

## **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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ATTENDEES

BRAD PAUL - ABAG Deputy Director

CAROLYN CLEVINGER - MTC Associate Planner Analyst

--oOo--

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.

--oOo--

MEETING AGENDA

PAGE

Introduction by Joan Chaplick

Presentation by Carolyn Clevenger

	PUBLIC SPEAKERS	
		PAGE
1		
2		
3	PETER HENSEL	5
4	RICHARD HALL	8
5	CLAYTON SMITH	10
6	CAROLYN LEMENT	12
7	NONA DENNIS	14
8	SUSAN KIRSCH	15
9	LINDA RAMES	17
10	AL DUGAN	18
11	HARRY BROPHY	19
12	RAY DAY	21
13	MARGARET KETTUNENZESAR	23
14	PAM DREW	24
15	JEAN RIEKE	26
16	NANCY OCADA	28
17	ROBERT CHILVERS	30
18	ELIZABETH MOODY	32
19	MARGARET NAN	33
20	ANN SPAKE	36
21	JULIE LEITZELL	39
22	CAROL SHEERIN	40
23	SUE BEITTEL	42
24	JOY DAHLGREN	43
25		

1	PUBLIC SPEAKERS (Continued)	
2		PAGE
3	VINCENT WELCH	44
4	BRENDAN BURKE	45
5	JIM BITTER	47
6	BARBARA SALZMAN	50
7	STEPHEN NESTEL	51
8	MARJORIE MACRIS	52
9	LILIE CROCKER	55
10	SUSAN WERNICK	59
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1

--oOo--

2

(Introduction by Joan Chaplick not reported.)

3

(Presentation by Carolyn Clevenger not

4

reported.)

5

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your

6

presentation, Carolyn. And now, we will start the

7

public comment. So I will be reading off names in

8

groups of three, and I'd like you to line up behind the

9

microphone. Ursula will be keeping time, so if you

10

approach the two minute mark, I'll just give you a brief

11

hand signal to wrap up your remarks.

12

If you do have additional comments beyond

13

your two minutes that you need, please remember, you can

14

provide comments in writing today, or by email, mail, or

15

fax, as Carolyn showed on the slide. So with that we

16

are going to get started. And I please ask that you

17

speak slowly so that our court reporters can get your

18

information down accurately.

19

So let's start with Peter Hensel,

20

followed by Richard Hall, and Clayton Smith. So if you

21

could start, your name and where you are from.

22

PETER HENSEL: I'm Peter Hensel, and I live in

23

Corte Madera. And just as a little perspective, I'm

24

definitely not against affordable housing. I think we

25

need more of it, but it needs to be dispersed through

Page 5

1 the community. I consider myself an environmentalist, so  
2 this, I tackled this gigantic document, a thousand  
3 pages, as best I could with limited time, concentrating  
4 mainly on biological and water resources, because that's  
5 all the time I had.

D1-A1 6 But what struck me, you know, on page 39  
7 of the biological resources report, there's a footnote  
8 that defines a certain section of Federal Endangered  
9 Species Act. It says, a taking is defined at section  
10 nine of that act, as broadly defined to include  
11 intentional or accidental harassment or harm to  
12 wildlife. Now, in the extreme, that could be something  
13 even as disastrous as killing wildlife.

14 So, if you are a modern day land-use  
15 planner or developer, what you want to do is mitigate.  
16 They have a word for that, LSM, or an acronym, I should  
17 say, it means less than significant impacts. So, this  
18 puts planners and developers in a kind of quandary,  
D1-A2 19 because, let's say -- and again, this is from the  
20 document, page 60, of biological resources.

21 In the event that construction with the  
22 needs to operate in any water course with flowing or  
23 standing water, a qualified biologist resource monitor  
24 shall be present at all times to alert construction  
25 crews to the possible presence of California red legged

1 frogs, nesting birds, salmon heads, or other aquatic  
2 species at risk during construction operations.

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

7 JOAN CHAPLICK: Yes, that's time.

8 PETER HENSEL: Afraid so.

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

D1-A3 11 PETER HENSEL: Well, let me just wrap it up.  
12 So, in other words, we need to do some more work on the  
13 people impacts of this report, and especially around the  
14 water, because -- and this will be my last sentence. I  
15 plugged into the California water agencies, they have a  
16 website, and they say that Central Valley farmers are  
17 going to get five, excuse me, 20 percent of the water,  
18 their contract water this year. And I said, my  
19 goodness, why are we planning for all these people under  
20 that scenario?

21 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

22 Following our next commenter is Clayton  
23 Smith, could come in line, and then I have Carolyn  
24 Lement.

25 Sir.

1                   RICHARD HALL: Hi, I'm Richard Hall, and I  
2 live here in San Rafael, and I represent a group called  
3 Quiet and Safe San Rafael. We are a group of residents  
4 spanning ten neighborhoods. And, first of all, I want  
5 to say, this is a big plan. It has big implications.  
6 And I also wanted to sort of bring up a point of fact, I  
7 kind of quickly went through obviously a big plan, as I  
8 mentioned, this has more implications for Oakland,  
9 San Francisco, some of the big cities.

D1-B1

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

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

25                   And through -- we have met with our town

Page 8

1 council, we packed the council chambers was overflowing  
2 with proponents to the PDA plan, stationary plan, yet  
3 our council voted five nothing against all those people.  
4 We are at our wit's end to work out how are we meant to  
5 object to the PDA, the general plan, the plan that  
6 basically almost all of us disagree with that's based on  
7 these transit oriented development principles, that we  
8 don't just buy into this vision.

D1-B2

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

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

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

D1-B3

23 RICHARD HALL: Sure. You have basically given  
24 us one alternative, no project, but I'm told by people,  
25 if we choose no project you still have to get to choose

1 an alternative. It feels like you haven't given us a  
2 choice. No project is no project. There is no  
3 (inaudible) choice that says no project. We would like  
4 to say no project, period, and eliminate the PDA here in  
5 San Rafael and North San Rafael. Thank you.

6 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your time.

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

9 CLAYTON SMITH: Yeah, my name is Clayton  
10 Smith, I'm from Mill Valley. You know, I look at your  
11 document, it starts with what I consider to be  
12 questionable scientific theories concerning the effects  
13 of CO2 on what is now referred to as climate change. It  
14 moves on, continues with population increases search  
15 that contradict those made by Department of Finance at  
16 the state level.

17 These are used to justify the overthrow  
18 of local control concerning zoning and development.  
19 And it culminates, interesting enough, on the last page  
20 of your summary document with this vast expenditure.  
21 Billions and billions of dollars on all these  
22 transportation items. And I look at this, and what I  
23 immediately sense, and I immediately feel, is cronyism.  
24 All this money, and I, I look at what the state does  
25 with the money we give it today, and we get big

Page 10

1   bureaucracy. We get an overgrown and overpaid state  
2   government, and we have almost no real value in exchange  
3   for our tax dollars.

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

D1-C5

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

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

Page 11

1 you.

2 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

3 And following Nona Dennis we'll have Susan Kirsch.

4 CAROLYN LEMENT: Carolyn Lement, San Rafael.

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

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

23 Secondly, housing is responsible for 40  
24 percent of greenhouse gases. What's out there now is  
25 green. All this building is not green. No matter what

Page 12

1 materials you use and how you dispose of the waste in  
2 building it, it's not green. Twenty units per acre is  
3 appropriate in our county. We are not urban. And you  
4 can't go five miles out into deep country below  
5 landslides and put more people at risk.

D1-D2

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

D1-D3

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

D1-D4

22 So far all this and more reasons, no  
23 project, give us an alternative, let us develop an  
24 alternative. It's going to taking more time in Marin  
25 than we have been given. Thank you.

1 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

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

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

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

10 NONA DENNIS: Okay. Sorry. Thank you. Okay.  
11 The first comment, is that as far as it goes, the EIR, I  
12 must say, stands in sharp contrast. It's subjective.  
13 It's comprehensive. It misses some major points, which  
14 we are going to be making, but in comparison with the  
15 plan itself, it is refreshing because it does identify  
16 the areas of controversy, it identifies the significant  
17 unavoidable impacts. It presents information  
18 objectively, whereas the plan itself is sugar coated and  
19 written through rose colored, I'm sorry, colored  
20 glasses.

21 So anyway, that's as far as it goes. So  
22 I've heard -- so main comment on the EIR, is that it's  
23 based on projections that now are in question. We are  
24 aware that there are discrepancies between the numbers  
25 projected by ABAG and those by the Department of

Page 14

1 Finance. We don't know, some people are familiar with  
2 those, the differences, the explanation of the  
3 differences, so forth, but it's our understanding that  
4 the entire EIR plan itself are premised on projections.  
5 And you have a deadline, you have no time to correct  
6 those.

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

D1-E2

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

D1-E3

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

25                   SUSAN KIRSCH: Good morning, Susan Kirsch,

D1-F1

1 Mill Valley, California, a 34-year-resident of  
2 Mill Valley. I want to make three comments regarding  
3 the EIR and its measurements with CEQA. You know, on  
4 the Executive Summary, page two, it talks about one of  
5 the requirements of CEQA, as you mentioned in your  
6 opening comment, is to inform decision makers and  
7 members of the public as to the range of the  
8 environmental impacts on the proposed plan.

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

D1-F2

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

23 However, project -- the no project  
24 alternative is the one that continues to honor local  
25 control through general plan and maintains that strength

1 of local communities working in collaboration but  
2 holding power with local communities, which many of us  
3 are in favor of.

D1-F3

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

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

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

D1-G1

23 LINDA RAMES: Good morning, I'm Linda Rames,  
24 I'm a resident of Mill Valley. I simply have one  
25 comment to make. Don't you think it's a little putting

Page 17

1 the fox in charge of the hen house to have MTC doing the  
2 EIR? They are hardly impartial. Thank you.

3 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.  
4 You can adjust the volume from the back.

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

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

21 Dr. Levy reviewed the total growth of the  
22 Bay Area but clearly stated at a recent ABAG meeting, he  
23 was not involved in and did not review the allocation  
24 process to the jurisdictions. The 18,400 jobs and  
25 33,000 population growth by 2040 makes no sense for

D1-H1

D1-H2

D1-H3

1 Marin. The ABAG numbers are 61 percent higher than the  
2 Department of Finance numbers for the Bay Area, but they  
3 are 400 percent higher than the Department of Finance  
4 numbers for Marin. This is an obvious anomaly and a red  
5 flag.

6 Thank you.

7 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thanks for your comment.

8 I have Harry Brophy next, followed by Ray  
9 Day.

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

12 (Discussion had off the record.)

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

15 HARRY BROPHY: My name is Harry Brophy. I'm  
16 from Novato. I have nothing against housing. That  
17 isn't why I'm here. In a way, it, it might effect it,  
18 but what I want to talk about is the water situation in  
19 Novato. I've looked at some of reports. I have a book  
20 full here that I haven't quite finished yet, but Novato  
21 is going to have problems with water. They have 6,100  
22 acres of feet they are using now, and ABAG projects  
23 12,000 feet by 2020. That's almost double.

24 In Novato, people at ABAG has projected  
25 is up around 64,000, that's way high. And what I'm

Page 19

1 getting at is, there's one pipe now that brings water  
2 into Novato. It's a 30 inch main. I went up and  
3 checked it, it comes from Sonoma. We are going to get  
4 another pipe, but in 2009, due to financial constraints,  
5 that pipe is out of the game.

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

13 We could set up a system where you could  
14 use above ground water, I could do that for you, but as  
15 it is now, the amount of water coming in is not  
16 sufficient. All these statements in this book are taken  
17 from North Marin Water District, in conjunction with  
18 talking with Krista Gabriel, he's the head engineer, all  
19 these things are true, and it comes down to where they  
20 tell you, by the year of 2020 when there's going to be a  
21 20 percent reduction by the State of California that's  
22 mandatory, the water you have now won't be enough.

23 You are going to have less water up  
24 there. You are going to have more people. You are  
25 going to have a major problem when you do the EIR. And

D1-I2

1 another thing about the EIR, I would like it to be  
2 impartial. So I don't know why Novato could be the lead  
3 on the EIR when they are in cahoots with ABAG trying to  
4 put these buildings up in Novato. It's got to be  
5 impartial, because they are siding together.

D1-I3

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

13 Thank you.

14 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

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

D1-J1

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

D1-J2

24 And especially one thing, as a result of  
25 SB50, which really messed us up, because the impact on

Page 21

1 schools, which are not permitted to be placed in the  
2 EIR, as far as the impacts to the local school  
3 districts. Giving example, in the, in Marin County  
4 here, 70 percent of the county's affordable units will  
5 be, are planned to be located in the Dixy School  
6 District and concentrated there. Now, okay. Now, you  
7 say so what's the impact of the affordable housing?

8           Okay. For example, I did a calculation,  
9 over the 40 year life of the project it would mean about  
10 14.8 million in tax revenues if it was done on a regular  
11 affordable basis. That meaning that the county's  
12 original plan of 20 percent affordable housing and then  
13 the rest to be market rate housing. Right now what the  
14 plan is on the existing PDA is to go ahead and have it  
15 100 percent affordable housing with the owner being  
16 bridge housing that is entitled then to not pay any  
17 property taxes that would be going to the schools.

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

24           So this is a problem, and I think that if  
25 it's nothing else, it's put in as a informational item

1 to the public so they know what the impact is to there  
2 local school districts, because otherwise it won't be  
3 mentioned, they have no say in what is going on. And  
4 this is a very important issue that hasn't been  
5 discussed and should be contained in any of these plans.

6 Thank you very much.

7 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

8 And next we have Margaret.

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

17 Climate change does is not addressed in  
18 terms of the areas where the population is planned. The

19 population is assuming transit orientation, because  
20 there is a Highway 101, which is inadequate and will be  
21 inadequate for many years. Shoreline Highway is  
22 impassible on weekends and sunny days. Shoreline  
23 Highway is accessed by flooded -- accessed from the  
24 bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge. There is no transit  
25 facility throughout rural, semi-rural Marin.

Page 23

D1-K4

1                   We are impacting populations that are  
2 planned. And it's unfortunate that an eagerness to gain  
3 funds for transportation, a process which was designed  
4 for urban renewal, which is desperately needed in parts  
5 of the cities which surround the Bay Area. Common  
6 change needs to be better addressed, and the impacts of  
7 the unfortunate probability of very high FEMA insurance  
8 on semi, on semi-rural populations and affordable  
9 housing, needy people, seniors, these kinds of  
10 considerations should be given a more economic -- that  
11 aspect should be analyzed in the document. Thank you.

12                   JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.  
13 Next, Pam Drew, Jean Rieke, and Nancy Ocada.

D1-L1

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

21                   I do not believe that you, as officials,  
22 have a role in telling the population exactly what they  
23 are to do and when they are going to do it. Whenever I  
24 first watched the Bay Area Plan it was that we had to  
25 prepare for two million people, one million of whom were

Page 24

1 going to be nearby migration, and one million by natural  
2 increase. That was when there was still immigration  
3 going on.

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

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

21 I'm a homeowner, and despite my race,  
22 despite that the fact that I am white, I'm still  
23 speaking for homeowners. For black homeowners, for  
24 Hispanic homeowners, for homeowners of all sorts. And  
25 we deserve to be heard. We haven't been heard and we

1 need to be.

2 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.  
3 We have Jean Rieke who is next, followed by Nancy Ocada,  
4 and then Robert Chilvers.

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

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

25 I think that when you look around the Bay

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

1                   JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your  
2 comment.

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

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

11                   This project actually started in June of  
12 2012, when you presented a draft DIR alternative for  
13 review by joint MTC Plan ABAG Administrative Committee.  
14 And on June 11, you released notice of preparation for a  
15 30-day public review period. Somehow I wasn't aware of  
16 this, otherwise I might have got involved a little  
17 earlier. From June 20th to June 28th, you held regional  
18 wide scoping meetings. I, unfortunately, didn't know  
19 about those, so I couldn't attend.

20                   On July 13th, of 2012, you presented your  
21 final alternatives for review by the joint MTC Plan ABAG  
22 Administrative Committee, in recommendation for  
23 committee -- which you probably did approve of it.  
24 Anyhow, I got involved in this in, when I attended a  
25 meeting in San Francisco in January of 2012, oh,

Page 28

1 actually it was 2011 that you started it. I'm sorry.

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

D1-N1.5

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

D1-N2

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

D1-N3

24           And then in transportation, which there's  
25 a lot of money being spent in that area, based on 2010

1 existing transportation networks and only include  
2 projects that have either already received funding and  
3 have environmental clearance as of May 1st, 2011. This  
4 would be a much better alternative, and it's too bad  
5 that so much money, when people are losing their homes  
6 all around us, so much money has been spent planning a  
7 process and not going to real jobs.

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

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

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

23 We also have almost 500 species of birds.  
24 And there's very good reason for that. It's because we  
25 have the open space, we have the trees, we have the

1 habitat. Well, how did Marin County, even now, after  
2 all of the growth that's been around us in the entire  
3 State of California, still maintain its beauty and its  
4 open space and its habitat? By fighting.

5           We have had this fight many many times.  
6 Marincello was proposed for the headlands and it was  
7 squashed. The Vincent Silvera properties were slot to  
8 be developed and that has been stopped. It's taken  
9 citizen action for decades and decades to preserve it.  
10 Now my backyard is the entire Bay Area, and Marin County  
11 is a jewel for the Bay Area. In fact, it's a jewel for  
12 the entire world.

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

23           The proposal to build it, literally,  
24 within walking distance of this hotel, 600 units in this  
25 area, which is an architectural treasure, and which is

1 almost entirely single-family detached homes, it would  
2 change the character of this very neighborhood  
3 profoundly. And anybody that thinks that this SMART  
4 train is going to have a station nearby is going to  
5 alleviate traffic on 101, if you build 600 new units,  
6 you are going to have at least a thousand new cars on  
7 101 every day, and for multiple trips. So, totally  
8 aggravate the traffic problem.

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

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

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

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

Page 32

1 essential.

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

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

19 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.  
20 Next we have Margaret Nan, and then Ann Spake, and Julie  
21 Leitzell. Those are all of the comment cards I have,  
22 so -- I have one more. So if anyone else is seeking to  
23 speak, please let us know.

24 Margaret, you are up next.

25 MARGARET NAN: Hi, I'm a homeowner and also a

Page 33

D1-Q1

1 long-term resident. I was raised in Marin County and  
2 Sonoma County, I went to school here, and then I  
3 returned after living in Los Angeles, New York, D.C.,  
4 and lots of urban areas, and I do not want Marin County  
5 to turn in to having some of these issues like urban  
6 areas. Like a lot of people have moved, specifically to  
7 Marin to enjoy the beautiful scenery and the nature.

8 I know I moved back to Marin, I think, I  
9 thank my family for raising me here and being able to  
10 have the privilege of living here. That being said, I  
11 do believe it's inevitable and there needs to be  
12 affordable housing of some sort placed in Marin County,  
13 however, after living in Hamilton, was our first home,  
14 we stretched to get in there, we stretched to get into  
15 Marinwood, we are in our third home now in Lucas Valley,  
16 after stretching, working really hard, my husband works  
17 here and so do I, I feel like we have sacrificed so much  
18 to live in this community, and I'm happy to do so, but I  
19 don't think we should be giving away the farm,  
20 necessarily.

21 We have -- our kids go to public schools.  
22 I believe in public school. We contribute to Kendale.  
23 To put this additional pressure on the school, and I  
24 talked to our local principal, and he actually was not  
25 really concerned about the homes that were going to be

1 built, 700 units in Marinwood, Lucas Valley have been  
2 proposed, he said that he was more concerned about Marin  
3 Commons being taken off the board as source of tax  
4 revenue.

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

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

24                   So what ended up happening, is you got a  
25 lot of people from outside the Bay Area with limited

1 options that were put in there by the developers. So  
2 you are identifying a set of people that you want to  
3 move to this area, but those people will not buy there.  
4 So I don't know what your solution is with that. I'm  
5 certainly for it, but it needs to be done properly. And  
6 I just don't like this being where it's going. And  
7 needs to be more controlled.

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

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

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

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

22 We need to plan for housing that's  
23 healthy for sensitive members of our community,  
24 including young children, pregnant women, seniors, and  
25 those who have compromised immune symptoms. You admit

Page 36

1 in your EIR that this plan is totally in contradiction  
2 to that. The current plan has the most and over twice  
3 the transportation projects exposed to mid century sea  
4 level rise inundation in the no project alternative.

D1-R2

5 You say it exposes more residents and  
6 more new residential development inundation by placing  
7 people closer to the bay than the other alternatives.  
8 The proposed plan does not provide the least  
9 environmental impact in relation to air quality. The  
10 EIR does not examine the effects on local or regional  
11 air quality from specific land use and transportation  
12 improvements in the proposed plan.

D1-R3

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

D1-R4

22 The proposed plan will also increase TACs  
23 and PM in disproportionately impacted communities  
24 creating even greater health disparities and  
25 environmental justice. Environmental justice person

Page 37

1 noted that low income housing is being used as a buffer,  
2 even as science advises against it. The Pacific  
3 Institute study says half of the land slated for infill  
4 development in our San Francisco bay region is located  
5 in communities with highest outbreaks of toxic air  
6 contaminants.

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

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

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

23 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

24 Next we have Julie Leitzell. She will be  
25 followed by Carol Sheerin and Sue Beittel.

1                   JULIE LEITZELL: Hi, I'm Julie Leitzell, I  
2 live in Larkspur. I apologize, I came in late. Are  
3 there any board of supervisors people here?

4                   JOAN CHAPLICK: We have the mayor of Novato --

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

15                                 It's going to be too late at that point.  
16 I have been over to the Pleasant Hill BART station where  
17 a transit oriented villages, and if you all want to go  
18 over there you will see that the whole bottom floor has  
19 for lease signs in the retail. There's only a Starbucks  
20 there that serves the office workers that comes across,  
21 you know, a six lane road to get there. These are  
22 developments that, generally, they are hard to fill.

23                                 I agree that the firefighters, the school  
24 teachers do not want to live in developments like this.  
25 I think it's ridiculous. I think that, that there have

Page 39

1 been central planning fiascos in the past. Marincello  
2 has been mentioned. Thirty thousand people were  
3 supposed to be living in the Marin Headlands. And with  
4 that project, 1959, the Army Corps of Engineers  
5 projected that the Bay Area would have 14 million people  
6 by the year 2020. They were obviously very off.

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

16 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

17 Our next speaker, we have Carol Sheerin.

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

Page 40

1     them many years, they wanted a tunnel, and it was  
2     dedicated two weeks ago.

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

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

17                    Ojai is an agricultural community with  
18     citrus groves, and they are fighting for -- they want  
19     400 units of affordable housing there. This is going on  
20     all over the state with nobody having any voice in the  
21     cities and towns that we live in, and the counties. And  
22     you are right, there should be supervisors here  
23     listening to this. And that's what we need to do, we  
24     need to get people to listen.

25                    You look like you are listening, and I

1 hope you are hearing.

2 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

3 Next we have Sue Beittel, followed by Joy  
4 Dahlgren.

5 SUE BEITTEL: My name is Sue Beittel, and I  
6 live within almost walking distance of this hotel. I  
7 live in an Eichler house that I bought for \$25,000 in  
8 1961, where Terra Linda was a entry level community. I  
9 am a strong believer in good collaborative planning.  
10 Much of it has to occur at the local level, or it has to  
11 be at least fine tuned at the local level.

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

22 I need to say, as somebody in the 85 plus  
23 group of people, that there are many others like me who  
24 live in this area. That those over 60 now comprise  
25 about 25 percent of our population. And that number is

Page 42

1 going to go, during the course of this plan, to well  
2 over 40, it's expected to go to 45 percent. And these  
3 people will either age in place in their houses, move to  
4 senior housing, or downsize into some of the affordable  
5 units that we are talking about providing.

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

9 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

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

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

20 I think it's much more sensible to  
21 provide, rather than new buildings for low income  
22 people, to provide rent subsidies for low income people.  
23 There are a lot of ways to provide low cost housing.  
24 One is sharing housing, and as people get older they  
25 could also rent their rooms. Second units are another

Page 43

1 way.

2 I guess inclusionary development having  
3 units disbursed in new developments, that's the way that  
4 we should be providing affordable housing, rather than  
5 large structures that -- and one that's being proposed  
6 is very remote from transit. These are just not the way  
7 to deal with that problem. And I think the problem  
8 probably starts with the state legislation. And I would  
9 like our elected officials at the local level and at the  
10 regional level to start assessing that legislation and  
11 seeing how it is dysfunctional in many ways.

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

16 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

17 Next we have Vincent Welch followed by  
18 Brendan Burke.

19 VINCENT WELCH: My name is Vincent Welch, I've  
20 lived in San Rafael since 1960. (Speaking Russian.)  
21 During the Korean War I was a naval officer, Russian  
22 language, working at the National Security Agency.  
23 (Speaking Russian.) This meeting reminds me of a  
24 government plan of the Soviet Union in operation. Top  
25 down, no bottom up. This is not Brigadoon, it's a brig.

Page 44

1 Thank you.

2 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments,  
3 sir.

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

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

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

25 The final thing are related to the

Page 45

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

D1-X3

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

19 And ABAG sails along like its own ship,  
20 doesn't hear any of this. You people need to go back to  
21 the think tank and realize you have got the wrong plan,  
22 and the wrong approach. We support affordable housing,  
23 just come up with something where the people are  
24 involved, where everybody can work something out we can  
25 all live with.

1 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

2 Do we have any other speakers?

3 We do need you to fill out a speaker card  
4 just so that we get the correct spelling of your name.

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

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

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

12 JOAN CHAPLICK: She just started.

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

17 JOAN CHAPLICK: Dyett & Bhatia.

18 JIM BITTER: Do we know what they cost the  
19 public to put this monstrosity together? We don't. I  
20 couldn't find it. We have a group called ICF  
21 International. 17 to 25 million dollars in federal  
22 government to draft all this, you know what. It's in  
23 the federal EPA, it's in the California EPA. It's a  
24 carb. It's what's behind SB-375. It's what's behind  
25 AB-32.

Page 47

1                   So the meter is running. But it's -- you  
2                   guys are getting it right, because the visiting  
3                   sessions, you can't make a reservation, you couldn't get  
4                   in, because you got filled up real quick, but some  
5                   people came anyway. Judy Arnold and Susan Adams were  
6                   kind of annoyed that people were disruptive, and some  
7                   people actually came from the East Bay.

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

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

23                  This is a great place and we know how to  
24                  do it. Martin drove his dry-cleaning truck. In here it  
25                  says prohibiting trucks from idling for more than two

1 minutes. I, I, we know how to do that. We don't need  
2 this bureaucracy. We don't need the federal government  
3 telling us how to live our life. This is a great place  
4 because of us, not -- you need to drive out 580, across  
5 680 and look at the stuff they are building out there.

6 And we should put our supervisors on the  
7 bus with all their belongings and make them, make them  
8 go live out there, because we don't want that in Marin.  
9 And you don't represent us, do you?

10 JOAN CHAPLICK: I'm the moderator.

11 JIM BITTER: You are the moderator. Great.

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

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

24 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

25 And I have a comment card from Barbara

1 Salzman. And then, are there any other any other  
2 speakers?

3 If you could give your card to Ursula,  
4 she will pass it over here.

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

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

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

16 There's a repeated reference to the fact  
17 that the more rural areas have more resource impacts. I  
18 think that's a major flaw in the document, because our  
19 101 corridor, our major corridor goes right by the tidal  
20 wetlands and all the endangered species habitats. And  
21 you also don't even mention endangered species, which  
22 was sort of shocking, because our major endangered  
23 species in the Bay Area, well we do have a few others,  
24 but are connected to tidal marshes. And we have a  
25 number of those, actually, right out here, (inaudible)

Page 50

1 creek, Corte Madera.

D1-Z2

2 A third issue I wanted to mention is a  
3 need for clarification about how your, how you're  
4 considering the priority development areas. Because  
5 there are certain ones identified in Marin County, they  
6 are not real clear how, you it's not easy to find them  
7 out, it would be very good if you would put them, list  
8 them in the document.

D1-Z3

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

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

21 JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

22 Next we have Stephen Nestel?

23 STEPHEN NESTEL: Yes.

24 JOAN CHAPLICK: And then followed by Marjorie  
25 Macris.

Page 51

D1-AA1

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                         We are the people under the juggernaut.  
12 And soon, as history shows, that the people in power  
13 will be the ones falling in front of the juggernaut. I  
14 just warn you to pay attention to the democratic  
15 process. We believe in our democratic process.

16           JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.  
17 Marjorie Macris. Okay. Just, don't rush, please, be  
18 safe.

19           MARJORIE MACRIS: Sorry. My writing isn't too  
20 good. It's Macris.

21           JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could just tilt the  
22 microphone down so we can hear you.

D1-BB1

23           MARJORIE MACRIS: It's Macris, M-a-c-r-i-s.  
24 And I'm speaking on my own, I'm not representing any  
25 organizations. I think that the one critical comment

1 that I have, even though I think that the idea of having  
2 a regional plan makes a lot of sense, and your idea of  
3 concentrating development in locations that have transit  
4 and other services is a very valid one, and it's  
5 something that has been an established principle in  
6 Marin County's plan, and for 40 years, but the one major  
7 criticism I have of this document is that it does not  
8 take into account the effects of sea level rise.

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

18           BCDC has done that, and you just choose  
19 the year 2040, which is the time horizon of the plan.  
20 But if we know this is going to happen beyond that, it  
21 seems to me that a good plan needs to take into account  
22 what we know is going to have major impacts on any  
23 development potential in Marin and around the rest of  
24 the Bay Area. And then coupled with the repeated  
25 emphasis on, we have to streamline CEQA, that is

1 particularly illogical due to the fact that the plan and  
2 the EIR don't really show what the impacts, particularly  
3 of sea level rise, as well as other impacts, are going  
4 to be on these Priority Development Areas.

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

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

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

20           BRAD PAUL: A number of speakers asked why  
21 there weren't members of the county board of supervisors  
22 here, and several of them called me, because they are  
23 meeting right now, their regularly scheduled meeting is,  
24 unfortunately, at this time. So they wanted to be here.  
25 I'm just, I'm telling you where they are.

1 JOAN CHAPLICK: We do have some additional  
2 hearings coming up. Carolyn is going to review them for  
3 us.

4 (Discussion had off the record.)

5 (Public hearing resumed.)

6 JOAN CHAPLICK: I have a speaker card here.  
7 So I have L. Crocker.

8 LILIE CROCKER: That's correct.

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

15 LILIE CROCKER: Yes, my name is Lilie Crocker,  
16 I live at just at Marin Lagoon, bought the house in  
17 2007. I'm a widow, have lived in San Rafael since 1966.

18 JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay.

19 LILIE CROCKER: I was told by my neighbor  
20 that, when I had gone to City Hall, that there's no use  
21 to come to these meetings. I went to the one with  
22 supervisors in, in San Rafael. And we were many. Here  
23 we have, and very knowledgeable people, but I was told  
24 by this person that it's absolutely useless. We are  
25 fighting City Hall, we are fighting Sacramento, we are

Page 55

1 fighting Washington, D.C. And we are, limited  
2 government is no longer the goal. It is growing  
3 government.

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

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

23 But I'm reminded that if you get  
24 something for free, you don't really take care of it as  
25 much as you have strived to work for yourself up, and

1 it's your money, you take better care of things. And I,  
2 I think, I was reminded by the, by the gentleman that,  
3 whatever happened to cruise ships, highrises? And  
4 cruise ship was -- sure, a nice man, a Russian person,  
5 but if you go to Moscow and you see this urban  
6 landscape, whatever, these highrises are slum money, and  
7 not, not many of them occupied. And is that what  
8 you want to happen in Marin?

9 Besides --

10 JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. That's it.

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

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

16 I have a speaker card --

17 Sir, if you could --

18 (Interruption in proceedings.)

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

21 JOAN CHAPLICK: Sir, if you could --

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

24 URSULA VOGLER: We have a process, sir.

25 JOAN CHAPLICK: I have my speaker card --

1 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I just  
2 want to know when the court reporter's comments will be  
3 made available, to us, the public?

4 You are not going to make the recording  
5 available, how about the comments? That's all.

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

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

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

17 So for those of you who have already  
18 spoken --

19 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is the  
20 juggernaut.

21 URSULA VOGLER: Just to answer your question,  
22 sir, through the public record document request you can  
23 make a public records request, we can send you those  
24 transcripts. Okay. So through info@onebayarea.org you  
25 can request --

1 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sixty days,  
2 ninety days after the period is done.

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

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

7 URSULA VOGLER. Asked and answered. Thank  
8 you.

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

11 SUSAN WERNICK: I just have one quick comment.  
12 I've lived in Marin my entire life. I work retail in  
13 Novato. I speak to people daily about this project, and  
14 there is very little awareness among the general public  
15 about what is going on. I understand you have a  
16 website. I'm someone who is linked into that. I get  
17 The One Bay Area updates, but most people do not.

18 So, I, my question to you, or my  
19 suggestion, perhaps, is that these meetings should be  
20 printed not in an article buried in the newspaper but an  
21 add that your organization's paid for and put out. They  
22 are carefully printed, they are in all newspapers of the  
23 Bay Area. We have so many people that are not clued in.  
24 We have thousands of people in Marin County that still  
25 do not know what the SMART train is, and yet the tracks

Page 59

1 are already being laid.

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

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

18                   JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

19                   Do I have anyone who hasn't spoken yet?  
20 Any additional speaker cards?

21                   Okay with that we are going to close the  
22 public comment period.

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

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 ) ss.  
 2 COUNTY OF MARIN )

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the  
 5 discussion in the foregoing public meeting was taken at  
 6 the time and place therein stated, that the foregoing is  
 7 a full, true and complete record of said matter.

8 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
 9 attorney for either or any of the parties in the  
 10 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way  
 11 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said  
 12 action.

13

14

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have  
 16 hereunto set my hand this  
 17 7th day of May, 2013.

18

19

20

21

\_\_\_\_\_  
 SALLIE ESTUDILLO, CSR. 9060

22

23

24

25

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
FOR THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Oakland, California

Reported by: SARAH GOEKLER  
CSR 13446

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ATTENDEES

- Carolyn Clevenger - MTC
- Mark Shorett - ABAG
- Jamillah Jordan - MIG/Moderator

---o0o---

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to Notice of the Hearing, and on Tuesday, April 16, 2013, commencing at 7:04 p.m. thereof at Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 101 8th Street, Oakland, California 94607, before me, SARAH GOEKLER, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, there commenced a Public Hearing.

---o0o---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MEETING AGENDA

PAGE

Introduction by Jamillah Jordan 4  
Introduction by Carolyn Clevenger 7

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

PAGE

CHARLIE CAMERON 15  
MYESHA WILLIAMS 16  
DEVILLA ERVIN 17  
BRENDA BARRÓN 19  
PAMELA TAPIA 21  
WOODY LITTLE 23  
TEADORA TADDEO 25  
SIGNE MATTSON 26  
KASEY SAETURN 28  
JILL RATNER 29  
EVELYN STIVERS 30  
PETER SINGLETON 31  
PUBLIC SPEAKER 33  
JIM BITTER 33  
AZIBUIKE AKABA 35  
RACHEL HALLOWGRASS 36

---o0o---

1 Tuesday, April 16, 2013 7:04 p.m.

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 MS. JORDAN: Let's get started.

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

8 We may get some more sound in a moment.

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

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

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

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

25 We also have Mr. Pedro Gonzalez, who is the

Page 4

1 mayor of the City of South San Francisco.

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

4 So our agenda for the meeting is as follows:

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

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

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

21 A court reporter will provide MTC with a full  
22 transcription of the comments, and the court reporters  
23 are located right over there (indicating), as you see  
24 them. So please go ahead turn in your comment card form  
25 if you haven't already done that.

Page 5

1           I will read the names of each commenter in  
2 groups of three. We ask that you please line up and be  
3 ready to comment. Please state your name for the record  
4 and the city where you live. We ask that you please  
5 speak slowly so that the court reporters can get all of  
6 your information down.

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

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

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

23           And finally on a housekeeping note, I just  
24 want to mention that the restrooms are located towards  
25 the entrance. The women's is on my left and your right.

Page 6

1 And the men's is located on my right.

2 So with that, I want to go ahead and now open  
3 up the hearing and introduce Carolyn Clevenger from MTC  
4 who will provide a brief presentation on the EIR.

5 Carolyn?

6 MS. CLEVINGER: Good evening. Hopefully these  
7 microphones should work.

8 My name is Carolyn Clevenger. I work in the  
9 MTC planning section. I'm the project manager of the  
10 draft EIR that we'll be talking about this evening.  
11 Sitting next to me is Mark Shorett with Association of  
12 Bay Area Governments, which is our co-lead agency on  
13 this document.

14 The purpose of this public hearing is to  
15 present an overview of the plan and the EIR, as well as  
16 to receive public comments on the Draft EIR. Responses  
17 to all comments and questions will be provided in  
18 writing in the final Environmental Impact Report.

19 I'd like to note that the focus of this  
20 meeting is on the EIR; it's not on the Plan document  
21 itself. So we ask that you focus your comments on the  
22 EIR. And for comments related to the Plan, you can send  
23 your comments to [info@onebayarea.org](mailto:info@onebayarea.org), or you can also  
24 attend one of the Plan open houses and public comment  
25 hearings that are being held throughout the region, and

Page 7

1 there's a brochure at the table where you came in  
2 identifying the opportunities to comment on the Plan at  
3 those public hearings.

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

13           Just as some background to help provide some  
14 context, the Plan is a regional task. It's the first  
15 time we've done and integrated land use and  
16 transportation plan. It's required by Senate Bill 375,  
17 and it requires an integrated land use and  
18 transportation plan, which hits two specific objectives  
19 of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent by  
20 2035 and also houses the region's population at all  
21 income levels.

22           The Plan embodies local visions, in that it  
23 works with local jurisdictions to identify areas for  
24 growth; priority development areas. And it seeks to  
25 increase economic competitiveness while also preserving

1 the natural environment of the nine-county region.

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

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

22 Get to the transportation side. On the  
23 transportation side, the Plan -- the total revenues  
24 forecasted over the 28-year plan period of \$289 billion,  
25 just over half, 53 percent, is local fund sources. It's

Page 9

1 primarily sales taxes raised at the county level. The  
2 nine counties in the Bay Area have local sales taxes.  
3 There's -- approximately 15 percent of the funds are  
4 regional, as primarily bridge tolls. And then the state  
5 and federal funds kind of round out the revenue sources  
6 for the Plan.

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

14           In terms of how the funds are expended,  
15 88 percent of the proposed Plan funds are dedicated to  
16 operating and maintaining the existing roadway and  
17 transit system. The remaining 12 percent is split  
18 roughly evenly between road and bridge expansion at  
19 5 percent and transit expansion at 7 percent.

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

1 public services and recreation.

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

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

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

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

24 The "Transit Priority Focus," which was called  
25 Alternative No. 3 in the EIR, includes higher densities

1 near high quality transit, also includes a higher peak  
2 period Bay Bridge toll, which is used to fund additional  
3 BART and AC Transit investments.

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

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

20 It also is -- it eliminated uncommitted  
21 roadway expansion projects in that alternative,  
22 including the express lane network was eliminated in  
23 that alternative. And it charged a VMT tax that was  
24 used to fund additional transit investments in the  
25 region.

1           In terms of how the alternatives performed in  
2 the Environmental Impact Report, all of the  
3 alternatives, including proposed Plan, have similar  
4 impacts. Alternative 5 is identified in the EIR as the  
5 "environmentally superior alternative." It had the  
6 greatest reductions of GHG emissions, greenhouse gas  
7 emissions. It also had fewer emissions for toxic air  
8 contaminants and particulate matter emissions as  
9 compared to the other alternatives.

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

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

21           As Jamillah outlined, there's multiple ways to  
22 comment on the Draft EIR. You can comment orally at  
23 today's meeting. You can submit your comments in  
24 writing, either at today's meeting or mail, fax or  
25 e-mail to my attention by 4:00 p.m. on May 16th.

1           And I just want to note again that comments on  
2 the Plan should be made separately to  
3 info@onebayarea.org or at any of the public hearings  
4 being held on the Plan throughout the nine counties.

5           In terms of schedule, the comments period  
6 closes on May 16th. We will be presenting the comments  
7 in responses to comments to the MTC commission and the  
8 ABAG board. Those are the two bodies that will vote on  
9 adopting the Environmental Impact Report as well as the  
10 Plan, and we anticipate a final adoption of the EIR in  
11 July of this year.

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

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

16           THE PUBLIC: Yes.

17           MS. JORDAN: Sorry about that mishap there.

18           So now we will open the comment -- open up the  
19 hearing here for the public comment. And I want to  
20 mention that along with your comments, any questions  
21 that you may have will be included and responded to in  
22 the final EIR. Okay? So let's go ahead and get the  
23 process started. I'm going to call up the first three  
24 speakers, and we ask that you form a line there in the  
25 middle and speak when I call your name.

1           The first one is Charlie Cameron, followed by  
2 Myesha Williams, followed by Devilla Ervin.

3           Mr. Cameron?

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

D2-A1  
7           First of all, only three things that I want  
8 you to note. Being that the current Union City west  
9 side is now completed, I do think it is not going to be  
10 able to perform up to expectations. The design is  
11 pretty much bad. It's piss poor bad, the way the buses  
12 come in and the location for other things to include the  
13 taxis and pickup area and the kiss and ride. I'll be  
14 sending in corrections for the San Jose Diridon Station.  
15 The signs. I was in crisis one time, and I realized the  
16 signage was screwed up and could be better.

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

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

25           Bye.

Page 15

1 MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

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

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

D2-B1 7 I want to thank you for this opportunity to  
8 comment on the EIR. I would like to state my support  
9 for Alternative 5. And even though the Draft EIR  
10 identifies this alternative as "environmentally  
11 superior," we believe that the Draft EIR does not  
12 adequately analyze the VMT and greenhouse gas reduction  
13 that this alternative would offer as compared with the  
14 proposed Plan.

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

25 Currently, youth, seniors and

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

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

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

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

23 MS. JORDAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

24 DEVILLA ERVIN: Thank you.

25 Hello. My name is Devilla Ervin, and I've

1 been working with the New Voices Are Rising Project for  
2 a more sustainable and resilient Oakland since I was 14.  
3 I'm now 23.

D2-C1

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

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

21 This is what I fear for thousands of other low  
22 income families with the adoption of this proposed plan  
23 in the absence of additional mitigation. Without  
24 careful, conscious, deliberate planning, more low income  
25 residents will be pushed out to less attractive and more

Page 18

1 polluted parts of the region, while new transit-oriented  
2 developments attract new residents who have not  
3 historically found neighborhoods like West Oakland  
4 attractive.

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

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

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

19 Thanks for your time.

20 MS. JORDAN: Thank you for your comments, sir.

21 I'm going to call up the next three speakers.  
22 First will be Brenda Barrón. Next will be Pamela Tapia,  
23 followed by Woody Little.

24 Please come to the center of the aisle.

25 BRENDA BARRÓN: My name the Brenda Barrón, and

1 I'm currently a freshman at San Francisco State  
2 University. I was born and raised in Oakland,  
3 California, and I lived my whole life here.

4 I have seen many problems in the community,  
5 and I have been to different meetings and spoken about  
6 what can we change. One of the problems that concerns  
7 me most is public transportation because I take it  
8 almost every day to school.

D2-D1

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

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

25 When I was five, I was too small to understand

1 what was going on. But as I grew up, I've seen and  
2 heard what people say about transportation in their  
3 community.

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

11 MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments.

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

15 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

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

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

23 The assumption that low income residents will  
24 avoid moving farther away from their jobs and their  
25 homes and neighborhoods despite these areas becoming

Page 21

1 more attractive to other residents. Without significant  
2 addition investment in affordable housing and other  
3 anti-displacement policies, displacement will occur.

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

15 After months of desperate job hunting, my  
16 mother found a job in a factory in Union City's  
17 Industrial Park. My mom now lives in Manteca but has to  
18 commute to Union City for work. What used to be a  
19 30-minute drive now become a four-hour commute. She  
20 doesn't have a car. She has to take the bus from  
21 Manteca to Stockton, from Stockton take a train to  
22 Richmond, from Richmond take BART to Union City, and  
23 from Union City take another bus.

24 She now has to pay over \$60 a week (verbatim)  
25 just to travel to work. She works eight hours at an

1 8-hour dollar rate turns out to 64. So she spends \$60 a  
2 day and she gets \$64 a day also, she's only getting \$4.  
3 She knows she cannot work. She literally cannot afford  
4 to work.

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

9 MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments.

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

18 Thank you.

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

24 The Plan Bay Area document states that the  
25 Plan will place 36 percent of communities of concern to

D2-E2

D2-F1

1 risk of displacement, while the EEJ alternative,  
2 Alternative 5 -- in this plan, 21 percent face  
3 displacement risk, and that's already with the  
4 assumption that are perhaps flawed because they rely on  
5 this model that does not take into account  
6 gentrification pressures.

D2-F2

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

D2-F3

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

23 I imagine that if I was in high school and my  
24 family had to start paying significantly more income  
25 because stores in the area were now catering to other

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

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           Thank you.

17           MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

18           I'm going to call up the next three speakers.  
19 First we have the Teadora Taddeo, Signe Mattson, and  
20 Kasey Saeturn.

21           TEADORA TADDEO: Hello. Good evening. I'm  
22 Teadora Taddeo, and I'm also a UC Berkeley student.

23           I take great pride in being a part of a  
24 cutting-edge and progressive region. I want to look  
25 back in 20 years and find that my community was on the

1 right side of history.

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

D2-G1

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

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

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

19 Thank you so much for your time.

20 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

21 Next speaker.

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

D2-H1

24 A few concerns: At this point, first of all,  
25 the amount of public notice, it claims in the report and

Page 26

1 in the EIR, that you outreached so many times in so many  
2 places, but I only heard about this by accident about  
3 maybe two weeks ago now. So that's the first thing. If  
4 you seriously want some public input, you've got to let  
5 people know.

D2-H2

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

D2-H3

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

D2-H4

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

Page 27

1 MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments,  
2 ma'am.

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

8 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

9 KASEY SAETURN: Hi. My name is Kasey Saeturn.  
10 I'm a senior at Oakland High School.

11 So I just wanted to say that I would like to  
12 see more eco-friendly buses, because so far I've only  
13 seen, like, a couple hydrogen fuel cell buses, and  
14 that's only on one bus route. So this bus route runs  
15 along my school, actually. It's the 18 bus, and I've  
16 only seen it a couple times, and I just think it'd be  
17 nice to see more eco-friendly buses.

18 Also on another note, I'm a student. So after  
19 school or, like, before school, I take the bus to school  
20 and to work and stuff like that. But the fact is, in  
21 the morning, it's really difficult to actually get on  
22 the first bus and be on time for school sometimes  
23 because it's just so packed. Because it's so packed,  
24 I'm either late to school and work, and it just doesn't  
25 exactly work out for me.

Page 28

1           So -- and another -- like, I also have to  
2 actually stand at the bus stops because there are no  
3 benches where I'm -- where the bus stops I'm at, so it's  
4 kind of difficult to actually sit down and get  
5 comfortable in the morning or after work, even. So it's  
6 just really hard for me.

7           Thank you.

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

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

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

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

25           There's an assumption that the buses are not

Page 29

1 overburdened unless there's an 80 percent threshold in  
2 terms of available seats systemwide that's crossed, and  
3 I think what the students have said is that both buses  
4 and BART are overburdened now and would be even more  
5 overburdened under the proposed Plan.

D2-J2

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

13 Thank you.

14 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

15 EVELYN STIVERS: Hi. Thank you.

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

19 My name is Evelyn Stivers. I work with the  
20 Nonprofit Housing Association. I also live here in  
21 Oakland, and we will be submitting comments in writing,  
22 but I did want to bring up an important thing that I  
23 think is overlooked in general in the Draft EIR, looking  
24 it over. That is sort of the underrepresenting how  
25 important increasing transit investment is on land use

D2-K1

1 and how that can have a greater reduction in GHG  
2 emissions than is acknowledged in the Plan.

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

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

16 Thank you.

17 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

18 PETER SINGLETON: Peter Singleton.

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

23 But what I wanted to do was I wanted to thank  
24 the young people for coming, and I don't personally  
25 support Alternative 5, but I think the students that are

1 here are raising a couple of really important points  
2 that I hope that you folks considered.

D2-L1

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

D2-L2

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

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

17 MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

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

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

25 And this individual. Pardon if I butcher your

1 name. Decline Lastot (verbatim)?

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Decline to state.

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

5 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I note that the EIR includes  
6 \$14 billion -- I note that the EIR includes \$14 billion  
7 in nebulous, quote, "anticipated unspecified," unquote  
8 federal dollars. The Plan relies on the use of these  
9 dollars. The EIR is entirely flawed because this  
10 reliance accounts for fully 5 percent of the money  
11 figured into projects that affect the environment.

D2-M1

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

D2-M2

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

D2-M3

22 MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

23 Sir?

D2-N1

24 JIM BITTER: I'll just be a second. So my  
25 name is Jim Bitter, and we came up from Mill Valley, and

Page 33

1 we generated a lot of greenhouse getting here. So  
2 thanks for holding this, and I want to thank the kids  
3 for coming tonight, except that -- or I just heard  
4 \$14 billion and the cost of MTC and the cost of the  
5 consultants and the cost of the consultants to put  
6 together the EIR report and other consultants that are  
7 involved in the EPA, federal, state, CARB -- what did I  
8 leave out? California Energy Commission. It's all the  
9 same language. It's all the same industry that's  
10 pushing this thing. And that the kids in the gallery  
11 here are going to end up paying for this because the  
12 State of California is in the hole about \$80 billion,  
13 and the federal government is approaching 17 trillion.  
14 There's no way we can pay it back.

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

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

1 other things that are coming.

2 So anyway, thank you very much.

3 MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

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

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

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

20 And I also think that -- some good things that  
21 I saw in the EIR is the assessment of air quality and  
22 the inclusion of diesel, which we're going to -- you  
23 know, is a project of ditching dirty diesel. I think  
24 that looking at black carbon and actually incentivizing  
25 programs that address mitigation, even if at the

Page 35

D2-01

D2-02

1 regional level you can't actually enforce mitigation on  
2 a local level, you can put criteria in place for  
3 incentivizing good projects that get funded that  
4 actually mitigate those anticipated impacts.

5 That's it. Thank you.

6 MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

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

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

14 So our next speaker will be Rachel  
15 Hallowgrass.

16 RACHEL HALLOWGRASS: Forgive me. I came in a  
17 little bit late, so I don't know what everybody else has  
18 said, but I did want to say that while costs about a  
19 plan like this are certainly large, and the funding by  
20 its nature is certain, especially given that we don't  
21 know a lot about the future economy, I just wonder about  
22 the alternatives that I think not implementing a plan  
23 remotely like this will be much more expensive, more  
24 expensive to our children in terms of health, their  
25 economy and their ability to participate in a healthy

Page 36

1 world. So in the abstract, yes, this is expensive and  
2 ambitious, and, yet, the alternatives can be much worse  
3 economically.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. JORDAN: Thank you for that comment.

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

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

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

19 Have a good evening.

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

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, SARAH L. GOEKLER, CSR No. 13446, a  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, hereby certify:

That the preceding hearing was taken in  
shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time and  
place therein stated, and that the proceedings were  
thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my  
direction and supervision;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
hand this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SARAH L. GOEKLER, CSR

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
FOR THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, April 17, 2013

Martin Luther King, Jr. Library

San Jose, California

Reported by: AUDREY L. TAKATO

CSR 13288

Page 1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ATTENDEES

- Carolyn Clevenger - MTC
- Mark Shorett - ABAG
- Joan Chaplick - MIG/Moderator

---o0o---

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to Notice of the Hearing, and on Wednesday, April 17, 2013, commencing at 1:08 p.m. thereof at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Library, 150 E. San Fernando Street, Suite 225/229, San Jose, California 95112, before me, AUDREY L. TAKATO, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, there commenced a Public Hearing.

---o0o---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MEETING AGENDA

PAGE

Introduction by Joan Chaplick 4  
Introduction by Carolyn Clevenger 5

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

PAGE

IVANA YEUNG 13  
ED MASON 14  
MICHAEL LUDWIG 18  
DON CONNERS 18  
HILDA LAFEBRE 20  
JIM BITTER 21

---o0o---

1 Wednesday, April 17, 2013 1:08 p.m.

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

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

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

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

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

21 Our basic agenda is we will be having a short  
22 presentation by MTC planner Carolyn Clevenger. She's  
23 going to provide an overview on the Draft EIR, and after  
24 she concludes her presentation, then we will start the  
25 public hearing.

Page 4

1           We have with us two court reporters who will  
2 be transcribing all of the comments that they receive  
3 today verbally, and everything we receive verbally and  
4 in writing will all be treated the same way and  
5 responded to in the final Environmental Impact Report.

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

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

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

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

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

25           The hearing for Santa Clara County will be on

1 May 1st, and there's information on a brochure at the  
2 front table that has the location and time of all of the  
3 remaining -- the six remaining public hearings on the  
4 actual Plan itself.

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

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

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

21 A little background on the Plan. It's the  
22 first time in the region that we've done an integrated  
23 land use and transportation plan as required by Senate  
24 Bill 375. That bill does require that the integrated  
25 plan reduce greenhouse gas emissions or GHG by

1 15 percent per capita by 2035, and also that the region  
2 houses the region's population at all income levels.

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

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

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

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

1 Counties.

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

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

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

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

21 In terms of how the funds are spent,  
22 88 percent of the funds are dedicated to operating and  
23 maintaining the existing system, that includes both  
24 roadways, local streets and roads, highways, and transit  
25 operations, as well as transit capital replacement. The

Page 8

1 remaining 12 percent is split roughly equally between  
2 roadway and transit expansion.

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

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

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

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

23           Now, I had mentioned that the EIR evaluates a  
24 range of alternatives. This provides some detail on  
25 those alternatives that were evaluated.

1                   One alternative is the No Project, and  
2                   that's required by California Environmental Quality Act  
3                   to look at the "No Project," which is the existing 2010  
4                   land use and transportation network, as well as those  
5                   funds that are deemed to be committed.

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

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

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

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

1 maintaining the system.

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

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

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

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

23 However, the proposed Plan did include some  
24 benefits as compared to Alternative 5. It had the  
25 lowest vehicle miles traveled or VMT in the region per

1     capita. It also included lower levels of congested VMT,  
2     so fewer miles that were traveled in the region at  
3     congested conditions. And less agricultural and open  
4     space were converted under that alternative.

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

10            In terms on commenting on the Draft EIR, you  
11     can comment either orally or in writing at today's  
12     meeting. You can also send it by mail, fax, or e-mail  
13     by May 16th. Our comment period closes at 4 p.m. on May  
14     16th, and the contact information is listed there.

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

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

24            And then in June and July, we will be  
25     presenting summaries and responses to comments to the

1 MTC Commission and the ABAG Board, with the final  
2 adoption of the Plan and EIR scheduled for July of this  
3 year. And the final EIR will include, as we've  
4 mentioned, a written response to each comment received  
5 on the EIR.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 IVANA YEUNG: Hi. Good afternoon. My name

1 is Ivana Yeung. I'm with the County Roads and Airports  
2 Department.

D3-A1

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

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

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

16 IVANA YEUNG: Okay.

17 MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

D3-B1

23 And on Page 1-2-7, it says that there's going  
24 to be an increase in the number of seniors that will be  
25 in the downtown areas. I really find that hard to

Page 14

1 believe in the Bay Area. It might be happening across  
2 the nation, but there are two articles that basically  
3 say, nobody is going anywhere for the baby boomers that  
4 are retiring.

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

10 Also, there is no mention on Page 1-2-24.  
11 There's jobs and prosperity. There is no mention made  
12 of the corporate commuter buses. If they were a transit  
13 agency, they would be at about six or seven as the  
14 largest transit agency.

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

20 You know, if you've got all these commuter  
21 buses going around, it implies -- even in San Francisco,  
22 you've got 24 percent of the population that goes out of  
23 the city, and it's a consequence. If you are going to  
24 assign a housing allocation to San Francisco as an  
25 example, why -- we've got commuter buses going on. So

Page 15

1 they don't live where they work. You know, the company  
2 town is extinct.

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

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

D3-B3 16 Well, if you want to reduce the greenhouse  
17 gases, let's make -- you know, don't do anything and  
18 just let everybody kind of suffer, and then maybe  
19 they'll get the message, because eventually, they may be  
20 commuting with the fish as the sea level rises. So I  
21 think that needs to be a message that's not being made.

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

D3-B4 24 ED MASON: Yeah. And also, 75 percent of the  
25 jobs are half a mile off of a freeway exit, and only

1 25 percent are within the 88 rail stations. So there  
2 seems to be a mismatch that maybe we should be  
3 encouraging more commuter buses.

4 Are my two minutes up?

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

7 ED MASON: Sorry.

8 MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

9 If you do have additional remarks that you  
10 would like to share, feel free to add them to a comment  
11 form and turn them in, or also comment -- send  
12 additional comments by e-mail, fax, or mail.

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

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

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

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

1 we receive the comments.

2 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll make a comment.

3 MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. So I'm going to give --  
4 I'll give you a few minutes. If you have --

5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: So --

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

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

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

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

23 MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.  
24 Our next speaker is Don Connors.

25 DON CONNERS: I know an awful lot of very

D3-C1

D3-D1

1 intelligent and highly educated people worked very hard  
2 on doing this Bay Area Plan and the Environmental Impact  
3 Report, so I don't mean to impugn your competence or  
4 motives; however, let's look at the history of past  
5 projections.

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

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

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

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

24 Our next speaker is Hilda, and I will let you  
25 pronounce your last name.

D3-E1

1 HILDA LAFEBRE: Hilda Lafebre with San Mateo  
2 Transit representing Caltrain in San Fran.

3 I saw in the presentation four alternatives;  
4 however, you mentioned a fifth alternative. Does that  
5 mean that in the document we will see five alternatives  
6 or four alternatives?

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

11 HILDA LAFEBRE: Okay.

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

15 HILDA LAFEBRE: All right. Thank you.

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

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

20 JIM BITTER: I have --

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

25 If we don't have any more people wanting to

Page 20

1 speak, we will close the public hearing portion of the  
2 meeting.

3 JIM BITTER: I'd like to speak.

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

5 JIM BITTER: I have a card right here.

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

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

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

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

24 The consultants that are here, MTB -- or not  
25 MTB, but the -- I need to take a breath here. The

Page 21

1 Metropolitan Transit Commission, an \$11.5 million  
2 bureaucracy, the consultants, ICF International, the  
3 company that did the Environmental Impact Report, that's  
4 Dyett & Bhatia.

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

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

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

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

24           The next generation, the college kids at San  
25 Jose and other places, are going to pay for all of this,

Page 22

1 so good luck, because the old people are set. But you,  
2 you are going to -- they're going to be in your wallet,  
3 big time.

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

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

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

15 Thank you.

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

17 ---o0o---

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, AUDREY L. TAKATO, CSR No. 13288, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, hereby certify:

That the preceding hearing was taken in shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time and place therein stated, and that the proceedings were thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my direction and supervision;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_

AUDREY L. TAKATO

CSR No. 13288

*This page intentionally left blank.*