3.8 EIR Hearings Oral Comments
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PLAN BAY AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SAN RAFAEL
APRIL 16, 2013

Reported by: SALLIE ESTUDILLO
CSR NO. 9060
ATTENDEES

BRAD PAUL - ABAG Deputy Director

CAROLYN CLEVENER - MTC Associate Planner Analyst

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the Public Hearing, and on April 16, 2013, 10:00 a.m. at the Embassey Suites Hotel, 101 Mcinnis Parkway, San Rafael, California, before me, SALLIE ESTUDILLO, CSR No. 9060, State of California, there commenced a Public Hearing under the provisions of California Environmental Quality Act.

MEETING AGENDA

Introduction by Joan Chaplick

Presentation by Carolyn Clevenger
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUBLIC SPEAKERS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PETER HENSEL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RICHARD HALL</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CLAYTON SMITH</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CAROLYN LEMENT</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NONA DENNIS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUSAN KIRSCH</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LINDA RAMES</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AL DUGAN</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HARRY BROPHY</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RAY DAY</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MARGARET KETTUNENZER</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PAM DREW</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>JEAN RIEKE</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NANCY OCADA</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ROBERT CHILVERSON</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ELIZABETH MOODY</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MARGARET NAN</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ANN SPAKE</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>JULIE LEITZELL</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CAROL SHEERIN</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SUE BEITTEL</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>JOY DAHLGREN</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC SPEAKERS (Continued)</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VINCENT WELCH</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BRENDA BURKE</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JIM BITTER</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BARBARA SALZMAN</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>STEPHEN NESTEL</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MARJORIE MACRIS</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LILIE CROCKER</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SUSAN WERNICK</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Introduction by Joan Chaplick not reported.)

(Presentation by Carolyn Clevenger not reported.)

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your presentation, Carolyn. And now, we will start the public comment. So I will be reading off names in groups of three, and I'd like you to line up behind the microphone. Ursula will be keeping time, so if you approach the two minute mark, I'll just give you a brief hand signal to wrap up your remarks.

If you do have additional comments beyond your two minutes that you need, please remember, you can provide comments in writing today, or by email, mail, or fax, as Carolyn showed on the slide. So with that we are going to get started. And I please ask that you speak slowly so that our court reporters can get your information down accurately.

So let's start with Peter Hensel, followed by Richard Hall, and Clayton Smith. So if you could start, your name and where you are from.

PETER HENSEL: I'm Peter Hensel, and I live in Corte Madera. And just as a little perspective, I'm definitely not against affordable housing. I think we need more of it, but it needs to be dispersed through
the community. I consider myself an environmentalist, so
this, I tackled this gigantic document, a thousand
pages, as best I could with limited time, concentrating
mainly on biological and water resources, because that's
all the time I had.

But what struck me, you know, on page 39
of the biological resources report, there's a footnote
that defines a certain section of Federal Endangered
Species Act. It says, a taking is defined at section
nine of that act, as broadly defined to include
intentional or accidental harassment or harm to
wildlife. Now, in the extreme, that could be something
even as disastrous as killing wildlife.

So, if you are a modern day land-use
planner or developer, what you want to do is mitigate.
They have a word for that, LSM, or an acronym, I should
say, it means less than significant impacts. So, this
puts planners and developers in a kind of quandary,
because, let's say -- and again, this is from the
document, page 60, of biological resources.

In the event that construction with the
needs to operate in any water course with flowing or
standing water, a qualified biologist resource monitor
shall be present at all times to alert construction
crews to the possible presence of California red legged
frogs, nesting birds, salmon heads, or other aquatic species at risk during construction operations.

Well, I got kind of a laugh out of that, actually, because one hopes that the state planners would provide a chair for this guy sitting there all day long watching the action. Am I?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Yes, that's time.

PETER HENSEL: Afraid so.

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could please wrap up your remarks.

PETER HENSEL: Well, let me just wrap it up. So, in other words, we need to do some more work on the people impacts of this report, and especially around the water, because -- and this will be my last sentence. I plugged into the California water agencies, they have a website, and they say that Central Valley farmers are going to get five, excuse me, 20 percent of the water, their contract water this year. And I said, my goodness, why are we planning for all these people under that scenario?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Following our next commenter is Clayton Smith, could come in line, and then I have Carolyn Lement. Sir.
RICHARD HALL: Hi, I'm Richard Hall, and I live here in San Rafael, and I represent a group called Quiet and Safe San Rafael. We are a group of residents spanning ten neighborhoods. And, first of all, I want to say, this is a big plan. It has big implications. And I also wanted to sort of bring up a point of fact, I kind of quickly went through obviously a big plan, as I mentioned, this has more implications for Oakland, San Francisco, some of the big cities.

Well, I think it's worth calling out that right here in Civic Center, where we are sitting today, the plan here and the PDA that manifests it, increase the population by 55 percent in just a small half mile radius zone, right here. In downtown San Rafael the impact is 58 percent population increase.

So I found that sort of the way this was presented was very dismissive of the actual impact. And I think this is, what's really happening is the residents I'm talking to, right here are impacted, are feeling like we are just waking up to a major impact on our life. We live here. We have vested interest in this being a great place to live. We want to have a voice. And we have consistently found that that voice is not being heard.

And through -- we have met with our town Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report
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council, we packed the council chambers was overflowing
with proponents to the PDA plan, stationary plan, yet
our council voted five nothing against all those people.
We are at out wit's end to work out how are we meant to
object to the PDA, the general plan, the plan that
basically almost all of us disagree with that's based on
these transit oriented development principles, that we
don't just buy into this vision.

And I think many of us here don't buy
into the transit oriented development vision. We think
there's an alternative way. We think there's many
things you haven't considered. First of all,
telecommuting is increasing, cars are green, gas
emissions have reduced, and preempted, they are making
radical steps forward there. There's changing of car
technology that might start to emerge, and I've
explained this one, in the next five or ten years.

So these are all things that can be taken
into account that we don't have such radical impacts on
our everyday lives.

JOAN CHAPLICK: And could you wrap up your
comments, please?

RICHARD HALL: Sure. You have basically given
us one alternative, no project, but I'm told by people,
if we choose no project you still have to get to choose
an alternative. It feels like you haven't given us a choice. No project is no project. There is no (inaudible) choice that says no project. We would like to say no project, period, and eliminate the PDA here in San Rafael and North San Rafael. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your time.

Our next commenter will be followed by Carolyn, and then Nona Dennis.

CLAYTON SMITH: Yeah, my name is Clayton Smith, I'm from Mill Valley. You know, I look at your document, it starts with what I consider to be questionable scientific theories concerning the effects of CO2 on what is now referred to as climate change. It moves on, continues with population increases search that contradict those made by Department of Finance at the state level. These are used to justify the overthrow of local control concerning zoning and development. And it culminates, interesting enough, on the last page of your summary document with this vast expenditure. Billions and billions of dollars on all these transportation items. And I look at this, and what I immediately sense, and I immediately feel, is cronyism. All this money, and I, I look at what the state does with the money we give it today, and we get big
bureaucracy. We get an overgrown and overpaid state
government, and we have almost no real value in exchange
for our tax dollars.

What we are getting back is substandard
government. And this I think is just more of it. This
is billions, hundreds of billions of dollars, most of
which is going to go into the coffers of the bureaucracy
and all those people that feed off this bureaucracy.
All the contractors, all the politicians, the financing
companies, and all the rest of it.

And it brings to mind, and my culminating
statement being, when Mussolini was asked to define
fascism, his definition of fascism was, everything in
the state and nothing out of the state. Again,
everything in the state and nothing outside of the
state. And I would argue that this document, One Bay
Area, is fascistic. It is a statement that we are now
all basically in the state, as described by these
bureaucrats and unelected officials, and that none of
our life, the life we have enjoyed in this country, will
be able to be permitted outside of the state.

And I think it's up to the duty of every
person who loves this country and who basically loves
the freedoms that are the gift of this country, will do
what they can to oppose such an opus document. Thank

you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. And following Nona Dennis we'll have Susan Kirsch.

CAROLYN LEMENT: Carolyn Lement, San Rafael.

Two boys escaped from the Nazis, and one of them got to go to the University of California and then get his master's degree from Stanford University in medicine. And then the army that sponsored that sent him back to Germany. And he finished his service there and came back and there was no place to live. My father lived in a chicken coop after the war.

Affordable housing, of course, is necessary. Better plan, of course, is necessary. I've never met anyone against affordable housing. If you are here, please come introduce yourself. That said, we have a variety of issues and I'm just going to speak on a potpourri of them about the EIR. First of all, we need more time to consider this carefully. The staff is doing it full time. Why isn't this meeting being held in the evening so we can get people here? My computer is still downloading 1,300 pages. It hasn't finished downloading the report yet.

Secondly, housing is responsible for 40 percent of greenhouse gases. What's out there now is green. All this building is not green. No matter what
materials you use and how you dispose of the waste in building it, it's not green. Twenty units per acre is appropriate in our county. We are not urban. And you can't go five miles out into deep country below landslides and put more people at risk.

The places that have been chosen in Marin County are dangerous. They are either toxic sites, they are next to cell phone tower farms, they are next to freeways where you double the chances of your children having autism and asthma, according to 93 studies that I downloaded. This is not examining the community's impacts. The EIR is insufficient in this way and the process has been scripted from the beginning.

So the process has been incomplete, exclusive, and too fast for us. The assumptions behind it are wrong. We have two freeway projects now in Marin, no one is living in them. They failed. And lastly, we have the water. The international standards for transit oriented development is spoke and wheel. It's not cramming people next to a freeway where they do not want to live.

So far all this and more reasons, no project, give us an alternative, let us develop an alternative. It's going to taking more time in Marin than we have been given. Thank you.
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

And let's see. We have Nona, then we
have Susan Kirsch and Linda Rames.

NONA DENNIS: I'm Nona Dennis, I'm
representing Marin Conservation League, and these are
our very preliminary comments on the EIR itself. I have
five comments. The first is that --

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could use the
microphone. We can't hear you.

The first comment, is that as far as it goes, the EIR, I
must say, stands in sharp contrast. It's subjective.
It's comprehensive. It misses some major points, which
we are going to be making, but in comparison with the
plan itself, it is refreshing because it does identify
the areas of controversy, it identifies the significant
unavoidable impacts. It presents information
objectively, whereas the plan itself is sugar coated and
written through rose colored, I'm sorry, colored
glasses.

So anyway, that's as far as it goes. So
I've heard -- so main comment on the EIR, is that it's
based on projections that now are in question. We are
aware that there are discrepancies between the numbers
projected by ABAG and those by the Department of
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Finance. We don't know, some people are familiar with those, the differences, the explanation of the differences, so forth, but it's our understanding that the entire EIR plan itself are premised on projections. And you have a deadline, you have no time to correct those.

When will we see a correction of those projections, such that all these assumptions underlying the EIR can be made consistent with projections that are accepted? Are we going to have to wait four years for review of the plan? The plan, the EIR itself does deal fairly well with directives of the transportation project, such as the displacement of open space and so forth. It fails to, however, address the long term indirect effects of the actual rate of growth, economic growth as projected.

This will have to be, those indirect impacts are not addressed. The impact of sea level rise should be carried beyond the mid century. And we will have some more comments to make on deficiencies in the EIR. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. Next we have Susan Kirsch, Linda Rames, and then Al Dugan.

SUSAN KIRSCH: Good morning, Susan Kirsch,
Mill Valley, California, a 34-year-resident of Mill Valley. I want to make three comments regarding the EIR and its measurements with CEQA. You know, on the Executive Summary, page two, it talks about one of the requirements of CEQA, as you mentioned in your opening comment, is to inform decision makers and members of the public as to the range of the environmental impacts on the proposed plan.

I would hold that this project has been grossly inadequate in terms of the people who are representing any of us in our communities, bringing forward being informed, educated and engaged around this. So, at this point at least, the project is failing on informing and engaging the public.

The second part of this is around picking the environmentally superior alternative. And in an example of the kind of double speak and the kind of manipulation that happens in this, what it says in Executive Summary, page nine, is that if the no project alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR must identify another alternative from among the alternative allies.

However, project -- the no project alternative is the one that continues to honor local control through general plan and maintains that strength.
of local communities working in collaboration but holding power with local communities, which many of us are in favor of.

The other thing that I want to comment on, is many groups have been holding great promise for this plan thinking that it's going to provide affordable housing. And I'd like to point out from page 108, in terms of hidden targets for equitable access, that in fact, instead of hitting equitable access, the wording from page 108 is that this plan moves in the wrong direction.

The share of household income needed to cover transportation and housing costs is projected to increase to 69 percent for low income and lower middle income residents during the Plan Bay Area period. And further, transportation cost from page 109 will change by one percent. This project is based on faulty assumptions, faulty numbers, and a faulty process. It should be slowed down and reconsidered.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. Next we have Linda and Al Dugan, followed by Harry Brophy.

LINDA RAMES: Good morning, I'm Linda Rames, I'm a resident of Mill Valley. I simply have one comment to make. Don't you think it's a little putting
the fox in charge of the hen house to have MTC doing the EIR? They are hardly impartial. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

You can adjust the volume from the back.

AL DUGAN: All right. My name is Al Dugan and I represent the Novato Homeowner's Association. And basically, I have three main issues, and they are with ABAG, which is the basis of this whole report is based on ABAG projections. Number one, the May 16th date is just not sufficient time for us to be able to analyze and give an independent review of the ABAG numbers and this report. It's just insufficient.

I also note that ABAG used the DFO migration factor from 2007 instead of the most recent Department of Finance migration numbers, and that makes a significant difference between the Department of Finance numbers and the ABAG numbers. And then, finally, ABAG top down planning does not have an adequate way to deal with an anomaly or an outliner like Marin.

Dr. Levy reviewed the total growth of the Bay Area but clearly stated at a recent ABAG meeting, he was not involved in and did not review the allocation process to the jurisdictions. The 18,400 jobs and 33,000 population growth by 2040 makes no sense for
Marin. The ABAG numbers are 61 percent higher than the Department of Finance numbers for the Bay Area, but they are 400 percent higher than the Department of Finance numbers for Marin. This is an obvious anomaly and a red flag.

Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thanks for your comment.

I have Harry Brophy next, followed by Ray Day.

Did you, ma'am, did you fill out a speaker card, or did I accidentally not call your name?

(Discussion had off the record.)

JOAN CHAPLICK: It's in the que. So you just have to stand. Please, sir, go ahead.

HARRY BROPHY: My name is Harry Brophy. I'm from Novato. I have nothing against housing. That isn't why I'm here. In a way, it, it might effect it, but what I want to talk about is the water situation in Novato. I've looked at some of reports. I have a book full here that I haven't quite finished yet, but Novato is going to have problems with water. They have 6,100 acres of feet they are using now, and ABAG projects 12,000 feet by 2020. That's almost double.

In Novato, people at ABAG has projected is up around 64,000, that's way high. And what I'm
getting at is, there's one pipe now that brings water into Novato. It's a 30 inch main. I went up and checked it, it comes from Sonoma. We are going to get another pipe, but in 2009, due to financial constraints, that pipe is out of the game.

So they have one way of getting water to Novato. And more than anybody in this room, I know what happens when a pipe full of water breaks. And don't tell me it can't, because I was in charge of the City of San Francisco the day that Loma Prieta had all the pipes break in the marina. We used the bay. You don't have that option right at this time.

We could set up a system where you could use above ground water, I could do that for you, but as it is now, the amount of water coming in is not sufficient. All these statements in this book are taken from North Marin Water District, in conjunction with talking with Krista Gabriel, he's the head engineer, all these things are true, and it comes down to where they tell you, by the year of 2020 when there's going to be a 20 percent reduction by the State of California that's mandatory, the water you have now won't be enough.

You are going to have less water up there. You are going to have more people. You are going to have a major problem when you do the EIR. And
another thing about the EIR, I would like it to be impartial. So I don't know why Novato could be the lead on the EIR when they are in cahoots with ABAG trying to put these buildings up in Novato. It's got to be impartial, because they are siding together.

They are not going to look at all these facts. They are just going to do like one did, do we have enough water? Yes. End the game. Let's look at it from the start of Maravelle all the way through where it comes down. There's nine water contractors between Russian River and lower Marin. They all have this water problem. And it's going to get worse.

Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Following our next speaker, Ray Day, we have Margaret Kettunenzesar, followed by Pam Drew.

RAY DAY: Hi, I'm Ray Day from Marinwood. And I'm just representing myself, so don't take this to mean that I represent the entire Marinwood area. I just wanted to say that I agree with the prior speakers indicating that the EIR focuses on transportation, jobs, air pollution, and ignores many things that are really important to the communities here in Marin.

And especially one thing, as a result of SB50, which really messed us up, because the impact on
schools, which are not permitted to be placed in the EIR, as far as the impacts to the local school districts. Giving example, in the, in Marin County, here, 70 percent of the county's affordable units will be, are planned to be located in the Dixy School District and concentrated there. Now, okay. Now, you say so what's the impact of the affordable housing?

Okay. For example, I did a calculation, over the 40 year life of the project it would mean about 14.8 million in tax revenues if it was done on a regular affordable basis. That meaning that the county's original plan of 20 percent affordable housing and then the rest to be market rate housing. Right now what the plan is on the existing PDA is to go ahead and have it 100 percent affordable housing with the owner being bridge housing that is entitled then to not pay any property taxes that would be going to the schools.

Okay. Now you say, what is the impact? Okay. For the school districts, that would amount to over the life, that would be 1.6 million that they would receive from the project out of the funds that would be sent to the schools, versus 3.8 million that they would be entitled to.

So this is a problem, and I think that if it's nothing else, it's put in as a informational item.
to the public so they know what the impact is to there local school districts, because otherwise it won't be mentioned, they have no say in what is going on. And this is a very important issue that hasn't been discussed and should be contained in any of these plans. Thank you very much.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

And next we have Margaret.

MARGARET KETTUNENZESAR: Horrible would be the use of the funds for urban areas. Unfortunately, in the unincorporated areas of Marin, all population has been added and creates an urban prophecy, which does not exist. The very sad thing is the PDA's and the information of location of affordable housing in Southern Marin, where I live, is on flood plain. A flood plain.

Climate change does is not addressed in terms of the areas where the population is planned. The population is assuming transit orientation, because there is a Highway 101, which is inadequate and will be inadequate for many years. Shoreline Highway is impassible on weekends and sunny days. Shoreline Highway is accessed by flooded -- accessed from the bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge. There is no transit facility throughout rural, semi-rural Marin.
We are impacting populations that are planned. And it's unfortunate that an eagerness to gain funds for transportation, a process which was designed for urban renewal, which is desperately needed in parts of the cities which surround the Bay Area. Common change needs to be better addressed, and the impacts of the unfortunate probability of very high FEMA insurance on semi, on semi-rural populations and affordable housing, needy people, seniors, these kinds of considerations should be given a more economic -- that aspect should be analyzed in the document. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

Next, Pam Drew, Jean Rieke, and Nancy Ocada.

PAM DREW: My name is Pam Drew, I'm from Novato. And I don't represent any one of the three lobbies that the Plan Bay Area has replaced democracy with. I believe in climate change. I believe the globe is warming. I believe we need to reduce GHG emissions, but I do not believe that we need to lie to the population in order to do that.

I do not believe that you, as officials, have a role in telling the population exactly what they are to do and when they are going to do it. Whenever I first watched the Bay Area Plan it was that we had to prepare for two million people, one million of whom were
going to be nearby migration, and one million by natural increase. That was when there was still immigration going on.

Very very shortly, few months after that little factoid was dropped, it was no longer seen in any of the literature. It was just two million people. You have to provide for two million people. Now, that's excessive growth. That's excessive growth in the face of all the DOF projections. And at the beginning you said that you were using the DOF numbers, but in the end we find that it's Steven Levi and a private corporation that is putting out all of these numbers.

This is based on something that is wrong. And if it's wrong from the very beginning it's going to be wrong at the end. It needs to be, no. No option. There is not enough water. You are encroaching on the bay lands from the Cargill Salt Flats all the way up here to Tam. Valley. This is a lobby between the corporations, the environment lobby and the equity lobby. I don't belong to any of those.

I'm a homeowner, and despite my race, despite that the fact that I am white, I'm still speaking for homeowners. For black homeowners, for Hispanic homeowners, for homeowners of all sorts. And we deserve to be heard. We haven't been heard and we
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

We have Jean Rieke who is next, followed by Nancy Ocada, and then Robert Chilvers.

JEAN RIEKE: Hi, I'm Jean Rieke from Larkspur. And, first of all, one thing around affordable housing that has troubled me, I really do think that most people understand the need for affordable housing and do not oppose it for any elitism, or anything else, but every time I hear about people needing 60 percent of certain peoples need to commute into the county for work, I'm wondering if they are taking the statistics of the number of people that live in the county that need to commute out of the county for their work.

So, I think that has to be understood, commuting in general is a big problem for everybody. And the other thing is, just a more broad base concern in two areas. One is that a little bit of it has the not in my backyard background, also, which I do not think that people that live in Marin County, at least in my experience, feel elite. They feel like they want to keep people from living here. For most of the people that live here, it's taken quite a struggle to come and live here.

I think that when you look around the Bay
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1 Area and you see whether it's because of highway
2 construction or infilling of housing, or whatever it is,
3 and I know these are all very deep complex problems, you
4 look at arenas that are not very attractive. At least
5 not along the freeways. And going farther and farther
6 out now, because what we see seem to be forgetting is we
7 live in such an incredibly beautifully blessed natural
8 area. And, unfortunately, we have lost that along 80,
9 880, 580, south of San Francisco on 101.

10 What I see here is an opportunity to try
11 to find balance in the basic concepts by which thinking
12 is done over future plans. And we still have some of
13 the suburban rural nature in Marin, and Sonoma County,
14 and farther north. And I would like us to treasure that
15 and to find a way to balance out all these needs and
16 wants.

17 And last thing I have a real problem
18 with, again not to not respect all the hard work that
19 people do, but in general I'm a little bit opposed to
20 top down government, because I don't think one size fits
21 all. And I think that when you, when, every time we
22 take control out of the local hands we have more and
23 more and more of the risk, than in general, every day
24 peoples needs are not being served, as much as people
25 are trying to serve them.
JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your comment.

Our next speaker, Nancy Ocada. Followed by Robert Chilvers, and then Elizabeth Moody.

NANCY OCADA: Hi, my name is Nancy Ocada. I live in Ross Valley. And I want to thank you for coming here. I guess your staff, I hope that my comments will -- I know that my comments will be included in some document that will be buried somewhere, but I hope that you pass on my comments to the appropriate people.

This project actually started in June of 2012, when you presented a draft DIR alternative for review by joint MTC Plan ABAG Administrative Committee. And on June 11, you released notice of preparation for a 30-day public review period. Somehow I wasn't aware of this, otherwise I might have got involved a little earlier. From June 20th to June 28th, you held regional wide scoping meetings. I, unfortunately, didn't know about those, so I couldn't attend.

On July 13th, of 2012, you presented your final alternatives for review by the joint MTC Plan ABAG Administrative Committee, in recommendation for committee -- which you probably did approve of it. Anyhow, I got involved in this in, when I attended a meeting in San Francisco in January of 2012, oh,
Actually it was 2011 that you started it. I'm sorry.

Anyhow, I was very surprised to find that there wasn't a single person in the room in San Francisco who was in favor of your plan. And I certainly am not. These come from your scoping alternatives. You say it's unclear that market dynamics will support protected PDA growth. You need to assess the market feasibility. I see businesses closing down everywhere.

I am a small business advocate, and I think we need more small businesses. And what this is going to do is going to put more businesses out of business. You're offering incentives of ABAG and CEQA streamlining. That means let's cut down more trees. I am against cutting down more trees. I'm against destroying the habitat, which is being done everywhere.

And, finally, I believe and I support the the no project alternative. Alternative number one, which is a land use based on 2010 existing land use conditions, continue existing general plans and local zoning into the future, assume loose compliance with urban growth boundaries and more green field development.

And then in transportation, which there's a lot of money being spent in that area, based on 2010
existing transportation networks and only include projects that have either already received funding and have environmental clearance as of May 1st, 2011. This would be a much better alternative, and it’s too bad that so much money, when people are losing their homes all around us, so much money has been spent planning a process and not going to real jobs.

We really need to have real jobs. And this planning process and the millions of dollars that ABAG and MTC has spent is really a very sad situation. So thank you very much for coming here, and I hope you enjoy your day in Marin.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Robert Chilvers, followed by Elizabeth Moody, and then Margaret Nan.

ROBERT CHILVERS: Rob Chilvers, President of Annabel. Marin County is truly a very very special place. It’s the only county in entire United States that has three national parks within its borders. One of those, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, which is largely within Marin, is the second most visited park in the entire national park system.

We also have almost 500 species of birds. And there’s very good reason for that. It’s because we have the open space, we have the trees, we have the
habitat. Well, how did Marin County, even now, after all of the growth that's been around us in the entire State of California, still maintain its beauty and its open space and its habitat? By fighting.

We have had this fight many many times. Marincello was proposed for the headlands and it was squashed. The Vincent Silvera properties were slot to be developed and that has been stopped. It's taken citizen action for decades and decades to preserve it.

Now my backyard is the entire Bay Area, and Marin County is a jewel for the Bay Area. In fact, it's a jewel for the entire world.

Try to think of one other city as large as suburban San Francisco that has anything like Marin County, literally within walking distance of the city. It doesn't exist anywhere, except here. We must preserve it. How did we get to the point where we have this beauty? The foresight of Burton and other politicians who put these national parks and national monuments together, the citizen activities of myself and the people in this room, and other citizens, we have to fight to keep it as beautiful as it is.

The proposal to build it, literally, within walking distance of this hotel, 600 units in this area, which is an architectural treasure, and which is
almost entirely single-family detached homes, it would change the character of this very neighborhood profoundly. And anybody that thinks that this SMART train is going to have a station nearby is going to alleviate traffic on 101, if you build 600 new units, you are going to have at least a thousand new cars on 101 every day, and for multiple trips. So, totally aggravate the traffic problem.

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you can conclude your remarks, please.

ROBERT CHILVERS: I think that elected representatives who support this growth do so at their peril.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. Okay. Elizabeth Moody, I believe is next.

ELIZABETH MOODY: I strongly support the nine Bay Area Planning. I've read the full plan but not the EIR. Sixty percent of our workers come from out of the county, making greenhouse gas raise, as well as the unfairness for those families who lose time, and the cost of travel, and the importance of this plan in providing for the three areas of sustainability. The environment, the economy with jobs connected with transportation, and equity, it's just absolutely
essential.

My three kids with their eight children, my three kids could not afford to live here, even though they worked here. And it has been very distressing for me to see that this county is so wealthy and 82 percent white, so I participate in ACE, Action for Coalition -- let's see. Action for Coalition Equity, which stresses the discrimination in this county. And it is absolutely essential that we do planning between, and integrate the planning between the nine counties that make up the region.

And it is, as far as all of the elements of sustainability, with the protecting the environment which the plan does, and it also continues to allow for the local land use, fully local decision making. So there's just no reason why we shouldn't cooperate, coordinate, and integrate, so that we have a better region and a better future.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

Next we have Margaret Nan, and then Ann Spake, and Julie Leitzell. Those are all of the comment cards I have, so -- I have one more. So if anyone else is seeking to speak, please let us know.

Margaret, you are up next.

MARGARET NAN: Hi, I'm a homeowner and also a
long-term resident. I was raised in Marin County and Sonoma County, I went to school here, and then I returned after living in Los Angeles, New York, D.C., and lots of urban areas, and I do not want Marin County to turn in to having some of these issues like urban areas. Like a lot of people have moved, specifically to Marin to enjoy the beautiful scenery and the nature. I know I moved back to Marin, I think, I thank my family for raising me here and being able to have the privilege of living here. That being said, I do believe it's inevitable and there needs to be affordable housing of some sort placed in Marin County, however, after living in Hamilton, was our first home, we stretched to get in there, we stretched to get into Marinwood, we are in our third home now in Lucas Valley, after stretching, working really hard, my husband works here and so do I, I feel like we have sacrificed so much to live in this community, and I'm happy to do so, but I don't think we should be giving away the farm, necessarily.

We have -- our kids go to public schools. I believe in public school. We contribute to Kendale. To put this additional pressure on the school, and I talked to our local principal, and he actually was not really concerned about the homes that were going to be
built, 700 units in Marinwood, Lucas Valley have been proposed, he said that he was more concerned about Marin Commons being taken off the board as source of tax revenue.

So Marin Commons was sold to the county, apparently, and they no longer have two million dollars in school revenue annually. So here we are getting squeezed from tax revenue from the schools and you are going to put more kids in our schools and have less resources. So that's certainly an issue. The other thing is I've seen, even in my community in Lucas Valley, for affordable housing. I've actually gone and talked to Sharon McAdams at Upridge Housing, I think it's very well run. I'm not against that.

What I'm against is putting in a lot of affordable housing, having people from outside the area coming here and taking advantage of that and having less, less revenue. When I lived at Hamilton at the Meadows I was told by police officers that police officers wouldn't buy there, because they would rather live in Vallejo, realize their 30 percent increase in their home price, trade up, than being set with one or two, three percent increase.

So what ended up happening, is you got a lot of people from outside the Bay Area with limited
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options that were put in there by the developers. So you are identifying a set of people that you want to move to this area, but those people will not buy there. So I don't know what your solution is with that. I'm certainly for it, but it needs to be done properly. And I just don't like this being where it's going. And needs to be more controlled.

JOAN CHAPLICK: And can you state your name for the --

MARGARET NAN: Margaret Nan, I live in Lucas Valley.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Our next speaker is Ann Spake, and then we have Julie Leitzell, and Carol Sheerin.

ANN SPAKE: My name is Ann Spake, I'm from Tam. Valley. I was carefully reading the EIR, and I note that three parcel viable for potential development. You were basically analyzing, calculating the profitability of new development or redevelopment on each parcel. I would submit that this profitability is fundamental to the proposed plan, proposed alternative, and it is profit over people.

We need to plan for housing that's healthy for sensitive members of our community, including young children, pregnant women, seniors, and those who have compromised immune symptoms. You admit
in your EIR that this plan is totally in contradiction to that. The current plan has the most and over twice the transportation projects exposed to mid century sea level rise inundation in the no project alternative.

You say it exposes more residents and more new residential development inundation by placing people closer to the bay than the other alternatives.

The proposed plan does not provide the least environmental impact in relation to air quality. The EIR does not examine the effects on local or regional air quality from specific land use and transportation improvements in the proposed plan.

The proposed plan could cause a net increase in emissions of criteria pollutants and PM10, and diesel, MP TACs from on roll mobile sources compared to existing conditions, and yet you considered it to have no adverse impacts. The proposed plan when you admit will cause a localized net increase of sensitive receptors being located in TPP corridors where TACs and fine particulate matters concentrations result in elevating cancer risk.

The proposed plan will also increase TACs and PM in disproportionately impacted communities creating even greater health disparities and environmental justice. Environmental justice person
noted that low income housing is being used as a buffer, even as science advises against it. The Pacific Institute study says half of the land slated for infill development in our San Francisco bay region is located in communities with highest outbreaks of toxic air contaminants.

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could complete your remarks, please.

ANN SPAKE: Yes. The proposed plan will cause an increase in traffic volumes and impair implementation of emergency response and evacuation response. It will increase greenhouse gas emissions. In conclusion, I would comment that the absurdity of the plan is that it is intended to address three major trends. Increased group living by seniors, and increased multi-generational households. This would not suggest the type of land-use planning which you are doing. It would suggest the opposite of dense structures with many small single units.

I would ask that you reject the proposed plan. It is poor. All the reasons you state in your EIR is basically not feasible to mitigate. Okay.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

Next we have Julie Leitzell. She will be followed by Carol Sheerin and Sue Beittel.
JULIE LEITZELL: Hi, I'm Julie Leitzell, I live in Larkspur. I apologize, I came in late. Are there any board of supervisors people here?

JOAN CHAPLICK: We have the mayor of Novato --

JULIE LEITZELL: Well, I wish, I wish they were hear. My problem is with the big picture and the top down central planning. We will not have any control over, I guess there are 14 sites in the county that are going to be open for overdevelopment, rezoning. That doesn't include all the various sites in all the cities. And when people start seeing these developments going up, they are going to have nobody to complain to, because of the levels of bureaucracy that we have to get through to get something stopped.

It's going to be too late at that point.

I have been over to the Pleasant Hill BART station where a transit oriented villages, and if you all want to go over there you will see that the whole bottom floor has for lease signs in the retail. There's only a Starbucks there that serves the office workers that comes across, you know, a six lane road to get there. These are developments that, generally, they are hard to fill.

I agree that the firefighters, the school teachers do not want to live in developments like this. I think it's ridiculous. I think that, that there have
been central planning fiascos in the past. Marincello
has been mentioned. Thirty thousand people were
supposed to be living in the Marin Headlands. And with
that project, 1959, the Army Corps of Engineers
projected that the Bay Area would have 14 million people
by the year 2020. They were obviously very off.

If you watched the PBS special on saving
the bay, what was the plan for all those people? We
were going to fill in a third of the bay. And we
started with Foster City. If you look at what they were
going to do, there was a large wide river that was going
to be flowing instead of the bay. So I, I urge every
elected official and everybody running for office, if
you are not opposed to this, this is going to be your
legacy. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.
Our next speaker, we have Carol Sheerin.

CAROL SHEERIN: I'm Carol Sheerin, I live in
San Rafael. A few weeks ago I read in the local
newspaper about the opening of the Devil's Slides
Tunnels, and I didn't think that I was going to be
affected by reading that article. The people in Devil's
Slide, the Caltrans wanted to build a four to six lane
highway going to the coast to avoid all those slides on
that highway. The people didn't want that. And it took
them many years, they wanted a tunnel, and it was dedicated two weeks ago.

And Anna Eshoo, who was a San Mateo County Supervisor at the time, and is now a congresswoman, spoke at the dedication to those tunnels, and she said, what I, what I saw was democracy at work and the people being heard. And what we need, is we need to have the people being heard. Because we are not being heard.

I would like to thank everybody who came to this meeting today and those who spoke, because we are trying to get our voices heard. And we, if we get enough of us, we will not be ignored. I was in Santa Barbara and Ojai over the weekend, and we have friends who have property in Ojai, and I was shocked to hear they are going through this very same thing.

Ojai is an agricultural community with citrus groves, and they are fighting for -- they want 400 units of affordable housing there. This is going on all over the state with nobody having any voice in the cities and towns that we live in, and the counties. And you are right, there should be supervisors here listening to this. And that's what we need to do, we need to get people to listen.

You look like you are listening, and I
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Next we have Sue Beittel, followed by Joy Dahlgren.

SUE BEITTEL: My name is Sue Beittel, and I live within almost walking distance of this hotel. I live in an Eichler house that I bought for $25,000 in 1961, where Terra Linda was a entry level community. I am a strong believer in good collaborative planning. Much of it has to occur at the local level, or it has to be at least fine tuned at the local level.

In 1973 Marin County came up with a very collaborative plan which divided the county into three corridors. That we now enjoy very much. A urban corridor, an agricultural corridor and open space recreational corridor. We have added a fourth corridor since then, so part of what those early good thingers did is plan a future for Marin County, which we are now trying to build on, so we will continue to have at least a few entry level places for people who work in Marin County.

I need to say, as somebody in the 85 plus group of people, that there are many others like me who live in this area. That those over 60 now comprise about 25 percent of our population. And that number is
going to go, during the course of this plan, to well
over 40, it's expected to go to 45 percent. And these
people will either age in place in their houses, move to
senior housing, or downsize into some of the affordable
units that we are talking about providing.

So I hope that you can continue to fine
tune this plan so that it meets the needs of the people
of Marin County.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Next we have Joy Dahlgren. I'll let you
pronounce your last name correctly.

JOY DAHLGREN: My name is Joy Dahlgren, and I
live in San Rafael in Lucas Valley. And I agree that
there's a need for affordable housing, but I don't agree
with what I see as being the way that this is intended
to be provided, which is in large projects. We all know
how this model has failed in many big cities. You get
too many people who are too poor all together. It's not
the right way to provide affordable housing.

I think it's much more sensible to
provide, rather than new buildings for low income
people, to provide rent subsidies for low income people.
There are a lot of ways to provide low cost housing.
One is sharing housing, and as people get older they
could also rent their rooms. Second units are another
I guess inclusionary development having units disbursed in new developments, that's the way that we should be providing affordable housing, rather than large structures that -- and one that's being proposed is very remote from transit. These are just not the way to deal with that problem. And I think the problem probably starts with the state legislation. And I would like our elected officials at the local level and at the regional level to start assessing that legislation and seeing how it is dysfunctional in many ways.

It's much better to support low emission vehicles than to try to build high rises in order to get less driving, because it just doesn't happen that way. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Next we have Vincent Welch followed by Brendan Burke.

VINCENT WELCH: My name is Vincent Welch, I've lived in San Rafael since 1960. (Speaking Russian.)

During the Korean War I was a naval officer, Russian language, working at the National Security Agency. (Speaking Russian.) This meeting reminds me of a government plan of the Soviet Union in operation. Top down, no bottom up. This is not Brigadoon, it's a brig.
Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Next we have Brendan Burke. And this is the last speaker card I have, so if anyone wants to speak, please fill out a card, otherwise this will be our last speaker.

BRENDAN BURKE: Hello, my name is Brendan Burke, and I'd like to follow up on that. Russia had a five year plan, my old childhood, and they never had enough grain grown. Plan never worked. That was the top down approach. ABAG's approach in Marin County is completely wrong. Their numbers are related to job growth in this county, don't dovetail in any way, shape or form with the Department of Finance, which is supposed to be the gold standard for growth around here.

They don't show what ABAG projects. Your projections are wrong. Your high density plan, we support affordable housing in this county. We have for years. But put a few units in with the current stuff. Don't make them standalone. The ripple effect of high density is horrible. The cost of infrastructure, the schools, the tax base, the real estate values, the environment all suffer under this high density plan.

The final thing are related to the
legislation is CEQA is not going to be undermined in Sacramento as Jerry Brown has envisioned. CEQA is the law. It involves local control and environmental review. ABAG pushing 375, which is not the law, it is a non compulsory guideline, should not be adopted in this county. Our supervisors have drank the Kool-Aide. They are going to ram this thing through, if they can. ABAG is wrong. Our supervisors are wrong.

High density is wrong for the county. It is out of character. I'm from Tam. Valley. Where is the mitigation on our 42 mitigating circumstances? There will be no mitigation. The homeowners will have to pay for it. And we will pay for it with destroyed quality of life, lower environmental situation, high traffic. And we are going to have to pay -- the sewage and the schools alone are, comprise more than the eleven million dollars the supervisors are going to get in the highway aid, but for doing, implementing ABAG's plan.

And ABAG sails along like its own ship, doesn't hear any of this. You people need to go back to the think tank and realize you have got the wrong plan, and the wrong approach. We support affordable housing, just come up with something where the people are involved, where everybody can work something out we can all live with.
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Do we have any other speakers? We do need you to fill out a speaker card just so that we get the correct spelling of your name.

JIM BITTER: It's B-i-t-t-e-r. It's real easy.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Please introduce yourself and where you are from.

JIM BITTER: Jim Bitter from Mill Valley. Mill Valley. And I see the lock is running over there, we have two minutes.

JOAN CHAPLICK: She just started.

JIM BITTER: So the public needs to know that the meter is running at MTC, where 11.5 million dollar salary bureaucracy. We have this diet, and -- can you pronounce that for me?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Dyett & Bhatia.

JIM BITTER: Do we know what they cost the public to put this monstrosity together? We don't. I couldn't find it. We have a group called ICF International. 17 to 25 million dollars in federal government to draft all this, you know what. It's in the federal EPA, it's in the California EPA. It's a carb. It's what's behind SB-375. It's what's behind AB-32.
So the meter is running. But it's -- you guys are getting it right, because the visiting sessions, you can't make a reservation, you couldn't get in, because you got filled up real quick, but some people came anyway. Judy Arnold and Susan Adams were kind of annoyed that people were disruptive, and some people actually came from the East Bay.

So I don't know where you came from, but I live here. I was born here. This is a wonderful place. I grew up across the street from the guy who owned the dump. This Italian. He played golf. He went to Marin Joe's with Adolf Delasatia. And he drove a dry-cleaning truck. Somehow he got the dump. Now it's Target, Home Depot. And I think he's in a rest home now. He drove a dry-cleaning truck.

And somebody, this, I almost hit print on this thing, but I went through it. And I planted trees in land, because I work landscaping and construction. They are out there now. In here it's telling us what trees to plant, how far from somewhere, and has something to do with the environment or something. It's insulting to all of us.

This is a great place and we know how to do it. Martin drove his dry-cleaning truck. In here it says prohibiting trucks from idling for more than two
minutes. I, I, we know how to do that. We don't need this bureaucracy. We don't need the federal government telling us how to live our life. This is a great place because of us, not -- you need to drive out 580, across 680 and look at the stuff they are building out there.

And we should put our supervisors on the bus with all their belongings and make them, make them go live out there, because we don't want that in Marin.

And you don't represent us, do you?

JOAN CHAPLICK: I'm the moderator.

JIM BITTER: You are the moderator. Great.

JOAN CHAPLICK: And if you could wrap up your comments --

JIM BITTER: Let me say this, so whoever represents us is conveniently not here today. Thank you, supervisor. And they are going to vote for this thing. It's a done deal. They appointed members of the planning commission, they are going to vote for it. The staff has swallowed all this indoctrination and school that we need. Nobody, we can't explain, global warming, climate change, greenhouse gases, you can't do it. Or come up to the mic. and do it for me, because it's in all the legislature. Thank you very much.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

And I have a comment card from Barbara
Salzman. And then, are there any other any other speakers? If you could give your card to Ursula, she will pass it over here.

BARBARA SALZMAN: My name is Barbara Salzman and I'm representing Marin Audubon Society.

JOAN CHAPLICK: A little closer to the microphone so you project.

BARBARA SALZMAN: And I have, I'm sorry, I missed your presentation. I have a few comments on the EIR and will be submitting a letter. One of the comments and concerns is that you seem to, well you don't seem to, it's pretty clear that you consider that there's little in the way of environmental resources along the 101 corridor.

There's a repeated reference to the fact that the more rural areas have more resource impacts. I think that's a major flaw in the document, because our 101 corridor, our major corridor goes right by the tidal wetlands and all the endangered species habitats. And you also don't even mention endangered species, which was sort of shocking, because our major endangered species in the Bay Area, well we do have a few others, but are connected to tidal marshes. And we have a number of those, actually, right out here, (inaudible)
A third issue I wanted to mention is a need for clarification about how your, how you're considering the priority development areas. Because there are certain ones identified in Marin County, they are not real clear how, you it's not easy to find them out, it would be very good if you would put them, list them in the document.

But, secondly, we have a major grant from your agency, from ABAG, or MTC, one of them, went to Larkspur for development, around the Larkspur ferry terminal, and that isn't even a priority development area. So it's not clear to me how you are considering the impacts from those, from that kind of a project, which is not even in a priority development area, how that's being considered in the mix, because it seems to me that your plan is developed around the priority development areas.

And I hear a buzzer, but we'll be submitting more comments.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Next we have Stephen Nestel?

STEPHEN NESTEL: Yes.

JOAN CHAPLICK: And then followed by Marjorie Macris.
1    STEPHEN NESTEL: Politics and power and money.
2    That's the answer. That's why we are dealing with all
3    of this. This actually is directed not to the EIR, but
4    to ABAG. You are riding on the juggernaut right now.
5    You have seen, you know that a lot of this data that you
6    are presenting is not scientifically valid. You also
7    know that you have been fudging the figures. You have
8    heard our arguments. And it's so frustrating coming to
9    these meetings and presenting clear logical arguments
10    and being ignored.
11
12    We are the people under the juggernaut.
13    And soon, as history shows, that the people in power
14    will be the ones falling in front of the juggernaut. I
15    just warn you to pay attention to the democratic
16    process. We believe in our democratic process.
17
18    JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.
19    Marjorie Macris. Okay. Just, don't rush, please, be
20    safe.
21
22    MARJORIE MACRIS: Sorry. My writing isn't too
23    good. It's Macris.
24
25    JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could just tilt the
26    microphone down so we can hear you.
27
28    MARJORIE MACRIS: It's Macris, M-a-c-r-i-s.
29    And I'm speaking on my own, I'm not representing any
30    organizations. I think that the one critical comment
that I have, even though I think that the idea of having
a regional plan makes a lot of sense, and your idea of
concentrating development in locations that have transit
and other services is a very valid one, and it's
something that has been an established principle in
Marin County's plan, and for 40 years, but the one major
criticism I have of this document is that it does not
take into account the effects of sea level rise.

There is a very dismissive comment in the
plan itself saying, well, we know that the sea level is
going to rise but we are sure we will work it all out,
but it doesn't say how. And in the EIR there is a
description of how sea level rise is likely to effect
transportation lines but not Priority Development Areas.
And it's, I don't understand why the plan does not take
into account the projection of sea level rise to the end
of the century.

BCDC has done that, and you just choose
the year 2040, which is the time horizon of the plan.
But if we know this is going to happen beyond that, it
seems to me that a good plan needs to take into account
what we know is going to have major impacts on any
development potential in Marin and around the rest of
the Bay Area. And then coupled with the repeated
emphasis on, we have to streamline CEQA, that is
particularly illogical due to the fact that the plan and
the EIR don't really show what the impacts, particularly
of sea level rise, as well as other impacts, are going
to be on these Priority Development Areas.

So it doesn't make a lot of sense to say
we have to expedite their development, when it's very
likely they are going to be under water in the
foreseeable future. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

I've gone through all of the speaker cards that I have.
The hearing is until noon, so we do want to accommodate
any late comers, anyone who comes. So if there is
anyone who hasn't spoken, and you would like to, please
fill out a speaker card. The MTC and ABAG staff and the
court reporters are going to be here until noon to
receive any additional comments that come through the
process.

Okay. We have some keys left at the
front table. So with that, we will have Brad from ABAG.

BRAD PAUL: A number of speakers asked why
there weren't members of the county board of supervisors
here, and several of them called me, because they are
meeting right now, their regularly scheduled meeting is,
unfortunately, at this time. So they wanted to be here.
I'm just, I'm telling you where they are.
JOAN CHAPLICK: We do have some additional hearings coming up. Carolyn is going to review them for us.

(Discussion had off the record.)

(Public hearing resumed.)

JOAN CHAPLICK: I have a speaker card here.

So I have L. Crocker.

LILIE CROCKER: That's correct.

JOAN CHAPLICK: And so if the court reporters could take the comments. So after, after this last comment we'll be closing the public hearing. If you have additional questions or comments we will take them in writing. Okay. So we have a final, a final comment here that I have a speaker card for.

LILIE CROCKER: Yes, my name is Lilie Crocker, I live at just at Marin Lagoon, bought the house in 2007. I'm a widow, have lived in San Rafael since 1966.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay.

LILIE CROCKER: I was told by my neighbor that, when I had gone to City Hall, that there's no use to come to these meetings. I went to the one with supervisors in, in San Rafael. And we were many. Here we have, and very knowledgeable people, but I was told by this person that it's absolutely useless. We are fighting City Hall, we are fighting Sacramento, we are...
fighting Washington, D.C. And we are, limited
government is no longer the goal. It is growing
government.

And life has to be fair. And as my
husband told me once, he said, I, I said, that's not
fair. He said, Lilie, life is not fair. You have to,
it doesn't, if you want to make it fair, I don't know if
robbing Peter to pay Paul is exactly fair, but we are
growing government. And when you look at the map and
here at Embassy Suites, when you build the housing and
the station at the end of McInnis Parkway, unless I can
swim or walk in wetlands, I have no way to get out of my
neighborhood, which is family housing.

And very nice, and I bought it for my old
age to be safe, because that's a, you, you have to go --
you can get in but you got to go out the same way. And
also, we, it's already a lot of traffic. And, well,
since business, big business is leaving into homes
maybe, not so many workers coming into -- and anyway, I
just say, I will be shut off with the commuters that
support, and my property taxes go up, or my -- well, it
goes for everybody, I guess.

But I'm reminded that if you get
something for free, you don't really take care of it as
much as you have strained to work for yourself up, and
it's your money, you take better care of things. And I, I think, I was reminded by the, by the gentleman that, whatever happened to cruise ships, highrises? And cruise ship was -- sure, a nice man, a Russian person, but if you go to Moscow and you see this urban landscape, whatever, these highrises are slum money, and not, not many of them occupied. And is that what you want to happen in Marin?

Besides --

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. That's it.

LILIE CROCKER: I know. I'm so frustrated because I think that you are going to do, government is going to do, and I have no recourse.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you, thank you for your comments.

I have a speaker card --

Sir, if you could --

(Interruption in proceedings.)

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: This has to do about a process question that you --

JOAN CHAPLICK: Sir, if you could --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's just real simply, you said --

URSULA VOGLER: We have a process, sir.

JOAN CHAPLICK: I have my speaker card --
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I just want to know when the court reporter's comments will be made available, to us, the public? You are not going to make the recording available, how about the comments? That's all.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. So that is, that is a question we will take into the process. I can't answer it right now. I don't know, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: You can't answer a simple question like that?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Yes. Yes. So my next comment is from Susan Wernick. I need Susan Wernick in the front of the room. I'm taking comments from those who have not commented, so if you have already spoken for two minutes, you can make additional comments in writing, but it is two minutes per person.

So for those of you who have already spoken --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is the juggernaut.

URSULA VOGLER: Just to answer your question, sir, through the public record document request you can make a public records request, we can send you those transcripts. Okay. So through info@onebayarea.org you can request --
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sixty days, ninety days after the period is done.

URSULA VOGLER: When we get the transcripts we can send them to you.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: We, you know we pay them.

URSULA VOGLER: Asked and answered. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you, sir. So our next speaker is Susan Wernick.

SUSAN WERNICK: I just have one quick comment. I've lived in Marin my entire life. I work retail in Novato. I speak to people daily about this project, and there is very little awareness among the general public about what is going on. I understand you have a website. I'm someone who is linked into that. I get The One Bay Area updates, but most people do not. So, I, my question to you, or my suggestion, perhaps, is that these meetings should be printed not in an article buried in the newspaper but an add that your organization's paid for and put out. They are carefully printed, they are in all newspapers of the Bay Area. We have so many people that are not clued in. We have thousands of people in Marin County that still do not know what the SMART train is, and yet the tracks
are already being laid.

So communication is really key. It is extremely frustrating that a project like this, as vast as this is moving forward, and the bulk of the population is unaware of it. So I think you could do a little better job by not telling people to go look for the information. Put it out there. Put it in print. We have got SMART train posters finally coming up along the freeway. So people are becoming a little bit more aware of it. What's that?

But that hasn't happened with this whole project. And then clearly you put a lot of money into it. I pay a lot of taxes, you could do it. So if we could just get this into The Chronicle, the IJ, the Press Democrat, all the newspapers, so people are aware of these meetings, and so it might spark some interest. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Do I have anyone who hasn't spoken yet? Any additional speaker cards? Okay with that we are going to close the public comment period.

(The Public Hearing concluded at 12:00 p.m.)
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PROCEDINGS

MS. JORDAN: Let's get started.

Good evening, everyone, and thank you all so much for coming out tonight. My name is Jamillah Jordan, and my planning firm MIG is working with ABAG and MTC on these public hearings tonight.

We may get some more sound in a moment.

I'll be your moderator tonight, and I want to thank all of you for coming out, taking the time, giving your attention to this really important issue.

Our purpose today is to receive your comments on the draft EIR. Tonight we have several members of the project team responsible for the Plan and the EIR documents here tonight listening. We also have two court reporters who will be transcribing the comments that we receive today.

So I want to go ahead and acknowledge the elected officials who are in the room tonight. And first up we have Mr. Mark Luce, who's an MTC Commissioner and ABAG board chair and Napa County Supervisor, Mr. Luce, over there.

We also have Mr. Robert Rayburn, a BART board member, in the audience tonight. Wonderful.

We also have Mr. Pedro Gonzalez, who is the
mayor of the City of South San Francisco.

Thank you all for coming out tonight. We appreciate that.

So our agenda for the meeting is as follows:

There will be a short presentation by Carolyn Clevenger, MTC planner, on the draft EIR. And her presentation will provide an overview of the EIR and the general process.

Following the presentation, we'll go ahead and start the public comment period. If you'd like to speak, we ask that you please fill out a blue card with your name and where you are from. We see an example of that. I have one up here as well that I want to show all of you.

Each speaker will have two minutes to provide their comments. We will have a timekeeper to help ensure that everyone sticks to that two-minute time frame and everyone gets the same amount of time. Once you hear the buzzer go off, it means that your time is up and we ask that you wrap up your comments.

A court reporter will provide MTC with a full transcription of the comments, and the court reporters are located right over there (indicating), as you see them. So please go ahead turn in your comment card form if you haven't already done that.
I will read the names of each commenter in groups of three. We ask that you please line up and be ready to comment. Please state your name for the record and the city where you live. We ask that you please speak slowly so that the court reporters can get all of your information down.

Once you reach the two-minute mark, you'll need to close your comments, and I will call up the next speaker. If two minutes is not sufficient, you can provide additional comments in writing, and these forms are available at the welcome table. I think all of you got one on your way in.

Okay. For those of you who do not wish to speak, you're encouraged to fill out a comment card and turn it in at the end of the meeting. You can also submit comments in writing via fax, mail or e-mail. The deadline for comments is May 16 at 4:00 p.m.

I want each of you to know that all of your comments, whether they're received verbally at today's hearing, through a comment card or sent in writing by fax, e-mail or mail that I mentioned, they'll be handled the same way and responded to in the final EIR.

And finally on a housekeeping note, I just want to mention that the restrooms are located towards the entrance. The women's is on my left and your right.
And the men's is located on my right.
So with that, I want to go ahead and now open
up the hearing and introduce Carolyn Clevenger from MTC
who will provide a brief presentation on the EIR.
Carolyn?
MS. CLEVENGER:  Good evening.  Hopefully these
microphones should work.
My name is Carolyn Clevenger.  I work in the
MTC planning section.  I'm the project manager of the
draft EIR that we'll be talking about this evening.
Sitting next to me is Mark Shorett with Association of
Bay Area Governments, which is our co-lead agency on
this document.
The purpose of this public hearing is to
present an overview of the plan and the EIR, as well as
to receive public comments on the Draft EIR.  Responses
to all comments and questions will be provided in
writing in the final Environmental Impact Report.
I'd like to note that the focus of this
meeting is on the EIR; it's not on the Plan document
itself.  So we ask that you focus your comments on the
EIR.  And for comments related to the Plan, you can send
your comments to info@onebayarea.org, or you can also
attend one of the Plan open houses and public comment
hearings that are being held throughout the region, and
there's a brochure at the table where you came in identifying the opportunities to comment on the Plan at those public hearings.

The purpose of the EIR is to analyze and disclose the potential environmental impacts of the implementation of the proposed Plan. It is meant to inform decision-makers, responsible agencies and the public of the range of environmental impacts of the proposed Plan. It also recommends measures to mitigate any significant impacts that are identified, and it also evaluates a range of alternatives to the Plan, which I'll go into in greater detail.

Just as some background to help provide some context, the Plan is a regional task. It's the first time we've done and integrated land use and transportation plan. It's required by Senate Bill 375, and it requires an integrated land use and transportation plan, which hits two specific objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent by 2035 and also houses the region's population at all income levels.

The Plan embodies local visions, in that it works with local jurisdictions to identify areas for growth; priority development areas. And it seeks to increase economic competitiveness while also preserving...
the natural environment of the nine-county region.

The Plan looks from 2010 to 2040 and identifies projected jobs and population growth in that time period, and this table summarizes the projected approximately 1 million additional jobs that the region will need to accommodate in that period and approximately 2 million additional people. The EIR evaluates the environmental impact associated with accommodating this growth; it doesn't evaluate the projection itself.

This map shows most of the focused growth in the Plan -- is allocated to PDAs, priority development areas. They account for less than 5 percent of the region's land, but in the proposed Plan they can accommodate approximately 80 percent of new homes and over 60 percent of new jobs. Approximately 40 percent of the new jobs and housing are projected to be in the region's three largest cities; San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. And approximately 75 percent of the growth is located in the four central counties; Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco.

Get to the transportation side. On the transportation side, the Plan -- the total revenues forecasted over the 28-year plan period of $289 billion, just over half, 53 percent, is local fund sources. It's
primarily sales taxes raised at the county level. The nine counties in the Bay Area have local sales taxes. There's -- approximately 15 percent of the funds are regional, as primarily bridge tolls. And then the state and federal funds kind of round out the revenue sources for the Plan.

Approximately 80 percent of these funds are committed funds, so those are projects that are either funded 100 percent locally or are through a certain point of project development when the Plan was begun. And those projects were deemed to be committed and not part of the regional decision-making process of the Plan.

In terms of how the funds are expended, 88 percent of the proposed Plan funds are dedicated to operating and maintaining the existing roadway and transit system. The remaining 12 percent is split roughly evenly between road and bridge expansion at 5 percent and transit expansion at 7 percent.

Turning to the Environmental Impact Report. It evaluates the impact of the proposed Plan on 14 environmental issue areas: Transportation, air quality, land use, energy, climate change and greenhouse gases, noise, geology and seismicity, water, biological, visual and cultural resources, public utilities, hazards and
public services and recreation.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report also identifies potential mitigations for each area where it's deemed to have a potential impact. Those mitigations would be implemented as appropriate at the local level, as local jurisdictions and project sponsors move forward with projects.

Since ABAG and MTC cannot ensure implementation of mitigation measures, those areas that are shown here in bold are still in the Environmental Impact Report deemed to have potential but significant impacts.

I mentioned earlier that the EIR evaluates alternatives. This highlights the different alternatives to the proposed Plan that are evaluated. California Environmental Quality Act requires that you include the "No Project" as one of the alternatives in the Plan.

The "No Project" takes the existing 2010 land uses and transportation network. It also includes those projects that I mentioned earlier that were committed. So projects that were 100 percent locally funded or far enough along in their project development.

The "Transit Priority Focus," which was called Alternative No. 3 in the EIR, includes higher densities
near high quality transit, also includes a higher peak period Bay Bridge toll, which is used to fund additional BART and AC Transit investments.

The "Enhanced Network of Communities," which is called Alternative 4 in the EIR, is based on input from business stakeholders. They opted to use a higher population total for that alternative. So forecasted a higher level of population and job growth in the region, and also included a more dispersed growth pattern. On the transportation side, that alternative included a higher period of bridge tolls, but those revenues in that alternative are used to fund additional maintenance of the state highway system.

And the last alternative, "Environment, Equity and Jobs," which is called Alternative 5, was developed based on input from the equity and environmental stakeholders. On the land use side, it emphasizes increasing opportunities for low-income housing in job-rich communities.

It also is -- it eliminated uncommitted roadway expansion projects in that alternative, including the express lane network was eliminated in that alternative. And it charged a VMT tax that was used to fund additional transit investments in the region.
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In terms of how the alternatives performed in the Environmental Impact Report, all of the alternatives, including proposed Plan, have similar impacts. Alternative 5 is identified in the EIR as the "environmentally superior alternative." It had the greatest reductions of GHG emissions, greenhouse gas emissions. It also had fewer emissions for toxic air contaminants and particulate matter emissions as compared to the other alternatives.

However, the proposed Plan did have the benefits over Alternative 5, it had the lowest vehicle miles traveled or VMT per capita. It also had lower congested VMT than Alternative 5, so fewer miles were traveled in congested conditions. It included less agriculture and open space conversion.

Alternative 3, the transit priority focus had the least environmental impact on the transportation side, as a future shorter commute, travel times, lesser amount of congested VMT, and a lesser potential for transited crowding.

As Jamillah outlined, there's multiple ways to comment on the Draft EIR. You can comment orally at today's meeting. You can submit your comments in writing, either at today's meeting or mail, fax or e-mail to my attention by 4:00 p.m. on May 16th.
And I just want to note again that comments on the Plan should be made separately to info@onebayarea.org or at any of the public hearings being held on the Plan throughout the nine counties. In terms of schedule, the comments period closes on May 16th. We will be presenting the comments in responses to comments to the MTC commission and the ABAG board. Those are the two bodies that will vote on adopting the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Plan, and we anticipate a final adoption of the EIR in July of this year.

So with that, I'll turn it go back to Jamillah.

MS. JORDAN: Great. Thanks so much. Okay. Is that better, everyone?

THE PUBLIC: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Sorry about that mishap there. So now we will open the comment -- open up the hearing here for the public comment. And I want to mention that along with your comments, any questions that you may have will be included and responded to in the final EIR. Okay? So let's go ahead and get the process started. I'm going to call up the first three speakers, and we ask that you form a line there in the middle and speak when I call your name.
The first one is Charlie Cameron, followed by Myesha Williams, followed by Devilla Ervin.

Mr. Cameron?

CHARLIE CAMERON: Yes. Good evening. The name is Charlie Cameron. I'm a Hayward resident, but I consider myself now a resident of Union City.

First of all, only three things that I want you to note. Being that the current Union City west side is now completed, I do think it is not going to be able to perform up to expectations. The design is pretty much bad. It's piss poor bad, the way the buses come in and the location for other things to include the taxis and pickup area and the kiss and ride. I'll be sending in corrections for the San Jose Diridon Station. The signs. I was in crisis one time, and I realized the signage was screwed up and could be better.

I'm going to be sending in correction -- correctly corrections with the correct spelling of the word "Capitol Corridor." It's misspelled in the document.

And I want to thank you, Moderator, for bringing to our attention now the deadline for comments is May the 16th. We didn't know that, and I didn't know that. Thank you for bringing that attention.

Bye.
MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

MYESHA WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is Myesha Williams for the New Voices Are Rising Project.

In New Voices Are Rising, we work with high school students to help them gain skills and experiences on behalf of themselves and their communities.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to comment on the EIR. I would like to state my support for Alternative 5. And even though the Draft EIR identifies this alternative as "environmentally superior," we believe that the Draft EIR does not adequately analyze the VMT and greenhouse gas reduction that this alternative would offer as compared with the proposed Plan.

The EEJ alternative funds significant investment for frequency improvement for high-demand systems like AC transit, which many people in the community that we work with depend on for daily access, opportunities and necessities. According to the Bus Access Health Impact Assessment conducted by the Alameda County Public Health Department, more investment and transit service, especially bus service, can improve health and vitality for riders, their communities and the transit system overall.

Currently, youth, seniors and
transit-dependent people's health is suffering as a result of disinvestment in transportation. The HIA found that reduction in bus service negatively affected the physical, mental health, safety and well-being of the most vulnerable rider.

In order to reduce VMT, we must restore local transit to a reasonable baseline of service by committing an additional 70 million per year to restore bus service cuts made over the past five years.

The EEJ alternative fairs the best reducing VMT miles traveled, which in turn helps us to reach our goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As the alternative with the strongest ridership, EEJ will ensure that public transportation remains accessible, affordable and will help to improve health and reduce health disparities.

Alternative 5 prioritizes bus, BART and plans for a free youth bus pass program. This proposal was especially significant for those of us who work with youth who experience negative health impacts and critical barriers to opportunity, due to rising transit costs, service cuts and route changes.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.
DEVILLA ERVIN: Thank you.
Hello. My name is Devilla Ervin, and I've
been working with the New Voices Are Rising Project for a more sustainable and resilient Oakland since I was 14. I'm now 23.

As a young man looking to live on my own, I am deeply trouble by the threat of displacement in my community and other areas slated as priority development areas. But underestimating the impact of displacement, I feel we are doing a disservice to the entire purpose of Plan Bay Area. This placement needs to be at the forefront of this conversation, not swept under the table. You cannot cut VMT and/or greenhouse gases, gas emissions without dealing with this threat.

Living in Oakland, I know many people who find themselves being forced to leave their homes and community that hold extensive history to find housing that is less expensive. One example of this is my foster mother. In my junior year of high school, she found a place that was affordable, but it was in Sacramento. She was still working in Hayward commuting five hours a day to and from work.

This is what I fear for thousands of other low income families with the adoption of this proposed plan in the absence of additional mitigation. Without careful, conscious, deliberate planning, more low income residents will be pushed out to less attractive and more
polluted parts of the region, while new transit-oriented developments attract new residents who have not historically found neighborhoods like West Oakland attractive.

Plan Bay Area should not add to the list of issues residents of West Oakland or similar neighborhoods have to deal with.

By increasing investment in public transportation, affordable housing and strategies to retain and build businesses that serve the existing community, Alternative 5 will go a long way towards addressing these concerns and mitigating the impacts of displacement pressure.

Plan Bay Area should be providing solutions and incorporating the strategies in Alternative 5 that make it the environmentally superior alternative, leading to a more truly sustainable and resilient Bay Area.

Thanks for your time.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you for your comments, sir. I'm going to call up the next three speakers. First will be Brenda Barrón. Next will be Pamela Tapia, followed by Woody Little. Please come to the center of the aisle.

BRENDA BARRÓN: My name the Brenda Barrón, and
I'm currently a freshman at San Francisco State University. I was born and raised in Oakland, California, and I lived my whole life here. I have seen many problems in the community, and I have been to different meetings and spoken about what can we change. One of the problems that concerns me most is public transportation because I take it almost every day to school.

Speaking today -- tonight was Plan Bay Area and the EIR do not do a good enough job of addressing the impact of adding more rides to the transit system. Without the level increasing transit investment that includes in the environment equity and job alternatives, adding more rides to the public transit system without enough adding investment will have serious impact for youth and other low income riders.

I have been taking public transportation since I was five years old when I started riding the bus to my mom's work, and I never thought transportation was a big deal until I grew up, but it has changed a lot since I was five. Bus stops have been moved far from my house. There are fewer buses, and I have to wait longer most of the time. Night services have been reduced. The bus I take that -- takes off 10:00 p.m.

When I was five, I was too small to understand
what was going on. But as I grew up, I've seen and heard what people say about transportation in their community.

In the last few years, bus lines have been changed and cut so that people get confused about which line goes to which places. The people do not want to see bus services cut; they want to see more bus routes and more frequent buses. Many people take the bus because they cost less than the BART -- than BART. The BART takes you back and goes farther.

MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments.

BRENDA BARRÓN: There are other problems with ground service levels. BART does not have enough transit so that people can sit down. Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

PAMELA TAPIA: Good evening. My name is Pamela Tapia. I'm a student at Peralta Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight.

The EIR Draft consideration of displacement is inadequate. The EIR fails to factor in the impact of gentrification on housing costs in neighborhoods that historically have been home to low income residents.

The assumption that low income residents will avoid moving farther away from their jobs and their homes and neighborhoods despite these areas becoming
more attractive to other residents. Without significant addition investment in affordable housing and other anti-displacement policies, displacement will occur.

In September 2011, my mother lost her minimum wage job. Her factory decided to pack up and move to South Carolina. She was out of a job. As a single parent raising two kids, my mom depended on the $280 she received every week to pay the $700 rent. She spent most of her check on housing and transportation. She decided to move to central valley to a city called Manteca. An apartment was half the price as our former home, but there are no jobs in the central valley. She had no option; she had to go back to what she was doing before.

After months of desperate job hunting, my mother found a job in a factory in Union City's Industrial Park. My mom now lives in Manteca but has to commute to Union City for work. What used to be a 30-minute drive now become a four-hour commute. She doesn't have a car. She has to take the bus from Manteca to Stockton, from Stockton take a train to Richmond, from Richmond take BART to Union City, and from Union City take another bus.

She now has to pay over $60 a week (verbatim) just to travel to work. She works eight hours at an
8-hour dollar rate turns out to 64. So she spends $60 a day and she gets $64 a day also, she's only getting $4. She knows she cannot work. She literally cannot afford to work.

So when spending so much money traveling, she determined she had to stop traveling. She often slept on BART, traveling the trains from one end to the other end, hoping to just catch another day.

MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments.

PAMELA TAPIA: I feel awkward writing this and even reading it to you, but I do not look for pity. This was not my goal. My goal was to inform you that this happens. The EIR assumes that displacement will not result in increased rates in commuting from outside Bay Area and cross commuting from -- between counties. This assumption is not supported by historical transit, and it's not supported by my experience.

Thank you.

WOODY LITTLE: Hello and good evening. My name is Woody Little, and I'm a first-year student at UC Berkeley but an Oakland native. I want to talk tonight a little bit about displacement, as some of the other commenters have echoed.

The Plan Bay Area document states that the Plan will place 36 percent of communities of concern to
risk of displacement, while the EEJ alternative, Alternative 5 -- in this plan, 21 percent face displacement risk, and that's already with the assumption that are perhaps flawed because they rely on this model that does not take into account gentrification pressures.

Now, this has two main effects. One effect is on the environment. We believe that because the Draft EIR does not take into account gentrification pressures, that the extent to which the EEJ alternative outperforms the proposed Plan, the GHG emission reductions is underestimated. So in fact, already -- though, Alternative 5 is already the environmentally superior alternative, it is likely far more superior than is currently estimated.

Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, these displacement pressures place social economic pressures on low income communities and communities of risk. I grew up with extreme privilege in Rockridge in an affluent community in Oakland. However, I try to put myself in the position of someone who would be displaced by gentrification.

I imagine that if I was in high school and my family had to start paying significantly more income because stores in the area were now catering to other
residents instead of us who had been living there a long

1
time, I wonder what our family would have been able to
2
afford in terms of other services for me to do outside
3
of school, extracurricular activities that enriched my
4
life and made it possible for me to attend UC Berkeley.
5

6
Additionally, I wonder what would have
7
happened if I had been displaced and had to restart my
8
life all over again in the middle of high school or in
9
the middle of elementary school, an even more
10
informative time in my life. I think that would have
11
been a significant obstacle to get into UC Berkeley and
12
to -- you know, the struggles that I now have in trying
13
to further my own education. I think that would have
14
been much more difficult under this Plan. So I hope
15
that you take those facts into consideration.
16

17
Thank you.
18

19
MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.
20

21
I'm going to call up the next three speakers.
22
First we have the Teadora Taddeo, Signe Mattson, and
23
Kasey Saetern.
24

25
TEADORA TADDEO: Hello. Good evening. I'm
26
Teadora Taddeo, and I'm also a UC Berkeley student.
27
I take great pride in being a part of a
28
cutting-edge and progressive region. I want to look
29
back in 20 years and find that my community was on the
right side of history.

Our regional plan, as a step towards sustainability, should promote safety and longevity for all people. A plan that neglects low income and under-resourced individuals is absolutely unacceptable in my eyes.

I believe the environment equity and job alternative can serve our community more fairly. Affordable, updated housing, quality transportation and increased security for residents susceptible to extreme weather. These are the provisions that simply must be made in any plan to be adopted in the Bay Area in 2013.

We need a plan that will carry us into the future, taking into account serious environmental concerns, as well as equity and justice for all Bay Area residents.

I support Alternative 5, and I strongly encourage you to consider it as well.

Thank you so much for your time.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

Next speaker.

SIGNE MATTSON: Good evening. Signe Mattson, resident of Albany.

A few concerns: At this point, first of all, the amount of public notice, it claims in the report and
in the EIR, that you outreached so many times in so many places, but I only heard about this by accident about maybe two weeks ago now. So that's the first thing. If you seriously want some public input, you've got to let people know.

Secondly, this is touted as a strategy for a sustainable region, but yet I have to find no mention of the question of food security, equitable production and distribution of food. This is -- I don't know how you can talk about sustainability, and you don't even mention the question of food.

Another concern I have is about the CEQA streamlining, and overriding of CEQA. Many of us are of the opinion that the CEQA requirements are already very weak, and yet you propose to weaken them further, and yet you're talking about improving the environment.

So I don't know how you lower environmental standards and then -- to improve the environment. If you're going to concentrate a bunch of people living in apartments along high transit travel areas that produce all these greenhouse gas emissions, one of your mitigations is going to be air filtering. So does this mean that you'll have windows that don't open and air condition on 24/7, except for when the power goes out and the air conditioning can't work?
MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments, ma'am.

SIGNE MATTSON: Okay. Sea level rise and tidal surges, and yet you want to concentrate the population at the shoreline? Doesn't make a lot of sense to me, and I ditto the comments about the preferred alternative. Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

KASEY SAETURN: Hi. My name is Kasey Saeturn. I'm a senior at Oakland High School. So I just wanted to say that I would like to see more eco-friendly buses, because so far I've only seen, like, a couple hydrogen fuel cell buses, and that's only on one bus route. So this bus route runs along my school, actually. It's the 18 bus, and I've only seen it a couple times, and I just think it'd be nice to see more eco-friendly buses.

Also on another note, I'm a student. So after school or, like, before school, I take the bus to school and to work and stuff like that. But the fact is, in the morning, it's really difficult to actually get on the first bus and be on time for school sometimes because it's just so packed. Because it's so packed, I'm either late to school and work, and it just doesn't exactly work out for me.
So -- and another -- like, I also have to
actually stand at the bus stops because there are no
benches where I'm -- where the bus stops I'm at, so it's
kind of difficult to actually sit down and get
comfortable in the morning or after work, even. So it's
just really hard for me.

Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you. I'm going to call up
the next three speakers now.

First we'll have Jill Ratner, followed by
Evelyn Stivers, and Peter Singleton.

JILL RATNER: Hello. My name is Jill Ratner.
I'm an Oakland resident, and I also work with New Voices
Are Rising, and I want to echo the comments of the
students who are very concerned about public transit and
about affordability and particularly about affordability
of housing and displacement.

One of the issues that I was concerned about
in reading the EIR was that it seemed to assume that the
significant -- that there will not be significant
impacts to the quality of trip experience for the bus
riders, adding more riders without a significant -- the
most significant possible increase in investment in bus
service.

There's an assumption that the buses are not
overburdened unless there's an 80 percent threshold in terms of available seats systemwide that's crossed, and I think what the students have said is that both buses and BART are overburdened now and would be even more overburdened under the proposed Plan.

We believe that the -- Alternative 5 offers significant mitigations that need to be more carefully assessed in the final Environmental Impact Report, and that particularly some of the assumptions, including the assumptions about cross-commuting, end-commuting and the transportation impacts of additional ridership without the highest level of investment need to be reassessed.

Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

EVELYN STIVERS: Hi. Thank you.

What a tremendous amount of work that obviously went into the EIR, and I really appreciate staff's hard work on that.

My name is Evelyn Stivers. I work with the Nonprofit Housing Association. I also live here in Oakland, and we will be submitting comments in writing, but I did want to bring up an important thing that I think is overlooked in general in the Draft EIR, looking it over. That is sort of the underrepresenting how important increasing transit investment is on land use...
and how that can have a greater reduction in GHG emissions than is acknowledged in the Plan.

Right now, the biggest limiting factor to affordable housing production in the region is money. Increasing bus and -- especially bus service, but local transit service, can make more properties competitive for tax credits. It can increase the amount of money that the state and the -- this region gets in an investment and can make more properties viable for affordable housing.

So I think that's an important consideration, especially given the current climate and the huge disparity we have between the regional transportation plan, which is a funding allocation plan and the housing plan, which is very well-intentioned but not funded.

Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

PETER SINGLETON: Peter Singleton.

I'm going to submit my comments on the Draft EIR in writing once I've had a chance to look over the document. As you probably gathered, it's a very large document.

But what I wanted to do was I wanted to thank the young people for coming, and I don't personally support Alternative 5, but I think the students that are
here are raising a couple of really important points
that I hope that you folks considered.

One is displacement. And I think all of the
alternatives have displacement risk that is significant
and should be looked at. And that's a big concern. And
these kids are right, what they're talking about.

The other is the importance of bus service.
And the Plan is very heavy on rail and light rail and
other kinds of what you call transit investments, but
bus service is often the -- adding buses to heavily
utilized routes and also dropping fares can be the very
best way to serve lower income communities that our
buses are so important to.

And I would just urge you to listen to these
young people, and, again, I -- thank you guys for
coming, I really appreciate it.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

We have one card remaining. I'm going to call
up that individual, unless -- if you have a blue comment
card, please hand it to our ushers here on the left and
right. Now is the time to do that.

So I'm going to call up the next two speakers.
That's Peter Singleton -- oh, I'm sorry. Peter already
spoke.

And this individual. Pardon if I butcher your
name. Decline Lastot (verbatim)?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Decline to state.

MS. JORDAN: And then the gentleman as well, if you wouldn't mind --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I note that the EIR includes $14 billion -- I note that the EIR includes $14 billion in nebulous, quote, "anticipated unspecified," unquote federal dollars. The Plan relies on the use of these dollars. The EIR is entirely flawed because this reliance accounts for fully 5 percent of the money figured into projects that affect the environment.

I also note that the population figures that are forecasted are entirely created by the staff. California statutory law has deemed the California Department of Finance as the proper authority to create population figures used by the Government in California.

Also, I was moved by the students' talk this evening about displacement, and it reminded me of the urban redevelopment that took place in the Bay Area in the 1960s to very, very bad effects. And the historical analysis was not included in the EIR.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

Sir?

JIM BITTER: I'll just be a second. So my name is Jim Bitter, and we came up from Mill Valley, and
we generated a lot of greenhouse getting here. So
thanks for holding this, and I want to thank the kids
for coming tonight, except that -- or I just heard
$14 billion and the cost of MTC and the cost of the
consultants and the cost of the consultants to put
together the EIR report and other consultants that are
involved in the EPA, federal, state, CARB -- what did I
leave out? California Energy Commission. It's all the
same language. It's all the same industry that's
pushing this thing. And that the kids in the gallery
here are going to end up paying for this because the
State of California is in the hole about $80 billion,
and the federal government is approaching 17 trillion.
There's no way we can pay it back.

I came from a little town up in Marin, and
there's probably lots of stories like this where we had
a city council, we had a planning commission, we had a
little white church, we had steam locomotives, we had
dairy farms. It was all our stuff. The federal
government didn't tell us what our town was going to
look like. That was the old United States of America.

So I'm telling the kids, get ready because
you're going to find out that people other than yourself
are going to be telling you about transportation,
housing, the kind of housing you have. And a lot of
other things that are coming.

So anyway, thank you very much.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

The next speaker I'm going to call up is Mr. Azibuike Akaba.

AZIBUIKE AKABA: Good evening. My name is Azibuike Akaba. I'm with the Public Health Institute in the regional asthma management and prevention project. So we're primarily focused on looking at air quality and protecting low income communities and communities of color that would be impacted by displacement.

As the young people stated, which I'm really proud to see so many young people come out and speak this evening and so articulately, I think that the issue of suburbanization of poverty, which isn't really highlighted very well in the EIR overall, is that low income people are going to be impacted, and there needs to be some type of strategy and/or mitigations to address that suburbanization of poverty.

And I also think that -- some good things that I saw in the EIR is the assessment of air quality and the inclusion of diesel, which we're going to -- you know, is a project of ditching dirty diesel. I think that looking at black carbon and actually incentivizing programs that address mitigation, even if at the
regional level you can't actually enforce mitigation on a local level, you can put criteria in place for incentivizing good projects that get funded that actually mitigate those anticipated impacts.

That's it. Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

So I'd like to take this opportunity to let you all know again that our ushers to the left and the right have the blue comment card forms. Give you another opportunity to fill that out and state your comment publicly, orally rather.

Are there any additional blue comment card holders who'd like to speak?

So our next speaker will be Rachel Hallowgrass.

RACHEL HALLOWGRASS: Forgive me. I came in a little bit late, so I don't know what everybody else has said, but I did want to say that while costs about a plan like this are certainly large, and the funding by its nature in certain, especially given that we don't know a lot about the future economy, I just wonder about the alternatives that I think not implementing a plan remotely like this will be much more expensive, more expensive to our children in terms of health, their economy and their ability to participate in a healthy
world. So in the abstract, yes, this is expensive and ambitious, and, yet, the alternatives can be much worse economically.

Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you for that comment.

So if there are no additional individuals who would like to fill out the blue comment form and make their comments orally, I'm going to bring the public hearing to a close.

As I mentioned earlier, you all have the opportunity, if you do not want to make your comment orally, to fill out this comment form as well and drop that off before you head out of the meeting and this will be included in the final EIR.

So with that, I'm going to go ahead and close the public hearing. I want to thank you all so much for coming out tonight. We really appreciate your time and attention.

Have a good evening.

(Hearing concluded at 7:50 p.m.)
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PROCEEDINGS

MS. CHAPLICK: Good afternoon. Thank you so much for coming today. My name is Joan Chaplick. I work with MIG. We're a consulting firm that is helping MTC to put on today's public hearing.

Our purpose today is to get comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area. So when you all came in, you were given the opportunity to receive a blue card. That's your speaker card.

If you would like to make comments during the meeting, you'll need to fill out one of those. They all will be brought up to me, and I will call out the names in sequence and every person will get two minutes — every person wanting to speak will have two minutes and be able to share their comments.

We are also receiving your comments in writing today, and you can also comment by e-mail, fax, and mail. And that information will be provided to you shortly. So that's our purpose.

Our basic agenda is we will be having a short presentation by MTC planner Carolyn Clevenger. She's going to provide an overview on the Draft EIR, and after she concludes her presentation, then we will start the public hearing.
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We have with us two court reporters who will be transcribing all of the comments that they receive today verbally, and everything we receive verbally and in writing will all be treated the same way and responded to in the final Environmental Impact Report.

So with that, I believe we are ready to get started. So Carolyn Clevenger from MTC.

MS. CLEVENGER: Good afternoon. Thank you for joining us today. As Joan mentioned, my name is Carolyn Clevenger with MTC planning. I'm the project manager for the EIR. Seated next to me is Mark Shorett with the Association of Bay Area Governments.

So the purpose of this public hearing is to present an overview of the Plan, as well as the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which are both out for public comment right now.

We'll be receiving your public comments here on the Draft EIR, and as Joan mentioned, all responses to comments and questions will be made in writing as part of the final Environmental Impact Report.

I would just like to note that the focus of the meeting today is on the Environmental Impact Report. There are a number of hearings going on throughout the region on the actual Plan itself.

The hearing for Santa Clara County will be on
May 1st, and there's information on a brochure at the front table that has the location and time of all of the remaining -- the six remaining public hearings on the actual Plan itself.

For comments on the Plan itself, you can, if you would like to, just send a comment via e-mail rather than attending one of the open houses and public hearings. You can send those to info@onebayarea.org, and that information is also in the brochure. So if you would like to grab that, that has the details.

The purpose of the Environmental Impact Report is to analyze and disclose the potential environmental impacts of implementation of the proposed Plan.

It's meant to inform decision-makers, responsible agencies, and the public of the range of potential impacts. It also recommends measures that can help mitigate the impacts that are found to be significant, and it analyzes a range of alternatives to the proposed project.

A little background on the Plan. It's the first time in the region that we've done an integrated land use and transportation plan as required by Senate Bill 375. That bill does require that the integrated plan reduce greenhouse gas emissions or GHG by
15 percent per capita by 2035, and also that the region houses the region's population at all income levels.

The Plan was developed working off of the Priority Development Area strategy that ABAG and MTC had been working on for a number of years, and it focuses on increasing economic competitiveness while also preserving the natural environment of the region.

Looking from 2010 to 2040, which is the out year of the Plan, the region projects -- and these are projections developed by ABAG -- 1 million additional jobs and roughly 2 million additional people in the region by 2040. And the EIR evaluates the environmental impact of accommodating that growth; it doesn't actually evaluate the forecasts themselves.

So the focused growth strategy that the Plan is built around focuses on Priority Development Areas that are shown in this map -- it's the pink and purple hues -- and it accounts for less than 5 percent of the region's land, but it accommodates nearly 80 percent of new homes and 60 percent of new jobs in the proposed Plan.

Much of this growth is concentrated in the core cities of San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland, as well as in -- 75 percent of the growth is accommodated in Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco.
Counties.

Turning to the transportation side, the revenues forecast for the region over the 28-year plan period are $289 billion. This pie chart shows the different sources of those funds.

So just over half, 53 percent of those funds are local funds, and that's primarily local sales tax revenue. Eight of the nine counties in the Bay Area have a local sales tax dedicated to transportation, and that's the bulk of those funds.

The additional funds are: Regional, 15 percent is primarily from bridge tolls, and then State and Federal funds. The 5 percent anticipated is based on fund sources that come along during the 28-year projection of the Plan that we don't necessarily know about right now.

But based on historical trends, that's -- we've had about a 5 percent of new funds and new programs that have come up over the life of the Plan. So we do account for those in the revenue projections.

In terms of how the funds are spent, 88 percent of the funds are dedicated to operating and maintaining the existing system, that includes both roadways, local streets and roads, highways, and transit operations, as well as transit capital replacement. The
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remaining 12 percent is split roughly equally between roadway and transit expansion.

The Environmental Impact Report looks at impacts on 14 different environmental areas that are listed here: Transportation, air quality, land use, energy, climate change and greenhouse gases -- which include sea-level rise analyses -- noise, geology and seismicity, water, biological, visual, and cultural resource, as well as public utilities, hazards, and public services.

This presentation is available on our website, so if you're trying to write this down, we can let you know where it will be available.

Potential mitigations are identified for each of the areas where there is deemed to be a potential impact. Mitigations would be implemented as appropriate at the local levels by local jurisdictions as they move forward with projects if they're using our EIR.

Since MTC and ABAG cannot ensure implementation of mitigation measures in all cases, those issue areas shown in bold are found to still have potential significant impacts.

Now, I had mentioned that the EIR evaluates a range of alternatives. This provides some detail on those alternatives that were evaluated.
One alternative is the No Project, and that's required by California Environmental Quality Act to look at the "No Project," which is the existing 2010 land use and transportation network, as well as those funds that are deemed to be committed.

So 80 percent of the funds in the Plan are going to projects that are either locally funded, in which case the regional agencies made no discretionary decision over if they move forward, or were so far along in project development that they were deemed committed if they were through a certain level of environmental clearance.

Alternative 3 or the "Transit Priority Focus" alternative looked at higher densities near high-quality transit service. It also included an additional high peak-period Bay Bridge toll, with revenues used to fund additional Bart and AC transit investments.

The "Enhanced Network of Communities" or Alternative 4 in the EIR was based on input from business representatives. It included a higher population growth assumptions, both for population and jobs compared to the Plan.

It also included that higher peak-period Bay Bridge toll, but in this alternative, it was used to fund additional investments in the State highway system.
maintaining the system.

The "Environment, Equity and Jobs" or Alternative No. 5 was based on input from the equity and environmental stakeholders. That alternative on the land use side emphasized increasing opportunities for low-income housing and communities of opportunity or job-rich communities.

It did eliminate uncommitted roadway expansion projects, and it implemented a VMT tax that was used to fund increased transit operations throughout the region.

So those were the range of alternatives that were evaluated in the EIR. In terms of how the -- what the analysis showed, all of the alternatives, including the proposed Plan, had similar impacts.

Alternative 5 or the "Environmental, Equity and Jobs alternative," was deemed to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative in terms of its overall environmental impacts. The total greenhouse gas emissions were reduced the greatest in that alternative, and air quality emissions were reduced the greatest in that alternative.

However, the proposed Plan did include some benefits as compared to Alternative 5. It had the lowest vehicle miles traveled or VMT in the region per
capita. It also included lower levels of congested VMT, so fewer miles that were traveled in the region at congested conditions. And less agricultural and open space were converted under that alternative.

Alternative 3 or the "Transit Priority Alternative" had the least impacts in terms of transportation as it featured shorter commute travel times, a lesser amount of congested VMT, and the least likelihood of transit crowding of the alternatives.

In terms on commenting on the Draft EIR, you can comment either orally or in writing at today's meeting. You can also send it by mail, fax, or e-mail by May 16th. Our comment period closes at 4 p.m. on May 16th, and the contact information is listed there.

Again, just to note, the comments on the actual -- on the overall Plan itself and the policies behind the plan should be made separately at info@onebayarea.org. And that information is all included in that brochure at the front table.

In terms of our overall schedule, we are right now in the middle of the EIR public hearings and the Plan Bay Area public hearings. The public comment period will close on May 16th.

And then in June and July, we will be presenting summaries and responses to comments to the
MTC Commission and the ABAG Board, with the final adoption of the Plan and EIR scheduled for July of this year. And the final EIR will include, as we've mentioned, a written response to each comment received on the EIR.

So with that, I'll turn it back to Joan.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you. So thank you for your presentation, Carolyn.

Now we will be opening the public hearing. Our court transcribers will be taking down exactly what you say. And if you would like to speak, I need you to fill out a blue comment card.

So I have received one, and I would like to bring -- Ivana Yeung will be our first commenter.

There are MTC staff who are collecting comments, and they'll bring them up to me. We'll just line up, and we'll hear everyone's comments.

Each person gets two minutes to comment. And Leslie up front is our timer. She has a timer that when the alarm goes off, you'll need to bring your remarks to a close. So that's our process. And with that, we will start with our first comment.

Please state your name and where you're from for the record.

IVANA YEUNG: Hi. Good afternoon. My name
is Ivana Yeung. I'm with the County Roads and Airports Department.

We had a comment regarding the transportation section, which is 2.1. We had read that there were going to be significant unavoidable regional impacts.

While we realize that is probably going to be the case, we are wondering if there were going to be plans to have a map or some analysis for the Santa Clara County in particular, just because we understand that we have a lot of employment areas here, but I feel that a lot of the congested VMT miles are going to be in the Santa Clara County. Are there any plans to include that in the EIR.

MS. CHAPLICK: Questions will just be recorded and responded to in the final EIR.

IVANA YEUNG: Okay.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you.

Our next commenter, I have a card from Ed Mason. And please introduce yourself and where you are from for the record.

ED MASON: Good afternoon. Ed Mason of San Jose.

And on Page 1-2-7, it says that there's going to be an increase in the number of seniors that will be in the downtown areas. I really find that hard to
believe in the Bay Area. It might be happening across
the nation, but there are two articles that basically
say, nobody is going anywhere for the baby boomers that
are retiring.

It's been my experience in roundtable and
personal surveys that basically seniors are going to age
in place and not go into the downtown areas, and I
believe that only the wealthy move to Rincon Hill in San
Francisco.

Also, there is no mention on Page 1-2-24.

There's jobs and prosperity. There is no mention made
of the corporate commuter buses. If they were a transit
agency, they would be at about six or seven as the
largest transit agency.

The real estate ads in San Francisco tell
that the residences for sale in nearby neighborhood
stops. And the housing quota that is going to be
allocated in San Francisco or any other location, who is
the residence really going to be designated for?

You know, if you've got all these commuter
buses going around, it implies -- even in San Francisco,
you've got 24 percent of the population that goes out of
the city, and it's a consequence. If you are going to
assign a housing allocation to San Francisco as an
example, why -- we've got commuter buses going on. So
they don't live where they work. You know, the company town is extinct.

But that's one way that I think there really needs to be a reevaluation by businesses to not get into this mode of saying, Well, you can live in hip San Francisco and congest all the neighborhood streets with the commuter buses but, you know, you can live here.

Highway investment. We always wind up mitigating everything and we widen. We've widened 880 in '96 and 2000. Now we're going to widen Old Oakland Road. Well, what happens if we did nothing and really made commuting a painful experience? Because your projections indicate that over the near term in long term, it's only going to be a few more minutes increased in commuting time.

Well, if you want to reduce the greenhouse gases, let's make -- you know, don't do anything and just let everybody kind of suffer, and then maybe they'll get the message, because eventually, they may be commuting with the fish as the sea level rises. So I think that needs to be a message that's not being made.

MS. CHAPLICK: If you could wrap up your comments, sir.

ED MASON: Yeah. And also, 75 percent of the jobs are half a mile off of a freeway exit, and only
25 percent are within the 88 rail stations. So there seems to be a mismatch that maybe we should be encouraging more commuter buses.

Are my two minutes up?

MS. CHAPLICK: Yes, your two minutes are up, sir.

ED MASON: Sorry.

MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. If you do have additional remarks that you would like to share, feel free to add them to a comment form and turn them in, or also comment -- send additional comments by e-mail, fax, or mail.

I have no other blue speaker cards, so if there's anyone who would like to speak, I'll give you a minute to fill that out. Our main purpose is to receive comments. So we don't have a question-and-answer portion. And any questions that you have will be responded to in the final EIR.

So if you would like to make a comment for the record, we'll need your speaker card.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: This is not a comment, it's a question on the presentation.

MS. CHAPLICK: You know, we're -- I'm sorry. We are not taking questions on the presentation. So they're all -- it's all part of the CEQA process, where
we receive the comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll make a comment.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. So I'm going to give --

I'll give you a few minutes. If you have --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: So --

MS. CHAPLICK: Sir, I'm needing speaker cards, if you would like to speak. So we are going to give people a moment to fill out a speaker card, and then it's two minutes per person.

So we have someone coming up here. We'll just need your name for the record. I have a card from Michael Ludwig. Okay, Michael. And you have two minutes to comment.

MICHAEL LUDWIG: Okay. Yes. Sorry I got here late, but I just was wondering why -- I mean, I don't know what exactly the lists of projects are in the Plan Bay Area, so I'm thinking you might be doing this kind of backwards to be holding the environmental hearing before the hearing for the list of projects.

And so I'm just wondering about that, and I just want to make sure that you encourage jobs and housing as close to transit as much as possible.

MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. Our next speaker is Don Conners.

DON CONNERS: I know an awful lot of very
intelligent and highly educated people worked very hard on doing this Bay Area Plan and the Environmental Impact Report, so I don't mean to impugn your competence or motives; however, let's look at the history of past projections.

In the middle '70s, we put the first fuel economy standards in. It was supposed to save an awful lot of oil because we were going to use less oil in our cars. So over the subsequent years, the fuel economy standard of people on the road roughly doubled. Savings in oil, none, because miles per car also doubled exactly, offsetting that.

We also have the record of light rail in San Jose, where the cost estimates kept going up and up and up, the ridership estimates kept going down and down and down, and the operating costs were tremendous. And that's just in San Jose. The same thing happened with BART earlier. It's doing well now, but it took an awful lot of time to get there.

What makes you think that your planning is any better than the past record?

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your comment.

Our next speaker is Hilda, and I will let you pronounce your last name.
HILDA LAFEBRE: Hilda Lafebre with San Mateo Transit representing Caltrain in San Fran. I saw in the presentation four alternatives; however, you mentioned a fifth alternative. Does that mean that in the document we will see five alternatives or four alternatives?

MS. CLEVENGERT: The proposed Plan is the other alternative. So it's the No Project, the Proposed Plan, and then the three additional alternatives that I described in more detail.

HILDA LAFEBRE: Okay.

MS. CLEVENGERT: So yes, since the previous slides went into detail on the Proposed Plan, I didn't include that in that alternatives chart.

HILDA LAFEBRE: All right. Thank you.

MS. CHAPLICK: I apologize for my break from process.

Do we have -- I have no other blue speaker cards.

JIM BITTER: I have --

MS. CHAPLICK: Please fill out a speaker card, and we'll have your name, and your comments can be entered into the record. I'll give you just a minute or so to fill that out.

If we don't have any more people wanting to
speak, we will close the public hearing portion of the meeting.

JIM BITTER: I'd like to speak.

MS. CHAPLICK: Yes. Just get me a card.

JIM BITTER: I have a card right here.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. And if you can state your name for the record. And the card, I just -- the court reporters use it to get your --

JIM BITTER: My name is Jim Bitter, B-I-T-T-E-R, and I'm from Mill Valley, California. I'm up north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Why am I down here getting lost in San Jose? I'm down here because I care about my country. I care about college kids that are the next generation that are having trouble finding jobs when you get out of here. You are going to have a big debt to pay when you get out of here.

And on top of that, you are going to be paying for all of this, and it's wonderful stuff. It's housing, transportation, green stuff, green stuff, green stuff everywhere, but there is no money at the federal level. $17 trillion, going to 22 trillion. $80 billion in debt in California.

The consultants that are here, MTB -- or not MTB, but the -- I need to take a breath here. The
Metropolitan Transit Commission, an $11.5 million bureaucracy, the consultants, ICF International, the company that did the Environmental Impact Report, that's Dyett & Bhatia.

This is San Jose. It's a big place, and you have how many people here? So you have invested -- they won't tell us what this costs. And it's on my computer, and I didn't hit print, because I -- but we're all paying for this thing.

You know, 99.99 percent of the public is not going to read it, they'll never see it, and I pity the next generation that has bought all of this and that is having to pay for it.

So what else can I say? I got lost coming down here.

So anyway, these meetings were conveniently arranged during the day when people couldn't get here. They have two at a time. The one up in Marin was arranged so that the Board of the Supervisors couldn't come. They're the ones who are responsible for this. Darrell Steinberg, who drafted the legislation, the legislature, the California Air Resources Board, they're all responsible for this.

The next generation, the college kids at San Jose and other places, are going to pay for all of this,
so good luck, because the old people are set. But you, you are going to -- they're going to be in your wallet, big time.

MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Do I have any more -- anyone wanting to fill out a speaker card and speak?

Okay. With that, we will close the public hearing and will -- you know, the MTC folks, we will be collecting comment cards, if you want to provide us written comments. But that's all we have for now, so with that, we are adjourned. And feel free, again, to stay and provide some additional written comments, if you prefer.

Thank you.

(Hearing concluded at 1:32 p.m.)
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