

## **3.10 Plan Hearings Comments on the EIR**



METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS  
PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA

ALAMEDA COUNTY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS – **COMMENTS ON DEIR**

Wednesday, May 1, 2013

Mirage Ballroom

--oOo--

CLARRISSA CABANSAGAN

That's okay. Hi. My name is Clarrisa Cabansagan. I am a transportation advocate at Transform. I am a long-time Alameda County resident. I went to Cal. I grew up in San Francisco and Daly City, and I want to say that I agree with what the Plan Bay Area is trying to do; trying to get us all to drive a little less and preserve our beautiful Bay Area. I went to transportation planning school because I realized how much of my life was determined by the choices that decision makers like you will be making in a few months. I'd like to say that I was pleased to see that the Environment, Equity, and Jobs scenario came out as the environmentally superior alternative. And I would like to urge MTC and ABAG to really look at what was modelled in that scenario, that increased transit operations funding, it reduced the scope of the highway network, put more affordable housing in communities where, you know, they weren't being planned for, and also put stronger anti-displacement measures. And I feel that, you know, we have the future of the Bay Area to look at. I feel that as someone who has lived here, who calls this place home, I work really hard to make sure that it works for everyone. So many of the people that I know are tripling -- doubling up in apartments. And that's kind of a testament to see the great need that we have. I'm proud to say that I got here on BART, and I biked from the BART station to here. And I think that that's why it's so important for us to invest in our existing transportation system, and to also improve transit and housing for everyone; not just people that can afford to live the way that they have been for so long. Thank you.

E1-A1

MYESHA WILLIAMS

My name is Myesha Williams, and I am here mainly to support two young activists that -- advocates that I've been working with for years, who are trying to make a way for themselves at this table. I just want to quickly say that I support -- I would urge you to include the measures around transit operation funding and anti-displacement measures that are currently in Alternative 5; the Environment, Equity, and Jobs alternative. Transit is really important to the communities that we come from, and especially to these guys that will be speaking today. Thank you very much.

E1-B1

PAMELA TAPIA

Good evening. My name is Pamela Tapia. I'm a student at the Peralta Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about the Plan Bay Area. I am here to urge you to modify the proposed Plan to increase the level of funding for transit and for affordable housing included in Alternative 5, and to also adopt the other anti-displacement measures in Alternative 5. Without more investment in affordable housing and other anti-displacement policies, displacement will occur, forcing longer, more expensive and more polluting commutes to low-income residents. In September of 2009, my mother lost her low -- her minimum-wage job. Her factory decided to pack up and move to South Carolina. As a single parent raising two kids, my mom depended on that \$208 to pay the \$700 rent on our apartment on the West Oakland-Emeryville border. She spent most of her check on housing and transportation. She decided to move her family to Central Valley where an apartment was half the price of our former home. But there are no jobs -- at least none that she was qualified to do the work. She had no option. She had to go back to do the same thing she had always been doing. After almost four months of desperate job-hunting, my mother found a job in the Union City's Industrial Park. My mom lives in Manteca, but has to commute to Union City for work. What used to be a 30-minute ride from our apartment near MacArthur BART turned into a 4-hour commute. Since she doesn't have a car, she would have to take the bus from Manteca to Stockton. From Stockton she'll have to take a \$20 Amtrak train to Richmond. From Richmond she would have to pay \$5 to get on BART to Union City. From Union City BART she'll have to catch another bus to her workplace, bringing the total amount to almost \$60 a day, just to travel for work. At a rate of \$8 an hour, working 8-hour shifts, she would make an approximate of \$64 a day. She would spend \$60 on transportation just a day. She literally could not afford to work. To avoid spending so much money traveling, she determined she would have to stop traveling. During weekdays, she would sleep in BART trains, riding the train until the end of the line, getting off and riding back down in the opposite direction; even sleeping on her job's cafeteria or on somebody's couch. I felt awkward writing this and even weirder reading this to you.

E1-C1

E1-C2

I'm not asking for your pity. That is not my goal, but these are the facts. This happens. The proposed Plan assumes displacement

will not result in increased rates in commuting from outside Bay Area or cross-commuting between counties. This assumption is not supported by historical trends and does not agree with my own experience. Thank you.

DEVILLA ERVIN

E1-D1

My name is Devilla Ervin. I was born and raised in Oakland. I urge you to adopt the transit operations funding and funding for affordable housing and other anti-displacement measures in Alternative 5.

As a young man looking to live on his own, I am deeply troubled by the threat of displacement in my community and other areas slated as Priority Development Areas. By underestimating the impact of displacement, I feel we are doing a disservice to the entire purpose of the Draft Plan. Displacement needs to be at the forefront of this conversation because you cannot cut down VMT and/or greenhouse gas emissions without dealing with this threat. Living in Oakland, I have known many people who find themselves being forced to leave their homes and communities that hold a sense of history and family to find housing that is less expensive. One example of this is my foster mother. My junior year of high school, she found a place that was affordable, but it was in Sacramento. She was still working in Hayward and was commuting up to five hours a day just to get to and from work. This is what I fear for thousands of other low-income families with the adoption of this proposed Plan in the absence of additional mitigation. By increasing investment in public transportation, affordable housing, and strategies to retain and build businesses that serve the existing community, the Equity, Environment, and Jobs alternative -- or Alternative 5 -- will go a long way towards addressing these concerns and mitigating the impacts of displacement. Without careful, conscious, and deliberate planning, more low-income residents will be pushed out to less-attractive, and more polluted parts of the city, while attracting persons who have not historically found these areas attractive. Plan Bay Area should not add to the list of issues residents already have to deal with. Plan Bay Area should be providing solutions and incorporating the strategies in Alternative 5 that makes it the environmentally-superior alternative, thus leading to a more sustainable and resilient Bay Area. Thanks.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS PUBLIC HEARING  
ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA CONTRA COSTA COUNTY /REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF  
PROCEEDINGS

Monday, April 22, 2013

COMMENTS ON DEIR

AVON WILSON:

E2-A1

Chairpersons, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Avon Wilson. I have lived at the same residence in Lafayette for 43 years. I am requesting that ABAG and MTC extend the public review time for both the Draft Plan and its Draft EIR. As we know, the plan is 160 pages. The Draft EIR is over 1,300 with many supplementary technical reports. Staff and consultants have been working on the plan for many years. Most recently, your bodies extended release of both documents by three months for fine-tuning, allowing an equivalent amount of time for what could be the most important public review is right and fair, providing parity between the public and those interests cited in the plan as stakeholders. In representative democracy such as ours, the primary stakeholders are the folks who elect the local, state, and state federal representatives, the folks who pay the bills, the public. We elect representatives to govern in our place so that we might do the other tasks necessary to producing a viable country. As follow-up, we are charged and required to review and approve our elect elected representatives' job performance and work products. Properly, a plan of this magnitude should be submitted to the public for a vote. Short of that -- short of that, an extended public review time of these documents is essential. It is self-evident. ABAG and MTC should provide for no less. Thank you.

E2-B1

DANIEL DEBUSSCHERE: Okay. Great. I submitted a question, trying to be positive about the plans, and the EIR and the question was phrased like this: I did a word search on the digital copy of the plan. And I word-searched for BART parking. There was none. This kind of gave me the impression that the plan is slightly slanted to someone's vision on how all the MTC funds should be spent for the next 30, 40 years. Now, I live in Orinda. I live in a 3000-foot home on a half-acre-zoned house. I'm very happy. And when I read in the plan that the reasons you want dense -- multi-density-type of housing is because of the rising population of Asians and Latinos seem to favor this modality. Well, I can assure you, if you gave them the choice of that versus what I have, the answer is simple. The reason that you're going to the dense multi-family, 20-units-per-acre-type of planning as defined in SB 375 is strictly an economic thing. And, quite frankly, it's driven by development efforts and development people who were in the Speaker of the House's office when 375 was drafted. So that's the special interest stakeholder. Now, I think you need to broaden the plan. You need to put quality of life in what it is you're doing. This stack-and-pack is only serving one interest. And it's not serving your clients and it's not serving us who live in the communities who have to accommodate these things. Thank you very much.

KATHLEEN JENKINS: Hi. Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Kathleen Jenkins. I live in Orinda and have been a proud member of Orinda for 17 years. I'm one of these people that are firm believers in free market economy. What does this plan presume? There is a plan for stack-and-pack housing in Orinda. If there was an interest, wouldn't these already be built? Because they're not already there, this means there's no market demand for this type of housing. If there's no demand, this means people don't want the type of housing you are suggesting. And that means that these will need to be heavily subsidized with public funding. If you put the stack-and-pack housing close to our Orinda public transportation, this suggests that you'll need to replace existing land use, which leads us to the need for eminent domain. Why would any city allow others to take the power to decide land use away from other cities and citizens who support the local community and schools and put it in the planned hands of others who don't live there and don't support the community? Furthermore, your plan and Draft EIR concedes

E1-C1

that past decision by residents and current preference in survey responses indicate that 60 to 70 percent of all new homes are requested to be stack-and-pack. Where is the empirical evidence that people's preferences will dramatically shift towards wanting to live in pack-and-stack housing. Thank you for your time.

**E2-D1** HEATHER PRUETT: My name is Heather Pruett and I live in Orinda; been a resident there for about 13 years, and I have two points to make. They're both fairly concise. The first has already made, but I want to make it again because it's very important. A very short time ago, in late March, ABAG released the Bay Area Plan, Plan Bay Area, it's development plans. One comment people may be aware of, it's 160 pages long, and along with it comes the 1300-page Environmental Impact Report. ABAG putting a deadline for concerned citizens to read all of that and respond by May 16th is completely impossible; it's unreasonable, and I am requesting that the deadline be extended by an additional 90 days. That's the first point. Second point I want to make is that ABAG really could not be forcing an increase in housing supply and pushing the unwanted stack housing, especially in small communities like Orinda, at a worse time. It doesn't make any sense to me when we've had over three-and-a-half million people leave this state and go to other states due to high taxes, due to high unemployment, which has not gotten any better. And, meanwhile, I work full-time at a very large utility company, and I'm starting to see a lot of people my approximate age group starting to retire. And where I'm going with this is we all know a lot of the baby boomers are starting to retire. A lot of people are starting to retire. In particular, there's about 78 million born between 1946 and 1961 who are going to be retiring in this area. They're going to be leaving, a lot of them are. We've seen the trend. We don't need more housing. This is the worst possible time to be adding in mass development stack housing when people are leaving, and that trend is clearly going to continue.

**E2-E1** JOHN DOE: I oppose Plan Bay Area, including but not limited to, all low income, high density stack-and-pack housing projects. Organizations such as OrindaWatch.org and Pleasant Hill Citizens for Responsible Growth have identified a plethora of community population growth, overcrowding, crime, police, educational, land use, vehicle use, tax, funding, and environmental issues, which are not adequately addressed by Plan Bay Area. So I have several questions related to this, and one of them was identified by Evelyn, the first speaker, and that is, why is Plan Bay Area, a plan of such great magnitude, not being presented to the citizens of the Bay Area, including Contra Costa County, for their vote. Governor Brown put on all those tax increases in the last election on the ballot. Why can't this, if it is such a great plan, be put on the ballot for the citizens to decide? I realize it's not required by law, but if all of you believe in this plan as you specify, why can't you put it on the ballot for us. Plan Bay Area requires **E2-E2** 80 percent of all new houses to be stack-and-pack. Where is empirical peer-reviewed evidence that percent of Bay Area citizens want to live in high density stack-and-pack housing. SB 375 requires unfunded mandates on counties and cities to be identified. Where is the analysis in the plan and the Draft **E2-E3** EIR that would cost the continues and cities of these unfounded mandates and the impact of this cost. **E2-E4** Why is there zero funding in Plan Bay Area for more schools, police, and fire protection needed for the population growth identified in the plan. Where in Plan Bay Area is the analysis of the impact of low- **E2-E5** income, high-density stack-and-pack housing on the property values of surrounding properties and the crime rates of applicable Bay Area communities. Since the plan impacts all nine Bay Area counties and all 101 cities of the Bay Area, why doesn't Plan Bay Area include city by city as well county by county economic and environmental impact analysis. Thank you.

RUSTY SNOW:

**E2-F1** Hello. I am Rusty Snow. I'm a member of the non-partisan group called Orinda Watch. Last month, Orinda Watch had a very large town hall meeting with over 325 people. From that meeting, our surveys indicated the majority of citizens opposed losing local control of their small towns. It appears the majority of citizens opposed the Plan Bay Area and its concepts of regionalism. Should policies like the Plan Bay Area be decided by the citizens and through Democratic process or should the fate of its existence be decided by an outside agency. Would the administrators of the Plan Bay Area do the right thing and allow

E2-F2 the Plan Bay Area to be decided by popular vote. No. 2, I agree with the other people that the plan and the EIR should be extended to allow people to have time to review it and to make comments. Our concern with the Plan Bay Area is that we do not believe in many cases that is based upon logical assumptions or accurate facts. Concerning this, I have the following questions: What right does ABAG have to mandate that the stack-and-pack housing be built if this ruins the character of our small towns. The plan calls for housing near mass transit. Why would anyone want to live next to BART. Have you ever tried to take a nap next to a BART train. That's kind of a loose comment, maybe a little simplistic. But I think that's a quality of life, is being able to take a nap during the day, etc., and BART is extremely noisy and not good for living next to it. Wouldn't it make more sense for businesses to be located next to mass transit like BART and housing located away from BART. The Plan Bay Area poses the exact opposite of this. Would stack-and-pack housing have an impact on adjacent property values? Has this been carefully analyzed. If the joining properties are negatively affected how are the property owners going to be compensated. Are there not laws that address the responsibility on governments if their actions cause property values to drop?

PETER SINGLETON:

E2-G1 Thank you, Madam Chair. Peter Singleton. While this isn't a hearing on the Draft EIR, I wanted to point out that one of the greatest deficiencies in the environmental review process is a sham process with a predetermining conclusion. And, with that in mind, I'd like to share with the public here where the Plan Bay Area exactly came from. The plan itself on page 3 says that it comes from SB 375 and that the plan's policies elements were developed by consultation and through the input of the public, the Bay Area citizens. This is not entirely correct. Plan Bay Area, in all essential policy elements, came from the Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area that was released July 29th, 1999, the Draft Plan. That's years ago by the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development. And the Bay Area Alliance was a collection -- a coalition of very powerful corporate interests, nongovernment organizations, and it was run by ABAG and MTC, but each policy element of Plan Bay Area; so the need to live in high-density housing, the need to take transit, the requirement that all cities be demographically even and that we need to move toward regional governance. Those were all part of the draft compact. The only thing that's missing from the draft compact is anything about greenhouse gas emissions or climate change because that rationale had not been discovered. So it's not entirely correct for the Plan to say on page 3 that it comes from SB 375. Actually, SB 375 comes from the compact. And, further, the plan did not -- the policy elements in the plan did not come from the public whatsoever. Thank you.

TERRY THOMPSON:

E2-H1 My name is Terry Thompson from unincorporated Alamo. This is all about central planning; didn't work in the Soviet Union and it's not going to work here. Julie, you said ABAG consists or composed of elected officials. I didn't vote for you, I didn't vote for any of the ladies up here. There are three kind of government. We have city government, we have county government, we have state government. There's no such thing as regional government. Regional government is non-existent. It's illegitimate. If you want public input, and you say that's why we're here tonight, there's one way to get public input. That's to put this for a vote. You have a 1,300 page EIR, which almost guarantees no one is going to read it. Maybe that was the design. So, as I recall, I went to a meeting down in Oakland and you had a big screen up and you had a bunch of options and various options of what you could do, what you were deciding on. And it seemed to me there was one option we can choose to be hung, another we could have a firing squad, or we could lethal injection, or maybe death by a thousand cuts. I think that's where we are now. There was one option, though, that I did like. My personal favorite was called "No Project." I said, you know, we want local control. And my wife just told me, "You mean, we don't want loco control." So I'd urge all of my friends here in the audience to demand of their cities, their towns, Get out of ABAG. We're doing this now over in Danville. They're going to agendize it. Corte Madera has already done this. I recommend that all of you get out your pitchforks and your torches and go to your town councils and get us out of ABAG.

SUSAN CALLISTER:

Good evening. My name is Susan Callister. I live in Lafayette. I'm a member of the Happy Valley Improvement Association board and part of the Lafayette Homeowners Council. I was a little bit concerned at the beginning of this evening when someone up there said that this particular thing was going to be going through in July. I do remember smart growth about nine or ten years ago, attending a meeting, and thinking, "Oh, God, I hope this doesn't go through," and it didn't. So I think a lot of the people that were up there this evening that asked you to sort of stand up to the plate and put this up for a vote -- and I'm sure there's money to be found in some of the grant money that's dangled around the communities that are designated PTAs, and you can you use that for a vote in Contra Costa County. The EIR and your Plan have some unrealistic forecasts for jobs, households and, you know, you refuse any kind of independent analysis. You know, I believe there's global warming. I believe we need to have housing for everybody in our community and help those that need help, but I don't believe that you're the decider of that. We are. Our communities are. Our downtown plan, our general plan, not this one Bay Area thing. So I urge you to listen to some of the people that spoke tonight and put it up for a vote of the people. And then a second thing on the PTAs, at least for our community, it seems as though our staff gets grant money dangled at them. So last year we had our street torn up for almost a year to get pink sidewalks and some trees torn down, and I don't know why we did it. It did put some people to work, but not for very long, and the outcome wasn't good. So once again, I ask that you stand up and you put it to a vote of the people. Thank you.

E2-I1

CHET MARTINE: My name is Chet Martine. I reside in Orinda. I've been there 12 years. My wife's been there over 45. I'm a retired patent attorney. I volunteered in the 8th grade middle school in San Francisco for a few years. I was a trustee for two years for a local deceased family, and I'm now a student of ABAG. My concern is the large unreimbursed cost impact on cities such as Orinda, the impact of the RHNA and housing element process on cities. This impact was increased by a March 30th, 2005 decision of the commission on State mandates. Per that decision, cities will no longer be reimbursed for their costs working on the RHNA and housing element process. In a service-matters issue -- this is on the website. You can look at it: Service matters. There's tens and tens. In that issue in July/August 2005, ABAG commented on that decision and said, quote, "Without reimbursement from the state, ABAG and other COGs" -- and that means cities such as Orinda -- "are simply not in a financial position to perform the next RHNA process." A question for you then is: What has ABAG done or will it do up-front before a city infill is built in their city? To assist the cities' abilities to work on the RHNA and housing element tasks, there was no mention of any such financial assistance in service matter issues after 2005. For example, will ABAG stop requiring cities to pay a membership fee to ABAG to partly offset this decision? For clarification, I do not mean the so-called incentives that could be paid to a city after completion of low-income housing. Lastly, I reserve the right to file with ABAG/MTC other comments in writing and without limit on the time I take to write them and without a limit on the number of pages.

E2-J1

E2-J2

Thank you. That's my protest against limiting to two minutes. And concerning air pollution, the mitigation standard in best practices was to locate balconies away from the polluting highway. That's crazy.

E2-J3

LINDA DELEHUNT: Hi. It's getting late. We've all heard so many wonderful comments. I can't believe the passion in this room, so I'm not going to belabor my particular points too because so much has been said. But I would just like to point out that it does appear that the concerns voiced here tonight point to a real process gone awry, and I believe you people can perhaps correct it, but I do think we are hearing about a process that's really gone awry. We are talking about a 1300-page document, which is about to be implemented before it has been adequately shared by our citizenry. And again, that points to a process that's really gone awry. The process itself needs to be revisited. I urge you, first ask citizens if they want to be a part of ABAG. That's the first question. Once you have confirmation, establish citizens oversight groups and then do individualized plans based on the unique individual characteristics of the communities

E2-K1

involved. If we don't do that, our Bay Area will ultimately become faceless, and that is not something that I think any of us want to see. So please, revisit the process. Thank you for listening.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA MARIN COUNTY – **COMMENTS ON THE DEIR**

REPORTER'S  
Monday, April 29, 2013  
Marin Center  
--oOo--

ATTENDEES  
PAT EKLUND, Mayor of City of Novato  
STEVE KINSEY, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
KATIE PRICE, Marin County Board of Supervisors, District 2  
--oOo--

P R O C E E D I N G S

RONNIE TEYSSIER

Hi. I am Ronnie Teyssier. I am a resident of Tamalpais Valley. I will be short and succinct. There are a lot of people who want to have their voices heard tonight. But I urge you to remove TamAlmonte from the Highway 101 Corridor Priority Development of the Bay Area. Mandating development as planned will cause irrevocable damage to the environment. And it will also subject the most vulnerable of our citizens to extreme environmental impacts, such as sea level rise, water deficit, toxic air contaminants, unacceptable traffic congestion. Again, please. I really urge you to remove TamAlmonte from the Highway 101 Corridor Priority Development of the Bay Area. Thank you much.

E3-A1

CRAIG THOMAS YATES

Craig Thomas Yates, City of San Rafael. I believe that the TODs that are going to be developed for this development should be a hundred percent accessible. And the fact that it's also the wetlands should be taken into consideration for the conditions that are expressed in the Draft EIR. And thank you.

E3-B1

JESSE SHEPHERD

Well, good evening, Board of Supervisors. My name is Jesse Shepherd. I am a resident of Santa Rosa. And I am here affiliated with Transportation Equity with Marin Grassroots. And I'm here actually tonight because I support the EEJ -- That's the Environment, Equity and Jobs initiative because compared to other services, it pretty much invests an additional 8 billion dollars in increased transit service, which would be tailored to fit our more equitable housing distribution plan. One of the things that concerns me is that I've been a transit user for -- a public transit user for my entire life. I grew up in Marin; lived in Strawberry for the first 20 years of my life. And the problem is, we don't have adequate public transportation serviced by Marin Transit, serviced by Golden Gate Transit, at night. We have pedestrians that can't get to and from the canal who have service jobs at Larkspur Landing, who have to walk under dangerous walkways. And we have people that can't get home. I know personally I have had to spend probably hundreds -- maybe as much as maybe a thousand dollars in the last two or three years just on cab fare to get home because, well, there were not public transit routes running at 11 o'clock, maybe 10:30 -- 11 o'clock, 12 o'clock at night that were adequate. And it is really important for somebody like me because I'm legally blind in one eye. So I depend on accurate, solid, firm public transit. And I feel that we need more of that in Marin County. So if that means that Marin Transit has to help, you know, get more funding for that, then we need to work on that. And that's hopefully what I hope that you guys would take into consideration. Thank you.

E3-C1

ERICKA ERICKSON

My name is Ericka Erickson, and I live in San Rafael. And I am -- I am affiliated with Marin Grassroots. I am also a County Planning Commissioner. I would like to ask everybody that's here to support the Equity, Environment Jobs scenario of the Plan Bay Area to please raise their hands. Basically for the ones that don't know, the environment and jobs -- environmental -- Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario was proposed by a network of health -- public health, affordable housing, and other grassroots groups back in 2011, when this Plan Bay Area was being proposed. And basically this scenario, it was considered the environmentally superior scenario from all the scenarios proposed during this process. And basically the -- by adopting the strongest aspects of this environmental -- Equity, Environment, and Jobs scenario in the Plan -- the Final Plan Bay Area, it would support transit operating budgets by about -- increased by about 5 percent. As we heard from Jesse, it is very needed. .... We

E3-D1

know that this scenario will result in the greatest reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. That's the primary goal of Senate Bill 375. It will create the strongest shift from cars to transit, walking, biking, and other alternative means of transportation. We will keep a hundred percent of the new development; would keep the current urban footprint; and allocate 12 fewer residents living in homes that we will be at risk of flooding sea level rise by 2050. I know that a lot of people in Marin County -- We are all concerned about sea level rising. So that option of the Plan will be the best to address sea level rising. The 30,000 fewer residents will be subject to sea level flooding by 2050, if we adopt that option. So I want you to urge all the decision makers to really consider the strongest aspects of this scenario in the Final Plan Bay Area. Thank you. And also have more incentives for affordable housing. I am -- as we know, we have a great need for affordable housing and also diversity of options of housing in Marin and the Bay Area. And that would support -- This option would support that. So -- But my main -- biggest concern, in terms of the Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario and the Plan Bay Area, and I want to urge you and all the decision makers to support this scenario and the aspect of it is regarding climate change.

CATHY CORTEZ

E3-E1

My name is Cathy Cortez. I'm a member of Marin Action Coalition for Equity and The National Low Income Housing Coalition. I am from Tiburon, California, and I support Equity, Environment, and Jobs. Marin County needs affordable housing. There have been opponents of the regional housing needs allocation and the population growth predictions that say the numbers are too high. But even as it stands today, the need for affordable housing is very real. One indicator that is reflective of that need is the fact that there are nearly 8,000 households on the Housing Choice Voucher Section 8 waiting list. That number -- That list has been closed since October of 2008. And even then it was only open for a one-week period of time. Marin needs affordable housing with or without population growth. The need is very real as it stands today. Thank you.

LOIS RIDDICK

E3-F1

Good evening. My name is Lois Riddick, and I'm -- I live in Marin City -- A Marin City resident, of course. And I've been advocating for Marin City, as well as throughout the county. And my concern is that -- I do support the Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario. It invests an additional 8 billion in increased transit service. And why transit service is so important to me personally, and to many people that make contact with me by e-mail or in person, I find that there are hillsides that are not accessible through the transit services. And I've been going to meetings. I've been writing letters and been advocating as a part of the housing and transportation committee, also serving as a commissioner on the Division on Aging. And so it is important that we look at the bigger picture. And I depend totally on transportation. I am disabled, and I am a senior. So I am coming from two points. I want you to consider that there is -- is that you see this commercial on TV; less and more. We need more transportation for seniors. We need this transportation because it allows the seniors across the county that are lonely to get more involved. There are seniors that are still volunteering. There are seniors that are getting older; perhaps would like to stop driving. But if we don't have the services accessible to those seniors, they will not be able to have their lives fulfilled in the way that is needed. Thank you.

LINDA RAMES

E3-G1

I am Linda Rames, and I am actually here to comment on the Draft EIR. It is full of inaccuracies and inadequacies. The most striking thing about it, however, is the total disregard for the residents of Marin now and those to come. One document -- Excuse me. This document has no problem building on floodplains, and there are no answers or mitigation for that.

E3-G2

It has no problem with the lack of water. The only mitigation for that is conservation; something Marin County is very good at already. In fact, we are famous for it. The police, fire, and schools that will have to be built -- They will have to be built, but they

E3-G3

don't give you any idea how that will happen; who is going to pay for it. Things like that.

E3-G4

These are just a couple of examples of a failed document, which also makes false predictions of population growth and employment opportunities in the future. In addition, there is no distinction between planned and potential development areas. They should clearly be spelled out in the Plan. Thank you.

LUKE TEYSSIER

E3-H1

My name is Luke Teyssier. I am a resident of Tam Valley. I am concerned about the environment, the community, the place we live. I have small children. I am concerned about water, the quality of life, the quality of air, and the quality of living. I feel that equity, environment, jobs, schools, housing, and a clean, safe place to live for everyone is extremely important, which is why I urge you, urgently, to remove us -- Marin County -- from Plan Bay Area. I urge you to remove us from the Priority Development Area. I urge you to forbid ABAG and MTC to exert control in our community. I would like to remind you -- to say it plainly -- I am opposed to Plan Bay Area. However, if you insist, I support the "no-action plan." Let us have local control over our community. We've done a pretty good job in our communities for the last 50 to 100 years of planning what needs to be done, which is why people want to live here. Let us have that local control. Now, I've heard advocates say, "Let's have ABAG because there will be all this money." Where does the money come from? It comes from us. What happens? The money goes to a big organization over there. They take their cut. They have their offices. They have their bureaucracy. They have their big show-and-tell sessions. Has anybody ever seen a Jimmy Stewart movie, the western, where the big fancy suits from New York come in, and Jimmy

Stewart sits there and says, "Now just wait a minute. Wait a minute. I know that's not right"? Every single time I have a meeting that involves ABAG, I have the same sense. Supervisor Kinsey, during the Citizen Marin Meeting, I noticed that you showed up in time for the news cameras, sided with the folks in favor of Plan Bay Area, and then removed yourself before the discussion happened inside. I submit that this is extremely problematic for two different reasons: The first one is, it appears to the casual observer that you have already made a decision, regardless of community input. Secondly -- I submit that by refusing, after you were invited cordially and multiple times by multiple people to enter and remain in the meeting, I submit, sir, that you have had many opportunities to receive local community input and were simply not interested.

PETER HENSEL

**E3-I1** Peter Hensel, from Corte Madera. I am very interested in water. Where are the water for 2.1 million new residents by 2040 going to come from? I think there is a serious disconnect between the Plan Bay Area and water supply, and it troubles me greatly because in 2001, Governor Gray Davis signed a couple of bills -- SB 610, and SB 221. They were companion bills. They require that big developers submit a Water Supply Assessment Plan before going forward. Now, there is a threshold of 500 units, below which you don't have to submit a Water Supply Assessment Plan. But considering the fact that Plan Bay Area is -- I think it's planning for 600,000 -- Let me -- Wait a minute. 600,000 -- 634,000 housing units by 2035. I mean, that's an incredible amount. That's 1,268 times 500. So I would say that Plan Bay Area is not exempt from submitting a Water Supply Assessment Plan. It is just absolutely not reasonable considering the fact that in California we are fighting over water all the time. Now, climate change is a reality. We all know that. We -- Even the most diverse oppositional foes here agree on climate change. But along with climate change, there comes a variability in weather. I mean, some places have super storms; other places have droughts. It is getting very difficult to forecast the weather. And this makes it also very more problematical when you start planning for so many people. I recently read something that the farmers in the Central Valley this year will be getting 20 percent of their contract water supply on account of a low snow pack in the Sierras. I think in the three months from January to March, we got 52 percent of what we normally get. I mean, this is very serious stuff. And so there's a saying in the water industry -- It's kind of an ironic saying. They use this term, "paper water." What it means is, water that is planned for that may belong to somebody else in the system, or that may be coming according to future planning, some hoops that people are going to jump through -- Okay. But one thing I want to say is that we shouldn't be banking on paper water.

LINDA PFEIFER

My name is Linda Pfeifer. I'm on the Sausalito City Council, and I would like to comment on the Draft EIR and the process of -- which I consider flawed -- for community outreach. Plan Bay Area represents the single largest plan for high-density development perhaps in the history of Marin, and yet most residents know nothing about it. The lack of transparency for Plan Bay Area has, in my opinion, been pretty abysmal. Many questions exist regarding high-density development plans in so many gray areas that I am not sure whether to call this Plan Bay Area or Plan Gray Area. Gray areas exist regarding sufficient water supply; the lack of a water assessment plan; endangered, threatened species' habitat, air quality, and traffic congestion.

**E3-J1**

**E3-J2**

California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15065(a1) states that a project will have a significant effect on the environment if it substantially reduces the number or restricts the range of endangered, rare, or threatened species. One Priority Development Areas borders the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and in the middle of the Pacific fly-away where hundreds of migratory bird species, home to 38 rare or special status plant species; nine federally endangered, one federally threatened, 13 federal species of concerns. It is the home of the endangered Mission blue butterfly, and California red-legged frog. Other PDAs are in environmentally sensitive areas prone to rising sea levels, in the middle of fragile marsh and wetlands ecosystems or landfill.

**E3-J3**

I have three core requests: Please delay the May deadline for the public comment on the Draft EIR; please, ABAG, provide resources at the local, individual city level to hold public hearings in individual cities to fully inform the residents, who still really know nothing about this high-density plan because the people of Marin deserve transparency; not Plan Gray Area. Thank you.

**E3-J4**

please explore other options beyond high-density development to reduce co2, carbon, such as tele-commuting;

ROBERT BUNDY

**E3-K1** Bob Bundy, Corte Madera. I am on the Corte Madera Flood Board. And we've spent a lot of time locally dealing with our infrastructure and the ability to be more resilient and withstand flooding, heavy rainfall, and high tides. One of the concerns that I've got is that the Plan doesn't really take into consideration sea level rise. And while I applaud the goals of trying to reduce co2 because that's what's driving climate change and sea level rise, we really need to look at how this is going to impact some of these development areas and some of the infrastructure, as far as the roads and transportation. The development is going to have to be hardened and protected in a way to prevent sea level rise from impacting it, and also to not create an island where the highways or transportation corridors are not going to allow anybody to get to those islands. FEMA is about to come out with new flood maps, and even FEMA is not really taking into consideration sea level rise in its full extent. So I think that that -- I know it's being thought about in relationship to the Plan, but I think it really needs to be addressed to a much greater extent to really look at what the total cost of some of these would be, and whether some of the locations for priority development really make sense. Thank you.

LIZ SPECHT

I am Liz Specht. I've lived in Mill Valley for 37 years. 23 years ago, I co-founded a non-profit, El Porvenir, which works with people in Nicaragua to put in clean water projects. It's the water that I'm concerned about. Even now, MMWD is asking us to conserve. If there are thousands and thousands more people living in our county, we're really going to have to think: Where does the water come from to give everybody who is thirsty a drink of cold water? We're going to have the problem that Nicaragua has. And if you're thinking that desal is the answer, think again because that would be counterproductive. Greenhouse gases are what we're trying to diminish by this Plan, but what's going to happen if there is a desal plan? It's going to add even more greenhouse gases to our air, and all of us are going to be enclosed in an even hotter bubble than we are now.

**Other Infrastructure Needs: Water, etc. Will be counterproductive if a desal plant is needed**

E3-L1

JOHN PALMER

Hi. John Palmer from Mill Valley. A couple of things. First of all, I agree with the speaker who came and said this is happening way too quickly. I'm not going to repeat what he said. I am just going to say, he is absolutely right. This is happening way too quickly. Not enough people are aware of it. Not enough people are aware of the implications of it. We really need to take the time to do it right.

E3-M1

The second thing is that a lot of Plan Bay Area is based on what I would call untested or unchallenged precepts. For example, the concept that high-density housing along an urban corridor will reduce greenhouse gases, that's just taken as a given. There's many, many, many similar precepts in this Plan which are really unchallenged. And I would like to see a really thoughtful challenge come forward. For example, that one, that high-density housing along transportation corridors will reduce greenhouse gas. It is obvious to all of us who live here, that if the transportation corridors become more clogged, it will have the exact opposite effect of not decreasing greenhouse gases, but increasing them.

E3-M2

If you really want to decrease greenhouse gases, the simplest possible way to do it is to increase public transit. I have a lot of sympathy for the people who stood up here and said they can't get around, they can't get through the canal, they can't get to their jobs. Every time we turn around, they're cutting, you know, public transit. So if you guys really care about decreasing greenhouse gases, then you should lobby very hard for increased public transit. That benefits everyone. And the only thing -- other thing I would like to say is that when the Plan Bay Area came out, there was an article in the Wall Street Journal. It was very telling; that what the Wall Street Journal said -- The headline of the article was, "California Declares War on the Suburbs." There's a lot of people here who believe that; that this is a centrally-planned, non-particularly -- not particularly well-thought-out way for people who have an entirely different set of benefits to be gained from it imposed on smaller communities that really don't have the power to resist. And I think that if you really take the time to get this right, you'll find that there is a way to empower the small communities to build more housing in a way that won't increase greenhouse gases. Thank you.

GUY MEYER

Hello. I am Guy Meyer. I'm a resident of San Rafael and of Marin County for the last 38 years. Sustainability starts in the present with existing communities, and I believe that sustainability is completely entwined with the essence of what democracy is. If you want to build a sustainable civilization from the ground, the people have to be completely connected to the process of decision making that affects them. Increasing density, increasing population, gradually -- and I'm old enough to see it. Maybe some young people haven't seen it -- lowers the quality of life. That's my opinion. California -- Excuse me. I believe that California needs a moratorium on all large or grand-scale developments. It's been the heritage, shall we say, of California since the 1960s. There is a book in the Civic Center I saw 25 years ago called, "The Destruction of the Golden State," written in 1967. The story has never ended. The story has never been challenged, and it seems to me that this process is giving a green light -- it is giving a jet-pack to the developers who are just hungry. It is a fantastic opportunity for them and not for the people of California and the Bay Area.

E3-N1

Fresh water. I can't believe how we take this for granted in California. I was trying to look for the details or something in the computer to see. I know that in 2006, a grand jury was convened in Marin County and wrote a report about our fragile water supply. Back in the 1980s, we coaxed the population to start getting water from the Russian River, ending our own self-reliance on our own water. That Russian River water may be taken away from us at any given time with more drought. How do you take care of your existing community? What is your oath of office to your residents that have voted you in, as opposed to the people who may want to move here someday, and God bless them wherever they are? The problem of taking care of the people where they are might help them where they are too. Locating people near highways is directly putting people in harm's way; exhaust,

E3-N1

particulate matter. There's been studies -- major studies that have shown that. Marin County has pretty favorable weather conditions; may not be as bad as Fremont or other places, but still, it's not good. California needs a new vision of local independence and strength gained from local manufacturing; things that we've completely lost. Anyways-- dependence on the building industry is not sustainable.

RICHARD HALL

**E3-O1** Thank you. I am Richard Hall. I live in San Rafael. Supervisors Kinsey, Rice, and Mayor Eklund. Thank you for having this time for us to speak. Plan Bay Area is supposed to reduce CO2 emissions. It is one of its primary goals. However, the Plan is questionable based on assumptions that are flawed, and it is actually more likely to increase co2 emissions. It's also likely to contribute to

**E3-O2** 101 gridlock, serves a subsidization program for transit and housing that will needlessly tax Marin residents. Plan Bay Area claims it will reduce the region's greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent. But the Plan itself admits that if nothing is done,

**E3-O3** emissions would actually fall by 12 percent. So even if its assumptions are valid, the Plan only makes a difference of three percent. But the Plan is built on three highly-questionable assumptions; that high-density housing will lead people to drive less and take transit more; that transit emits less co2 per passenger mile than driving; that reducing greenhouse gas emissions is worthwhile no matter what the cost. The core premise is that high-density housing will increase ridership, but Portland has tried this. For 25 years, Portland has had one of the most aggressive transit-oriented development policies, and it has failed. The Cascade Policy Institute up there has found that people living in four and five-story transit-oriented developments built in that city are no more likely to take transit to work than people living elsewhere. In downtown Portland, during the most intense investment in MAX, their light rail, the share of weekday commuting on transit actually fell from 40 percent of trips to 36 percent during the past decade, according to the city's own auditor. So we are repeating past historic mistakes here. Why are we repeating them? There's no need for this. You should just look at Portland's failure. Plan Bay Area rewards the construction of high-density housing units near transit, such as right here in north San Rafael Civic Center SMART station. This is going to inundate roads and intersections that are already at capacity with added traffic, and yet have no measurable increase in transit ridership. It did not work. They do not take more transit. The second premise, that transit emits less CO2 per passenger mile than driving, also fails to stand up to scrutiny. Trains in Austin, San Diego, and other cities are like our SMART train. SMART has not reduced its -- released its co2 figures publicly. So if we base it on those similar trains, the average per passenger mile of a train like the SMART train will be no better than the average car in 2025. Golden Gate Ferry is three times worse than cars, and Marin and Sonoma County buses are as bad or worse than cars. So this is built on bad premises; bad logic.

TONI SHROYER

**E3-P1** Good evening. I'm Toni Shroyer. I'm a Novato resident and Marin County native. Currently the Draft Environmental Impact Report has failed with regard to public safety, and is developer-oriented and not public safety public-oriented. Public safety is essential to everyone. Developers advocate for best practices of management of multi-family dwellings of 40 units or more. Why? Because it is more viable or profitable for them. Profitability cannot have dominion over public safety. Adequate public safety should include all units; not just those of 40 units or more. Because of budget cuts, many cities and counties do not have a full complement of law enforcement personnel. This is true of staff of code enforcement officials as well. So my question is: Are we going to build even more units and stretch our current law enforcement personnel even further? The developers are being allowed to compromise public safety whenever they decide to build. For example, the California Tax Allocation Committee -- the CTAC -- allows nonprofit developers to have a 55-year tax exemption and are not held accountable for keeping their complexes free of crime. What we have seen in Novato, CTAC will request security cameras, security gates, and part-time security guards, and then the developer is deemed in compliance regardless. Clearly, this is not enough. There are two things we must accomplish: First, we must have best practices for all affordable and multi-family units, regardless whether they're clustered in 40 units or more. Two, there must be public safety impact fees imposed to developers to compensate for the stress placed upon the current infrastructure by high-density housing. Let's be people oriented; not developer oriented. Thank you.

FRANK EGGER

**E3-Q1** Supervisors and Mayor, Frank Egger, President of Ross Valley Sanitary District. Speaking for myself only; not the Board. I also serve as Central Marin Sanitation Agency Commissioner. We treat the sewage from two-thirds of San Rafael, all of the Ross Valley, and Corte Madera; roughly a hundred thousand residents. To my knowledge, no one from ABAG or MTC or One Bay Area Plan has ever contacted the Ross Valley Sanitary District regarding our system's current status and future capacity. One Bay Area Plan and its EIR are fairly flawed. The Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board meets Wednesday, May 8th in Oakland to issue the final Cease and Desist Order against our Ross Valley agency. We have major structural capacity issues. The estimated cost to repair in that capacity is 180 million dollars. The One Bay Area Plan calls for 1,446 new residential units in Ross Valley, and 2,246 new jobs. Sewer collection treatment capacity issues must be addressed. For the record, Fairfax is one of the most affordable communities in Marin. How did that come about? Fairfax has height limits. Fairfax protects existing rental units. I authored the ordinance in the '70s, during a previous term as mayor. We made findings in past -- what I called the "Affordable Housing Act." No apartment or multiple residential housing unit in Marin may be -- in Fairfax may be converted to a condominium. I was personally sued by a developer for loss of his income because Fairfax prohibited his condo conversion application for 127 apartments that he wanted to set up and sell individually. Case law was established as a result of the developer's lawsuit. Fairfax has never lost a residential unit to a condo conversion. Unless employees in our communities can earn a living wage, affordable housing will be out of reach for them. During another term as mayor, I authored Fairfax's Living Wage Law, and to this day Fairfax has the highest Living Wage Law -- wage ordinance in not

only California, but the nation. Protect existing affordable housing. Stop condominium conversion. Make sure -- Mandate Living Wage Laws in all of our cities.

KERRY STOEBNER

**E3-R1** Kerry Stoebner, Mill Valley. And I also want to identify myself as one of the members of the Marin Water Coalition that was here, I think, four years ago talking about the proposed desalination plant. And I think before we go further with the One Bay Area Plan, there has to be an identification of where the water is going to come from for this massive new development because we were told by MMWD that we were in crisis, that there was no more water, that we would run out of water unless we built a 400 million dollar desal plant; that contrary to the assertions that you want a -- greenhouse gas emissions cut down, a desalination plant uses nine times more energy than water obtained through conventional sources. And MMWD right now is the largest energy user in Marin. This is -- Not only that, but for our desalination plant that is proposed for Marin, we would take the water from our toxic -- the toxic hot spot -- San Francisco Bay -- that is filled with fire retardants, arsenic, pesticides, herbicides, and I do not think that these are all going to be removed via reverse osmosis. There are no safe levels for carcinogens. And that is what you would be asking us to replace our rainwater with from our seven reservoirs. We can be self-sustaining -- a sustainable watershed here in Marin, but not if we add the equivalent of an entire new town.

RAY DAY

**E3-S1** Hi. I'm Ray Day. I'm a resident of Marinwood; been in Marin County for over 35 years. Just to restate this for everyone in Marinwood, we are not against reasonable affordable housing. We just don't need a hundred percent affordable housing. And that's the problem. I am in favor of "No plan for the One Bay Area"; reason being that with the densities proposed and especially in our area, it doesn't fit Marinwood and its open space surroundings. We have a beautiful community, and we are going to go ahead and fill it up with these several-story units to go ahead and accommodate the hundred percent affordable housing.

The people brought up water as one of the issues that is in this area. I'll tell you, being from Southern California at one time, 90 percent of the water is imported in Southern California. And San Diego tried a program to recycle that water. Media got ahold of it, and they called it "Toilet to Tap." Okay, folks? That's what we are going to have; Toilet to Tap. So get used to it.

**E3-S2** The public needs to vote on this -- these plans. It shouldn't be left up for the discretion of public officials. They just don't have the common sense to vote for what we need. Please extend the deadline for the comment on the EIR. Thank you very much.

JAMES BITTER

**E3-T1** James Bitter, Mill Valley. I want to avoid saying what I really think, like having to tell Susan Adams that reading -- she is reading the EIR report; having trouble getting through it. That report wasn't meant for public consumption. It was meant for the benefit of the consultants and their numerous -- it costs across this country millions of tax payer dollars. It was meant for their benefit. I want to avoid the sight of Steve Kinsey standing next to the sign -- the guy with the sign, "Apartheid in Marin." I am a native of Marin. It was one of the most embarrassing things I have seen in a long time; Judy Arnold at the Board of Supervisors criticizing people. At the visioning meetings, people actually came from the East Bay -- Can you imagine that? People from the East Bay. And they were a little bit disruptive. They were slightly -- about as unhappy as this crowd is about what you're doing. But let me remind Judy Arnold that ABAG and MTC are in the East Bay. They're in the same building. Steve Kinsey is on the -- is a commissioner. \$11,000, I believe, that he got sitting on that Board. He is going to vote for this thing. The rest of the Board is going to vote for this thing. The Board of Supervisors -- I'm running out of gas here -- they appoint the planning commission. As we speak, they are working on 17 sites where we are going to have 30 units per site. We have to do this. The Board has appointed them. The Board is -- our Board of Supervisors is the Plan. God help us.

SUE HESTOR

Hi. I'm Sue Hestor, and I am from San Francisco. I couldn't come to the San Francisco meeting because I was at another hearing. I support regional housing needs allocation for San Francisco and, if anything, it needs to be increased. Part of the unknown problem to very many people is that we are losing middle class and low-income housing by the tens of thousands in San Francisco because of upscaling to the -- I was going to say dot com -- the techies that are coming into the City and other upscale people.

**E3-U1** The problem we have with the map is that San Francisco all along the Bay side is totally fill, a hundred percent fill. San Francisco grew by filling in the Bay. And we have marshes, and we have dead boats that are sunk, and the land is put on top of them that constitutes the San Francisco waterfront. At the same time, ABAG has this area as the area for growth of housing. I know this area. This area is not -- The only housing that can be built in this area, particularly south of Market, is high-end condos. We

**E3-U2** need affordable housing, and yet the Plan calls for in-fill development on areas that will never take affordable housing. And sea level rise is an inevitable problem. Right now there is -- sea level comes in -- the sea comes in to the old marshes. We had deaths in Loma Prieta in the south of Market. Everyone knows about deaths in the Marina. We had them in south of Market. Where can I submit a map? A map. I want to submit a map. SUE HESTON: I came from San Francisco. Damn it. I want to submit my map. SUE HESTON: I wanted to submit --

HELEN LINDQUIST

**E3-V1** I want to make a couple of comments. In the old days, marshes were filled in, levies were built, and they thought this was the way to go for housing and for farming. Now we know the value of marshes, and how they can protect the environment; how it is great for birds and in-coming tides, high tides. So let's not build any of this multiple housing on marshy areas. The SMART railroad is bad enough. It goes through a lot of it.

**E3-V2** The other point is that I'd like a true scientific check for ABAG and MTC to do for basing their whole raise-on-bet on greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gas emissions are not a problem. They've gone down since we're using more natural gas. SB 375, which links this transport to a reduction in greenhouse gases is false hearing, and we shouldn't rely on that. Just as we shouldn't stick with AB 32 by Schwarzenegger. If you know anything about carbon dioxide -- we all breathe it, as do cars. So if you want to help the climate, stop breathing.

SHARON RUSHTON

**E3-W1** Good evening. I'm Sharon Rushton. I am from the El Monte district in unincorporated Marin. And I'm representing Sustainable Tam El Monte, as well as myself this evening. The Draft Plan Bay Area's Draft Environmental Impact Report demonstrates that implementation of Plan Bay Area would cause 39 significant, unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts resulting in severe environmental harm and serious illness, injury, and loss of life. The severity, magnitude, and number of these impacts are astonishing. They include, but are not limited to: Impacts from insufficient water supply, inundation from sea level rise, exposure to hazardous materials, inadequate waste water treatment capacity, a net increase in sensitive receptors located in transit priority project corridors where there are high concentrations of cancer-causing toxic air contaminants --and fine particulate matter emissions. As well as additional environmental impacts --and sensitive --

CAROL SHEERIN

**E3-X1** My name is Carol Sheerin. I live in San Rafael. I've been in my house for 46 years. Some of you may have read my letter in today's IJ. I also e-mailed a copy to every town, city, county-elected official to make sure they read it. I -- the letter basically asks for all officials of every town, city, and county to band together and request a six-month extension on the comment period en masse for us to have time to handle all of this. It was pointed out by Susan Adams that it was a 1,356-page document, which is much too much to read. Democracy is not given a chance to work with this Plan Bay Area. One speaker mentioned elections when you ob -- all of you are up for election. I'd like to give you a reminder that the democratic process for holding our elective officials accountable is a recall.

PETER LACQUES

**E3-Y1** Peter Lacques, Fairfax, California. One minute; not enough time to comment. I have concerns in the Environmental Impact Report about water, supplies for the projective growth.

**E3-Y2** I also have concerns about the location of many of these PDAs in areas that will be subject to rising sea level rise, which also is not adequately addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

**E3-Y3** Fundamentally, according to ABAG's own handout, Chapter 5, Performance, I have questions whether this is the right way to go because the rationale for this is to increase affordable housing to reduce greenhouse gases. ABAG's own numbers indicate that as a result of the Plan, low-income people earning under \$38,000 after this is implemented will be spending 74 percent of their income on housing and transportation, versus 72 percent now. That's actually increasing the cost of housing and transportation; does not seem very effective. Likewise, commute times are going to either remain the same or increase. It does not seem to be addressing affordable housing or transportation.

ANN SPAKE

**E3-Z1** First of all, one minute is not enough to make comments, so mine will be in writing -- my detailed comments. I've spent at least 50 hours trying to read in detail the EIR on this Plan, to understand whether it really takes into account the things that we need it to address for sustainability, and I find it to be completely deficient. Again and again it states that the impacts are significant and unavoidable. I would suggest to you they are very avoidable. It consistently and repeatedly basically identifies and discounts the serious impacts that it states. The -- one of the fundamental flaws in it is that it addresses -- says it can only address the effects of the projects on the environment, but it cannot address the effects of the environment on the project. And I assume the project is people -- involves people.

MARGARET ZEGART

**E3-AA1** I'm sorry to take the time. On Page 1.2-25, it says, in the DEIR: PDAs are nominated by local jurisdictions to appropriate places to concentrate future growth; existing neighborhoods by transit to provide a larger range and also to have a better, more friendly environment. Now, you people know that 250 percent of the new housing is going to be on floodplain. It's absurd. It doesn't meet equity; doesn't meet any standard at all. I hope that you will -- I appreciate all you do for us in the county. I really

do, but this is a mistake, and you can correct it. I don't -- I wonder if you can get -- grant us the money you've already accepted for two transportation projects because that seems to be tying down your good judgment.

PLAN BAY AREA PUBLIC HEARING  
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 8, 2013  
NAPA COUNTY ELK'S LODGE

**COMMENTS ON DEIR**

No comments on the DEIR at the Napa hearing.

Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, April ,  
Hotel Whitcomb

COMMENTS ON DEIR

STEVE WOO

**E4-A1** Good evening. My name is Steve Woo. I'm from Chinatown CDC here in San Francisco. We would like to call out today Section 2.3 of the draft EIR, which identifies potential adverse impacts due to the implementation of this plan. Specifically called out in Section 2.3 it is what the EIR considers the community's disruption and displacement. The draft EIR actually identifies that the addition of new housing units and commercial spaces in priority development areas could stimulate demand and attract new residents and businesses, resulting in new development types, higher prices and leading to displacement of existing residents. The draft EIR also projects that this plan will significantly increase density within the Bay Area's densest urban centers, which will impact local land uses, desirability and rents, resulting in what the EIR considers, quote, "permanent localized displacement and disruption." In addition, this plan calls for 160 major transportation projects around the Bay, impacting over 12,000 households. And the result of this called out in the draft EIR is specifically the potential to disrupt and displace communities. So regardless that the draft EIR goes on to list mitigations for these impacts, the mitigations are an important thing to note because under the new CEQA streamlining laws, provisions of SB 375, if a project satisfies mitigations, the project can go forward in the new streamline CEQA process. So taking a look at the mitigations is very important; however, the mitigations in the EIR do not go far enough, and, frankly, are deficient in addressing the community disruption and displacement concerns. So what we would like to see and to have commented for the record is further analysis in the EIR, an analysis of mitigating long-term impacts of displacement and disruption of communities, further analysis of housing affordability needs within PDA today compared to post-plan implementation and how increased density within the PDAs will impact affordable housing needs. Analysis of how to link housing density, which the plan calls for, to creation of new affordable housing for low- and moderate-income folks to offset displacement. And also, principle of one-to-one displacement -- one-to-one replacement and relocation of all low-income households directly displaced by the Plan's transportation projects. Thank you very much.

JOEL RAMOS

Good afternoon, Supervisor Mar and Commissioner Halsted. I really appreciate the opportunity and the format that this is -- that you are all facilitating here. For full disclosure, my name is Joel Ramos. I work for TransForm. I'm Senior Community Planner there. I'm also appointed to the MTA Board of Directors. I'm not speaking on behalf of the MTA tonight. Tonight my opinions are my own and TransForm's. I am a resident of San Francisco and work over in Oakland. We are deeply supportive of the direction that we're heading.

**E4-B1** We don't think that we got it all together yet, but we're certainly headed there. We're really happy that the EEJ alternative, the scenario that we suggested, emerges the environmental and superior scenario, and we hope that you will -- that the Commission will move towards adopting the strongest elements of that scenario.

What we are concerned about is a couple of things that I think most folks have already mentioned this evening: The lack of really addressing the affordable housing needs that are going to be -- that are going to come to the Bay Area with this plan. We're particularly concerned that we found that in the plan that after build-out, even in the best case scenario, we're expecting people of lower incomes to spend a full 73 percent of their incomes on housing plus transportation, and we don't see that as a sustainable way of controlling the sprawl that we're going to be trying to limit. What will happen eventually without stronger policies in place to protect that from happening, these folks will end up living further and further away from a place like San Francisco, and we will then encroach on our precious farmlands and open space that we're so fortunate to have in this Bay Area.

**E4-B2** The second point that we're mostly concerned about is something that Ms. Vaughan spoke to earlier, which is the idea of widening freeways. We understand that we need to make our freeway system more efficient, and one of the ways we can do that is simply by just refurbishing some of the lanes that are already in existence, turning them into high-occupy toll lanes and use those revenues to fund the transit that we so sorely need. That's all I have time for. I thank you so much for your service and look forward to furthering the conversation.

PETER COHEN: Good evening. Thank you. Peter Cohen, Council of Community Housing Organizations. I've heard a lot about affordable housing. Well, we're in that particular line of business as an advocacy coalition. I just wanted to remind us what's at stake here from a long-term vision standpoint. We're talking about going from regional development that's maybe 50/50 between urban and suburban development, something in the order of 65 to 70 percent of growth in more compact urban areas. And that sounds good, but what does it mean? What are the implications? For San Francisco, that means 92,000 new housing units, which is about 25 percent of all the new

**E4-C1** growth in the major cities of the Bay Area. 25 percent of all this new urban development is to be in this city. That's a high state for us. What does that mean at ground level? Steve Woo was here earlier from Chinatown Community Development Center who pointed out -- and interestingly enough, the EIR calls it "community disruption and displacement." That's some pretty interesting words, but that has been all along for our organization not an antigrowth perspective but concerned about the implications of growth when you particularly overload a system at the community level in a place like San Francisco. The report shows that under the proposed Plan Bay Area

## Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report

scenario, that the potential for displacement goes from 21 percent to 36 percent. For all the good planning and thinking and empathy that has gone on over the last three years, the proposed plan increases the potential for displacement from the existing 21 percent where we are already struggling to keep our community stable, to 36 percent. What are the mitigations and safeguards? There's no funding in the SCS for affordable housing. And I want to point out the folks who are here supporting affordable housing, that planning for affordable housing is totally different than funding for affordable housing. You don't get nothing out of the plan, unless there's dollars for that to be built. So this is an aspiration, not a reality. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don't see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we're still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. Thank you.

KATE WHITE

Good evening. Kate White. I've lived in San Francisco in the Mission since 1996, and I want to thank the decision makers, our leaders here and our staff for the many -- I think it's years. I was going to say months, but many years of working on this plan, and I am thrilled to see that it is -- I believe, 100 percent of the growth is planned within urban growth boundaries, so we're hopefully moving in a better direction away from sprawl in this region. So thrilled about that. I think the plan could be even better, and I urge you to look at the equity environment and jobs alternative. Some of the components there would add more homes, including affordable in places that -- where it really makes sense; where there's the most opportunities with more jobs, access to public transit, good schools. .... And I also think the EEJ alternative put some more incentives for cities to prevent displacement and supporting building homes that people of all incomes can afford. And so take a look at EEJ alternative and bring less traffic, healthier residents, fewer traffic deaths, more affordable neighborhoods and would do a better job in allowing our most vulnerable neighbors to stay in their homes. Thank you.

And also to -- I am still concerned that we are putting money into highway expansion. In this day and age, it's almost shocking when you think about it. In San Francisco, as you know, we're taking down the freeways, and we're creating wonderful parks, boulevards, more housing -- affordable houses, revitalizing places like Hayes Valley, the Embarcadero -- the Ferry Building would not have happened if we didn't get that freeway down, Embarcadero Freeway. So I really think we need to shift more money -- billions of dollars away from freeway expansion to transit, and as one of the 40 percent of San Francisco who does not own a car and doesn't plan to, I really would like to see our transit system working a lot better, and that means money and investment.

E4-D1

STARCHILD

Good evening. My name is Starchild. I'm a Bay Area native and San Francisco resident since 1995. I have been coming over here a lot longer than that because my grandmother lived in the city growing up. I oppose Plan Bay Area for a number of reasons, including things that other people have mentioned. The overall scope, I think -- the problem is simply that there's a failure to recognize that economic freedom works better. That means letting people make their own individual choices instead of having Government come along and make people's plans for them and confiscate their money to pay for them. I'm concerned about the lack of transparency in this process. It was mentioned that there was a 1,300-page or something report. You know, how much money did it cost to prepare that report? And how much is this overall planning costing? What are the salaries of the people involved in this planning process? And is there taxpayer limited government advocate representation in the actual nuts and bolts plan and not just these public meetings. There's a lot of things that we could do that I think would not involve the Government that would help the whole agenda, which, you know, is good in many ways. Reduce sprawl. We could make it easier to develop housing in the cities, reduce costs of permitting, reduce building code requirements, these kinds of things. We could de-criminalize hitchhiking. We could de-criminalize riding skateboards and bicycles on sidewalk in cities. Do things like that to encourage transportation. Stop criminalizing people for sleeping in their cars. Many people are poor and can't easily afford housing here, and part of the reason they can't afford housing is because property taxes are too high. That doesn't just affect owners; it affects renters because that gets passed along to renters. And costs that are imposed on business get passed along to employers in the form of lower wages and fewer jobs. The Government redevelopment also has a history of racism in this town. The Western Addition used to be the city's primary African-American neighborhood, was decimated by the city's redevelopment agency during the 1960s. Blacks were forced out in massive numbers and many businesses were forced to close. I urge you to take these things into consideration and include a less-Government libertarian perspective in the actual plan. Thank you.

E4-E1

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA  
SAN MATEO COUNTY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Monday, April 29, 2013

Crowne Plaza Hotel

**COMMENTS ON DEIR**

JEFF HOBSON

Hi. I'm Jeff Hobson. I also I work with TransForm, and we'll be submitting some more detailed comments in writing as well focused and more a bigger picture of this evening. I don't live here in San Mateo County. I live in Alameda County, but I can't go to Alameda County's meeting on Wednesday night because I'll be coaching a Little League game. And I see a little bit of similarities between the reasons that I coach in Little League and the reasons that I'm here this evening to talk about this regional planning. I also happen to participate in my kids' schools' PTA. I'm on -- I'm the treasurer of the homeowners' association in the condo I live in. And I do all of those kinds of things because I believe in collective action to try and make our lives better. I think we can do well by doing this planning. So I appreciate the work that all of you are doing to try and help make all of our lives better through that mutual planning. I also want to talk about freedom a little bit and talk to you about my wife's aunt who lives in San Mateo, not too far away. She just turned 70, recently retired from teaching at San Francisco State for many years. She still drives some, but she doesn't think that she is a safe enough driver to be out on the freeways. And she's probably not alone. And so she gets around almost entirely on public transit. Certainly, when she goes any distance -- she does come up and visits me and my family. And so she depends on having the freedom of having public transit available to her in order to be able to live her life. I hope that through this plan that we are able to do more investment in public transits. We would like to see more investment than is actually in the Draft Plan as it stands. So we notice that in the Draft Plan, the Draft Environmental Impact Report that came with it, looked at several different scenarios and found that one of them, the equity of the job scenario -- Well, it's the best one. So we'd like to see that.

E5-A1

BOB COHEN

Good evening. Thank you for letting me speak. My name is Bob Cohen, and my wife and I are long-term residents of unincorporated San Mateo County. I consider myself a pragmatic environmentalist, but I'm also an oceanographer and a certified consulting meteorologist. As a scientist, I'm very interested in the climate change debate, and I think that's portrayed as a small part of the One Bay Plan, but it's also shown as the Number 1 goal of the plan in the room next door. And I would like to bring to your attention some observations which have been ignored in the preparation of your plan, but they have a huge impact on the decisions you're making today. I have a plot here, which I'll deliver after I talk, of sea level of San Francisco from 1850 to present. It's available from NOAA data. It's public data, and you can see a constant slope during the entire period from 1850. Given that CO2 only started increasing in 1950 until present, there's no change in the slope of the sea level, which proves that sea level is independent of carbon dioxide increase. Similar plots are available worldwide, including Europe and New York City. And my question to you is, what verifiable assumptions are MTC and ABAG using for sea level changes, and how do they affect the climate change portion of the One Bay Area Plan? There's also a series of reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC. And they've so far issued four reports in their -- they have another one in preparation to be published in 2014. Fortunately, that was leaked to the press about two months ago, and I have here a plot from that report, which I'll also give to you afterwards. But this graph shows that temperatures have been stable, not increasing, since 1997. And you can see with the plot of temperature that the models are not predicting the observations. And so that the observations are now --

E5-B1

GAIL RAABE

Good evening. I'm Gail Raabe, a resident of Redwood City. When I read the Draft Plan and related documents, I was pleased to find these three statements: "The Plan will create livable communities, reserve open space and direct development within the

2010 urban footprint, promoting development and priority development areas, takes development pressure off the region's open space and ag lands. Open space preservation requires regional solutions." What I didn't find in these documents is any assurance that this plan will actually protect the region's important open space lands. The plan's draft EIR acknowledges that many of the transportation projects could induce further development onto farmland, open space and even into the bay. A good example are the 1,400 acres of salt ponds in Redwood City. The ponds are designated in open space in the city's general plan. They're under Williamson Act open space contract. They provide habitat for thousands of migratory shore birds. The scientists identify the ponds as important for marsh restoration. They're included in the approved expansion boundary for the National Wildlife Refuge. And finally, the site is threatened by potential new development plans. By all measures, the salt ponds are a great candidate for ABAG's priority conservations area designation. And yet when six local and regional groups submitted an application for consideration, the Redwood City council did not forward the application on to ABAG, so now there's a real concern. If the transportation improvement projects for Redwood City are implemented, they will definitely help Redwood City's award winning downtown plan. But these same transportation improvements will make the salt ponds even more vulnerable to future bay-fill development. There needs to be a strong regional mechanism in place to insure protection for the Bay Area's open space lands. This objective is a critical part of the Bay Area plan that has not been adequately addressed. Thank you.

E5-C1

JOSHUA HUGG

Hi. Josh Hugg. I'm a resident of San Mateo. And I came here 15 years ago as an engineer for Intel. I worked in R&D down in Santa Clara, and I wouldn't have even considered coming here had I not been given a salary that allowed me to buy a house. Points of my mortgage; took care of all my closing costs. By moving into my neighborhood of San Mateo, which is north central, which is also considered by MTC as a community of concern. I made it that much more difficult for my neighbors. And Silicon Valley is a very special place. We draw from an international pool of workers. All of them are -- have had similar deals that I had or even better. If you've -- the net result of the decades is, we've relegated over half of our workforce to commuting in, and a lot of those people -- you know, they grew up in our community. And when there was ever a chance to buy a house, they looked at the prices and just left. I'm very happy that we -- that we're moving forward with the sustainable community strategy plan because I think it helps address some of these gaps, maybe not aggressively enough. I would encourage you to look closer to the equity environment and job scenario for some of the proposals that it has. But we have to stop bleeding our communities. North central has some of the worst overcrowding. If you're not commuting into the county, then you're moving into overcrowded conditions. If you're graduating from college, more likely than not, you're moving right back in with mom and dad, and that only lasts for so long. So with the priority development areas that are being proposed, I would hope that we can maximize those high opportunity areas; access to transit, access to amenities. My mother-in-law takes advantage of that in Redwood City. More people need to be able to take advantage of those high opportunity areas.

E5-D1

WILLIAM NACK

You ready? Good evening. My name is William Nack. I've been a resident of San Mateo for 47 years. I'm here this evening to speak on behalf of San Mateo County Building Trades Council, representing 26 local San Mateo County construction unions.

E5-E1

While there will be some negative impacts from construction as a result of this plan, the Draft EIR and the plan itself missed a critical positive impact as a result of the proposed alternative; that being jobs, millions of construction industry jobs. In addition, the EIR in its mitigation measures should make policy recommendations encouraging or requiring project sponsors to pay the workers area standard wages and require local apprentices who are enrolled in the State of California approved apprenticeship programs to be part of the construction team. Without labor standards in the plan and the EIR, the transit-oriented housing that will be developed as a part of this plan will not necessarily benefit local workers or pay decent wages. Creating middle class jobs is a key to improving the health of our local communities. Decent wages will ensure the construction workers can afford housing in the Bay Area. This will allow them to travel fewer miles per day to get to work, thereby improving their health and decreasing air pollution from vehicles. Highly skilled and continuously trained local workers will be permitted and accountable to implementing the best environmental mitigation measures envisioned by the EIR for construction projects. The outcomes of the proposed mitigation measures in the EIR will depend on the quality and commitment of the workforce that will implement that. I look forward to working with you to implement these proposed amendments to the plan and the Draft EIR, and I thank you for allowing me to speak to you this evening.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION and ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA -- SANTA CLARA COUNTY  
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS -- WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2013 -- HILTON SAN JOSE

**COMMENTS ON DEIR**

SUSAN STUART

Hi, I'm Susan Stuart. I'm with the County Public Health Department. And -- which is a member of the Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative. We'd like to commend the regional planning bodies and the participating stakeholders for this innovative effort. The draft plan is an enormous step towards sustainability, as it prioritizes existing transportation and focuses on the location of housing near transit, the reduction of premature deaths from particulate matter, the preservation of ag land and open space and the investment in local projects that support focus growth through the One Bay Area grants.

**E6-A1** However, a major concern with the draft plan is the displacement of vulnerable communities that would result from the dramatic increase in the cost of housing and transportation predicted in the draft plan. The plan expects lower-income families to spend nearly three-quarters of their income on housing and transportation, leaving very little for food, clothing and education. This is both a financial burden for individual families, as people are saying, and a threat to the viability of the local economy. It also means that a large percentage of the population will continue to spend long hours in commutes to work, making it difficult for them to spend time with their families in their communities and difficult for them to get physical activity, which is so important in the prevention of chronic disease.

Another concern is the expected rate of injury and fatality collisions in the communities that will experience the biggest growth and the need to invest more heavily in projects that calm traffic and make roads safe for all users. Going forward, we ask that you continue to partner with Public Health and refine methods for measuring impacts on health. One example is the Integrated Transport and Health Impact Modeling Tool that was developed with MTC staff. This research determined that for every 1 percent increase in active transit commuting, the region could expect a roughly 1 decrease -- 1 percent decrease in mortality.

**E6-A2** We urge the regional agencies to continue to explore alternatives, including the Equity, Environment and Jobs Alternative, which was called the environmentally superior alternative in the draft EIR. Thank you.

CHRIS LEPE

**E6-B1** Hello. So my name is Chris Lepe. I'm the community planner for TransForm, a Bay Area transportation advocacy organization. And, you know, overall, we support the plan. Plan Bay Area is going to bring people closer to their jobs, and it's going to provide better transportation options. For the first time, transportation projects are being ranked in terms of cost-effectiveness and benefits for the environment and for communities. So this is a greatly superior plan from where we have come from before, from previous plans. And -- however, we do have few different concerns. In particular, the HOT lane network. So we are not

**E6-B2** opposed to HOT lanes, but we are opposed to adding excess capacity.

And so we would like to see, instead of the revenues from the HOT lanes go towards additional highway expansion -- what we'd like to see that instead go to is transportation options -- better public transportation options. For example, shuttles, you know, buses along -- express buses along the freeways and also a low-income pass to allow for low-income individuals as well as youth, a youth pass -- to allow them to be able to access different destinations. So I think the HOT lane network is one of the main concerns that we have, but we think that can be fixed. Also, we would like to see more funding for transit operations. So with the EEJ, the Environment, Equity and Jobs Alternative, there's actually a significant amount of additional transit operations projected as part of that plan that will help reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and get people from Point A to Point B.

**E6-B3** Finally, as we invest in communities such as low-income communities, we should try to avoid the displacement of people living in those neighborhoods. Because those are the folks that are dependent on our public transportation services. So we would like

**E6-B4** to see anti-displacement measures as part of the plan. And just -- I'd like to finish by saying that the EEJ alternative provides so many more benefits in regards to health, the environment and just improving the quality of life for Bay Area residents. Is that my time?

SUSAN M

**E6-C1** Hi, my name is Susan, and I'm from Gilroy. And I do want to say -- just add to what Jeff said about the population. Because people are leaving California. California is the highest-taxed state in the country, with New York, and it's going to get worse. So people are leaving, they are not coming in. So I've got to say that the -- that that has to be looked at again, because it's not going to reach that. But, anyway, I want to say, regarding -- I perused the EIR, the 1335 pages of the EIR, and what I see is total control over my life. It's in housing. It's in transportation. It's in land use, taking away from agriculture, ranching. We used to be the breadbasket of America, that's gone. Okay? You are opening up space that you say can be used by the public, no, we can't

**E6-C2** go on these lands anymore. They are going into open space to just sit empty. Is this to put on the solar things to run the energy we need for our electric cars. What I see is the total control of my life, and I did not vote for this.

I'm just going to address a small part of it, because it's got to do with the electric car issue. Have we looked at -- first of all, electric cars are cost-prohibitive. That young gentleman, Mr. Chen, who spoke first, he wants to get into something a little bit more cost-effective. That car will cost him 20,000 more than a gas-fueled car. They're poor performance. They've gone under

with taxpayer money. There's some failures in the Volt, with the engine fires. Fisker was billions of taxpayer monies that failed. There were recalls on Toyota Priuses. And my question is, where are the recharging stations going to be and how much are they going to cost? And what are the hours that are going to be needed to recharge your vehicle? I wonder if all of that has been addressed. And where is the -- this is electricity to recharge, right? Aren't we looking at limiting the use of our electricity? Where are we going to get that electricity?

SUSAN RUSSELL:

Okay. I'm speaking from the League of Women Voters of the Bay Area. We strongly support regional planning that coordinates Bay Area transportation and housing land use decisions to reduce greenhouse -- greenhouse gas emissions and to meet the region's full housing needs for people of all incomes, in accordance with SB 375. Done well, regional planning will protect our environment, improve our economy, increase social equity, conserve agricultural lands and make our lives safer and more secure. These are region -- issues of regionwide importance that require thoughtful regional policies.

The recently released draft EIR and the equity analysis provide a wealth of information that should be used to improve the draft Plan Bay Area approved for study. In particular, we note that the draft EIR identifies the Environment, Equity and Jobs or the EEJ scenario, Alternative 5, as the environmentally superior alternative among scenarios analyzed. The EEJ alternative also outperforms the other alternatives and most of the performance targets and equity metrics your agencies have adopted. Compared to all the other alternatives, the EEJ alternative would bring us less traffic, healthier residents, fewer traffic deaths, more affordable neighborhoods, and would do a better job of allowing our most vulnerable neighbors to stay in their homes. We urge MTC and ABAG to incorporate the best elements from the EEJ alternative and add key mitigations into the final Plan Bay Area to improve outcomes on a host of issues vital to the future of the region.

In particular, with regard to affordable housing, plan for sufficient housing affordable to low-wage workers in all infill locations with access to jobs and transit. With regard to displacements, strengthen the One Bay Area grant program to better incentivize local anti-displacement and affordable housing policies. Fund mitigations such as land-bagging and housing rehab. And with regard to health and active transportation, fund more active transportation and complete streets programs to maximize health co-benefits of physical activity and transit use and better mitigate air pollution.

LIBBY LUCAS:

Hi. My name is Libby Lucas. My background is environment and recreation. I probably shouldn't be speaking because I have yet to get ahold of the -- a copy of this document to really read it in hard copy. I looked at the transportation plan briefly today at one library, but the other libraries didn't have the documents. I think that my biggest concern is -- the meeting the other day, someone waved two or three pages in the air and said, These are all the wetlands that are going to be impacted. I think when AB 375 was passed, it was to address climate change. And I think the wetlands, marshes, are your best way of mitigating for car emissions. The equestrian capability is quite extraordinary. And yet if you -- if this plan is removing acres and acres of wetlands, I think that's highly questionable as far as overall planning. You know, the salt pond restoration is lovely, but it's a lot of open water. It doesn't do the same job the marshes themselves do. And so often your expanding of a highway like 101 is then impacting the marshes that are still there as a buffer.

And I guess my other concern is that with the density increase, you have to consider the schools and the libraries and the places for children to play. And the minute your population density gets to a certain point, they're the ones that are going to be suffering if they can't, you know, fly a kite or swing a baseball bat. So please look at the overall impacts that your plan is making. Thank you very much.

CAT NGUYEN:

Hello. My name is Cat Nguyen. I'm with the Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation, VIVO. And, first of all, I do want to thank the -- everyone who was part of Plan Bay Area. I feel like this is the first time ethnic communities, immigrant communities, refugee communities was really asked to be involved in the outreach. And there was a very active effort to get us involved in the outreach. So we do want to thank you. And the staff has been really great about that. In general, we do support the Plan. We do agree with TransForm and some of the other groups that the Environmental, Equity and Jobs Alternative is a plus to the plan, in general. The main emphasis we would like is affordable housing to low-wage workers in infill locations with access to jobs or transit. Thank you.

MICHAEL DITTMER:

Hi. My name is Michael Dittmer, and I'm from DeAnza College. I'd like to also voice my support for Plan Bay Area. But, like Chris Lepe, I'd like to support my -- voice my support for the EEJ option.

I believe that the money from the HOT lane should be used to support public transit options instead of simply more lanes in the road.

And I also believe that the displacement that poor and low-income people are facing in our housing should also be addressed as well. Now, there's a lot of people here who seem to think that we're going to, you know, tell people where they have to live, tell them what car they have to drive, and that simply isn't true. We need to think about the ways that our car-centric planning has ruined people's lives. Think about what New York City did during the 1960s under the design -- under the traffic planner -- who I believe his name was Robert Moses. And what they did is that they destroyed neighborhoods in order to build more highway. If that's not government intrusion in your life, I don't know what is. That is very clear and an example where we need

to empower people with our transit options and our housing options instead of limiting what they can do because they have to purchase a car and they have to drive on the highway.

The simple fact remains that if we were to put this to a vote, severe problems could happen. So, for example, when BART was implemented, there were certain counties like Santa Clara County that did not approve of the plan. And, as a result, BART was -- BART was fragmented across the Bay Area. The simple fact remains is that we need to coordinate our effort in order -- so that in -- for an example, like Plan Bay Area, so that we can get an effective solution. If Santa Clara County was to vote against the plan and Alameda County was to vote for it and then another county voted against it, we'd get fragmented implementation. And that would be worse for everyone, including those taxpayers who want their money well spent. The fact remains is that there are plenty of externalities to our car use. People are dying. There are about 40,000 people who die from car pollution each year because we drive cars. That needs to change. That costs lives. That costs money.

And, ultimately, we need public transit solutions that actually solve that problem. Ultimately, we don't need our public transit solutions to distribute money from the poor to the wealthy through the use of HOT lanes that would prioritize wealthy people over poor people, even when poor people pay for those lanes. Thank you.

CECILIA NG

Yeah, so Michael is a very hard act to follow, but I'll do my best. All right. My name is Cecilia, and I'm also from DeAnza College. And, first, I'd like to really thank Plan Bay Area for recognizing and honoring all points of view by having these faces, faces like these. I'd like to push for more -- like others said, to have more community voices speak in these things, and reach out to them so they can provide their input. And, specifically, I have come here today to show support for the Environment -- Environment, Equity and Jobs Alternative. And I'm -- I'm personally coming to speak as a person of color, a student who plans to study in the Bay Area and ultimately live in the Bay Area, work here. And, really, I'd like to show my utmost support for the EEJ, because it is the best. Because it's going to bring us less traffic, healthier residents and fewer traffic deaths and more affordable neighborhoods and it would do a better job of allowing our most elderly neighbors to stay in their homes.

E6-H1

And then, really, like, my perspective is that for the Plan Bay Area to continue, we have to look at long term and always keep in mind environmental justice. And for that to happen, we need to make sure that low-income people do not get priced out and left out of the planning. And for that to happen, I'd like to show my support for rethinking how we're implementing the new HOT lanes and to show support for better funding for public transportation, better public transportation options, such as BRT. And I'd like to also show support for protection against displacement; specifically, for people with low income in housing. And -- yeah. Thank you very much for your time.

MOUNIA O'NEAL:

Hi. I'm Mounia O'Neal. I just want everyone who is here and a student, raise your hand. Because I think it's really awesome. We brought a lot of people from DeAnza College, who are going to be transferring soon to colleges in the Bay Area. Just because -- this is something that really affects our lives, as students who have lived here our whole lives, such as me. I've lived here for 20 years, my whole life. And I've seen how a lot of the policies that have been implemented have impacted my own life, as a daughter of a single mother and someone whose father was in the Army, just because of how difficult it could be to get around and to access a lot of the resources. And so I really do want that freedom of choice of not being able to -- of not having to drive continuously. I -- I used to nanny, and I worked -- two full-time jobs now. And so driving around and taking my siblings everywhere is just a huge burden on myself and on my family. To implement something like bus rapid transit, that would basically make access to our schools and to our communities -- you would basically be saying that you don't need a car to be an active member of our community, which I don't think should be true. And just in terms of the environmental justice. When I was a nanny, I could see so many of the kids that I worked with would -- are developing asthma and having, basically, a lot of -- sorry. I'm getting really nervous. A lot -- sometimes when we think of these things like environmental justice we kind of see it as a huge theory rather than something that's actively in the lives of a lot of Bay Area residents. So I just want to voice my support for the EEJ plan and for including students, people of color, minorities, disabled folks, in this plan. So thank you so much.

E6-I1

ANARUTH HERNANDEZ:

Hi. My name is Anaruth Hernandez, and I'm with DeAnza. I'm a student at DeAnza school. Go DeAnza. And I just really want to thank you guys for having this plan. I am in support of the plan. I think it's very mindful and thoughtful to try to think ahead. And I really like the gentleman's vision of not just thinking ahead but being innovative with all the resources that we do have here. I would like to voice my, I guess, approval of EEJ, which is the Environment, Equity and Jobs Alternative. I think it is very important. It's a very important aspect of how we move forward, and I think that the Bay Area needs to.

E6-J1

So some of the things that I really like about this plan is affordable housing. And I know that it has a lot of different definitions. To me, it means being able to live in a house, in an apartment, with my two parents. Public transportation, it is very -- it's very important. Without it, my dad would never get to work, which is about a three-hour bus ride. And so on and so forth. I think what I would really like to make sure you guys understand is that the impact is realistic. And not only would my dad not be able to get to work, but my mom wouldn't, either. And I -- they actually leave me the car. So I'm a student. I get to work and take the car and drive to school. And I really like that, but I need -- I need to not be able to have to rely on a car. And there's a lot of opposition against this plan, and I think it's because -- like another gentleman said,

everyone comes from somewhere. Right? And that's just -- that's just how it is. But I can't express how much it means to me that you have these public hearings. And I really hope to participate more. Thank you.

BRIAN DARROW:

**E6-K1** Hi. Good evening. I'm Brian Darrow with Working Partnerships USA, and I'm here to express our support for most of the Plan Bay Area draft. We think the plan is really a step in the right direction. Particularly, we're glad to see that all of the growth is really focused within the existing urban service area, bringing housing and jobs closer together. I think most of us who live in Santa Clara County know that we have vast opportunities to live in low-density suburban communities. I grew up in one. And we'll continue to have those opportunities. What we lack is options for more walkable neighborhoods, with access to transit. So we're glad to see the region starting to plan to invest in that type of growth, in incentivizing cities to move in that direction if they can.

**E6-K2** What we think is missing, however, from the plan are some of the best aspects of the Environment, Equity and Jobs scenario. In particular, we'd urge MTC and ABAG to strengthen the One Bay Area grant program to better encourage anti-displacement and affordable housing policies. It's critical that we don't push out the families that rely most on transit from the areas that are being improved by transit investments.

**E6-K3** Secondly, we'd ask that you prioritize transit operations with future unrestricted funds. And please ensure that the HOT lane network is designed in a way that mitigates the impacts on low-income commuters. And also that we use existing highways rather than spend money on building expanded freeways.

Finally, I'd just like to make the point that we'd like the plan to consider the quality of the jobs that development creates. Unfortunately, one-third of jobs in Silicon Valley now pay less than enough to meet the basic standard for self-sufficiency. In 2000 that was one-fourth of the jobs. So we're moving in the wrong direction. In other words, it's very hard for workers to afford to live here, which increases commute times, it increases traffic congestion, and it lowers quality of life. We'd like to see standards in the plan to encourage using a local work force and encourage jobs that pay sustainable wages that allow folks to afford to live here. Building a strong middle class doesn't just happen by itself. It's the result of conscious policy decisions and long-term planning. So it's important to make sure that our land use and transportation plans consider and promote the creation of quality jobs. Thank you.

**E6-K4**

SUSAN MARSLAND:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am here to support SB 375 and the plan area draft of the plan that we have in front of us tonight that emphasizes housing elements and transportation. This plan does prepare the San Francisco Bay Area as an economic player in a global world. I do have one concern about Target Number 7 on equitable access, and hope that the 10 percent decrease on Page 108 can be raised to help struggling households. And those kinds of households involved all kinds of people, from teachers, police, fire. And we need to do a little bit more to support those people. If you can please incorporate some of the recommendations from the EEJ, which will help also address the gap in equitable access for all people. Thank you. And thank you to the students that came tonight. I have a lot of respect and admiration for you being here. Thank you.

**E6-L1**

JEAN RYAN:

Hi. I'm Jean from Morgan Hill. And I understand where those DeAnza students are coming from, because at one time I was a student and wasn't making -- very little money. But the American dream is to have your own home, and most of these homes are in suburbia. And part of this plan is taking money out of suburbia to finance this regional plan. I downloaded the 1300 pages of this EIB report, and I was able to get through the first 100. And the thing that hasn't been mentioned here is about the vehicle miles driven in your plan. I think eventually you want to impose a tax on people who drive cars and record how many miles they drive and tax them accordingly. To this I find a terrible thing in California, because we're being taxed already. But to tax the miles you are driving? Who is that going to hurt? It's going to hurt low-income people, anybody trying to get to work. I think it's vastly unfair. But this is something that was not mentioned, but it is in your report. Thank you.

**E6-M1**

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE )  
DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA )  
SOLANO COUNTY )

PUBLIC HEARING  
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF  
PROCEEDINGS MONDAY, APRIL 22,  
2013  
SOLANO COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS - MCCORMACK  
HALL

**Comments on DEIR**

Bob Berman

I'm Bob -- I'm Bob Berman and I live in the city of Benicia. And I guess I generally support what I've read so far about the plan.

- E7-A1** My main focus here tonight and my main focus of the work I am doing is to ensure protection of the Bay Area and Solano County's open space and farm lands. So I do have a couple comments. In regards to goal one, which is safeguard and restore the berm and habitats, the plan seems to fall on the protection of open space only as a consequence of development and does not map out strategies or policies that can ensure the berm and protection of conservation lands. The One Bay Area Grant Program directs ten million dollars as a part of a pilot plan to support the priority conservation rights, but I would note that this is only a fraction compared to 310 million dollar investment provided for the priority and voluntary transportation and improvements. So one specific request I would make is to grow the One Bay Area Grant Program, the pilot program, in terms of the priority conservation areas, focus investment from all sources on protecting and managing the high priorities conservation
- E7-A2** lands that are not yet currently protected and this is especially important in Solano County. In terms of agriculture, again, I think the plan does a good job in recognizing the value of agriculture; however, beyond the One Bay Area Grant Program, there are really no measures to ensure the permanent protection of agricultural lands, nor policies and strategies that facilitate the growth and improve deficiencies of that agricultural so agricultural is set. So, again, I think we could be doing better policies and programs. In terms of goal three, which is to provide all Bay Area residents to access of parks and recreational open space, I
- E7-A3** believe that the plan could explicitly call out better our plans to increase parks in urban and suburban areas and to improve access to and the utility of open for recreation. In addition the plan could identify a purchase of increase of residents' and visitors' abilities to access parks and trails by public transportation. And in terms of Solano County, I would note that we have two state parks here in Solano County, both of them in the Vallejo/Benicia area. And one of them certainly, the Benicia state recreation area, but both parks are on the state's original closure of the state parks. And although records are done in the Benicia State Capital Park, the Benicia State Recreation area is certainly is in danger of closing for changed circumstances in the future. And, finally -- so I would just simply say that overall, I think the plan lacks a specific actions of policy needed to ensure long-term protection and investment of the Bay Area's park open space. Thank you.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT – COMMENTS ON DEIR  
PLAN BAY AREA  
SONOMA COUNTY

LLOYD GUCCIONE:

You are blessed, my son. I'm very glad to have heard the speakers who came before me. I'm very glad to have seen Mr. Grabill here and the comments that have been made already. My concerns perhaps are a little bit different. I have problems with regional government concerns. I have problems that the vision, notwithstanding the excellent work that has been done on planning transportation and trying to resolve issues -- I believe it will not resolve the issue. Why? Well, past experience. One time there was one-lane highways. Then there was two. Then three. What happens? Lands values go up. Pressures grow. This is a natural course of events that all of us have witnessed, whether in Southern California, back East or here; here, especially in Sonoma County where I've been since . So well-intended improvements in transportation are going to have outfall, and I believe the mitigation that MTC, that ABAG, that our local representatives will attempt will not be sufficient because they have not been sufficient in the past. That is a concern. In the comment; the equity analysis, EIR alternatives, it the states that "thanks to increased affordable housing production." I am from Guerneville, and I would like to say we had an affordable housing unit, units, put into our area. And one of the reasons given was, it was a necessary allocation from ABAG that Sonoma County have so many, and Guerneville must accept a certain number of units. Now, Guerneville is a long way out of the corridor and the Priority Developments Areas, and yet it will be impacted, as will other outlying areas. It is very, very hard to not have that happen. I would like the Plan to certainly give very good consideration to what will be the impact. Reducing commute times; an important factor. However, it has unintended consequences. I know that your staff, the staff here, everyone, is very, very competent, and the people who spoke before me are knowledgeable. But I don't know if it will suffice because I believe the underlying premise, the paradigm under which it operates, is not doable. Thank you.

ROSA KOIRE:

I'm Rosa Koire. I'm the executive director of the Post Sustainable Institute. One thing that I did notice when I read through the Plan and the EIR was that it looks like you want to bring back redevelopment even though it's been ended in California. You want to bring bank tax increment financing, TIF. And this is really a problem because what it does is it sucks the funds out of the areas that you want to improve for , and years. One other thing I noticed, this Plan is the same plan all across the United States with a major exception. But the Plan is identical to Plan New York, PlanET, PlaniTulsa. It's identical to the Hanoi Center Regional Plan .This is the same Plan all

across the world. You need to take a look at that. And I know you have looked at it because you're elected officials, but the people here, who think they're talking about just the regionalization of the San Francisco Bay Area, are completely uninformed. This Plan is a worldwide plan. This is not some fantasy or a tinfoil hat thing. This is reality. And you need to take a look at it and ask yourself what this is all about. Now, I'd also like to tell you that we will be suing you. Planned Bay Area violates the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. You are not paying just compensation for the rights that you'll be taking, that you are taking through this Plan. Priority Development Areas restrict 100 percent of residential development and 100 percent of commercial development to just a few small areas of the Bay Area, about four percent. Okay? And then what about the rest of the 96 percent of the Bay Area? You're violating the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, that is the Equal Protection Clause. Development rates will be 80 percent higher; eighty times higher within the PDAs. You're also violating the voter-approved Urban Growth Boundary ordinances. They can only be changed with voter approval. This is a violation. Bay Area Plan Bay Area permanently strips all development rights from rural counties in the nine county Bay Area county. You're effectively taking conservation easements on our rural lands without paying for it. Bay Area Plan Bay Area restricts development rights of property within the Priority Development Areas, too, because you will be limiting development to mixed-use high density smart-growth development. If you use form-based code, then your existing building will be nonconforming, legally nonconforming. One other thing I want to say is that cities are supposedly not supposed to have to comply with this, but that is a lie. If your city wants state or federal transportation dollars over the next years, it will have to comply with Plan Bay Area, and cities have already created Priority Development Areas in compliance with Plan Bay Area. To contribute to this lawsuit, and we hope that you will because this is your only opportunity to stop OneBayArea -- Go to [PostSustainabilityInstitute.org](http://PostSustainabilityInstitute.org) and make your checks payable to Post Sustainability Institute. They will go for a legal fund that will only be used to stop OneBayArea. Thank you.

**JENNY BARD:**

Thank you so much for allowing us to comment on the OneBayArea Plan. I am an enthusiastic supporter of the OneBayArea Plan. I support regional planning. I, too, want to echo the comments made by many of the previous speakers; David Grabill, Denny Rosatti, Ann Hancock, Steve Birdlebough, Ginny Doyle and others. Greenhouse gasses are continuing to arise. Regional planning is critical to reducing the public health burden and costs of a car-dependent society; sprawl. This comes from transportive-related air pollution and lack of safe and abiding alternatives to driving. Communities designed around cars and driving are responsible for the traffic pollution and congestion, which contributes to global warming. And this also limits opportunities for healthy, active lifestyles such as walking and cycling; and providing opportunities for our seniors to age in place and not be relying on driving. So the OneBayArea Plan begins to address this. I want to urge you to do more. I think the Plan could do more.

**E8-C1**

There are elements from the Equity, Environment and Jobs Alternative that actually increases investments in active transportation and alternative transportation. There are -- this scenario actually performs the best of all the scenarios, and having a little more information about those plans at these public hearings I think would be very important. Let's see. I'd also like to see a little bit more specificity in the breakdown of expenditures on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure because it was not really evident on the pie charts and as well as the -- what percentage of all the investments are going to increase bicycle and pedestrians usage and what policies will lead to what percentage of trips by bicycles and pedestrians, too. That would be helpful to know. Thank you.

---oOo---

*This page intentionally left blank.*