

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date:	May 13, 2009	Author:	Danielle Griffith
	5:30 pm to 7:00pm		
Meeting Topic:	2009 CTP EIR	Attendees:	Steve Beck – Para transit Driver for Volunteer Wheels Willard Richards – SCTL/CWUSC Zemo Swytink – Sonoma Wildlife/SSU Bill Kortum Steve Birlebough, Friends of SMART
		Staff present:	Janet Spilman, SCTA Seana Gause, SCTA Chris Barney, SCTA Patrick Angell, PMC Danielle Griffith, PMC
Project Number:	28-0114	Cc:	Doug Kim

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

1. **Zemo Swytink - Relationship between the EIR and CTP – if the EIR chooses to remove all analysis of bicycle trails and pedestrian paths would not be in CTP, with the exception of the Ferry service?**
 - a. **Role of the Alternatives in CEQA and why we chose particular alternatives? Why we chose particular ones? If part of Sonoma is one, should alternative have the same analysis of the plan itself? Would consider analysis equally though – if Port is part of the Alternative? Then not part of Alternative?**
 - b. **Do you consider green house impacts imbedded in road improvements or just use of road improvements?**
 - c. **The alternatives and mitigation measures proposed needs all to be things the authority has authority over? So when you say it cannot be mitigated it is mitigation under control of authority? Is there any way this can be approached? Example of water agency – reduced greenhouse gas plan introduced greenhouse gas responses but could not do anything.**
 - d. **Refer to possible greenhouse gas mileage benefits and approved mileage. Vague, considering smart growth and things that people are doing, the improved mileage, improved calculations, mobile emissions and greenhouse gas reduction is state mandated but not looking at it as a constraint in the model.**

7-1

7-2

7-3

7-4

7-5

- e. Who has the authority to establish gas taxes? Is it Bay Area wide to allow for gas taxes? Wasn't it done for the Bay Area – for 10 cents? | 7-6
- 2. **Willard Richards** – Rather pleased with the original plan that were proposed to reach the level of greenhouse gas, then when reading appendix E, were over 25% concluded further than the reduction. | 7-7
 - a. Wouldn't Alternative Number 5 result in an increase that range from 19 to 25%? How do we get the 325,000 gallons per day to get to the 2025? | 7-8
 - b. Where is the best place to get the list of projects and the adopted plan? Is it an overview or does it list specific projects? | 7-9
 - c. As the technician you are required to address the comments? Will you address the comments? What weight do you give to the comments? This is a heavily weighted comment how are you going to do that? Interested in can you do more than (inaudible). What is the recourse if the connect doesn't do that? | 7-10
 - d. Why doesn't the report (talks about reducing emissions) but all the people on the authority have more precise goal for achieving Sonoma County Transportation in the Climate Action Plan? | 7-11
 - e. Greenhouse gas calculations doesn't measure goal of plan and actual impacts. | 7-12
- 3. **Steve Birdlebough** Seems to be a disconnect between what needs to be done and what happens. The alternatives are not weighted enough. There are things that could be alternatives or joint control by someone in Sacramento. | 7-13
 - a. You mentioned the authority has no control over land use and they are integral to each other whereas it was done in the CTP, but the EIR doesn't? | 7-14
 - b. If the rail started five years from now and within five years we have transit oriented and pedestrian oriented with 1,000's of people living that way. You can't account for that in your report? You don't account for greenhouse gas and other potential benefits. On the other hand some of your mitigations state vague things that could be done with some amount of money. You are talking about MTC giving certain amounts of money. | 7-15
- 4. **Steve Beck** - Looking at various impacts in the handout out and it is very vague about what would be done. Looking at impacts and mitigation measures from air quality, some of the mitigation measures are vague and the SCTA can do something about it. I am sure that they will (gives example of bus service reduction and Board of Supervisors) Have mitigation measures that are outside control of SCTA, but then can't consider things outside of SCTA? | 7-16
 - a. Seems like use of public transit other than the train is getting short changed and there is a social impact with the reduction of buses and there are a number of people that won't be able to drive. What about Para transit, see no evidence the HOV lanes do anything to reduce to reduce traffic? | 7-17

3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 7, Public Meeting May 13, 2009, 5:30 to 7:00 pm

- Response 7-1: The Draft EIR evaluates and discloses the physical environmental effects of the full implementation of the proposed CTP as described in Draft EIR Section 3.0. Potential modification of the proposed CTP may require additional environmental review under CEQA depending the extent of the changes.
- Response 7-2: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.6 (Adequacy of Alternatives Analysis and Additional Alternatives to be Evaluated) regarding how the range of alternatives were selected as well as Draft EIR Appendix G and Section 4.0 that identifies which alternatives include Port Sonoma project.
- Response 7-3: The commenter should note that the Draft EIR evaluates the GHG emission impacts associated with the full implementation of the proposed CTP (construction and operation) (see Draft EIR pages 5.0-21 through -26).
- Response 7-4: Various projects contained within the 2009 CTP are not under the jurisdiction of the SCTA, and the SCTA does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on other jurisdictions. Thus, specific mitigation cannot be provided at the Program EIR level of analysis because project- and site-specific impacts cannot be identified. The commenter is referred to Master Response (3.4.2 Jurisdiction and Role of SCTA) and Master Response 3.4.5(Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts) regarding feasibility of SCTA to implement some mitigation measures.
- Response 7-5: The new fuel economy standards are included in the revised Cumulative Impacts Section 5.0., where vehicle fuel use could decrease due to significant improvements in fuel economy mandated by federal requirement and particularly by State Pavley regulations. These technological requirements will help reduce and even reverse the growth in reliance on petroleum-based fossil fuels that are not renewable in their nature. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts, Master Response 3.4.2 (Role and Jurisdiction of the SCTA) as well as Draft EIR edits provided in Section 4.0 of this document that provides updated fuel consumption estimates (including estimates for the Draft EIR alternatives) that utilize future fuel economy assumptions that were used in GHG emission estimates in the Draft EIR.
- Response 7-6: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.2 (Jurisdiction and Role of the SCTA) and Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts).
- Response 7-7: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.5(Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts) as well as Draft EIR edits provided in Section 4.0 of this document that provides updated fuel consumption estimates (including estimates for the Draft EIR alternatives) that utilize future fuel economy assumptions that were used in GHG emission estimates in the Draft EIR.

3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

- Response 7-8: Alternative 5 is the only Alternative that comes close to meeting the GHG reduction emissions goals, however there are programs contained within the Alternative 5 that are outside of the jurisdiction of the SCTA and are not able to be directly implemented as part of the 2009 CTP. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts) as well as Draft EIR edits provided in Section 4.0 of this document that provides updated fuel consumption estimates (including estimates for the Draft EIR alternatives) that utilize future fuel economy assumptions that were used in GHG emission estimates in the Draft EIR.
- Response 7-9: The existing CTP is available from SCTA. Draft EIR Section 3.0 provides a list of projects associated with the proposed CTP and Section 4.0 includes project list for the Draft EIR alternatives.
- Response 7-10: All comments provided during the public meetings and submitted during the public comment period are reviewed and responded to herein. There is no preferential determination or weight given to any comments, all are reviewed and responded to accordingly.
- Response 7-11: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts) and Master Response 3.4.2 (Jurisdiction and Role of the SCTA)
- Response 7-12: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.3 (Commitment of Funds), 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts) and Response to Comment 2-2.
- Response 7-13: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.2 (Jurisdiction and Role of the SCTA) and Master Response 3.4.6 (Adequacy of Alternatives Analysis and Additional Alternatives to be Evaluated) regarding how the range of alternatives were selected and evaluated, as well as Section 6.0 of the Draft EIR for the analysis of alternatives.
- Response 7-14: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.4 (Program EIR/Level of Detail) and Master Response 3.4.2 (Jurisdiction and Role of the SCTA).
- Response 7-15: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.3 (Commitment of Funds), Master Response 3.4.2 (Jurisdiction and Role of the SCTA) and Master Response 3.4.5 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts).
- Response 7-16: The commenter is referred to Master Response 3.4.4 (Program EIR/Level of Detail). Also, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measures that are feasible for SCTA to implement (though some require coordination with other agencies) and meet the requirements for mitigation under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4.
- Response 7-17: Comment noted. The commenter's statements are not related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR and no further response is required.