

MEETING MINUTES

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	May 13, 2009	<b>Author:</b>	Danielle Griffith
	3:00 pm to 4:30 pm		
<b>Meeting Topic:</b>	2009 CTP EIR	<b>Attendees:</b>	Robert B. Tanner Ann Hancock – Climate Protection Campaign Grace Schulman Alan Strachan Alejandro Peres
		<b>Staff present:</b>	Janet Spilman, SCTA Seana Gause, SCTA Chris Barney, SCTA Patrick Angell, PMC Danielle Griffith, PMC
<b>Project Number:</b>	28-0114	<b>Cc:</b>	Doug Kim

This memo summarizes the CTP EIR’s Public Meeting for comment on the DEIR.

1. **SPEAKER?** Why isn’t CO<sub>2</sub> examined in the EIR? Under the Energy summary there is increased consumption but doesn’t convert into CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent. | 6-1
  - a. Is there a bottom line comparison of CTP implementation and 1990, existing v. 1990 conditions? Comes within AB 32 window, where we will hit the cap, CO<sub>2</sub> transportation related? | 6-2
  - b. Is there a problem with AB 32 1990 and gap we are going to hit? | 6-3
  - c. If the EIR shows we are not hitting it, does it jeopardize the AB 32? | 6-4
  - d. Does the EIR show the AB 32 cap? Makes no contribution with requirements towards the cap. | 6-5
  
2. **Robert B. Tanner** - The Do Everything Alternative. Environment and greenhouse gas not particular are and area wide transportation issues and intersections. Just want to make sure dealing with it correctly because I am only dealing with one part of the pie and there are other issues, pedestrians, bikes. | 6-6
  
3. **Ann Hancock** – What if the EIR highlights failing of the CTP, what can you do? | 6-7
  - a. The comments on the EIR open the door to the CTP? | 6-8
  - b. Is it okay that the EIR looks at the financially constrained list of projects? | 6-9

## MEETING MINUTES

---

- c. Do you not necessarily have to provide benefits or analysis of the Alternatives? | **6-10**
- d. Impacts are derived from financially constrained list of projects but there are alternatives as well? | **6-11**
- e. Did you define what financially constrained is? | **6-12**
- f. On slide six (of presentation) when it lists goals of the CTP, I think that some of the goals conflict. | **6-13**
- g. On slide 13, lists milestones, what happens then? And then when you're done does it go before the SCTA board? Then what happens? | **6-14**
- h. On slide 15, significant unavoidable environmental impacts – is this a highlight? | **6-15**
- i. Or favorite significant unavoidable impacts – what about greenhouse gas emissions? Can you detail more – I find the math hard to grasp? | **6-16**
- j. New terms? – Tiered and streamlines, and how it relates to the RTP, Sonoma County General Plan and City General Plans. – So is it tiered and streamlined a consistency thing? How does what we are saying here and the EIR, you said GP, with the RTP isn't? Does it mean finish one and they adopt it? What is the relationship between the two the CTP and RTP? Has the RATP been adopted? | **6-17**
- k. Letter from Attorney General's office, October 1008, related to the RTP? Are some of the new things coming out of the AG's office did the document consider this? The interpretation of AB scoping plan and AG's perspective? | **6-18**
- l. Would that also be true for the EPA position? But there are characteristics/data doesn't change the conclusion. | **6-19**
- m. What about GHG and EPA finding that it does affect health? | **6-20**
- n. Transportation and design and greenhouse gases? | **6-21**
- o. What kind of overriding are the SCTA going to have to find in the findings? What will it take? | **6-22**
- p. Ultimately it just has to be a vote of the Board? And then if someone wants to sue can they? | **6-23**
- q. Doesn't that make the EIR vulnerable to attack in terms of the way it is laid out? | **6-24**

### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

---

#### Letter 6, Public Meeting May 13, 2009, 3:00 to 4:30 pm

- Response 6-1: Climate change and GHG emission impacts are addressed in Draft EIR Section 5.0 (Cumulative Impacts). The commenter is also referred to Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts) regarding updated fuel consumption estimates that are now consistent with future fuel economy assumptions used in the Draft EIR GHG emission estimates.
- Response 6-2: The CTP is a long range planning document and the EIR is a Program EIR. Analysis of previous 1990 conditions is outside the cope of this Draft EIR as specifically noted in State CEQA Guidelines 15125(a). The environmental baseline conditions for an EIR analysis is as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation is released, rather than a previous date. The Draft EIR provides an analysis of greenhouse gas emissions in Section 5.4 and is based on whether the CTP would be inconsistent with State efforts to address climate change (AB 32).
- Response 6-3: The commenter is referred to Response to Comment 6-2 and Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts).
- Response 6-4: The commenter is also referred to Response to Comment 6-2 and Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts).
- Response 6-5: The commenter is referred to Response to Comment 6-2 and Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts).
- Response 6-6: Comment noted. Draft EIR Alternative 5 includes transportation improvements, transit improvements, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, land use and pricing strategies (see Draft EIR Appendix G and Section 4.0).
- Response 6-7: The commenter is also referred to Master Response 3.4.5(Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts). The SCTA Board of Directors may consider Alternatives to the proposed 2009 CTP as part of its consideration to adopt the CTP.
- Response 6-8: The commenter is also referred to Master Response 3.4.5(Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts). The SCTA Board of Directors may consider Alternatives to the 2009 CTP as part of its consideration to adopt the CTP.
- Response 6-9: The commenter is referred to Draft EIR page 3.0-9, Overview of the 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan, specifically paragraph one which states:

*The 2009 CTP is a multi-modal transportation plan that articulates how Sonoma County's transportation infrastructure (e.g., streets, highways, transit systems, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities) will be maintained and improved over the next 25 years. The CTP is financially constrained to project transportation revenues that are reasonably expected to be available over the 25-year planning*

### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

---

*period. However, the CTP may also include a set of illustrative transportation projects that would have benefits if additional revenue is secured in the future.*

The Draft EIR project description and environmental analysis are conservatively based on projects and improvements that are feasible for SCTA to implement.

Response 6-10: Table 6.0-21, Summary of Alternatives Comparison, compares each Alternative against the 2009 CTP and provide information on whether there will be a less than significant impact, significant impact comparable with the proposed project, significant impact, with more potential impacts than the proposed project or a significant impact, with less potential impacts than the proposed project.

Response 6-11: The commenter is referred to page 6.0-30 through 6.0-63 of the Draft EIR. This section analyzes the Alternatives and compares the impacts associated with the proposed project against the Alternatives impacts. Moreover, Table 6.0-21, Summary of Alternatives Comparison, compares each Alternative against the 2009 CTP and provides information on whether there will be a less than significant impact, significant impact comparable with the proposed project, significant impact, with more potential impacts than the proposed project or a significant impact, with less potential impacts than the proposed project.

Response 6-12: The commenter is referred to page 3.0-1, first paragraph of the Draft EIR. Specifically the text states:

*The project is financially constrained, includes capital highway and transit improvements listed in the Measure M Strategic Plan, constrained programs identified in the MTC's pending Transportation 2035 Plan, and includes trend-based assumptions for growth and pricing of the transportation system.*

Draft EIR Section 3.0 also provides list of what projects are included in the proposed CTP.

Response 6-13: Since no comments on the analysis of the Draft EIR are provided, no further response is required.

Response 6-14: The SCTA will prepare written responses to comments received during the public comment period and include them in the Final EIR, the Draft EIR will then be presented to the SCTA Board for certification under State CEQA Guidelines.

Response 6-15: The commenter is correct, the slide summarizes the findings of the DEIR of the significant unavoidable impacts.

Response 6-16: The commenter is referred to Section 5.0 Cumulative Impacts, specifically pages 5.0-20 through 5.0-26, which addresses impacts from implementation of the proposed project on global climate change. The

### **3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR**

---

Draft EIR found the proposed CTP would not have any significant unavoidable impacts on global climate change.

- Response 6-17: The commenter is referred to Section 3.0, Overview of the 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan, specifically pages 3.0-16 through 3.0-17 which describes how subsequent lead agencies can streamline subsequent environmental assessments by “tiering” from the Program EIR by incorporating relevant discussion by reference and concentrating on issues specific to the later project that were not addressed in this document. The commenter is referred to page 3.0-9 for a discussion of the relationship between the CTP and the RTP, which notes that projects within the proposed CTP are incorporated into the 2009 RTP. The Draft EIR does utilize the environmental impact analysis provided in the Sonoma County General Plan Update EIR, while the traffic analysis for the proposed CTP is based on land uses set forth in local general plans (including the Sonoma County General Plan).
- Response 6-18: The Draft EIR analysis of climate change was based on review of guidance provided by the California Attorney General’s office and is similar to the conclusions of the MTC 2009 RTP Final EIR regarding climate change.
- Response 6-19: The CTP and Draft EIR’s analysis of climate change is consistent with the recent guidance on addressing climate change as part of the environmental review process under CEQA, including recommendations provided in the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research technical advisory entitled “CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review” (June 2008). While not a general plan, the proposed CTP is also generally consistent with the recommended transportation, VMT reduction, transit improvement and pedestrian and bicycle policies identified in the California Air Pollution Control Officer Association’s “Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans” (June 2009).
- Response 6-20: The environmental effects of climate change are anticipated to result in health effects. Draft EIR pages 5.0-11 through -16 specifically notes the environmental effects from climate change that are anticipated to impact transportation facilities in Sonoma County.
- Response 6-21: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.5(Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts).
- Response 6-22: CEQA Findings of Fact that will be prepared and adopted for CTP approval will need to identify project benefits that outweigh the anticipated significant environmental effects identified in the Draft EIR as provided for under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.
- Response 6-23: The comment is referred to Response to Comment 6-22.
- Response 6-24: SCTA considers the Draft EIR adequate and meets the requirements of CEQA.