

3.13 Written Comments Testimony at Plan Hearings

This section contains responses to written comments on the Draft EIR submitted at public hearings.

F-A Alameda County Resident

F-A1: This comment does not raise environmental issues under CEQA. See Master Response A.1 about local control over land use. Commenter's support for the No Project alternative is acknowledged.

F-B Marita Platon

F-B1: The EIR for Plan Bay Area has been prepared in compliance with CEQA using the latest information publicly available. Part Two of the Draft EIR extensively explains existing conditions and analysis of impacts with many citations to these data sources. An EIR is required under CEQA and Plan Bay Area is a response to both federal (MAP-21) and State (SB 375) laws, as explained in Chapter 1.2 of the Draft EIR.

F-C Mike Garrabrants

F-C1: MTC AND ABAG respectfully disagree with this comment. Please see Master Response B.1 about the population projections relied upon in the Draft EIR's analysis.

F-C2: As the transportation planning, coordinating, and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, MTC functions as both the regional transportation planning agency, a state designation, and, for federal purposes, as the region's metropolitan planning organization (MPO). As such, it is responsible for regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and for screening requests from local agencies for state and federal grants for transportation projects to determine their compatibility with the plan. SB 375 is a new law requiring that the RTP propose a land use pattern supported by the RTP's transportation investments that together will reduce regional GHG emissions to hit targets set by the California Air Resources Board. The MTC and ABAG Board consist of elected representatives from many counties and cities of the region and their decisions reflect the decisions of these voter-selected officials. Please also see Master Response A.1 about local control over land use.

F-D Eric Strattmann

F-D1: MTC AND ABAG followed CEQA requirements for public noticing of the EIR. See Chapter 1.2 of the Draft EIR for a description of the public participation process for development of the proposed Plan. Regarding public engagement for the EIR, please see Chapter 1.1 of the Draft EIR for a description of the Notice of Preparation and public scoping process and Chapter 1 of this Final EIR for a description of the public review process for the Draft EIR. See Master Response C regarding the request to extend the public comment period. In addition, see response F-C2 for further information on the role of elected officials in developing and adopting Plan Bay Area. Please also refer to Master Response A.1 about local control over land use.

F-E Colleen O’Connell

F-E1: See Master Response B.1 regarding the population projections.

F-F Jewlia Eisenberg

F-F1: Commenter’s support for the proposed Plan is acknowledged.

F-G Janet Maiorana

F-G1: See Master Response C regarding the request to extend the public comment period.

F-H Pam Drew

F-H1: These issues were addressed in the Draft EIR, in Chapters 2.12 (water supply), 2.9 (protected species and wetlands), 2.1 (traffic), and 2.2 (air quality). In addition, see Master Response B.1 regarding the population projections. Chapter 2.10 proposes Mitigation Measures 2.10(a) and (c) to reduce significant contrasts with the scale, form, line, color, and/or overall visual character of the existing community, although local jurisdictions retain land use authority on allowable densities; see Master Response A.1 regarding local control over land use.

F-I Ericka Erickson

F-I1: MTC AND ABAG followed CEQA requirements for public noticing of the EIR. See Chapter 1.2 of the Draft EIR for a description of the public participation process for development of the proposed Plan. Regarding public engagement for the EIR, please see Chapter 1.1 of the Draft EIR for a description of the Notice of Preparation and public scoping process and Chapter 1 of this Final EIR for a description of the public review process for the Draft EIR.

F-I2: Commenter’s support for Alternative 5 is acknowledged.

F-J Michael Ludwig

F-J1: As stated in Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR, “as a program-level EIR individual project impacts are not addressed in detail; the focus of this analysis is to address the impacts which, individually or in the aggregate, may be regionally significant...This approach does not relieve local jurisdictions of the responsibility for evaluating project-specific, locally significant impacts.” Individual projects pursued under the proposed Plan are likely to have a range of adverse and positive environmental effects, which will all be evaluated by the project-level environmental analysis for those projects. For an understanding of how the five alternative growth scenarios compare to one another with respect to their air quality and transportation impacts at the regional level, please see Table 3.1-56 on page 3.1-121 of the Draft EIR.

F-K Ed Mason

F-K1: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-L Carla Giustino

F-L1: PDAs were designated by local land use authorities, such as the County of Marin, and were not selected by MTC or ABAG. However, Commenter's request will be considered by decision-makers as part of the EIR certification process and action on the proposed Plan. See Master Response I regarding the PDA process.

F-L2: The proposed Plan does not discuss or allocate the types of housing units and whether or not they are affordable. This is an issue for the local jurisdiction and land developers. See Draft EIR Chapter 2.14 regarding impacts on public services, although the funding and provision of such services are the responsibility of local jurisdictions. See Master Response F regarding displacement. Your opposition to the housing allocated to Marin is noted and your request will be considered by decision-makers as part of the EIR certification process and action on the proposed Plan.

F-M Liz Sprecht

F-M1: See response E3-L1.

F-N Jack Simonitch

F-N1: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-O Nathan Stout

F-O1: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-O2: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-P Sofia Lozano-Pallos

F-P1: Please see Appendix C of the Draft EIR for a list of transportation projects included in the proposed Plan.

F-Q Finau Faleofa

F-Q1: The comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA. MTC and ABAG followed CEQA requirements for public noticing of the EIR. See Chapter 1.2 of the Draft EIR for a description of the public participation process for development of the proposed Plan. Regarding public engagement for the EIR, please see Chapter 1.1 of the Draft EIR for a description of the Notice of Preparation and public scoping process and Chapter 1 of this Final EIR for a description of the public review process for the Draft EIR.

F-R Jean Ryan

F-R1: See response E6-M1.

F-S Ed Mason

F-S1: MTC and ABAG believe that the proposed Plan will work as analyzed in the Draft EIR.

- F-S2: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.
- F-S3: See Master Response D.1 regarding greenhouse gas emissions included in analysis for SB 375 target. The cost of the proposed Plan is not an environmental issue that requires a response under CEQA.
- F-S4: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.
- F-S5: CEQA streamlining is a feature of SB 375 and is beyond the control of MTC and ABAG. See Table 1.1-1 on p.1.1-14 of the Draft EIR and Master Response A.2 for a description of the requirements for CEQA streamlining.
- F-S6: See Master Response C regarding the request to extend the public comment period. Public facilities are typically the responsibility of local jurisdictions and the proposed Plan does not change that; see Chapter 2.14 of the Draft EIR for analysis of impacts on public facilities. See Master Response A.1 and A.3 regarding local control over land use planning and the level of specificity in the EIR. The remainder of the comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.
- F-S7: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.
- F-S8: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.
- F-S9: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA. See response to comment C153-9 regarding transit ridership trends relative to investment.
- F-S10: Congestion in San Francisco is a local issue and as stated in Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR, “as a program-level EIR individual project impacts are not addressed in detail; the focus of this analysis is to address the impacts which, individually or in the aggregate, may be regionally significant.” See Master Response A.3 regarding level of specific
- F-S11: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-T James B. Walsh

- F-T1: This EIR analyzes environmental impacts created at a regional level as a result of the proposed Plan. Global population issues are beyond the scope of the EIR.
- F-T2: MTC and ABAG followed CEQA requirements for public noticing of the EIR. See Chapter 1.2 of the Draft EIR for a description of the public participation process for development of the proposed Plan. Regarding public engagement for the EIR, please see Chapter 1.1 of the Draft EIR for a description of the Notice of Preparation and public scoping process and Chapter 1 of this Final EIR for a description of the public review process for the Draft EIR. Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR includes a list of preparers. The remainder of the comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-U Nathan Daniel Stout

F-U1: Commenter's opposition to the proposed Plan is acknowledged.

F-V Michael J. Hayes

F-V1: The proposed Plan is not the cause of the projected population growth, but rather seeks to accommodate it, as required under SB 375. See Master Response B.1 regarding population projections.

F-W Roger Delaware

F-W1: This comment does not raise environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

F-X Adam Kirshenbaum

F-X1: Commenter's support for the proposed Plan is acknowledged.

This page intentionally left blank.