So within Marin, for example, we will have a couple of examples. We have a San Rafael downtown which is really centered around the new Smart Station. And then we would have, at a lower scale, development along the 101 corridor.

And so these are very different types of places. The idea for supporting planning in these PDAs involves the difference of a process and different sort of community-driven vision.

And then just to look at our neighbor to the north, since we don't have a meeting up in Sonoma, just a couple of examples. Santa Rosa downtown would be a City Center PDA, which is really kind of a place that, again, has a Smart Station and really anchors future development. This is what we've been working with Santa Rosa to develop, future development in that particular part of the region. And then you get to a place like Cloverdale which would have a lower-density type of transit town center, again taking advantage of
the investment in Sonoma.

In addition, the strategy involves Priority Conservation Areas and Investments Areas. And Priority Conservation Areas work in tandem with the PDAs because these are the places in the region where we have a rich set of natural resources and open spaces. A number of these resources are actually really economically valuable, particularly in North Bay communities.

And these are, again, locally selected. And I should mention when we're talking about locally nominated or locally selected, there are elected officials involved in the proposal, and that involves both saying we would like this to be a PDA as well as saying here's the type of PDA in terms of growth, in terms of character, et cetera, that we think is appropriate.

So with the Priority Conservation Areas, again, it was driven by that process. Obviously there's already a lot of land that is restricted from development or protected in some form or fashion, particularly in Marin County. But these conservation areas are part of a effort to really identify places that might be at risk and places that would be of strategic value in trying to secure.
So Investment Areas are part of the overall growth strategy in the sense that they are places that don't have the same level of anticipated development as the Priority Development Area, but support the overall regional objectives by preserving rural communities, reducing pressure on open space and increasing access to employment.

So for instance, there's a number of Investment Areas which are Rural Community Investment Areas in Sonoma County. And the local jurisdictions propose that this typology, this type of Investment Area, be brought forward because it's really a place where you say, "Okay. How can we work with a very small amount of growth which we're anticipating in our rural community to help create a greater concentration of local services right near downtown?"

One of the big issues for a number of these areas is poor pedestrian access or bicycle access. How can we use the very limited amount of resources that are available to really support this investment strategy?

So let's then move on, and then we can get to all the other alternatives. So very quickly, the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy. Just to look at it on a map, this is a situation in which you see 80 percent of the region's new homes and 66 percent of
the region's new jobs going into Priority Development Areas. Those comprise four percent of the Regional Plan. So again, just to be clear, we are talking about the Preferred Alternative. Here we're talking about a 2010 to 2040 growth period. So that gives you a sense for the overarching framework there.

Now let's go into all the alternatives. The first one is No Project, and that's required by CEQA. The second, Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy, which I described in a little greater detail -- we can take your comments after.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No, I just thought that No. 1 was the most appropriate one.

MR. SHORETT: We can take those comments afterwards. Thank you.

The third alternative is Lower Concentrations of PDA Growth. The fourth, Eliminate Inter-Regional Commute, and then five, Environment, Equity and Jobs. So let's get into a little more detail. No Project. And again, this is required by CEQA.

There's two alternatives that are always required in a CEQA analysis, and that involves the Project Alternative and a No Project alternative. And then we also want to look at a range of other reasonable possible developments and transportation scenarios in
the future.

So this includes no planning project, no planning effort in Priority Development Areas. That doesn't mean there's not going to be any development there. And we would anticipate dispersed job and housing growth pattern supported by existing General Plans and zoning.

Transportation. This would be based on the 2010 existing transportation network. It would only include projects that have either received funding or have environmental clearance as of May 1st, 2011.

And then going on to the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy, we really talked about the land use already. But a key part of that is retaining affordable housing in PDAs and then focusing investment into PDAs which we are already starting to do and have been doing through PDA Planning Programs which have distributed grants to communities to put together specific plans and other local plans to really put community-driven visions into a clear framework through which future developers can move forward.

But let's also talk about transportation. This is where you get the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy. $277 billion budget; 88 percent is directed to operations and maintenance of the existing system,
and that really supports the fact that we're talking about focusing most of the development into existing communities and protecting other communities outside of those locations. And so therefore we really want to make sure that the infrastructure in those locations is strong.

So this also advances key investment strategies: Close the GHG Gap, Fix-It First, OneBayArea Grant Framework, Fund High Performers -- we can provide more detail on this if you'd like -- Squeeze More Efficiency Out of Our Existing System, and then Making our Existing Transit System Sustainable. So that's particularly sustainable from a financial perspective.

So the next one is Lowered Concentrations of PDA Growth. That would involve fewer new jobs and housing in PDAs. We would anticipate additional growth close to transit outside of PDAs and decentralized jobs and single family construction supported by General Plans.

So from a transportation perspective, we would again have the Preferred Transportation Investment Strategy.

No. 4 is Eliminating Inter-Regional Commute. The land use in this case would involve all jobs being filled by Bay Area residents. And then we would anticipate this would involve major subsidies for
housing close to employment centers at the edges of
the region to help make that first bullet possible.

In terms of transportation, this would involve a
modification of the Preferred Transportation
Investment Strategy which would include putting in
place the Transit Comprehensive Operations Analyses
set of recommendations. And then only HOV lane
conversions for express lanes. So it would also
involve implementing policies related to road pricing
and parking pricing.

So the final alternative, and again, as Ashley was
noting, a big part of what we're asking for today is
your feedback on the appropriateness of these
alternatives and any additional ideas you may have.

Finally, Environment, Equity, and Jobs. Land use.
This would involve additional affordable housing in
locations with high levels of low-income commuting as
well as additional affordable housing in locations
with high-performing schools and local resources. In
some cases, there would be the same kind of places.

Transportation for this alternative would be
another modification of the Preferred Transportation
Investment Strategy which would include restoring
transit to 2005 service levels and only converting HOV
lanes in express lanes.
So let's go to one more slide. And this is a description, a set of puzzle pieces that together provide us with a tool box that we can test to identify ways in which we might be able to achieve the intended outcomes of the Plan.

And so we have zoning, incentives, fees and subsidies, road pricing, parking policies, growth boundaries and natural areas. And through the modeling process that we're going to use here, what we're going to be able to do is introduce these into the scenarios and find out what the relative impact of them is going to be for the -- we should say the projected impact of them is going to be on development patterns and other outcomes that we're assessing.

So to reiterate, all five of these are going to be analyzed by the same set of environmental criteria, and also very importantly, none of them are going to supersede local land use control. And if you look at SB 375, there's absolutely nothing coming out of this process that supersedes local land use control.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That sir, is a lie.

MS. NGUYEN: Sit down, please.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That last part is a lie.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's not true.
MS. NGUYEN: We ask that you hold your comments. We will give you an opportunity --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, what do I see when you're telling a fib?

MS. NGUYEN: Sir, please. Please. We want to have a really good conversation today and we will give you an opportunity to speak.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: This isn't a conversation. That's an outright lie, and we don't accept it.

MS. NGUYEN: Sir, we ask that you hold your feedback. We will take your feedback.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, we ask you to tell the truth.

MS. NGUYEN: We ask that you hold your feedback and please respect everyone in this room by not shouting and disrupting.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Respect us by telling the truth.

MS. NGUYEN: We will give you an opportunity to comment.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And that's a big one. That's heavy. That's how we start. That's a big one. AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How can you go forward when everything you say is based on a lie?
THE REPORTER: Excuse me. I'm the court reporter here. Just as a point of order, I am a neutral person.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No, you're not. You've been to every one of these meetings.

THE REPORTER: It's my responsibility to make a verbatim transcript of these proceedings. If you want your comments to be on the record, you need to state your name first.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Dissent and objection. That should pretty much cover it.

MS. NGUYEN: We ask that you, again, respect the groundrules that we set for this meeting. We ask for civility and respect, and if you continue to disrupt we will ask you to leave.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's what we're asking for.

MS. NGUYEN: And I will give you an opportunity to comment. This is the last call on comments. We will provide you in less than two minutes an opportunity to speak.

We just have two more slides to cover, and I'll do them quickly. But the purpose of this scoping meeting is again, to hear your comments on scope and content for us to consider as we prepare the environment.
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That is not the purpose.

MS. NGUYEN: So this slide -- please hold your comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That is not the purpose.

MS. NGUYEN: Please hold your comments. The purpose of this slide is to kind of give you some questions that we have for you with regards to the range of reasonable alternatives that we have to evaluate. So in thinking about these alternatives, we ask that you look at these questions.

Are we applying the right policy strategies to really help shape both the land use and transportation improvements that are planned over the next 28 years? Are there any missing strategies that you want us to consider as we define those alternatives?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Absolutely.

MS. NGUYEN: Are there any alternatives that you have that you want us to consider that's entirely different from the ones that we presented?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Definitely.

MS. NGUYEN: The ones we presented are open for discussion, and this is the reason we're here
today is to hear your comments on those alternatives, as well as any other environmental issue in this document. So we do want to hear your feedback on those areas.

We wanted to share with you the schedule and the process by which we will be working on preparing this environmental document. Our intention is to collect comments through the scoping process, which has occurred over the past two weeks. We'll take all the feedback that we've heard and we will present it to our Metropolitan Transportation Commission as well as The Association of Bay Area Governments Executive Board for their review and consideration. We do seek their approval in July so that we can move forward with the actual environmental assessment.

As Hannah mentioned, we will plan to produce a Draft Environmental Impact Report for public review in mid December, and we will look forward to presenting a Final Environmental Report on the Plan for adoption and certification in spring of 2013.

With that, that concludes our staff presentation, and I will only it up for comments. Let me explain again how we are taking comments.

We want to record your comments properly for the record. We ask that you hold the blue speaker card
and stand in a line next to this podium. We ask that each speaker has the opportunity to provide their comments. We do not wish to have disruptions in the audience so that we can hear the speaker. We ask for no cross dialogue because it's a distraction that disenables our court reporter to properly record your comments.

We ask you again to disagree respectfully. We are really hear to listen to your comments, and if you disagree with us, we respectfully agree to listen to those comments and we're not making any commentary one way or the other. We ask that you do the same.

I'm really trying to give everyone here an opportunity to speak and to provide your feedback. So please, respect the groundrules. It's going to help us really to move and hear comments from everyone who wants to speak today.

So with that, if you are interested in speaking, you may form a short line and as the line goes shorter other folks can stand up. Please have your blue card in hand, and before you speak, please state your name for the record. But please provide us with your feedback.

Because there is a large number of people in this room, you may hear a timer ring. That just gives you
a sense that you've been there about two,
two-and-a-half minutes, and if you can wrap up your
comments, we would certainly appreciate it.

MS. BEITTEL: My name is Sue Beittel, and I
have lived in Marin County for over 50 years. And I
am currently the chairman of the Commission on Aging,
a 23-member commission that is advisory to the board
of supervisors.

One of the things that I'm here to say is that
we'd like you to take into consideration the growing
number of older people in Marin county. We're
currently at about 30 percent for people over the age
of 60. In the year 2025, that number will go to
45 percent. The fastest growing group are those
people 80 and over.

We have prepared a paper in 2010 about the housing
needs of older adults. Some maybe prefer to age in
place in their long-time homes or move to smaller
units with access to service. Whether they live in a
residential setting with others, as people age they
will likely need assistance and/or services to remain
living independently. Ideally, the work force
delivering the assistance and services should live
close by in housing they can afford.

It is important for older and disabled adults to
live where they can move about without cars and have access to vital services such as shopping, medical facilities, government centers, libraries, educational programs, and recreational activities. There is a need for both existing and new large housing developments which will serve older adults and individuals with disabilities to include appropriate on-site services that support independent living and aging in place. Overall development standards are needed that include universal design principles such as wheelchair accessibility and that sort of thing.

There is a critical need for affordable housing and the protection of the existing supply of modest homes and second units and the creation of policies that make it easier to construct new modest-size homes and second units.

Many older and disabled adults live on limited fixed incomes; therefore policies and procedures should be pursued to maintain and increase rental housing and second units.

I would like to also mention that the Commission on Aging has been working on senior mobility programs to get people out of their cars because they don't drive so well any more, and we are interested in a volunteer driver program, increased access to
paratransit, and a new program that we're working on
now called Catch a Ride.

I might also add that I'm observing this meeting
for the League of Women Voters. Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comments.

Next speaker, please.

MS. NYGREN: Yes. My name is Karen Nygren.

I am a member of the Transportation Authority of
Marin's Technical Advisory Committee. I've been
involved in transportation starting when I was mayor
in Tiburon and on the planning commission in Tiburon.

But I speak for myself today. I just told you
that to give some background, that I really am
involved. I have eight questions that I would like
answered in the EIR, for the scoping.

One, I request that you mix-match the
alternatives. The Preferred Alternative is not the
answer. Will the public support your PDAs or your TPP
PDAs as the density is proposed? You can propose
something, but in fact, what you propose must be
accepted by the public, and I question if the public
is going to support what you're proposing.

Will eliminating CEQA requirements or streamlining
them be a weakening of the California Environmental
Quality Act? Will environmental protections be
overlooked? Will significant impacts be created?

Will haste be made waste or create unknown significant problems?

I am strongly opposed to waiving any CEQA requirement or even streamlining it. It's just too valuable to overlook.

How will greenhouse gases be improved with very dense and congested PDAs or PDA TPPs? Would traffic impacts significantly increase as density is increased with PDAs and TPPs, including air quality? Would increasing funds to support alternative fuel vehicles, research, development and other ways to reduce use of gas or reduce the vehicles rather than the billions for roads and housing reach the goals for SB 375 faster?

I know that there is only supposedly 700 million proposed to be given to your alternatives and billions offered for roadways and housing. Is the Plan Bay Area truly the best way to achieve SB 375 goals as it is currently proposed? Will it as proposed reduce greenhouse gases, or is this just a way for developers and housing and jobs?

I think what you need to do is put the jobs first and the housing to follow. Thank you very much.

One other point, please. If we can get a higher
percentage of funding for affordable housing, this will make the PDA Areas even more capable of meeting or improving the arena numbers to meet the goal of affordable housing. Right now it's just insignificant for what you're proposing. Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you for your comment.

Next speaker, please.

MR. SMITH: My name is Clayton Smith. I'm from Mill Valley.

First I want to say that it is my opinion there is no law as far reaching as SB 375. It should have been put before the voters on the general ballot, on a general statewide ballot.

This law is, in my opinion, an affront to democracy and is a usurpation of the right of the local communities in regards to their zoning and their building.

Secondly, I'd like to say that -- I think it's a point of important information that this whole Plan Bay Area is based on a $200 billion dollar bribe by the federal government so as to buy off our local politicians and displace the true will of the actual residents of our community.

Thirdly, I'd like to point out that a widely-distributed analysis by a Mill Valley resident...
named Bob Silvestri, which is available online, has demonstrated clearly that the so-called sustainable development ideas promoted by this Plan will actually increase greenhouse gases.

What we really have here is centocracy replacing democracy. And this is what CEQA streamlining is really about. It's about bureaucracy versus community. And it's revealed here by the Politbureau-like top-down dictates that are coming to us from unelected government employees who, in my opinion, are lining their pockets at the expense of the greater community while engaging in their own career self-promotions at the expense of the taxpayers.

It is not only undemocratic, it is in fact anti-democratic. It promotes social parasitism, governmental corruption by private development interests, destruction of local control of our communities, the subsidy of the big and the destruction of the remaining human-scale aspects of our communities. And I urge everyone in this room who loves the Bay Area and loves particularly Marin County to vote this down and to do whatever is in your power to oppose this, and to oppose the people who are promoting this great evil which I consider to be
simply a plan that has been brought to us as we know by ICLEI. It's Agenda 21, and it is essentially a means by which you were attempting to erase what is in fact our community.

MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please.

MS. KRALOVEC: My name is Michelle Kralovec. I'm a concerned citizen. You know, I see with all this opposition that OBA, ABAG and MTC, SMART, PBA and all the other names, plus ICLEI, that they name themselves. It kind of reminds me of a really bad store I live near. They kept changing their name because they thought people would think it was a better store than the one before. But it was the same crummy place inside.

The thing is is that the name didn't change a thing, and you haven't taken into account or at the very least show that you care what we think.

You have this website you keep saying our questions will be answered on. Well, they're not. They never have been. You run out of time before the rest of us get to speak. And it makes me wonder back to the brainwashing from an early age, games like Sims and the biased schooling that you received. Makes me wonder why more people don't send their kids out of state to private schools so they're not indoctrinated
at any early age.

I raised two sons. They're awesome human beings, and they can think for themselves, not like little robots. The problem now facing you is that we do think, and we're not fooled by you. We also have plans, and they don't involve following all this nonsense.

You break the Brown Act's rules over and over and over again by trying to keep us out of your plans. You did them way before a lot of us even knew about it. You say you want our feedback. Well, get ready. You're going to get it.

The question is would you like me to tell you how I think you should live? Think about this. I know that you're about to have a baby. Well, how are you going to feel when that baby has 104 temperature and you have to go down two flights of stairs to get your baby to the doctors. Maybe there's an ear infection; who knows? And you have to fight through the crowds of people that live there only to get onto a train or a bus to take you to that doctor. How safe do you think that is for the other individuals plus your baby when your baby is sick? Have you ever thought of that?

Sustainable housing doesn't -- there is no
sustainable anything. There is no bit of housing
that's ever been built anywhere that lasts forever.
So just toss that word out. It doesn't make sense.
You get this kind of thing when you live in a
ghetto. I never have, so I've been very fortunate.
But it will be a ghetto. You'll have neighbors
fighting with neighbors, kids racing up and down the
floor above you. It's not going to be nice. People
will be allowed to take one bath a week if they're
lucky because they're knocking out all the dams. We
won't have enough water.
I have a friend that has a ranch that she just
inherited from her parents. She cannot subdivide it
among her two boys and themselves because there are
suddenly flowers there that is native to the area and
it wasn't there before.
So a lot of things are changing that we have no
control, and that's really how it's supposed to be.
Our forefathers made sure we had a constitution that
was supposed to be followed by the people for the
people.
You can't drive anymore now because there's gas to
consider, and you only have an allotment. The bikes
that you were supposed to be able to share with the
other people in your town are all gone. Suddenly
they're missing. So that doesn't work.

You have no more privacy, no property, and no more rights. Does that sound really good to you? And those of us that saved our money, bought a house, saved for college for our children and maybe our retirement have to give it all away to people that don't want to work and live in the same ghetto as us? I don't think so.

Would you like to hear somebody else's kids screaming all day long? I love my kids. I could put up with that for my kids, but I don't want to listen to my neighbors.

What if the low-flow toilet isn't working because there's not enough water to clear the line? That's not sustainable.

You are not elected officials, yet you're making plans for our lives, in our towns, in our counties, our state and our country. You use the city and state governments to facilitate your plan. You steal our money, our tax dollars, and we don't like it.

You think that you can call these so-called planning meetings and never answer questions and always say we don't have more time? Well, you can't shut us up anymore because we are coming back, and we are sending every single thing that our videographer
tapes, and we're sending it out all over the United States and that means millions and millions of people. And it has reached the likes of Sean Hannity and some others that are actually going to put it on their show.

So I've noticed that the parking in Novato has changed because they minimize the parking by sticking a tree in between every two parking spaces. Up in Petaluma, where there was once parking for people that wanted to watch their kids play Little League, there is no parking there anymore. They're narrowed the street, made a bike lane and foot paths. And now you can't go to see your son play unless you take a bus or you walk miles and miles and miles. And there's one handicapped woman that I watch that has three kids that play Little League, and she has a hard time getting in. And there is no handicapped parking there for her.

So trust me. You think you're planning anything? No, you're not. You're just mere puppets. Well there are more of us now, and these videos, like I say, are going out. We will take this standing up and fight for our rights. And you're banking that we'll finally give up and go away and that you can proceed as planned? You did this behind closed doors for way too
1 long a lot earlier than 2007, and now we're taking
2 action. And just who do you think you are?
3
4 MS. NGUYEN: Next speaker, please. And
5 again, we ask and remind you that we are looking for
6 your feedback on the environmental issues for this
7 EIR. So we appreciate if you can stay on point.
8
9 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: America is our
10 environment.
11
12 MS. NGUYEN: We again ask you to not disrupt
13 That's your final warning. The next warning we will
14 escort you out.
15
16 MR. WILLIS: The name is Richard Willis.
17 Would you like to tell me what questions you would
18 like me to ask? Go ahead. Maybe I can give you some
19 answers. May I ask my questions or do you want me to
20 ask your questions? Okay.
21
22 Folks, I think I have got it in a nutshell. I
23 kind of inadvertently picked up this pen as I was
24 filling out the speaker card, and I noticed after a
25 few seconds it didn't work. It was all bent.
26
27 Folks, this is the sustainable community
28 strategies.com pen. Made of cardboard. With a little
29 bamboo sticker that says recycled. (Approaches
30 Ms. Nguyen) Would you mind giving it to those folks?
31 Just so you know I'm not kidding.
There is your sustainable plan. I'm so mad. I have very little more to say. But I should add that I spent many years in the venture capital business, and I've seen more plans and thousands and thousands of business plans.

I've got to tell you, on a scale of one to ten, this doesn't make the scale. It totally lacks credibility. It's full of self-serving statements. It's alphabet soup. It's a million government agencies; nobody quite knows who does what and who pays how much.

It's based on a senate bill that is basically fraud and anybody with any science background knows that. There are no references; there are no authorities. There is no published science backing the bill that this is based on. Somewhere somebody's got to say, boy, we're working on a program here that's based on something that is not true.

And I would add on the subject of civility, we need to be told the truth, and when I'm told that none of this, the SB 375 and 32, don't impinge on local planning, that is not true, and we would rather you not tell us that. It's been repeated over and over. It's part of the narrative, and it's not true. So on the subject of truth and civility, we expect it from
you in order for us to give it back.

Last point. Some of you may be familiar with George Orwell and Animal Farm, 1984. Another book that he wrote had to do with language. It was very, very good. I see spread throughout these presentations this vague language of equitable access, economic vitality, healthy and safe communities, climate protection. Be serious. The world's been going up and down for millions of years, tens of millions of years, and you think you're going to change it and protect it? I think the cardboard pen says it better than I can.

MS. KOEHLE: My name is Orlean Koehle, and I am the state president of Eagle Forum of California. Eagle Forum has long had a history of standing up for property rights and privacy rights. And I believe that what we have experienced with this OneBayArea Plan is a violation of both of those.

I would like to be respectful and I will talk about the EIR and the environmental issues that you recommended. I'm going to talk about sustainable development, about the greenhouse gases, global warming, about endangered species, and I would like to end saying something about social equity.

First of all, how do we define sustainable
development? Nobody seems to have any clear
definition. Last week was this huge conference in Rio
de Janeiro called Agenda 21 + 20. And before it got
started, a reporter was interviewing some of the key
people. None of them could give a clear definition of
sustainable development.

I would like to tell you my definition. It is
pure socialism, and it is top-down government control.
It is planned economy rather than the wonderful free
enterprise system that has made our nation so great.
It is a planned economy where your free economy, your
free enterprise system, the free market system will no
longer be in existence.

Secondly, the global warming, the greenhouse gas
issue. I was listening to the radio last Saturday and
it mentioned that the reason why Sonoma County did not
have a very good grape crop -- in fact it was down 13
percent -- was because of the cold summer we had last
year. And I thought, now how does that go with global
warming? We had a really cold year. We had a cold
year around the globe. For someone to say that we
have a continual rise in temperature, that is not
true.

We have climate change. You've changed the name,
and true, climates change. They get warm; they get
cold. And what tiny little bit of difference can mankind do to that?

We heard Lord Monckton speak in Sacramento a few months ago at a hearing at the state capital. He said -- he's the authority on global warming, on climate change, from England. He's world-renowned. He goes all over speaking. He said that if we continue with this policy in California implementing AB 32 and SB 375, we will cost our state in ten years $400 billion, and we will do absolutely nothing to curb any greenhouse gases. It's ludicrous.

And for California to think that we can do this all by ourselves -- we're the lone state supposedly taking on this whole climate change program -- it's arrogant of us to think. We are not the lone state on the planet. We're affected by all the other nations. China and India are doing nothing to curb their greenhouse gases, so how with that affect us? The atmosphere goes around the globe.

Thirdly, I would like to mention endangered species. We are the endangered species. We are the ones that are going to be suffering the most from this, especially those who live on rural land, which I live on.

My husband and I are in the rural section of
Sonoma County. We've already had to fight so many of 
these policies with the new policy that was 
implemented in 2006, the General Plan in 2020. And 
rural land, anyone who lives on it, is suffering from 
this and will suffer even more so.

And secondly, we need equal justice not social 
justice. This is going to be making it so that 
certain people will be given certain privileges. It's 
not going to equal justice for all people.

The speaker before me mentioned Animal Farm. I 
recommend you all read it. In there you will see the 
wording, "Some animals are more equal than other 
animals." Now that's what this is doing. Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. SHROYER: Hi. I'm Toni Shroyer. I'm a 
Marin County native and a Novato resident. And I want 
to thank everybody that's here that's taken time off 
of work. No matter what your opinions are, you care, 
and that's part of the democratic process. So thank 
you.

Before I go to what you were asking us to respond 
to, what I found was very disturbing is to just kind 
of bypass the "No Expected Impacts of Regional 
Importance." And one was not only hazardous materials 
but public services.
This is of grave concern because right now what's happening -- and we're seeing this dramatically so with two projects in Novato -- is that the nonprofit housing doesn't pay any real estate taxes; no county tax, no city tax, no school tax, no real estate taxes at all. Yet they can make millions of dollars a year off the backs of the poor, off the backs of the taxpayers and off the backs of the community.

And there is no accountability. They can get away with not providing crime-free or safe housing for the people that they claim to help. So we have a situation here in Novato right now where people are being victimized in their own homes. This is women and children, and they don't live in safe housing.

So it's kind of a misnomer when, in fact, in one of these pages where it says "healthy and safe communities" because we don't have that. And there's no restrictions here to mandate that. So that is a grave concern.

And nonprofits need to give back too. Right now because we have -- I witnessed a drug deal as I was biking. I was being environmentally -- instead of driving I was biking. And on Center Place, Center and Diablo, my son at I at 3:00 o'clock in Novato, Saturday, saw a drug deal, a blatant drug deal.
So what we've done, the children of Novato and some parents, we've literally asked for pennies for police dogs so we could buy a third police dog so that we could be safe and have all three dogs narcotics trained. So we as a community and children are picking up change off the street so that they can be safe while these -- let's call it what it is -- slum lords are making millions. So it's just not fair.

Also I do encourage you to read all three -- and there's going to be a fourth one coming out -- of Bob Silvestri's blog, because he has alternative ways that are not included in here to be sustainable. And to -- well, I don't like the word sustainable because I think it's abused, but meaning environmentally.

So right with this sustainable community strategy, we're actually having a loss of life, a loss of quality of life, increased local pollution. And is it really sustainable? Because as an environmentalist, I'm really looking at how sustainable this is. And what it is is sustainable for the developers who can get a tax exemption for 55 years without paying anything back to the infrastructure. So it seems that you're concerned more about the infrastructure of the transportation on Scenario Two than you are on the infrastructure of the community.
And how are you going to help potentially high-risk people -- some yes, some no -- so that they can escape the cycle of poverty? What are the social programs? What are the life skills? What is the asset management? The family planning? It's simply not here.

Also with the sustainable community strategy, the developer does not have to have local talent, not local construction, not local jobs that are created. For example, the Warner Creek Project which is 30 units per acre is 60 units, right across from the Wyndover Apartments. And they have used construction workers from out of town, out of Novato, and out of county. So they are going back and forth, back and forth on the 101 to create a sustainable community. It's a hypocrisy.

So going back to what you're asking us to do, we need to mandate mandatory safe housing, because that's not happening. Nonprofit housing needs to give back to the community and not make millions off of the poor and not waive any CEQA requirements. And also we need monies for social services so that people can succeed.

I support affordable housing, but I don't support high-density housing. We need to go look at Bob Silvestri's suggestions.
So I think it's important that we also have local control. And what has been mentioned by some of the speakers but not here is private property rights. Whose property are you going to be rezoning? Is this going to be right now without their consent or with their consent? What happens if you have a property owner with a site that you want to build something on and they don't want you to build it? I think our private property rights are being attacked under this scenario.

So I would go for Number 1. And thank you for listening. I know you have a hard job. This is just kind of -- for lack of a better word -- a dog and pony show because I keep on seeing the same thing over and over again for the last two and a half years, and all the public input is really not being considered. And that's not democratic and it's not fair. Thank you.

MS. MOODY: I'm Elizabeth Moody, and I have been 48 years in Marin County. 33 in Novato and 15 in Mill Valley. I believe the One Bay Area Plan is absolutely essential. We must have regional planning.

60 percent of our workers and the ones that probably work on Warner Creek were there because they weren't available in Marin. We must look at SB 375, and I think the Plan Bay Area does that very well.
Sustainability means balanced environment and economics and equity, and that's what I believe the Plan Bay Area does for our region. With 60 percent of our workers coming in from outside the county and driving further than any other county does is something that we have to address regionally.

I think that Plan Bay Area is doing everything they can to get input, and the timeline indicates that. I think that it does not impact in any way on local planning and 20 units per acre is very fair.

I think that in some cases density is very favorable. I especially like it when there are the -- such as our Miller Avenue in Mill Valley where there is the only opportunity for any mixed use, and that one level with some apartment buildings that are several levels, I think, make still with proper landscaping keep a very small community, local feeling, that Mill Valley desires very much.

The local planning is not affected. The design and planning and zoning and all is retained by the local community. And the local communities have their representation in the regional planning.

We must work together, and the sustainability -- and that also means reducing the greenhouse gases because most it comes from cars and our workers have
to come in because they can't afford to live here.

It's fascinating that in Mill Valley besides the seniors who have been increasing in such great numbers in the county, the children are the other growth group, and that this is absolutely delightful.

So please keep up your good work, and we'll all work together, I hope, to develop a plan that allows the local communities to plan and design the way they want to and yet regionally works together for a sustainable and keeping a healthy and viable region.

So thank you very much.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. DURHAM: Anne Durham. We're seeing here again today the effect of a communitarian and philosophical approach to government which dominates public expectations and legislative agendas.

Seemingly gone are the days when the government was limited, where individual's inalienable rights were politically acknowledged and where money was honest.

At the core of this transformation is the political process of regionalizing the country, of which MTC and ABAG are an integral part. Political regionalism is the antithesis of representative government, and is thereby unconstitutional.

Regionalism restructures or reinvents the operation of
government and is the blueprint for your serfdom. It has infiltrated our transportation, water, farming, land uses systems and cities and countries, every aspect of governments.

Regionalism is being used to destroy traditional political boundaries like county lines and usher in a transformed system of governance that abolishes private property.

If you look at Agenda 21, Chapter 7, Human Settlements Promoting Transport Systems, you will see where they are getting their marching orders.

Towns across the country are adopting these transport systems because these systems are imposed upon locales by a regional level of government largely unknown and underestimated. Regionalism might sound benign, but the consequences must be understood by freedom-loving people or liberty will be trampled.

The metropolitan planning organizations are federally mandated, and like the COGs, give opportunity for the restructuring of American government. They are setting an infrastructure for a new economic system based on public-private partnership in replacement of free enterprise.

COGs and MPOs are federalized organizations that break down America's constitutionally-formulated
government structure. Their purpose is to control and
direct local government from behind the scenes. Today
they propel the federal injection of the globalist
agenda into local government policy, and thereby
negate the protections afforded by our constitutional
system of government.

In other words, regionalism is in fact, communism.
Regionalism promotes Soviet-style councils that
develop policy that is rubber-stamped by elected
officials with no real meaningful public oversight.
It is an extra constitutional level of government that
advances globalist objectives while insulating most
elected officials.

The government no longer operates the way we were
told in our eighth grade textbooks. Federal regional
organizations are throughout the country, but the
battle is always local. Our prospects for the future
of America hang in the balance.

It is absolutely essential for the restoration of
the American republic that political regionalism be
terminated, and all that they have done here and those
before them, all that you have done here has to be
declared constructionally null and void. Thank you.

//

//
MS. TAVARES: Hi. Deborah Tavares. First, I want to let you know that they would not show the map that they are really orchestrating this agenda from. This is the Wildlands Project map that everyone can go to, stopthecrime.net, and print off.

This is a map that was originally by Dr. Michael Coffman. You can see that under this program of treason that you are orchestrating under -- and make no mistake about it -- you are organizing under the plan, and I just -- hear me out because you're my kids' age. So this is an educational moment for you.

I just want to tell you that you are organizing under the Iron Mountain Report. It was a report that was hatched in the 60s in an underground nuclear survival retreat. And it was asked to be started by Kennedy. It took them a number of years, about four, and it was released when Lyndon Johnson was president.

It was so catastrophically wicked and evil and treasonous that it was asked never, ever to be released to the American people. On top of the fact that it talks about regionalism, dividing America up into ten districts, collapsing our Constitution and Bill of Rights -- which is what this is doing, and you're working in that regard -- it states the most horrific, fear-based program to cause people on a
global scale to buy into agendas out of fear. They believed that through fear we would abate all common sense. And through fear, we would give up our freedoms, which is what has happened.

Unfortunately, we see in the Iron Mountain Report, that pollution, mass pollution, was invented. And when you see the report, you will see how mass pollution was created. They were willing to pollute the earth to create fear that we were the cause of pollution. And we are not.

I will tell you that what this report calls for is absolute complete domination of all people, of all nations, for all times. This is an enormous, enormous, massive global land grab. This is an enormous massive global grab of all energy and resources on the face of the planet. It's intention is to create all of us into a third-world country and be slaves, and it's intention is to eliminate a great number of us.

In this map you will see the Wildlands Project Map. If you research this, you will find that among many of the foundations that are supportive of this, Ted Turner is one of the foundations. He gave a billion dollars to the United Nations. He is a globalist. He is eugenist. He wants elimination of
the current population of 95 percent.

But that's a lot of numbers. Many people think it might only be 80 percent global depopulation, and some think it might be 50 or 60. But it is a program of elimination of population.

And make no mistake about it, the report called NWO Exposed 1969 by an insider, a eugenist, also laid out what we see in the Iron Mountain Report and exactly what you youngsters are doing unbeknownst.

You are bringing forth a program that is treason. I started out telling you that. And I know that you don't know it, or you wouldn't be sitting there right now I would hope.

I can tell you that when we discussed this with our kids, my daughter in particular started crying at 4:30 in the morning when she learned the truth. She couldn't believe that this was hatched into the end of the demise of the American people.

We are as an American nation in the crosshairs of the most inhumane global disaster that we've ever faced. And One Bay Area is a portion of that being manifested before our very eyes.

Rural living is considered sprawl. We are considered gluttons. We're considered pigs if we have rural property. We must be relocated to human
settlement zones. I don't know if you have had the opportunity to watch the Hunger Games, but I would ask that you do. That's an excellent illustration of the human settlement zones.

This map talks about that. You're seeing a collapse in all of our highways and roads. If you go to Portugal right now, all the new highways that they installed have road sensors in them, which is what our highways have in them now. All the roads that are under construction right now are going to become toll roads. The cost of traveling on what few roads will remain will take you out of your cars simply because you will not be able to drive on the roads.

In Portugal, a man rented a Hertz car from the airport, drove to Lisbon and couldn't pay the tolls because it was all by camera. He became a felon and received additional fines because he had to leave the country before they ascertained what his toll fees were.


We also know that the global grid, the smart grid, has a built-in obsolescence. If you didn't know it, you will now. It's only intended to last 20 years. Why only 20 years, when our grid has lasted between 50
1 and 100 years? That's because there just won't be the need to supply all of you because many of you truly won't be here.

2 You can see on this map -- again, stopthecrime.net -- you will see exactly where the human settlement zones were then. But there are fewer zones now.

3 And I can tell you that we have much to be concerned about, and we should fight every single day against this type of treason that's being presented to the United States and to all us. It is going to eliminate private property rights, and that is one of the bases of the Iron Mountain Report, elimination of private property rights.

4 It's also creating a new religion, the love of the earth. We see that now happening all over the country. And I can tell you that humans will take a lesser status than an animal. Humans will take a lesser status than a rock. This is what it calls for.

5 On the Web site, you will also see the Wildlands Project revealed, and it tells you all life, human and nonhuman, has equal value. Resources and consumption above what is needed to supply vital human needs is immoral.

6 Human population must be reduced. They say this. I'm not saying this. This is in their plan. And
western civilization must radically change, present
economic, technological and ideological structures.
That's a requirement of this plan. Thank you very
much.

MS. NGUYEN: I'm just reminding people to try
to focus their comments on the environmental issue
areas. Thank you.

MS. TAVARES: It's all about the environment.
Thank you.

MS. PAGETT: Betty Pagett. Resident of Ross
Valley since 1981. Long before many of the
conspiracies described today, my father worked with
Governor Reagan on how cities and counties needed to
look to serve the 20th century. And many of the same
ideas emerged from that but were never acted on.

I speak today for the future of my grandchildren
and those who will grow up with them. We wanted Marin
to preserve the 80 percent of our county that's open
space and agriculture. We want to reduce Marin's
enormous ecological footprint.

We want to face up to our service economy. We've
created many low-paying jobs because those are the
people that serve us in health care, retail,
restaurants. And we have created in our free economy
no place for those people to live or any way to get to
work except for single occupancy vehicles. And therefore, I speak in support of the Jobs-Housing Connection.

Nobody is doing this to us. We need to do it to make our own community viable. And it's time for Marin to take some responsibility for its impact on the rest of the region with most of our workers coming in from across the region. It's time for people who question how we live to look at some of the smaller homes that we've created in small communities that actually are near services, jobs and transportation and do reduce traffic and do create community that is a good place to raise children or to age. It's time for us to live together with those our children will grow up with.

MR. BENNETT: Jim Bennett, Sonoma County. See, I respect these handful of folks' right and freedom to see the benefit of being close to their shopping and not having a need for an automobile. That is your choice. That's what our country is about is choice and freedom.

But this is about anything but. Personally, I didn't sell my home in Southern California near the beach and come live in Sonoma County to live in a human settlement gulag. I came up here to live in the
country. And from the playbook that we're supposed to be playing by, the Constitution, which pays homage to our natural unalienable rights that are uniquely ours and not to be reconciled through or granted by government, I and the other 8 million people in the Bay Area whose freedom of choice in terms of where and how they live and their transportation options and their economy and their American dream will be absolutely abolished and decimated. Unless you are one of the few, the chosen few, that will benefit in terms of being a developer or something with this smart growth developer, pretty much anything that you do for a living will be decimated.

See, the basic tenet is that an impoverished serf will go along with things that an abundant free citizen simply will not. It's as old as the hills. As a matter of fact, this oppression -- and make no mistake; I'm not comfortable associating that word with our country -- but if it looks like a duck and walks like a duck and quacks and it's got all the earmarks of a duck, I guess it's a duck. And this is has got al-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1 of the earmarks of oppression. Ain't nothing unique about it. The only thing new is the excuse, the trigger for this whole Hegelian dialectic and the high-tech component of it.
Speaking to the CEQA part of this. The growth rate postulates are flawed. Your job projection postulates are flawed. The whole methodology is flawed. The Plan is fundamentally opposed to our Constitution, namely the Fifth Amendment; therefore, it is flawed. You're taking the liberty, literally, of thinking it is within your authority to impose this Plan is flawed. Your claims that this Plan will create jobs to maintain and sustain a prosperous and equitable economy is flawed. In fact, it is a complete lie.

This will devastate our economy; not hurt it, ruin it for all but the few stakeholders and public/private partners. In keeping with the very definition of fascism, government will pick winners and losers in what was a free market landscape, all but abolishing the free market and property rights.

The decline in California, the numbers that we show that we all read about in desirable California, mirror our adherence to this sustainable policy as insidiously implemented in the American Planning Association's Growing Smart, a Legislative Guidebook, Model Statutes for the Management of Change. I used to like that word.

It would be impossible for MTC ABAG's EIR project...
team to understand, review and reconcile this amount of public input between July 11th and July 13th. The short predetermined timeframe speaks to the lack of genuine intention to conduct a bona fide legal, valid EIR, even though this step's legitimacy is required for One Bay Area's legality.

The empowerment of, and huge appropriation of money being granted to unelected commissions and associations mirrors a Soviet model of governance as does the whole concept of One Bay Area, which is illegal and unacceptable in these United States, as it employs a model of Soviet governance. And we live in the United States of America.

Now, the Constitution provides for our dissent under exactly these circumstances, and we fully intend to exercise it. And if you think you have taken the measure of our resolve, as you will soon see, you have not. We are going to see to it that our local public officials are tattooed with this treasonous decision to go along with this One Bay Area Plan, and we're going to see to it that they have all kinds of opportunity to explain it to their constituents. They can use that same rhetoric and warm and fuzzy words that you guys have been employing in these One Bay Area meetings and see how it plays with their...
constituents. I don't think it's going to play that good.

So in closing the only thing I would say, and I try to find a bright light in this whole deal, it has been said that all bad things that happen and all bad situations and all bad people are both our teacher and a lesson to us and an opportunity. And the second half of 2012 is going to represent a culmination of both of those things. And if we get it right, we're going to find grace in this horrific situation, and we're going to pull together and remember what the word community really means, and not community with an "ism" at the end of it. A community where we are accountable to each other and not to an overreaching government.

MS. BUCHEN: I am Wendy Buchen, and I live in San Rafael. I used to live in Belvedere. I've lived in Marin County since 1959.

I've seen several of these sort of regional governments going on. We really were pushing for regional government in 1973, but I guess that didn't happen.

I would like to point out, first of all, that the members of ABAG are all elected. They are not appointed. They are elected.
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Not by us. Not by us.

MS. NGUYEN: Please. We ask that you do not have cross-dialogue so we can properly record her comments.

MS. BUCHEN: You elect your city or county government. Each city has a representative, and that is an elected member of the city council or town council or whatever you have. You also have the counties -- I think they have more than one representative. They are all representing the county so that they are elected people. And they are elected people. And you voted indirectly -- you vote for people that are serving on ABAG as among their civic duties.

I'd like to point out, gas and air pollution is really -- a good deal of it is major health. The children are getting asthma much more than they used to. That's a new thing. Please try and make the air unpolluted. And that is a regional thing.

The next thing is -- oh, the woman who said the slumlords are making millions. I am involved in one of these low-cost housing buildings, and we have to fundraise to get that place going. We can't keep it up without trying to raise money from the community to keep it going. That is a total loss. It's hard to
manage. And actually one of the problems is that we have so few people in our housing as opposed to some of the larger houses -- developments -- apartments and stuff. This meant it's much cheaper to keep a big place up because you just have -- one yard will take care of everybody. We have one yard taking care of 15 people. It is all this dealing in quantities.

My question of ABAG after the end of this is that I notice that all of your red stuff in San Francisco was along the Bay. And I wondered if the BCDC is going to have anything to say about -- they have developments there.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment?

MR. WILHELM: Good afternoon. My name is Don Wilhelm. I'm a resident of Novato and a past chair of the Citizens Oversight Committee for the Transportation Authority in Marin. I've been involved in citizen involvement in transportation issues throughout the county.

Today I'd like to express my concern about the CEQA streamlining that was included in SB 375. Why did the authors of that legislation find it necessary to consider destroying something that has been very effective in controlling the development and the impacts within the state through the CEQA operation?
It looks like that the staff is having some difficulty in handling the CEQA streamlining issue. The Transit Priority Project, TPP, to my knowledge is just another new description of the need to change CEQA. In their presentation today, you have a three-line issue describing the TPP. Now there has to be more detail on what a TPP is, and that information should be made fully available to the public.

In the same PowerPoint presentation, you have the statement, "If the proposed residential or mixed use project is consistent with the land use designation, the density, the intensity and policies of Plan Bay Area, if they have that, they may be eligible for complete exemption of CEQA."

Now each of those statements, land use designation, density, intensity and policies and Plan have to also be defined very thoroughly so that one would know what decisions were being made in providing some exemptions. I think it would be very important in your alternatives to present the alternative that would result in a CEQA streamlining, but also alongside of that, have an analysis of what the impacts would be if there were the current CEQA regulations. So in that way, one could make a judgment as to what the impacts are of CEQA.
If you don't want to do the comparison, then we won't know until years down the road when some of these projects keep coming through and the developers are claiming exemptions. And it's in accordance with the laws. There would be no means to control what you end up with. And of course we know that the developers will be striving for maximum density, minimum cost and minimum remedies.

So again, I would recommend that you do a comparison in each of your alternatives with CEQA streamlining and without CEQA streamlining. Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment.

MS. SPAKE: Hello. My name is Ann Spake. My concerns have to do with the fact that supposedly in our county-wide plan, we're concerned with the 3Es, the environment, the economy and equity. And what I see in this Plan that concerns me greatly is the fact that the economic interests, namely the Building Industry Association and such, have overridden equity and environmental concerns.

This is very clear in their opinion article bragging about having spent years of advocacy to try to eliminate environmental considerations, streamline
CEQA and even get the Bay Area Management District to
disregard the overwhelming knowledge that exists about
the health impacts building in close proximity to
major roads and freeways.

This is unconscionable. This is not sustainable.
If you want to develop a plan -- and I do believe in
planning -- we need to understand that change is
inevitable, growth is optional, and we have to stop
making plans that put vulnerable people in vulnerable
places.

I understand there was a CARE study that showed
that approximately 20 percent -- between 20 and 25
percent, I think -- of the PDAs in five of the
counties were in areas where the air impacts were
absolutely adverse for any sensitive receptors, namely
children, pregnant women, seniors and so forth. They
recommended strongly on an equity basis that it would
be environmental injustice to be placing residential
development in such locations.

In my particular case, I live in Tam Valley.
We're looking forward to sea level rise there, and we
also happen to have a transit center. So somehow
you're planning for basically TPP and PDA in an area
that's going to be inundated and is too close to two
major freeways for consideration of the health
impacts.

These health impacts also increase health
disparity and medical costs. So I would ask you to in
your EIR to not streamline CEQA because that is the
very guarantee that we have that we will be able to
live sustainably in the environment and without
adverse health impacts.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment.

MS. KIRSEH: My name is Susan Kirseh. I'm
from Mill Valley, California. I'd like to go on
record as just recommending that the project
consideration go for a No Project, the first option in
this.

And I'd like to say a part of that is based on the
fact that going back to the very first meeting of One
Bay Area that I went to over a year ago, we were
looking at some of the assumptions that this whole
project is based on.

One of the key assumptions is that we're going to
be facing incredible growth, job growth in this
country. But today, we have in today's Marin's IJ,
today's paper saying that the Census found that Marin
lost more than 10,000 jobs in the downturn that has
just happened in this recent period.

So what we're faced with is looking at One Bay
Area attempting to do a 28-year plan. So the whole timeframe of it seems inappropriate.

Further, the idea that this state would be allocating -- on page 30 it says $277 billion dollars to go towards transportation planning. When we're facing so many issues around health care and education, or we know what's happening in the housing market, to have so much money being delegated to this project from legislation that can't even balance our own state budget on a year-to-year basis seems like we're moving in a really poor direction.

And it's not that planning isn't a good thing. I think everyone would agree we need planning. But this Plan is so off base.

Going back to what you referred to (INAUDIBLE) 2007, that we need to go back to revisit what's happening in One Bay Area for the cost, the timeframe. These meetings -- I've been to several of them -- there's rarely not distrust with what's going on, and with some understanding of why there's mistrust for a feeling of misinformation coming our way.

Just a couple of final points. I would agree that we should keep CEQA strong. There should not be streamlining for CEQA in ways that our environment is actually undermined.
I'd further like to support the references to Bob Silvestri's article and encourage people to go to The Patch to see some of the alternatives and bigger, broader thinking around planning for housing and transportation than what we're getting from One Bay Area.

And finally, another one of the speakers had talked about how you do not intend to look at the impacts on public service. And again, I would like to say that by having -- and again, the numbers in this document vary, but it's from 11.1 billion to the 277 billion -- to say that that much money going for this kind of project will not have impact on public service seems to be an oversight that needs to be reconsidered. Thank you.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Next comment.

MS. RANDOLPH: Hi. My name is Angelika Randolph. And I actually feel sorry for all of you for having to put up with us. However, we have been sold these bags of tricks before, and we're not putting up with it any longer. So that's just the beginning of what you're to hear today.

I'd like to refer especially to your claiming to reduce greenhouse gases. To that, I need to say that some of our local organizations have put all our money
that was supposed to go for roads, et cetera, into
this so-called smart train. We all thought we were
going to get a European clean speedy train, and what
we got is a diesel stinker.

And we know from the East Bay -- we know how many
of the children are affected with this horrible diesel
train going through there. So they are very weary of
these projects.

And also with affordable housing. We've tried
that. We have it here in Marin. We have it all over.
And what do we get? Look at the Canal. High density
there. We have crime. We have illegals living there.
It's a perfect haven. All these high-density
communities are all fantastic for -- in one apartment
-- and I speak from experience. Six or eight families
live in one apartment. They're all illegal.

And then beware if they ever hit you. They drive
undocumented, have no insurance. One of them broke my
neck -- (Indicating) -- driving with no insurance.
Some darn illegal. And if I did not have insurance on
my insurance for uninsured or for someone driving
without insurance, I would have lost my home and
everything because I was in a wheelchair. I had to
learn to walk again. My arm was paralyzed, et cetera.

I am saying no more of these housings here in
Marin. These low-income housings don't work. Forget it about saying transportation to these places. We don't have any normal transportation here. We have maybe one or two clean buses. The rest of them are all those stinkers. So we don't even have a European system.

Let's first concentrate on getting the jobs and then we get the transportation. We're no longer giving money, $8 million dollars of our local money that was supposed to go to fix our roads to SMART or any of those nonsense organizations. Thank you.

MS. OKADA: Good afternoon. My name is Nancy Okada. I live in the Ross Valley. I want to thank you for coming here and taking public comment, and I hope that you listen and consider public comment because a lot of us feel the same way here in Marin.

We have a beautiful place. We have some inappropriate development in spots, but it seems that what the plan is for Plan Bay Area -- and I know that you plan to designate, or Marin's already been designated urban -- is to basically just pack 'em in.

I would like to go on record in favor of the No Project. As a friend of mine said, if you come to a public hearing and you don't speak, you are not there. I'd like you to just really consider the amount of
money that's being spent to do this dog and pony show that you've taken around the Bay Area. I've gone to a couple of other events of yours.

There are child care centers for poor women that are being closed in this county. There are people who are on GSA who are having their benefits cut. There are people who are homeless living in the Canal area and living in the Woodlands area in their cars and probably in other places. There are people who are surfing on couches. There are really a lot of things that are going on where the money that's being spent to rent this room and to provide your per diem or whatever you're getting, salaries, could really better be spent on social services for our population.

If you're going to be packing more people in, I'd like to know what kind of jobs we're going to be getting in San Rafael. It seems that more and more we see more and more vacancies of commercial buildings. And these businesses can't make money so they've got to go out. So that means we lose important services for our population.

People are renting rooms in their houses just so they can hold on to their houses. There's foreclosures that are not being talked about all over this county, and yet, we still have huge salaries for
some of our wonderful administrative personnel in our various schools and civic enterprises.

So I would just like to say that we really need to learn in the entire Bay Area to live within our environmental footprint, and that means that we need to consider that we can only take so much. And for your Plan, it would be better to scrap it at this point and then concentrate on really helping the people at the bottom level who really are the ones who need the help. Thank you.

MS. LINDQUIST: Good afternoon. My name is Helen Lindquist. I am a resident of Tiburon.

I want to look at the basis for all this planning and scheming. You may remember if you are up with the scientific or political scene that back in 2006, Schwarzenegger brought in the Global Warming Solutions Act. Everyone was being scared that the globe was warming up and we have to do all these things to cut back the greenhouse gas emissions so that the globe doesn't overheat. And then not much later on came SB 375, and this is the transportation one that's all this one big plan's coming on.

How many of you know -- oh, I'm not allowed to ask you questions, but I'll pose it as a question -- how many of you know the basis for all this? All this is
based on the IPCC at the United Nations, the
International Panel on Climate Change.
They have been putting out reports every three or
four years. They have utilized gray literature.
Scientists who have contributed articles -- the
overseeing committee writes the summary for the report
before checking back with the scientists that that's
what they really said.

There's been Climategate, where a lot of these
scientists were exposed as fudging their data, making
out that the temperature was going whoop like this
(indicating) and in fact it's not. There has been no
global warming, no temperature change, since, what, 10
years now. More. 12. And all this is based on this
greenhouse gas emissions.

How many of you know what greenhouse gases are
that is meant to be causing this trend, this big
gases -- you'll never guess what 95 percent of
greenhouse gases are. Have a guess. Water vapor.
Right.

Carbon dioxide, the bogey gas, is colorless,
odorless, and less than five percent, is meant to
control the whole temperature of the world. Bunco.
And this has scared us into all this planning and
scheming and basing on this. Run clean energy. Got
to cut back greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation.

If you follow the true scientists -- and there
aren't many of them out there. I heard Lord
Monckton's name mentioned. There's CFact. There's
Morano. There's lots of people to follow on with
that. You'll find that all of this is hype.

It all comes from the United Nations. And if you
were attuned to the politics a while back, Rio. They
had their big Rio + 20 convention in Rio again. They
changed their tune. It's no longer global warming or
climate change. Climate change is all the time, by
the way, in case you haven't known about ice ages and
things in the past.

This new convention was a change to sustainable
development. What do we got filtering down to a local
level already? Sustainable development. They're
going to pack us in around transportation corridors.

Let's get rid of AB 32. Let's repeal SB 375.
Dump the lot. It's all based on false science.

MS. DENNIS: Good afternoon. My name is Nona
Dennis. I represent Marin Conservation League, not to
present a position on the sustainable communities
strategy, but rather to focus on the content and the
scope of the EIR. I believe that's the purpose of the meeting this afternoon.

So I've gone through the topics that you've listed at the beginning with transportation and would like to ask you to either address some questions or to add some points or to consider where we think emphasis should be placed in the EIR.

The first one I think I would follow on a previous speaker's comment which is that probably one of our biggest concerns is the streamlining of CEQA to be considered as incentive to prepare plans.

We've already heard from Don Wilhelm what our concerns are around streamlining CEQA. I have engaged in CEQA practice as a professional as well as a public interest person since 1971 since CEQA actually began. So I've watched it evolve, and I'm particularly concerned -- we are concerned that it will be weakened.

We would like you to clarify since we've only seen kind of telegraphic information as to how CEQA would be eliminated or streamlined, what particular facets of CEQA would be removed or weakened in streamlining? Would it be cumulative impacts? Would it be conformance with a local General Plan? What specifically do you mean by levels of streamlining?
CEQA? We're very concerned about that.

Beginning with the actual topics, the first one is transportation. The first point, your first bullet point is just baffling to me and I don't know how you're going to do it, "decrease in the average number of jobs within 15, 30, or 45 minutes from home by auto or transit." I have no idea how you're going to do this at a programmatic level. This seems to relate to very specific job centers and so forth. So you're going to need to explain how you -- it's really a demographic study here as much as the transportation. So how are you going to do this?

The second point is that while you mentioned level of service only at Level F, we feel that if anything is not to be taken out of the CEQA analysis of a particular project, it is balancing vehicle miles traveled with level of service. We're concerned about the so-called paradox of densification, which is something that occurs when you're trying to achieve long-term goals through reduced vehicle miles traveled, but in fact you may end up with a dense, poor level of service within a concentrated area. So please take that off.

In looking at air quality, which is next on your list, I think that we would benefit from some kind of
a comparison showing how much of greenhouse gas you could reduce by focusing on auto efficiency, on low-carbon fuels, and so forth, in comparison to. This approach, which is to shift to land use, which is a very slow-moving kind of boat, shift to land use.

So please give us a comparison. How effective -- what are the benefits of the two approaches, the fuel efficiency approach versus the land use approach.

The second one, let's see. Well, we want you to focus under, in the topic of air quality, the question of health risks due to increased particulates, TACs -- toxic air emissions from mobile sources within transit corridors -- we want you to particularly emphasize issues that may come up with placing denser housing in close proximity to transit corridors. How are you going to mitigate that problem? You're trying to achieve both? Denser housing? Close to transit corridors? How are you going to solve that conflict, air quality problem?

Under land use and physical development, this is a partial list. We'll probably submit something in writing. We would like you to compare -- consider the reuse of existing housing stock, the recycling of existing housing stock compared to new construction in order to accommodate growth.
Under energy, we'd like you to analyze not just the increase in nonrenewables, but rather the increase in energy consumption overall, which may come along with the growth. That is to say, that even renewable resources of energy are not benign. There are impacts associated with wind and solar and so forth. And we think that those -- it's those increases in energy overall that needs to be considered.

Under greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, the second point is vulnerability of land uses and transportation to sea level rise. We'd like you to look at the impacts of various approaches to adapting the sea level rise which would have to be followed in order to accommodate any new growth or densification in areas that are vulnerable to sea level rise. Like Tam Valley, for example. Areas along the shore. In many instances in Marin County. So what are the impacts of those adaptive methods? Go one step further if you're determined to densify in those areas. They're vulnerable.

Under noise, we'd like you to consider not only construction noise but post-construction noise. That is, if you are going to be siting -- if the idea is to site housing in close proximity to transportation corridors, what are the mitigations for noise from
transportation? They're considerable, the impacts are.

Under geology and seismicity, we'd like you to consider the impacts of adding any housing or development in areas on fill lands. We have many, many communities in Marin County along the shore that are already built on old Bay mud fill drains. To densify will perhaps raise some geologic problems.

We'll skip biology for the moment. We hope you're planning to avoid wetlands and stream corridors, habitats in Marin County. As you well know, we have many, many areas that are simply not going to be even considered for future development.

Water resources. Again, tie this back -- the placement of structures within 100-year flood hazard areas; tie this back to the cross reference to sea level rise.

Visual resources. That really has to do with community character. Culture. I won't go into that.

Under water supply, we certainly want you to look very, very closely at Marin County at our finite water supply. We can conserve up to a point, but you can't conserve nothing. You can't conserve no water.

Finally, under No Expected Impacts of Regional Importance, we do not want you to dismiss hazardous
materials. The fact that you are actually considering the possible development areas at sea level rise will in fact expose critical infrastructure that is capable of emitting hazardous materials. So do not eliminate that from a programmatic EIR. There are too many areas that do have hazardous materials within the reach of sea level rise.

And public services, I think that's already been pointed out that that's an area that should not be eliminated simply because it does not seem to have regional importance.

So with that, we will probably submit perhaps more detailed comments. But I really wanted to focus on what you're here for today, to hear about the scope of the EIR. Thank you.

MS. DaSILVA JAIN: Hello. My name is Katherine DaSilva Jain, and I just want to say thank you very much to the people who have been very explicit and clear to those of you sitting there representing ABAG. I thank you for your patience.

I want to reiterate the critical nature of CEQA and that we certainly may not do any streamlining which is detrimental to the environment. It's ridiculous to be supporting bills which are to reduce greenhouse gases and then to eliminate one of the
biggest protections to avoiding greenhouse gases.

I also want to emphasize as well the Marin County Plan. The overall plan is that we must not have development when it will require desalination of water. We talked very little about water, but it's a very finite resource. It's part of the Marin County Plan, and please, that has to be observed. Thank you very much.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you. Are there any other comments?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Five percent of America is developed. Have you flown lately?

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you everybody for your comments. The meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: CEQA legally provides for your responding. You guys aren't adhering to the law.
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